



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, December 13, 1971 - Friday, December 17, 1971

Index

**A detailed index by subjects and speakers
appears at the back of this volume.**



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, December 13, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday, December 13, 1971, being the first day of the first session of the 29th 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.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1971

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

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House, took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I am commanded by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to state that he does not see fit to declare the causes of the summoning of the present Legislature of this province until a Speaker of this House shall have been chosen according to law; but today, at a subsequent hour, His Honour will declare the causes of the calling of this Legislature.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Clerk of the House: Members of the legislative assembly, it is my duty to call upon you to elect one of your number to preside over your deliberations as Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Perhaps, Mr. Clerk, this motion will provoke some more positive response from across the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Mr. R. F. Nixon, (Leader of the Opposition) that the hon. member for the electoral district of Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) take the chair of this House as Speaker.

Clerk of the House: Are there any further nominations?

I therefore declare the nominations closed and declare the Hon. Allan E. Reuter to be the Speaker of this assembly.

Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable members, the privilege of serving you as Speaker carries with it the responsibility to protect the rights and the privileges of each one of you. There are other important responsibilities, of course, and I am fully aware of all of them, but I am particularly conscious of my duties to each member of this assembly. It will be my

main concern to protect those rights at all times and to see that no member is denied his full parliamentary privileges.

I have reviewed the history and the tradition that applies to the office of Speaker and I found it not only interesting but quite informative and explanatory as regards some of the present customs.

I have great respect for the philosophy that has carried those ancient customs over the years to the parliaments of the present-day. It will be my intention to preserve and carry out those customs during by term of office. I am honoured deeply at being elected to this very high office and, before I proceed to the chair, I want to express my appreciation to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Leader of the Opposition and my sincere gratitude to all hon. members for their expression of confidence.

This House will now adjourn during pleasure.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor then re-entered the House, 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 have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me.

If, in the performance of these duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me and not to the assembly whose servant I am and who through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and country, hereby claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your person at all reasonable times and that their proceedings may receive from you the most favourable consideration.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to declare to you that he freely confides in the duty and attachment of the assembly to Her Majesty's person and government and not doubting that the proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temperance and prudence, he grants and upon all occasions will recognize and allow the constitutional privileges.

I am commanded also to assure you that the assembly shall have ready access to His Honour upon all suitable occasions and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from him the most favourable consideration.

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

On behalf of our Sovereign, I extend congratulations to the Prime Minister and his ministry, as well as a special welcome to those hon. members who attend their first session of the Legislature.

During this first session of the twenty-ninth Parliament of Ontario, the government will place before you its supplementary estimates incorporating many special programmes to alleviate winter unemployment and other expenditure designed to reinforce the positive economic impact of the budget. You will also be asked to approve amendments to The Income Tax Act to implement tax reductions to further increase demand in the economy; changes in the province's Succession Duty Act and The Corporations Tax Act; and legislation to reduce the burden of health insurance premiums.

Bills will also be introduced to implement changes in pension legislation. Finally, you will be asked to approve legislation concerning the structure of government.

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: We have with us today in the Speaker's gallery a very important and dignified guest in the person of Sir Peter Hayman, the high commissioner of the United Kingdom in Canada.

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.)

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, the Lieutenant Governor, transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1972, and recommends them to the legislative assembly; Toronto, December 13, 1971.

I beg to inform the House that Mr. R. F. Nixon, member for Brant, is recognized as the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

I also beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the chief election officer and laid upon the table the roll of the members elected at the general election of 1971.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Sir, on a question of privilege? The privilege to which I refer, sir, is the right of the members of this House to an honest election, properly run. It is my submission, sir, that in the three ridings of St. Andrew-St. Patrick, Lambton and Humber, such an election did not take place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Down you go.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, their voice, if not their wit, has improved.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Johnston: See who is here, eh? My, the hon. member is going to hear from us.

Mr. Shulman: There are many people who regret that in the member's own riding.

Sir, I submit to you that between these three ridings, practices occurred which were improper, unfair, dishonest and corrupt. Sir, may I ask that the election in these three ridings be referred by you, as the guarantor

and keeper of our rights and privileges, to the committee on elections and privileges, when struck, for a full examination of the facts, for the following reasons, sir.

In the riding of St. Andrew-St. Patrick, which is the most serious of the three involved, there have been 18 violations of different sections of The Election Act and there is, in addition, evidence of corrupt practices in the fact that in eight polls one or more cases of impersonation occurred. Impersonations are recorded in polls 10b, 11b, 15, 20, 23, 31, 44 and 91.

In addition, at poll 10a two persons voted who had already voted in the advance poll. The deputy returning officer permitted them to vote, despite the fact that they were not listed in 10a, but in 10b. One person was listed and voted in 10b and was also permitted to vote in 10a.

There is an unexplained vote discrepancy at poll 87 where more ballots are shown as having been cast than are listed in the poll book. According to the poll book there were 451 voters. The official return shows 453 votes, while a document in the poll book, the statement of the poll, signed by the officials and scrutineers, declares that 459 ballots were counted.

In a large number of cases the forms in the poll book were not filled out at all. No statement of the poll was completed in the books for poll 10a, 10b, 20, 26b, 37, 52, 65, 69, 72, 81, 83, 86, 96, 98 and advance poll 3.

In one poll the New Democratic scrutineer was threatened with arrest for requesting challenges according to the provisions of The Election Act, and at another poll the scrutineers were prevented by the deputy returning officer from carrying out their duties.

The enumeration was done so defectively as to contribute to prejudicing the result of the election. Whole buildings were passed over in the preliminary list, especially student and group residences.

Special enumerators, and the returning officer himself, repeatedly failed to keep appointments they had made. The returning officer several times refused to give voters evidence of their registration. After promising to hire extra enumerators brought to his office by the New Democratic Party to help clear up a backlog of several hundred names, he refused to do so; but did later hire further enumerators but only through the Conservative candidate's office.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Shame!

Mr. Shulman: More important, sir, at least 11 polls were visited by two men purporting to represent the returning officer, and the scrutineers were ordered to leave the polls while discussions took place between one of these men and the DRO.

In poll 40, one of these polls, the scrutineer, immediately after being allowed to re-enter the poll, noticed the corner of a ballot caught in the lid of the ballot box. As you know, sir, ballots are not put in through the edge of the lid. This strongly suggests, sir, improper tampering with the ballot box in the absence of the scrutineers who were improperly required to leave.

The total of votes cast for the winning candidate in these polls was greater than the difference between the winning candidate and the runner-up, sir.

Mr. Bullbrook: Where was the Premier that day?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where was I?

Mr. Shulman: Also in poll 10a, the NDP scrutineer was required to leave by the returning officer. It should be noted that in all of these polls the polling clerk was not appointed from a list supplied by the Liberal candidate as provided in section 56.

Sir, I suggest to you that the results of this investigation are prima facie evidence for the non-seating of the man at present seated as coming from this riding. In any case, the matter should certainly be referred to the committee on privileges and elections.

In the riding of Lambton, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Johnston: Get him, Lorne, get him!

Mr. W. Hodgson (North York): That is what you get.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: One, the \$50-per-person payment under the supplementary tax assistance for the elderly was paid in the old people's homes on election day by coincidence. Twilight Haven in Petrolia is such a home and had its own polling station. A new \$50 bill was handed to each person as they went to get their voting ballot with the words, "This comes from Mr. Davis."

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That was generous!

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The member for Lambton is proud of that achievement, is he?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, he can certainly afford it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know I couldn't.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a somewhat lengthy statement pertaining to the election. He still has not indicated what he believes is his point of privilege. I would ask him to state at the first instance when he rises again what is the point of privilege that he sees.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: My point of privilege, sir, is that one of the privileges—perhaps the most important privilege—of the members of this House is that they are entitled to an honest election, and in those three ridings an honest election did not take place.

An hon. member: The member got one.

Mr. Speaker: It would seem to me that the hon. member has stated what he believes to be a point of privilege. It is not necessary for him to continue to enumerate all of the items as he has been doing. If he will be good enough to provide me with a copy of what he has set forth, I will consider it.

But I must point out to him that, first of all, it obviously cannot be referred to the committee on privileges and elections because no committees have yet been established. Second, the hon. member knows full well, I am sure, that he can issue a writ in the Supreme Court to take up this particular matter.

If he will provide me with a copy of his complaints, I will be glad to consider them.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, I will do that, but I wish to point out I asked that it be referred to the committee when struck. The reason it is not being referred to the Supreme Court—there are two reasons, but the most important one is that the Supreme Court would only entertain successfully such a complaint if there was proof available that the number of votes dishonestly or improperly cast were greater than the majority. Unfortunately, sir, this is not the case. However, as the guardian of our privileges, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I am suggesting to you that other action is required, and it is required in this House.

Mr. Speaker: I will be glad to consider the hon. member's submission and make a ruling on it as soon as is possible.

Mr. Johnston: Yes, in about five years.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): There is the next cabinet minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, speaking before the orders of the day to the matter of the supplementary estimates and certain matters which will follow, I have the honour to introduce to the Legislature on behalf of the new government of Ontario important changes in our ongoing fiscal policies. These changes consist of supplementary estimates and certain taxation measures which together represent a deliberate adjustment in our budgetary position in the light of changing economic conditions.

This year the Ontario government has made decisive moves in the area of economic stabilization policies of an order never before undertaken. In our policy initiatives we have made a concerted effort to anticipate future economic trends and to offset emerging economic weaknesses.

The emergence of the expanded provincial role is the inevitable outcome of the growth in our fiscal responsibilities and the increasing importance of the provincial-municipal sector in the national economy. Acceptance of this responsibility means that we must use our fiscal resources and maintain the necessary flexibility to keep policy in step with economic reality.

The expansionary measures of our April budget have been reinforced by additional discretionary tax and expenditure measures to bolster economic growth. I would like to provide today, prior to the House dealing with supplementary estimates, some explanatory remarks on these actions and to place them in the context of the evolving economic situation.

The Ontario economy has been performing well below its full potential for some time. This year alone, I estimate that about \$1.5 billion in output and over 70,000 jobs have been lost because of the underperformance of the economy.

In its 1970 budget the Ontario government advanced the view that a three per cent unemployment level is a reasonable target for the Ontario economy. By contrast, actual experience in the last two years has been very disappointing, and I need not detail here the degree to which federal fiscal and monetary policies were responsible for this.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Why is the Treasurer hesitating?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Here we go again.

Mr. Reid: Play the record again.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will read that sentence again, Mr. Speaker.

I need not detail here the degree to which federal fiscal and monetary policies were responsible for this.

An hon. member: They were not going to do it. If they wanted to do it, all they had to do was do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do members know the electorate did that on the twenty-first? They did it for them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I now estimate that real growth in 1971, at 5.5 per cent, will be close to my earlier anticipations, but unemployment, at 5.3 per cent, will be higher than I had forecast.

Next year I am hopeful that real economic growth will be in the range of six per cent. However, unemployment will continue to be a problem. Members may recall that it took almost four years after the last major recession to bring the economy back to full employment. This time with concerted government efforts the recovery period can probably be shortened. The most recent outlook for 1972 convinces me that unemployment will improve gradually, and hopefully the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment in Ontario may decline to 4.5 per cent by the end of next year.

The government of Ontario moved in its April, 1971, budget to create an expansionary environment for the private sector, and there can be no doubt that without these policies the economic situation in Ontario would be significantly worse than it is today. I would remind members that we have had no increases in provincial taxes for over two years. On the contrary, our budgetary policies have been made progressively more expansionary in order to cushion the impact of federal deflationary measures. During this time, we have also increased significantly the level of tax relief to local taxpayers.

In the past two years we have refined and strengthened the Ontario government's ability to provide strong measures of economic stabilization. The full-employment budgeting technique is now a normal part of our budgetary policy apparatus and provides econ-

omic guidelines to indicate the degree of expansionary thrust in our fiscal policies. This year the government has again introduced a wide range of selective seasonal employment programmes. Our operational experience with these programmes is accumulating rapidly and is being actively used to improve their effectiveness.

On the federal-provincial front we have pushed hard for an improved system of fiscal policy co-ordination. In this regard, I am tabling two documents today. The first paper, "The Reconstruction of Economic and Fiscal Policy Co-ordination in Canada", contains a set of definitive proposals for improved intergovernmental economic and fiscal policy co-ordination, which we presented to the meeting of ministers of finance on November 1. The second paper, presented to the meeting of first ministers on November 15, by the Prime Minister of Ontario, specified detailed points requiring federal action and clarification; it is called, "Questions on Federal-Provincial Economic Co-operation".

In our discussions with Ottawa we have obtained agreement in principle to an annual review by ministers of finance of economic progress and targets, and to the establishment of a more systematic intergovernmental review of seasonal employment programmes.

I would now like to review the basic fiscal plan which I introduced in my April budget. Let me emphasize that the overall fiscal plan for 1971-1972 has not changed in its objective: that is, the continuing expansion of the economy and a substantial improvement in the unemployment situation. The changes to our original fiscal programme have been made deliberately to reinforce its fiscal thrust.

Members will no doubt remember that my budget of April of this year called for a deficit of \$415 million. It is also important to recall in my basic fiscal plan the emphasis on tax reductions rather than increases in expenditures. While discretionary increases in expenditures were made to relieve seasonal unemployment, the key element in the plan was the five per cent corporate investment tax credit. The tax credit was introduced to shore up business-sector confidence and investment, especially in manufacturing, which employs over a quarter of Ontario's labour force. This fiscal initiative was based on our own economic analysis and was subsequently reinforced by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics survey of investment intentions.

In my April budget I stressed that despite the maximum utilization of our resources we

could not expect to accomplish full employment by ourselves. The success of our policies depends on the fiscal and monetary policy support of the government of Canada. Consequently, the Ontario government recommended the followings steps to the federal government: elimination of the federal three per cent temporary income surtaxes; reduction of long-term interest rates; and lowering of the external value of the Canadian dollar.

The federal income tax surtaxes bore more heavily in Ontario than in the rest of Canada and consequently had a much greater restrictive impact on incomes and demand in this province. It was for this reason that we advocated their removal in December, 1970, and in subsequent months. The federal government's decision to remove these surtaxes in its June, 1971, budget was therefore very welcome. A modest reduction in long-term interest rates has occurred in recent months but unfortunately, as members are aware, the continuing high value of the Canadian dollar remains a great concern.

Despite federal and provincial actions, further ongoing provincial action has been necessary in view of the continuing rise in unemployment and the uncertainties caused by the recent economic measures by the United States. Consequently, on October 8 the Prime Minister of Ontario announced a two-part plan for further economic stimulation involving the balanced use of tax reductions and selective expenditure increases. Before explaining these changes in detail I shall briefly review their overall impact on the budget.

The changes from our original budget plan will result in an increase in the budgetary deficit for the current fiscal year to \$553 million. The increase of \$138 million in the budgetary deficit from April results from a relatively small increase—

Mr. Sargent: Now he tells us—after the election. He tells us now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —of \$36 million in revenues and an increase in expenditures of \$174 million. Expenditures are now forecast at \$4,436 million. The bulk of the expenditure increase is in the form of discretionary outlays to expand the economic thrust of government fiscal operations and to meet higher welfare costs as a result of high unemployment.

The broad dimensions of the province's revised fiscal plan for 1971-1972 are shown in the accompanying table.

ONTARIO'S REVISED FISCAL PLAN

(Millions of dollars)

	Original 1970-1971 actual	Original 1971-1972 budget	Revised 1971-1972 budget
Net general revenue	3,752	3,847	3,883
Net general expenditure	3,846	4,262	4,436
Budgetary deficit	(94)	(415)	(553)

I am confident that the expanded thrust of this revised plan combined with the parallel increase in federal expansionary actions will give a substantial boost to output and employment in the year ahead.

Now I would like to explain more fully our specific expenditure and tax actions.

First, I shall discuss the government's revised expenditure plan. This increase in spending over the April budget forecast is basically divided into two parts. The most significant portion relates to the general economic situation. This includes our direct winter employment stimulation programme, the acceleration of other capital works undertaken earlier in the year because of economic conditions, and increased welfare payments. Together these items account for over \$80 million of the expenditure increases.

The revised expenditures also cover a variety of other discretionary actions taken by the government since last April, including provision for the elimination of pensioners' health insurance premiums, increased capital subsidies to Metropolitan Toronto for subway construction, additional grants to regional governments, accelerated purchasing of recreational land, and other items which are detailed in the supplementary estimates. The total supplementary estimates tabled today cover gross expenditures of \$173 million. Full details on the revised expenditure plans of the government are contained in the financial statements in Appendix B of this statement.

In advancing this—

Mr. Sargent: The same pre-election promises.

Hon. Mr. Keough: —this additional spending for 1971-1972, let me emphasize that the government has not departed from its objective of rigorously restraining growth in the size of the civil service. I am pleased to announce that we have been successful in realizing this goal, as shown in Appendix B

of my report, even though our programmes have been significantly expanded.

Before describing our expanded winter employment programme, I shall briefly review the previous actions taken by the government to increase temporary employment.

Last winter our policy was implemented through the Ontario seasonal employment programme and the municipal employment incentive programme. I can now report that both were successful in terms of providing productive work for the maximum number of people and reducing the numbers on welfare.

The 697 municipalities which participated in the municipal employment incentive programme provided a total of almost 300,000 man-days of work, or an average of two months' employment for over 7,000 men. The intensified summer programme resulted in the employment of over 16,000 students at a cost of \$18.9 million.

It is my view, was my view and continues to be my view, that the best way to restore full employment is through tax cuts which encourage investment and the expansion of private-sector activity. Expenditure increases, however, if adopted on a selective and prudent basis, can play a special and important role in the direct relief of seasonal unemployment. Based on our encouraging experience with the early 1971 programmes and our determination to do everything possible to relieve the hardship of unemployment, the government decided in late summer to significantly expand and diversify temporary expenditure increases.

Past experience with the Ontario and federal seasonal employment programmes indicates that there should be an emphasis on municipalities and other local bodies, because they have greater sensitivity to local employment conditions and project possibilities. Our experience also indicates the need for strong incentives such as grants and forgiveness provisions since they maximize the municipalities' ability to participate. Finally, it is evident that capital works should be relied upon only to the extent that they can be immediately accelerated into the winter period. With this in mind, the government established the following programme selection guidelines:

1. Maximum impact on peak unemployment months and on removing people from the welfare rolls.

2. Consistency with overall government policy and budgetary priorities, including public-sector spending restraint and minimum pressure on the local tax base; and

3. Administrative flexibility and simplicity, with fast commencement and phase-out of projects.

On the basis of these guidelines, the programmes advanced by the government will provide a seasonal expenditure pattern which will work positively to reduce unemployment this winter. At the same time, the temporary nature of these expenditures means that there will be little or no permanent addition to public sector expenditures.

The outline of our programmes was announced by the Prime Minister on October 8, and subsequently other ministers have announced details of particular programmes. I am now in position to give the members a full description of our policies.

The amount allocated to the municipal employment incentive programme has been increased from \$7.5 million in 1970-1971 to \$35 million, of which \$25 million is included in the 1971-1972 supplementary estimates. The remaining \$10 million will be spent in 1972-1973.

In addition, through consultation with the provincial-municipal liaison committee, the administrative terms and conditions of the programme have been made considerably more flexible and generous this year. Increased grants, based on the relative burden of welfare caseloads, are available to all municipalities and the length of the programme has been extended to six months.

These grants have been extended to cover materials, supervisory and other indirect labour costs, up to 25 per cent of the direct labour costs. Any reasonable project, geared to providing additional employment this winter, will qualify, including projects involving clerical and technical people as well as manual labour. It is further proposed that municipalities be permitted to perform work on private property, with the agreement of the owners, in order to increase the number of qualifying projects.

The programme will also be broadened this year to include school boards and other local boards and commissions. With the exception of school boards and conservation authorities, boards and commissions will make their applications through municipal councils. Mr. Speaker, with the large expansion and increased flexibility of this programme, we anticipate that as many as 30,000 temporary jobs will be created over the next six months.

Mr. Sargent: Why not make it 70,000 like the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman) did?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Ontario seasonal employment programme has also been enlarged significantly—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): What is the member for Grey-Bruce doing back there?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Last winter it involved four departments and expenditures of slightly over \$8 million. This winter, nine departments will participate in administering 16 individual projects with total expenditures now estimated at over \$23 million. Projects will include: improvement of parks, forestry and wildlife resources and conservation authority lands; removal of dead elm trees along highways; accelerated maintenance projects undertaken by The Departments of Public Works and Correctional Services and the Ontario Housing Corporation; and special youth programmes to be administered by The Departments of the Environment and Social and Family Services.

We estimate that the Ontario seasonal employment programme will provide over 10,000 temporary jobs. In addition, The Department of Labour will increase its subsidies for on-the-job training to produce an estimated 3,000 additional training places in industry.

On October 8, the government further enriched its programme for capital works acceleration in order to concentrate construction activity in the coming winter period. In addition to the planned acceleration of projects by The Departments of Public Works and Transportation and Communications, a further number of capital works were approved for immediate action.

These include projects by The Department of Public Works; a \$10 million programme for the construction of day nurseries; and the utilization of accelerated Central Mortgage funds by the Ontario Housing Corporation. I anticipate that the combined effect of these accelerated capital programmes will result in an additional \$30 million being expended in the 1971-1972 fiscal year, of which a substantial portion will be concentrated in the winter period.

This is an appropriate point, Mr. Speaker, to outline Ontario's participation in the federal-provincial employment loans programme which was announced by the federal government on October 14. Ontario has been allocated \$28 million for capital investment projects up to March 31, 1973. Funds may be applied to provincial or municipal projects accelerated within 1971-1972, or to projects

already included in the budget for the current fiscal year in return for a commitment to accelerate projects next year with a corresponding capital value. The loans will contain a forgiveness provision equal to 75 per cent of the on-site direct labour costs incurred during the period November 1, 1971, to May 31, 1972. It is our intention to participate fully in this federal programme.

These funds have been offered first to Ontario municipalities and the province will use any unallocated balance. We are now in the process of finalizing the agreement with Ottawa and by the end of January, I expect to announce the full details of Ontario's participation in this programme.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined the Ontario government's programme to increase employment in Ontario over the next five to six months. I would emphasize that the government will be continually monitoring the progress of our policies as they affect the employment situation. We will maintain a flexible stance and adjustments will be made as they become necessary.

Let me now proceed to the tax actions the Ontario government intends to legislate. We are introducing measures in four areas. First, we are implementing the personal income tax cuts already announced for the 1971 and 1972 taxation years. Second, we are presenting revised legislation to give effect to the health premium reductions announced in September. Third, we are amending our corporations tax to ensure that federal employment support grants will not be taxable by Ontario. Fourth, we are introducing major changes in our succession duties to go into effect on January 1, 1972, when the federal government vacates the field of death taxation.

I would remind members that on October 8 the Prime Minister of Ontario called for federal income tax reductions to stimulate economic revival and offered to join the federal government in implementing a complementary provincial cut in personal income taxation. Therefore, let me commend the federal government for moving to reduce personal and corporate income taxes in its October 14 budget. We have worked out with the federal government the mechanics of a parallel Ontario tax cut and are now in a position to put it into effect.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is known as patronizing the federal government.

An hon. member: It took them six days.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: —three dollars a week.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Ontario personal income tax will take effect in two distinct stages. The first stage consists of a 3.6 per cent tax cut for the six-month period from July 1, 1971, to December 31, 1971, at a revenue cost of \$22 million. Because this retroactive tax could not be incorporated into the payroll deduction system and reflected immediately in take-home pay, it will take the form of a reduction from 28 points to 27.5 in the Ontario rate of income tax for the full 1971 taxation year. This means that individual taxpayers will receive the benefits of this first-stage tax cut by Ontario when they file their 1971 income tax return in early 1972. The 3 per cent federal tax cut for the period July 1, 1971, to December 31, 1971, will take effect in the same way so that the combined reduction will generate income tax refunds for most taxpayers in early 1972.

The second stage in the Ontario reduction consists of a three per cent tax cut for the 12-month period January 1, 1972, to December 31, 1972, at a revenue cost of \$36 million. This 1972 income tax cut has been designed to parallel exactly the corresponding federal income tax cut for the same period and will show up in take-home pay almost immediately. I am pleased that the new federal-provincial tax collection agreement possesses the additional flexibility necessary to permit this positive and speedy impact.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that these Ontario personal income tax cuts, along with the corresponding federal reductions, will provide a strong stimulus for the economic recovery now under way. They will not only augment consumer purchasing power but also provide renewed optimism to our people.

On September 13, the Prime Minister of Ontario announced comprehensive reforms in our health insurance premium system to improve its fairness and efficiency. Our new policy consists of four important changes: abolition of premiums for people aged 65 and over, and for their eligible dependants, effective January 1, 1972;—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): I advocated that two years ago and I have not seen anything further.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): The member is on the wrong side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Introduction of a combined health insurance premium in place of separate OHSIP and OHSC premiums, effective April 1, 1972; reduction in the total premium levels to \$11 per month for single persons and \$22 per month for couples and families, effective April 1, 1972; and—

Mr. Ruston: It is still too high.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —broadening of premium assistance provisions for low-income families and individuals, effective April 1, 1972.

Mr. Sargent: What about the nursing homes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These important reforms will generate benefits for all taxpayers, particularly pensioners and low-income families, and will treat all subscribers uniformly both for hospital and medical coverage. I estimate that these changes will reduce our total premium collections by \$127 million annually.

My colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), will bring forward legislation to implement these changes in our health insurance premium system.

The new legislation will also include provisions to ensure that employers pass on to employees and retired employees any savings resulting from the reductions in premium levels. Our policy has been designed to provide benefit to individuals and families, not to generate cost savings to employers. Let me reassert, therefore, that under the new system all employers will be required to maintain at least the same dollar level of premium contributions on behalf of each employee and pensioner as they are required to pay by any agreement under the existing system. This will mean that out of total premium collections of about \$500 million in 1972-1973, employer contributions will account for more than \$300 million, or over 60 per cent, and that less than 40 per cent of our total premium burden—

Mr. Bullbrook: What about the administrative problems?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —will fall directly on individuals and families.

The federal government has implemented a programme of employment-support grants to mitigate the negative effects on Canadian industries of the recent United States import surtax and other measures. The federal

Employment Support Act provides that any employment-support grant paid to a manufacturer will be included as income for the purposes of federal income tax.

This means, in effect, that part of the assistance provided by this temporary programme will be recouped in the form of corporate income taxes. Because of the close parallel between our corporations tax and the federal tax, this offsetting impact would ordinarily also apply in respect of our corporation income tax. I do not believe that this is a desirable policy, particularly since the federal grant programme has been established as a short-run response to an emergency situation.

Accordingly, we intend to amend our Ontario Corporations Tax Act to exclude federal employment-support grants from our income tax base. In this way, the province will reinforce, at least in a modest way, the positive assistance provided to Ontario manufacturers under the federal programme.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The government didn't do that for the gold mines.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would point out to members that this short amendment is the only change in our Corporations Tax Act that the government is advancing at this time. We do not intend to incorporate in our legislation the substantial changes in corporate taxation set out in Bill C-259 until we are fully confident of their workability, impact and adequacy for Ontario.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let me reiterate that in my view it would be irresponsible to submit to this Legislature major changes in tax law that the government itself has not fully evaluated, understood and approved.

Mr. Sargent: Why start now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Our approach, therefore, will be to continue our thorough analysis and intensive review of the federal reform legislation so that we can determine our future tax policy on a deliberate and sound basis.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The minister is going to have a different taxing statute, is he?

Mr. Sargent: What does he have here?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is right.

An hon. member: Quiet, Eddie!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would like to take this opportunity to review for members the Ontario government's position on the taxation of wealth. As members will recall, the Ontario government, in its 1969 white paper on provincial-municipal tax reform, proposed the introduction of a capital gains tax and the gradual elimination of taxes upon death. As an interim measure, we also proposed to relinquish our succession duties in exchange for 75 per cent of the revenue—

Mr. Lawlor: They sure pulled the rug out from under the minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that would accrue in Ontario from full application of the 1968 federal Estate Tax Act.

In our 1970-1971 budget, we advanced the gradual reduction of succession duties even before the introduction of a capital gains tax.

Mr. Lawlor: See how wrong the government was!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We followed this course because we felt that the new federal legislation had made death taxes too severe and would have an adverse impact on small businesses, family farms and Canadian ownership.

Since my 1971 budget the federal government has disclosed the details of the taxation of capital gains, as well as its determination to vacate the estate and gift tax fields at the end of 1971. The immediate elimination of the estate tax was an incredible about-face. It put the onus on the provinces to prevent the obvious inequities inherent in a tax system that eliminates death and gift taxes when the tax on capital gains has barely started.

Mr. Lawlor: That was a fallacious argument all by itself, but go ahead.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It takes a period of time before a capital gains tax becomes effective in moderating undue accumulations of wealth and generates revenues comparable to present death tax yields. To illustrate, the new capital gains tax will generate no more than \$10 million to the Ontario government in 1972. However, this modest increase will only just compensate the province for revenue losses attributable to the other personal income tax changes in the federal bill C-259. It is essential for revenue reasons alone, therefore, to maintain some form of taxation of wealth upon death, be it a gradually diminishing level. It is also essential for equity reasons, because in the absence of

such death taxation all wealth could be passed between generations without any meaningful tax consequences.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): We have been saying that for a long time.

Mr. MacDonald: St. Paul on the road to Damascus.

Mr. Bullbrook: Who wrote that?

Mr. Reid: He must have stayed up nights thinking that one up.

Mr. MacDonald: "Saint Darcy" on the road to Chatham!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, now that the federal government—

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is embarrassed about that, isn't he?

Mr. Reid: I thought he fired that speech-writer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, now that the federal government has abandoned the death tax field completely, the Ontario government accepts full responsibility for an appropriate level of taxation in this field. Our tax effort in this area will be judged in future years against the effectiveness of the taxation of capital gains. In other words, as the tax on capital gains gradually matures, our succession duties can be phased down. In the end there may no longer be any need to levy succession duties upon death. At such time wealth accumulations will have been subject to income and capital gains taxation and therefore will have paid their fair share on a current basis.

Mr. Cassidy: At half the level for a wage earner!

Mr. Reid: They are only taxing their own members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Under the present system, Ontario's succession duties generate revenues of about \$70 million and the federal estate tax collects \$56 million in Ontario, for a total of some \$126 million annually in wealth taxation. Half of the estate tax revenues are turned over to the province so that Ontario retains \$98 million and the federal government \$28 million of the total wealth tax yield.

In the absence of any policy change by Ontario, the elimination of federal estate tax on January 1 would mean an abrupt reduction of \$56 million in wealth taxation and a revenue loss to the province of some \$28

million annually. The province cannot afford such a precipitous revenue loss nor does it agree that such a large one-step reduction in wealth taxation is equitable. Accordingly, we are advancing changes in our succession duties legislation aimed at producing a total revenue yield of \$96 million—about the amount we are receiving now—and maintaining an equitable pattern of wealth tax incidence.

Mr. Cassidy: They've got their chance and they're blowing it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Our initial policies for the succession duties field consist of changes which will give us the full scope of the death tax field and will enable us to direct relief from current death taxes where we feel it is most needed. I am recommending the following specific changes in our legislation in respect of deaths occurring after midnight of December 31, 1971—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hurry up and die!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Die in stages!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All rate schedules will be doubled, but all surtaxes will be eliminated; the exemption for widows and widowers will be increased from \$250,000 to \$500,000—

Mr. Bullbrook: That will really help a lot of people!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All estates valued up to \$100,000 will not be subject to duty regardless of their distribution—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How about that one?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: He is not talking about anybody on this side.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Always wait for the last comment.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All gifts made within 15 years prior to the death of the deceased—

Mr. Singer: Fifteen long years.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —will be included as property of the deceased passing on his death if made on or after January 1, 1972. The change introduced in my 1971 budget already eliminated succession duties on all but 5,000 of our 45,000 estates annually. I estimate that the above changes will further reduce the number of dutiable estates to about only

2,000 per year. Furthermore, we estimate that the total yield from our revised succession duties will be about \$96 million allowing for about \$30 million in relief from the current estate tax plus succession duty levies.

We are currently negotiating with the federal government and most provincial governments in order to formulate an appropriate provincial gift tax to be administered by the federal government. Such a gift tax is an essential complement to our succession duties, and will be effective on January 1, 1972. Between the gift provisions in our succession duties and a federally administered provincial gift tax we fully protect the base of our wealth taxation. Let me assure members that this will not involve double taxation on gifts, because we will provide offsetting credits for gift taxes previously paid.

The changes I have just outlined will provide substantial relief to all categories of beneficiaries. These changes will eliminate the tax burden on all estates under \$100,000, improve the incidence of this tax, and will greatly reduce tax pressures to sell Canadian family businesses and family farms.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Sort of thrown in.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, given the new taxation and spending policies I have just outlined, let me summarize the province's revised fiscal position for 1971-1972. I now anticipate that net general revenues will reach \$3,883 million as against estimated net general expenditures of \$4,436 million. Our budgetary deficit for the current year, therefore, will increase to \$553 million, up \$138 million from my original budget plan. Our position on non-budgetary account has improved considerably with \$36 million in additional receipts and an \$87 million reduction in disbursements. These changes have increased our estimated non-budgetary surplus to \$193 million for 1971-1972.

Mr. Singer: That is just playing with the books. That doesn't mean a thing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I believe that the increased budgetary deficit represents an appropriate fiscal response by Ontario to the problem of high unemployment and the need to reinforce economic expansion. Our balanced—

Mr. Singer: Taking from one pot and putting it in another.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —programme of income tax cuts and employment-generating

expenditure increases, commits the maximum resources at our disposal to the goal of restoring full employment in Ontario. I am confident that our positive actions, along with renewed vigour in private sector activity, will move this province toward greater prosperity in the years ahead.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some concluding remarks on the work of the Committee on Government Productivity. The government's ability to respond to economic and social needs is not only a function of its ability to develop appropriate economic and social policies, but also is critically dependent on the viability of its basic organizational structure.

In my capacity as chairman of the Treasury Board, I have had the opportunity to closely follow the progress and the work of this group of executives from both business and government. They have all been diligent and dedicated in performing their challenging task. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a most sincere tribute to Mr. John Cronyn, the chairman, who is prudently and effectively guiding and fostering the development of the committee's efforts and recommendations.

The other committee members who have all contributed generously to this effort are: First, from the deputy minister ranks of the government of Ontario—Mr. G. H. U. Bayly, Mr. C. E. Brannan, Mr. A. R. Dick, Mr. H. I. Macdonald and Dr. J. K. Reynolds; and, second, from the Ontario business community—Mr. C. C. Hay, Mr. G. R. Hefferman, Mr. A. Powis and Mr. R. D. Wolfe, and the executive director, Dr. J. D. Fleck.

The Cronyn committee has undertaken the most extensive analysis ever produced of the structure and operations of the Ontario government and has developed substantive recommendations to make our organization equal to the challenges of the future.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me sum up my statement today. The government of Ontario has moved positively to strengthen economic performance and job creation in Ontario.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The Treasurer said that last spring.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The additional expansionary tax and expenditure measures we have introduced represent the determined efforts of a responsible government—a government, I might say, Mr. Speaker, which, under

the leadership of the Prime Minister has just received a very convincing mandate which should be recorded.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These measures, then, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The new wave inundated the members opposite.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These measures then, Mr. Speaker, indicate that we will do all in our capacity to improve economic performance for the well being of our citizens of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was a Throne Speech.

Mr. Sargent: Four years of that nonsense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

TRIAL OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY INMATES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In the absence of the Attorney General I would like to ask the Premier if he has any knowledge as to whether the Crown attorney or anyone representing the Attorney General participated in the reported sentence negotiations associated with the trial of the 13 convicts at Kingston. If he is not aware as to whether or not that occurred, has he undertaken an investigation to see if it did?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of it but I will certainly ask the Attorney General about it.

Mr. Singer: Here he comes now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, now that the Attorney General is here I would ask him if the Crown attorney representing his office participated in the reported sentence negotiations associated with the trial of the 13 convicts at Kingston.

I would ask him if he considers the procedure, as reported, unethical in any way, or one which should come under his jurisdiction, and finally, in this connection, did the Crown agree with both the defence plea and the findings of the court.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this matter could still be before the courts. The appeal time is not yet up and

therefore I think it would be most improper to discuss it in this House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Since the matter was put before the public in a large part of the province today by the Globe and Mail, then surely he owes it both to the Crown attorneys who work for him and for those people who are concerned about this matter, not to say the judge who was referred to in the article, to give the views of the chief law officer of the Crown at this time? Surely, Mr. Speaker, we could ask the Attorney General for a fuller statement?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I agree. A fuller statement should be forthcoming, but certainly not at this time. I refuse to be responsible for what appears in the Globe and Mail, believe me.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Shulman: A point of order, sir, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Mr. Shulman: In reference to the Attorney General's comments, surely just because something might come before the courts is not a valid reason not to discuss it here, and currently it is not before the courts.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the hon. minister has the right to answer the question or not, as he sees fit.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of clarification, will the minister undertake to give a statement to the House at an early date?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, since the Attorney General talked about the time for appeal not having elapsed, could he advise the House as to whether or not he intends to put in an appeal?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On the basis of the information that I have before me, the Crown does not intend to appeal the sentence.

Mr. Singer: Could the Attorney General advise us how many more days the time for appeal has to run in case any of the defendants wish to?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I can find that out.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is nice.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Lawlor: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary to the original.

Mr. Lawlor: You are your usual gracious self, sir.

The question is, leaving aside the local Crown attorneys, did the minister himself or his deputy have any role whatsoever to play in reaching that determination?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In reaching that what?

Mr. Lawlor: Well, making a deal with respect to the sentencing and to what pleas would be accepted.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Would he care to elaborate upon that?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Lawlor: A supplementary: Why not?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: For exactly the same reason that I thought I gave to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary—

Mr. Lawlor: The government is starting out very badly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Quite apart from the Kingston matter, does the Attorney General find reprehensible the whole thought of plea bargaining?

An hon. member: A very good question.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, no matter how adroit my hon. friend is in asking a question such as that, it obviously relates back to the same specific case and therefore my answer would have to apply.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for High Park a supplementary? Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

SALE OF LONDON CREDIT BUREAU

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Is he aware that the London Credit Bureau has just been bought by Retail Credit Collectors of America, with head office in the state of Georgia? Is he aware that this is the fourth in a string of credit bureaus bought by this same company? Does he agree that this is an intrusion into the control of business affairs in Canada which should not be tolerated and if he does, does he propose to take some action?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour and Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I became aware of this just prior to the House sitting. It is my understanding they have purchased the London Credit Bureau. In this connection, there would also be the London Credit Bureau collection agency. Now they would have to apply to my department for a transfer of that licence and I will be looking at it at that time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is it possible, then, that the minister might use his authority to veto the sale?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the collection agency, I may have that power. In connection with the credit bureau itself, I do not have that power.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: If the minister has the power—if he is advised that he does have the power—will he undertake to veto the sale as described?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will not undertake to veto it, Mr. Speaker, but I will certainly have a look at it and I share the member's concern, quite frankly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if the minister decided to exercise his right to veto, could he make a full statement to the House as to the basis for it? Would he explain his actions and the basis on which he makes the decision so that we have a precedent from which to work?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, I would make a statement to the House on that, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL EMPLOYMENT LOANS PROGRAMME

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a final question of the Treasurer, following on his very

important statement, in effect a mini-budget—not so mini—would he explain to the House the participation of the Province of Ontario in the programme put forward by the federal government, besides the one that is known as the federal-provincial employment loans programme?

He indicated that would extend to \$28 million as compared with the \$25 million that we have put forward. There are other programmes having to do with local initiative. To what extent are we participating in those on the basis of the communities of the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that there is a correction which should be made, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about a \$28 million federal loan programme which they have put forward as opposed to a provincial—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The federal loans are forgivable, of course?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On the labour part of it, if it is spent before May.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is what we are concerned with, making jobs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, if it is done before May, on the labour portion only. This compares with a \$35 million straight provincial grant programme. When are you going to go right back to the pennies?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if he wants to make this clear, he should read again the section of his speech in which he said in 1971 there will be \$25 million applied. The government certainly has not spent that yet.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is \$25 million up to March 31 and the remaining \$10 million presumably would be spent in April and May.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker on a point of order, if you will permit me—we are starting a new session. There is no doubt that we are here as the opposition and we congratulate the government on the excellent mandate that the Treasurer referred to, but surely this is an occasion when the Treasurer doesn't have to posture. He can give us the facts. He doesn't have to protect Bob Stanfield. He doesn't have to undermine Ben Benson any more. All he has to do is look after the benefits for the people in this province.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If he can give me a reasonable answer, if one exists to the question, I will be glad to hear it.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member got it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am only trying to put the things on a relative basis.

One is a \$25 million loan programme; the other is a \$35 million grant programme, both over the same period of time. In addition, the federal government, I believe, has made available some part of the \$50 million programme of assistance to municipalities. We think our share may be in the neighbourhood of \$8 million, and we think probably no one has any idea what portion will accrue to Ontario of the \$50 million community programme, which is being handled by the Manpower offices and about which we frankly know very little.

I accept the admonition of the Leader of the Opposition. I am not trying to be argumentative. It simply had occurred to me that over the course of the last couple of months he might have learned that it doesn't pay to namby-pamby to Ottawa all the time.

Interjections by hon. members.

LOCAL INITIATIVE PROGRAMME

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Treasurer is going to mend his ways.

I would also like to ask—

Mr. MacDonald: Don't hold your breath.

Mr. R. F. Nixon:—for some information about the—what do you call that programme?—local initiative programme. Does this not require the participation of at least an official of the provincial government to give approval?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Does it not require which?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The participation of a provincial official.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is completely independent of The Department of Municipal Affairs?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): It goes through The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Treasurer's colleague says it does.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Perhaps my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right. Well, if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs can tell us to what extent the province is participating in the local initiative programme that does require his department apparently to give consent or approval before the programme proceeds?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, it does not require consent from our department. We receive the applications and transmit them to Ottawa. Up to the present time we have received about 50 to 70 applications. We have transmitted them to Ottawa; none has yet been approved.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: None?

Hon. Mr. Bales: None.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Supplementaries?

Mr. Lewis: May I—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: This is a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister referring to the local programme or to the \$28 million in this statement?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I am referring to the local initiative programme which is a \$50 million programme for the whole of Canada. It is not divided up into allotments for provinces.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I address, therefore, a question to the Provincial Treasurer? Has any of the \$28 million yet been expended by the Province of Ontario, and how many municipalities have asked for assistance to this stage, and in what amounts?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Of the \$28 million that have been offered to the municipalities?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't know whether any of them have replied yet. It has been offered to them. If they want it they have until the end of December to avail them-

selves of it. If they don't, then we will take up the entire amount of money ourselves, the \$28 million, as a province.

Mr. Lewis: Then may I ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs, have there been any requests for the use of that \$28 million?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have had inquiries, but no formal requests. We have sent out letters to all municipalities advising them as to the particulars and the method of application.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: In view of the minister's reply, how can the minister conceivably envisage this programme as providing employment for this winter?

Mr. Lewis: It doesn't.

Hon. Mr. Bales: This is a federal programme and quite frankly we think it should have been done—

Mr. MacDonald: Any programme that you are going to be involved in—how is it going to provide jobs for this winter on the basis of your reply?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We think it should have been done a different way. This is not the provincial programme, this is the federal programme. We simply co-operate with the federal authorities to deal with the municipalities.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The difference is, ours works.

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary?

Mr. MacDonald: Yours came in as late as theirs.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It works.

METRO CENTRE PLAN

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Municipal Affairs: On the assumption that the minister tomorrow receives a request for the approval of the Metro Centre Part 2 study, will he grant that request, or will he refer it to the Ontario Municipal Board?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The Metro plan has not yet been finalized by the city of Toronto. When it does it will be forwarded to me and it will be dealt with in the normal way and considered. I will also consider requests that I may receive for referral to the OMB.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary: Is the minister satisfied that there has been sufficient opportunity for public hearings and public submissions during the stages in which this Metro Centre plan has been coming on its way, considering that it is now in the penultimate stage?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is premature to answer that until the matter comes to me from the city of Toronto. It isn't finalized there yet. Let's see what happens there. They have certainly had fairly extensive hearings in the recent days and weeks, and I will assess it when it comes.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister inviting further public submissions on the Metro Centre plan to him directly, or is he saying his judgement will be delivered on the basis of the last few days of debate?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, people are quite free, once the matter is finalized at the city of Toronto, to make submissions to me in reference to the finalized plan that the city passes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is it not in fact correct that the minister may, of his own initiative, insofar as an official plan is concerned, refer it to the municipal board, and shall, on request of any person, refer it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I shall not necessarily refer, if I felt that that request was frivolous or designed to delay, or for other such reasons. We will certainly carefully assess the request to refer to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Mr. Lewis: Section 44 of the Act—

Mr. Speaker: I will permit one more supplementary. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I would just like to ask the minister—for the guidance of this House and also of the outside groups—if he could give us an indication of what period of time he considers is reasonable for objections to be filed with the minister after he has received the Metro Centre bylaw from Toronto city council? What period of time does he consider reasonable for these objections to be filed? Is it one hour, or is it a day, or will he give at least a week or two for objections to be filed?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member is going to get into a lot of trouble.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear from reading the newspaper reports this is a very detailed and complicated matter and it has to be treated very carefully and examined by the department. Certainly it is not going to be done in a day or an hour, but it will be dealt with by us as quickly as we can. I think it would take at least a week and probably longer for us to deal with it within the department. And within that period of time the public will certainly be quite free to make whatever submissions they wish.

Mr. Cassidy: To calm the fears of those outside—

Mr. Speaker: Order, No further supplementaries. The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Martel: Check in the woodwork.

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

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: No further supplementaries on that question.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN ONTARIO

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: In the Premier's interdepartmental report on foreign investment in Ontario he indicated the formation of a committee to discuss the contents of the report and to proposed recommendations. Can he indicate to the House what kind of a committee he has in mind? It is likely to be a select committee of this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I hope to be in a position to inform the hon. members before the week is concluded as to what direction we might take on this matter.

Mr. Lewis: No further questions.

Mr. Speaker: No further questions? The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

TRANSPORTATION POLICY FOR METRO TORONTO

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: I notice in

the supplementary estimates an amount of \$14 million for capital roads construction. May I ask the minister, when does he intend to introduce his new transportation policy for Metropolitan Toronto, particularly as it applies to the northwest quadrant of Metro which has been so seriously and grievously affected by the abandonment of the Spadina Expressway?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Very well spoken. The member read that very well! Very good! That is good!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where does the member's leader stand on that one now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the details of the plan as requested by the hon. member for—High Park-Forest Hill?

Mr. Givens: Forest Hill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Forest Hill—will be disclosed to the Legislature and to the public as soon as the investigations of the task force which is at present examining the alternatives and is approaching the completion of this work—involving the Chairman of Metro, the Minister of Transportation and Communications and support staff—have been completed.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Pending the completion of this report—which I suppose will be tabled in the fullness of time—does the Minister of Municipal Affairs intend to impose a freeze on all highrise rezoning applications in the Spadina Expressway corridor—pending the completion of this report that the Minister of Transportation has just referred to?

Hon. Mr. Bales: My colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and myself have worked very closely together in reference to these matters and I do not think at the moment there are any applications of that nature.

Mr. Ruston: That is something new.

An hon. member: That is a switch.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is the difference between your party and ours.

Mr. Lewis: I didn't catch the end. By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: All right, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: —did the minister say there were no applications of that nature, to his knowledge?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I do not recall any at the moment that are reported.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

COST OF PRESCRIPTIONS

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: In view of the study by the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association which shows that in the first year after Parcost was introduced in Ontario the cost of prescriptions rose by 3½ per cent, can the minister explain the statements from his department that Parcost was supposed to reduce the price of prescriptions? And can he explain or detail what changes he is going to make to try to make Parcost effective?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting with the drug advisory committee in an in-depth study, from my point of view, of Parcost and its implications and those limitations it has, tomorrow morning and throughout tomorrow as a whole. I would much prefer, if I may, to delay a definitive response to that until I have met with that particular body.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, sir!

Mr. Shulman: In his response, would the minister also try to find an explanation of the various statements that have come out of his department over the past two years saying that the cost of prescriptions had gone down when in actual fact the contrary had taken place?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, they did go down, I think, by eight per cent, Mr. Speaker. The three per cent referred to by the hon. member is not one that I am aware of. But again, when I go through this and assess the figures tomorrow and subsequently, I think it probably warrants a statement, not only in response to this member's question but generally to the whole House.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. There is a supplementary. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Has the minister a report on the overcharging by Parcost pharmacies in the

Ottawa area? Has he ordered an investigation into overcharging by Parcost pharmacies in other parts of the province to see if it exists?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a report on the Ottawa situation, not by specific—

Mr. Cassidy: Can we have it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have, but not by specific order. We have been investigating Parcost and questions of overcharging throughout the province by spot-checking. I will know more about this when I get my reports in tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

BAN ON STUDDED TIRES

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, again, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Has the minister received a number of petitions and requests from the people of north and northwestern Ontario in regard to the ban on studded tires? Is he prepared to reconsider his decision and exempt northwestern and northern Ontario from the ban on studded tires?

Mr. M. Hamilton (Renfrew North): It is the same question as the last time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes, and to the second part, no.

Mr. Reid: May I ask, by way of supplementary, if the minister, for the record, could indicate to the people of northwestern Ontario why their rights and privileges, as they see them, are being denied by this government in regard to the use of studded tires?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh come on, come on!

Mr. Bullbrook: A very good question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I have never known, really, that there are any special rights and privileges accrued to one part of this province and not to another.

Mr. Martel: The minister should tell the north that. Tell that to the north financially.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is a right they have but it won't be done.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Without prolonging this and turning it into a debate, I would have to suggest that it is very difficult to have a ban and then lift it in any one part of the province. We have been into this many, many times for the benefit of the members in the last House. Maybe it is appropriate for the benefit of the new members but I have no more to add to it than that at this moment, Mr. Speaker. I have answered the two parts of the member's question and it will have to stand at that for now.

An hon. member: As usual, no favours.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. member for Thunder Bay, with a supplementary.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the minister if he is not aware of the different driving and climatic conditions in northwestern Ontario, and if he is not prepared to make a concession to drivers and motorists in that area and satisfy himself that there is some validity in their claims that there is a need for studded tires? Will he not conduct tests on roadways instead of on ice-covered lakes?

Mr. Speaker: I hardly think that is really supplementary to the original question. The minister may answer if he wishes.

An hon. member: It is sliding into it anyway!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a slippery question.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Is the minister's department participating in the testing of the new plastic chain developed by the Vancouver garage man about which there were articles recently? It is apparently much more satisfactory from a safety point of view than studded tires and not damaging to the roads.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, the department is participating in this study, researching the use of them. Without making any full commitment of any kind it would appear that they are much

more effective and much less damaging than studs.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's refusal to grant the north the right to have studded tires, I wonder if he would undertake to keep the highways and roads bare at all times so that the safety enjoyed by southern Ontario can also be the right and privilege of people in northern Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the department has had a bare pavement policy, as far as it is humanly possible to achieve it, both in the north and in the south—

Mr. Stokes: I wish the minister had been with me yesterday driving to the airport.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister personally handle the snow removal?

Mr. Stokes: The minister has not tried those Manitoba roads lately.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I would have to add this, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order to say it, that the ban on studs is not a matter of removing for drivers what is a matter of driver convenience. Our decision is based for all practical purposes on the matter of highway safety for which we are also responsible, all of which has been supported by numerous pieces of research, particularly the last on the part of the Canada Safety Council.

Mr. Stokes: Ask the hon. member for Kenora! That is not what he said when he was up north.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Read what the—

Mr. Stokes: He says one thing down here and another up there.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park. Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: What action is the minister taking about tires bearing studs that are crossing into Ontario from Manitoba?

An hon. member: And Quebec!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The matter of enforcement is one, shall we say for, the

police, and the manner of determining it to be an offence or otherwise is a matter for the courts. We are leaving it right at that for the moment.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: I will permit one more supplementary. The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Has the minister heard of the former NDP cabinet minister, Mr. Borowski, who promised to ride shotgun on Manitoba cars entering Ontario and using studs? Has this come to his attention and what action does he propose to take if this does happen?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that in the situation where Mr. Borowski was the late minister I never entertained any serious element of fear from his blandishments. Now that he is not there I entertain even less fears on this score.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

ALLEGED OPP LENIENCY DURING PROVINCIAL ELECTION

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Did the Attorney General issue the order that the Ontario Provincial Police be unduly lenient with respect to traffic violations during the recent provincial election?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. Any remarks I heard, Mr. Speaker, were just the opposite to that.

Mr. Gaunt: The Attorney General was in the wrong part of the province.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I guess so.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the Attorney General investigate this matter and report back to the House?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If the hon. member has a specific instance in mind I would be glad to have it.

Mr. Gaunt: I have a whole caseload.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What did they pinch the member for?

Mr. Gaunt: My timing was very poor, I might add.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-view.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Would the minister please tell us whether instructions went out to the provincial judges that the fees were to be reduced in half after October 1? This is a fact.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What fees?

Mr. Worton: Traffic fines.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of this at all. If the hon. member will give me some examples I will be glad to check into them. I really thought the member for Huron-Bruce was trying to be funny; that is why I made the facetious reply.

Mr. Gaunt: I had thought it was all part of the big blue machine, but apparently it wasn't. I can give the Attorney General the information.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, we have more specific ways of reaching the people than that.

Mr. Gaunt: I see. In any case, I will get the information. Would the Attorney General investigate upon receipt of that information and report back to the House?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will be glad to, or to the hon. member directly.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Mines. When does the Minister of Mines intend to put a stop to the removal of sand from the dunes in Prince Edward county, as promised by his leader prior to certain events that took place on October 21?

Mr. Shulman: As soon as the dunes are gone.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this question should be more appropriately directed to my colleague the Minister of Lands and Forests, under whose jurisdiction this matter lies.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, then I would direct the question to the Minister of Lands and Forests or the Prime Minister who made the statement from the public platform, either one.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, this matter is being studied right now. We are going—

Mr. Young: This is just exactly what the minister said before.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the minister going to take some action?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, surely the minister can't get away with simply saying it is being studied. This matter has been studied ad infinitum, and a statement was made very clearly on the hustings that this was going to stop.

What is the timetable for the order to be issued that the sand will no longer be removed from the dunes in Prince Edward county?

Mr. Stokes: They will complete the study when the last dune has gone.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I think what has been said was that they are looking into alternative sites. If the hon. member can give us an alternative site we would be very glad to hear about it because—

Mr. MacDonald: The government has a stop order on the dunes at the moment? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —at the present time it is very difficult to find an alternative site.

Mr. Renwick: They gave this one away.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have studies, ecological and other studies, under way. I hope that some time in the future I will be able to make a complete report on this. The matter is being looked into very actively.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition. A supplementary?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question; Is the minister aware that since this problem became public the withdrawal of sand has been accelerated? It is now at almost four times the rate of withdrawal that it was about a year ago.

Can he report to the House on some sort of a status report that has been referred to by the member for the Quinte area, I believe, having to do with the government view on the continued use of the sandbanks?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the company in question has a very legal document

whereby it has a lease. A lot of this sand is self-renewing. At the present time—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what it is in the minister's department, a renewable resource!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the present time we have engaged some of the most expert people who are conducting studies on the effect to the environment. We are also looking at alternative sites. From the information we have been given there is no easy economical alternative site. I hope that at some time in the future I will make a progress report.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the minister a report?

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

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister consider applying for an injunction to prohibit the further removal sand until an alternative source of aggregate is found?

Is that an audible shake of the head?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will take that under advisement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I asked the minister if he had a report available. I wonder if he would answer that question. Is there a status report available?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are conducting studies. I could give a progress report at some time in the near future.

Mr. Reid: Is there one now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased, Mr. Speaker, to show that this question is a very complex question.

Mr. Reid: Is there a study or isn't there?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There is a study. I just mentioned this a few minutes ago. There is a study.

Mr. Reid: May we see it? Will it be presented to the Legislature?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food: How can you, it is in progress.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I wonder if the minister could explain why, if this sand is self-renewing, the dunes are disappearing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, Order please! In view of the answers given by the hon. minister, I think there have been sufficient questions on this point at this time.

Mr. Reid: What answers?

Mr. Speaker: To the questions.

The hon. member for Downsview.

PAYMENTS TO BUCKMINSTER FULLER

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Could he advise us of the emoluments paid to that interesting gentleman, Buckminster Fuller, for the studies that he produced so that the Premier could make a speech during the election?

Second, how long did it take Buckminster Fuller to come forth with the new plan or suggestion, which was described by the Tory candidate in Downsview as the equivalent of the Eiffel Tower to Paris?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, without getting into any observations as to what the Progressive Conservative candidate in Downsview said, and the relevant impact of that particular decision in that whole matter on the electoral success of the member for Downsview, he should be very grateful; otherwise he might not have been here.

Mr. Reid: We don't blame the Premier for that.

An hon. member: Hear, hear, that's for sure!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I shall get the figures as to the cost and I should point out to him that this was not developed for the purposes of a speech. It was, I think, a press conference, if memory serves me correctly, right here in the building. I will get the amount paid to Mr. Fuller before the session is complete.

Mr. Lewis: He does not know.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier does not know the amount paid?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have a rough idea, but I want to be accurate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the rough idea?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I will be accurate.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: In addition to the amount paid, how long was Mr. Fuller engaged in these important activities; over what period of time?

Mr. Young: When did he start?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't tell what number of hours were allocated. I will find out if I can and also the rough period of time. I would be delighted to get it. There is no secret about it. I will get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Premier indicate to us whether he plans to go ahead with this on his own, as he indicated in his press conference, or whether the matter of Buckminster Fuller's recommendations is now dead for all time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I made a very clear statement at the time of the press conference which has been repeated since. That is, if the utilization of the land there can be done by Metro with some help from the province, we would be delighted to assist in any way we can.

I also made it quite clear at the time of the press conference and subsequent to that, that if Metro determined that they had no use for this particular land, and if it could be fitted in with the urban or rapid transit portion of it, that the province would be quite prepared to take this off the hands of Metropolitan Toronto and move ahead with some form of plan accordingly. That has been made clear to them.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, does the Premier by that confusing statement discard any initiative at all to be taken by the province in finding any use for this land?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it has become very abundantly clear this government is prepared to take any relevant initiatives. We took the initiative with respect to the utilization of that land. Whether Metro is enthusiastic or otherwise, I cannot determine at this moment. They may even have some other thoughts for it themselves. Who knows?

But as far as the province is concerned, we are quite prepared to co-operate. If Metro determines that they have no use for this land, then the province is prepared to go ahead with the initiatives to see that it is utilized—and that was made abundantly clear a month ago.

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

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further supplementaries on that one?

The hon. member for Sudbury East.

POLLUTION INDEX IN SUDBURY

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of the Environment: On Saturday evening, the last reading I received with respect of the pollution index in Sudbury was something like 87. Could the minister indicate to the House what the highest reading reached was, and what action was taken beyond the reduction of 25 per cent which took place early Saturday morning in the Sudbury area?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of the Environment): Yes Mr. Speaker, the figure of 87 is correct. This was reached early Sunday morning.

As far as action is concerned, a ministerial order was issued requiring the company to immediately cease operation of five copper converters, to immediately cease operation of five nickel converters and also to close down six copper converters in the main aisle and to immediately cease operation of a blast furnace in the Orford building.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question: As I understand it this represented what percentage? Approximately 25 per cent of the production?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, the ministerial order would be closer to about 50 per cent—50 per cent capacity.

Mr. Martel: Well, I would like to ask—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the company did voluntarily, upon being notified locally of the index reading, shut down about 25 per cent of its operations without any request from us.

Mr. Martel: Well Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary: Would it not be advisable then that once we go beyond the 50 per cent and it continues to accelerate that there be an index whereby, by law, without a ministerial order always necessary, there be automatic cutbacks? Let us say if it reached 75 that there would be an automatic cutback by 50 per cent, instead of what occurred on

Saturday—no one knowing really what was going on.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, after the hon. member called me at 12 o'clock on Saturday night he knew the whole story.

Mr. Martel: It was 9 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That is a terrible time.

Mr. Lewis: It just felt like 12.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Martel: My Saturday evening was ruined. I felt the hon. minister's might as well be, too.

Mr. Lewis: He called me after he called the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The minister should have called him back at 4.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Who did you call?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might say, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, it is only when the index exceeds around 52 that we can require a particular plant to curtail operations. Between 32 and 52 they do it on a voluntary basis.

As the hon. member also knows, Mr. Speaker, this was a sort of a phenomenon. The situation was that the plume from that plant was right over the monitoring station in Sudbury and the air was crystal clear apparently in all the rest of the area, including the Nickel Belt.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It might have been a plot, I don't know, in view of the fact that the House is opening today. But, in any event, I am told by people who should know that it was a phenomenon and I hope it won't happen again.

Mr. Martel: Final supplementary; this will be the final final one. When is that second monitor which the minister promised during the election coming?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Up to this weekend I don't know, but I would assume in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that our timetable would have it within four to five months.

Mr. Martel: The minister said two, when he was in Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I think I have allowed sufficient on that particular question. The hon. member for Waterloo North.

DELAY IN PROPERTY TRANSFER NOTIFICATION

Mr. E. G. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

What action will the minister take regarding regional assessment offices to help municipalities with the problem which they are now encountering? The problem is that no property transfers have been forwarded to the municipality since last July, resulting in the municipalities being required to issue, by hand next January, interim tax notices, which should be done by computer if the regional assessment offices were giving the municipalities their information properly and quickly as they received it formerly when it was in local hands.

Hon. Mr. Bales: If this is a problem in the member's particular area, Mr. Speaker, I will look into it and give a reply tomorrow.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: I think it requires a little more than that. This problem has been going on.

Might I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, is he not aware that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs said this problem would not exist and now it does exist? I would ask the present minister that he give it serious and urgent consideration.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I shall.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Bring back Darcy!

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

MEETING AT MUSKOKA SANDS

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, not knowing who is the chairman of the Conservative caucus, I shall direct my question to the Prime Minister.

Who paid for the first caucus of the Conservative Party after the October 21 election which was held in the Muskokas at some posh establishment? Was it from the Tory party campaign funds or was it from public funds?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear much from the member for Hamilton East during the campaign and it is now very obvious why. His research is quite limited.

The first Progressive Conservative caucus—a very enthusiastic gathering, which all members attended, completely committed to having four successful years followed by another four at the conclusion of those—was held this morning at 10 o'clock.

The meeting of the policy and priorities committee of cabinet, which was composed of some five or six ministers—there were four or five other ministers who attended making representations on behalf of their departments to enable the government to move ahead very expeditiously with the financial and fiscal economic problems of this province—was held at Muskoka Sands. There were in attendance, as I say, some five to 10 ministers in total and about 10 to 12 public servants. We found it to be a very constructive exercise, Mr. Speaker, and we are sure it will have benefits for the public generally here in the province.

Mr. Gisborn: As a supplementary, would the Prime Minister tell me who paid for that meeting?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Welch presented the seventh report of the Ontario Arts Council for the year 1970-1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports of debate 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 each 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.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that as the Legislature has been convened in this special

session for the purpose of considering only those matters which have been laid before it in the address of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the House hereby resolves to dispense with the customary address in reply to the Speech from the Throne and the formal debate thereon, as the subject matters of the speech may be debated during the consideration of the motion and the legislation submitted to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we agree that the formal debate on an address in reply should be dispensed with under these circumstances, but there are matters of importance pressing upon us, and we also agree that these matters can be discussed during the debate on the bills which will be introduced evidently this afternoon and in the next two or three days.

The only thing that made me feel that perhaps we couldn't agree with the motion was the inclusion in His Honour's address of a phrase referring to "positive economic impact of the present budget." No doubt the Treasurer means well when he says that the concept of the budget is unchanged, but still we are now presented with substantial supplementary estimates which we want to discuss later this week.

The emphasis on winter works certainly is an important one, and since it is now well into December we believe that the programme might very well have been brought into more effective play even earlier. I am aware of the fact that some of these moneys have already been put to work; at least we want to examine to what extent this has been accomplished, but we feel we can undertake this during the debates on the various bills.

The supplementary estimates do cover a broad range of departmental endeavours and responsibilities and therefore we agree with the motion. We believe that the debate on these matters can be undertaken under other headings.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Mr. R. F. Nixon, that the member for the electoral district of Northumberland (Mr. Rowe) be appointed Deputy Speaker and chairman of the committees of the whole House for the present session.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission, and to provide for the advance—

Mr. Singer: Order, order! The minister had better go back to school.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Clerk prepared to proceed now? What was the order?

All right. Introduction of bills; I called motions in error.

Introduction of bills.

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the Treasurer going to be here when we debate these bills? He's not going to leave it to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler)!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bullbrook: We went through this last year, and the Treasurer had nothing to say about the legislation. We want him here!

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

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 TAX

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Mr. Bullbrook: Fifteen years he is extending the exemption! Does the minister realize the administrative problems in that?

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It closes the hole.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT BY MUNICIPALITIES

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to facilitate the Relief of Unemployment by Municipalities.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to further the government's employment incentive programme in relation to the municipalities. Under the provisions of the bill, municipalities would be permitted to carry out works on private property, provided they first obtain the consent and the approval of the owners of the property and the approval of the department in reference to the programme itself.

HEALTH INSURANCE COMMISSION AND HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and to provide for the Advance Organization of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HEALTH SERVICES INSURANCE ACT

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital services Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to give a brief explanation of the three related bills. These are being introduced today to provide for the establishment of the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and to give it the necessary authority to carry out the planning and the initial operation of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Mr. Martel: I told the government that two years ago.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The legislation being placed before the House today is temporary insofar as it will come into effect on January 1, 1972, and will be in effect until more detailed legislation can be introduced at the next session. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing a new Act to supercede this one, which will be a more definite statement of government policy and operating procedures to govern the whole of the health insurance plan.

This temporary legislation is being introduced at this time so that the commission will be able to implement those policies heretofore announced by the government. As the members are aware, the new health insurance plan will, firstly, combine the Ontario Health Services Insurance Plan and the Ontario Hospital Insurance Plan, effective April 1, 1972; secondly, provide premium-free health insurance for all residents of Ontario, 65 years of age and over, and their dependants; thirdly, provide one premium to cover all health insurance services which, incidentally, is lower than the present combined premiums of the two plans; and lastly, improve premium assistance for low-income families and individuals.

At this juncture, Mr. Speaker, I would note that specific details regarding premiums and premium assistance will be dealt with by regulation and will be as announced earlier this fall by the hon. Prime Minister.

In order to provide for the integration, co-ordination and development of all health care services in Ontario we will be placing the hospital management function, at present carried out by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, under The Department of Health. When the management function for the hospital system has been taken into the main line of the department we will have, for the first time, one government department responsible for the provision and administration of unified health care services throughout Ontario.

In addition, through today's legislation, the insurance aspects of health care will be combined under one unit to cover a wide spectrum of benefits including insurance arrangements for extended health care—the nursing home programme—which becomes effective April 1, 1972.

Associated with these developments, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Ontario Council of Health to expand its role to include the provision of continuing advice on all health care facilities. For this purpose, I have requested the Ontario Council of Health to establish a

committee with representations from such groups as hospitals and health professions, as well as other knowledgeable people, to represent the broader public interest. I expect the Council of Health to maintain and expand upon the type of constructive advice now provided by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this temporary legislation and the change in organization will provide this government with authority to work toward the implementation of more effective health care and insurance services for the people of Ontario by April 1, 1972, three months ahead of the announced original date, July 1, 1972.

CORPORATION SECURITIES REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Carton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Corporation Securities Registration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, all the amendments set out in this bill are of a house-keeping nature. They are vital to the efficient administration of the Act. They permit officials of the department, who have been designated by Lieutenant Governor in council by regulation, to issue certificates. The requirement that such certificates be issued under the hand of the minister is deleted. As a result of the amendment, the procedures for certifying legislation will be brought in line with the present practice and be similar to that set out under The Business Corporations Act.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Welch moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce at this time these amendments. As you may already be aware, the main purpose of the legislation introduced this afternoon is to make it possible for a teacher to take early retirement with a pension that has been earned to that time. To accomplish this, we have changed the pension calculation so that the present age-related reduction factors are eliminated if he should retire at a point in time when his age at

last birthday, added to his credit in the fund, equals at least 90. To receive the maximum pension possible, to find 70 per cent of the average of the best seven years' salary, it is still necessary to have credit for a minimum of 35 years of service. For example a teacher with 35 years of credit in the fund is able to draw a full pension of 70 per cent after age 55 while a person with 33 years of service at age 57 would be entitled to a 66 per cent pension, avoiding the age-related reductions contained in the old provisions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can one transfer to other service?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Would the member let me have a letter on that, because I would be glad to take that up before committee stage.

Another amendment in the Act, Mr. Speaker, provides that the interest rate at present being paid on the permanent investments of the fund will be increased to six per cent compounded half-yearly.

Mr. Cassidy: Hear, hear! It is about time.

Mr. Martel: Out in the boondocks.

Hon. Mr. Welch: At the same time, of course, all future investments will contain an interest provision which will not be less than the rate of long-term investments made or guaranteed by the province.

A third amendment, in the name of male liberation, makes it possible for the widower of a female teacher to receive a dependant's allowance on the same basis as the widow of a male teacher.

An hon. member: That will knock the rats off the rafters, I will tell you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That will "larn" them.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mind you, at the same time, if the spouse of a teacher is a teacher in his own right, we have made it possible for the survivor to continue to draw his own pension and at the same time have the right to apply for a dependant's allowance as well.

Also included in the Act, Mr. Speaker, are a number of general housekeeping items and I am sure all would agree that these amendments should be seen as progressive developments with relevance to the educational community of Ontario. I am very pleased to be able to present them to the members of the Legislature this afternoon.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, these amendments are complementary to those in the previous bill introduced by the Minister of Education.

DAY NURSERIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, as has already been stated earlier today, part of the government's programme to stimulate the economy and provide winter works was to make available \$10 million for the construction of day nurseries.

The amendments that I am introducing today will enable the government to move forward with this programme. These amendments provide the legislative basis for a 100 per cent provincial grant to municipalities, Indian bands and local associations for the mentally retarded for all work completed on approved day nursery construction projects before June 1, 1971. On any remaining work to be completed on these projects after that date the grant will be 80 per cent. These capital grant arrangements apply to the cost of land, the construction of new buildings or the addition to an existing building. Equipment is also included if the building has reached the stage where equipment can be appropriately ordered.

Since renovations to existing buildings to make them suitable for daycare centres are of a labour-intensive nature, we will also pay 100 per cent of all approved renovations from November 1, 1971, to June 1, 1972. This will encourage again the creation of new facilities immediately, while creating jobs in many communities during these winter months.

All of these provisions, Mr. Speaker, apply to both municipalities and Indian bands, which are empowered by The Day Nurseries Act to build and operate day nurseries with capital and operating grant assistance from this government. All nurseries constructed

through this winter works programme will be eligible for the usual operating subsidy of 80 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments also provide for a major extension of government support for daycare services for retarded children. In his analysis of services for the mentally retarded in Ontario, Mr. Walter B. Williston stated:

Mentally retarded persons should be helped as far as possible in the context of their families, the communities in which they live and to which they will return, and the schools that they attend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with specific reference to day nurseries Mr. Williston further stated, and I quote:

There would seem to be no reason why The Day Nurseries Act should not be amended to permit local associations to run nursery schools and to be eligible for provincial assistance on the same basis as municipalities.

There is no doubt that the problems faced by the parents of retarded children are unique and involve financial and emotional pressures that often are not understood by society. It is the government's view that some special assistance is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for these parents and their children to ensure that adequate daycare facilities exist and that the accessibility to those facilities is not dependent on the financial resources of each family. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the amendments I am introducing today will provide, for the first time, capital grants for day nursery construction to local associations for the mentally retarded.

During this winter, the same capital-grant incentives that we have announced for the municipalities and Indian bands will apply to these local associations. Community services for the mentally retarded can be effective only when they are completely accessible. In the past, the relative high cost of day care for the retarded has caused a hardship for the families of retarded and multiply-handicapped children.

Mr. Speaker, to remove this financial burden I am pleased to tell the House that this legislation will provide an 80 per cent subsidy on the operating and maintenance costs of all approved day nurseries operated by local associations for the mentally retarded. This extension of direct support to parent associations will do much to assist retarded children to remain with their families while

developing and participating in their own community.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this new legislation will provide for an extension in the eligible age for day nursery care for retarded children from 10 years of age, the age which applies for normal day nurseries, to 18 years of age for those concerned with the retarded. We believe that this change will provide greater assistance again to the families of retarded children who wish their children to remain in the community. It will also reduce the emphasis on institutional care of retarded children.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the members will be pleased to hear—and I will close with this—of the response that we have already had to this winter works programme. Every area of the province has indicated an interest in it. A total of 102 submissions have been received from across Ontario, and 38 of these submissions are formal applications. Members of my department have been working with each community to clarify its needs and finalize its proposals.

Mr. Speaker, of the 102 submissions, 63 have been from municipalities, 13 have been from Indian bands and 26 have come forward from local associations for the mentally retarded. To ensure that the allocation of these new facilities is even throughout the province, an informal quota has been established for each region, taking into account population, existing daycare resources and the current welfare caseload.

Mr. Speaker, day care is an important part of today's social services. The expenditure of this \$10 million during these winter months will not only provide a direct stimulus to the economy but it will also encourage the development of a much needed social service in all parts of this province.

This government is committed to providing adequate daycare services for the people of Ontario, and particularly for retarded children. These legislative changes I have introduced today will do much to bring us closer to that goal.

PLANNING ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill gives municipalities the direct discretionary power

to issue or withhold permits for the removal or wrecking of buildings or structures.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent the large construction companies, in this city particularly, from blockbusting by buying one or two houses and ripping them down and so deteriorating the value of the area.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, there is a consensus that we will adjourn the House—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How did the minister guess?

Hon. Mr. Winkler:—and tomorrow we will proceed with the bills standing in the name of the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) because of commitments he has in the course of the week, followed by supplementary estimates.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I wonder if the House leader could advise us if we are likely to have printed copies of these bills, and when?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, there should be printed copies of all bills tomorrow morning.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Before the House adjourns again, has the minister some thought as to the order of supplementary estimates?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In order as they are printed.

Mr. Lewis: In order as printed? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:20 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(117 members)

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Allan, James N.	PC	Haldimand-Norfolk	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Apps, Hon. C. J. S.	PC	Kingston and the Islands	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	PC	Leeds	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bales, Hon. Dalton A.	PC	York Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Beckett, R. B.	PC	Brantford	12 Inwood Dr., Brantford
Belanger, J. Albert	PC	Prescott and Russell	Sarsfield
Bennett, Claude	PC	Ottawa South	35 Avenue Rd., Ottawa
Bernier, Hon. Leo	PC	Kenora	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Birch, Mrs. Margaret	PC	Scarborough East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bounsall, E. J.	NDP	Windsor West	2121 Riverside Dr. W., Windsor
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L	Etobicoke	50 Pettit Dr., Weston
Breithaupt, James R.	L	Kitchener	90 Church St., Kitchener
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	PC	Cochrane North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bullbrook, James E.	L	Sarnia	881 Tudor Close, Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	NDP	Sandwich-Riverside	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Carruthers, Alex	PC	Durham	R.R. #1, Campbellcroft
Carton, Hon. Gordon R.	PC	Armourdale	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Cassidy, Michael	NDP	Ottawa Centre	160 Waverley St., Ottawa
Clement, John T.	PC	Niagara Falls	3897 St. Mark St., Niagara Falls
Davis, Hon. William G.	PC	Peel North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davison, Norm	NDP	Hamilton Centre	122 Sandford Ave. S., Hamilton
Deacon, Donald M.	L	York Centre	Glenburn Farms, Unionville
Deans, Ian	NDP	Wentworth	38 Beaconsfield Dr., Hamilton
Downer, Rev. A. W.	PC	Dufferin-Simcoe	263 Beech St., Collingwood
Drea, Frank	PC	Scarborough Centre	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Dukszta, Dr. Jan	NDP	Parkdale	40 Park Rd., Apt. 702, Toronto 5
Dymond, Dr. Matthew B.	PC	Ontario	280 Cochrane St., Port Perry
Eaton, Robert G.	PC	Middlesex South	R.R. #2, Dorchester
Edighoffer, Hugh	L	Perth	147 Nelson St., Mitchell
Evans, D. Arthur	PC	Simcoe Centre	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Ewen, Donald Wm.	PC	Wentworth North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Ferrier, Rev. William	NDP	Cochrane South	292 Cedar St. N., Timmins
Foulds, James F.	NDP	Port Arthur	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Gaunt, Murray	L	Huron-Bruce	170 Diagonal Rd., Wingham
Germa, Melville C.	NDP	Sudbury	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Gilbertson, Bernt	PC	Algoma	R.R. #1, Richards Landing
Gisborn, Reg.	NDP	Hamilton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Givens, Philip G.	L	York-Forest Hill	76 Caribou Rd., Toronto
Good, Edward R.	L	Waterloo North	Box 116, Main Parliament Bldg., Toronto
Grossman, Hon. Allan	PC	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Guindon, Hon. Fern	PC	Stormont	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Haggerty, Ray	L	Welland South	R.R. #1, Sherkston
Hamilton, Maurice	PC	Renfrew North	R.R. #5, Pembroke
Handleman, Sidney B.	PC	Carleton	81 Grandview Rd., Ottawa K2H 8B7
Havrot, Edward M.	PC	Timiskaming	148 Tower St., Kirkland Lake
Henderson, Lorne C.	PC	Lambton	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Hodgson, R. Glen	PC	Victoria-Haliburton	Box 240, Haliburton
Hodgson, William	PC	York North	R.R. #1, Kettleby
Irvine, Donald R.	PC	Grenville-Dundas	River Rd. W., Box 135, Prescott
Jessiman, James H.	PC	Fort William	Vickers Heights, P.O., Thunder Bay "F"
Johnston, Robert M.	PC	St. Catharines	10 Canal St., St. Catharines
Kennedy, R. Douglas	PC	Peel South	120 Harborn Rd., Mississauga
Kerr, Hon. George A.	PC	Halton West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lane, John	PC	Algoma-Manitoulin	Box 214, Gore Bay
Laughren, Floyd	NDP	Nickel Belt	R.R. #1, Copper Cliff
Lawlor, Patrick D.	NDP	Lakeshore	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lawrence, Hon. Allan F.	PC	St. George	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lawrence, Hon. A. B. R.	PC	Carleton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Leluk, Nicholas G.	PC	Humber	5 Blair Athol Cres., Islington
Lewis, Stephen	NDP	Scarborough West	19 Parkcrest Dr., Scarborough
MacBeth, John P.	PC	York West	9 Palace Arch Dr., Islington
MacDonald, Donald C.	NDP	York South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
MacNaughton, Hon. Charles	PC	Huron	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Maeck, Lorne	PC	Parry Sound	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Martel, Elie W.	NDP	Sudbury East	46 Ferguson Ave., Capreol
McIlveen, Charles E.	PC	Oshawa	100 Alexandra St., Oshawa
McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy	PC	Chatham-Kent	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
McNeil, Ronald K.	PC	Elgin	R.R. #2, Springfield
McNie, Jack	PC	Hamilton West	Box 250, Hamilton
Meen, Arthur K.	PC	York East	95 Lord Seaton Rd., Willowdale
Miller, Frank S.	PC	Muskoka	R.R. #1, Bracebridge
Morningstar, Ellis P.	PC	Welland	97 Alberta St., Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	PC	Ottawa West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Newman, Bernard	L	Windsor-Walkerville	1290 Ypres Blvd., Windsor
Newman, William	PC	Ontario South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Nixon, George	PC	Dovercourt	315 Salem Ave., Toronto 4
Nixon, Robert F.	L	Brant	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Nuttall, W. J.	PC	Frontenac-Addington	797 Princess Anne Bldg., Suite 206, Kingston
Parrott, Dr. Harry C.	PC	Oxford	22 Wellington St. N., Woodstock
Paterson, Donald A.	L	Essex South	1 Talbot West, Leamington
Potter, Hon. Richard T.	PC	Quinte	Box 42, Parliament Bldg., Toronto
Reid, T. Patrick	L	Rainy River	Box 187, Fort Frances
Reilly, Leonard M.	PC	Eglinton	639 Yonge St., Toronto 5
Renwick, James A.	NDP	Riverdale	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Reuter, Hon. Allan E.	PC	Waterloo South	45 Main St., Galt
Rhodes, John R.	PC	Sault Ste. Marie	60 Hussey St., Sault Ste. Marie
Rollins, Clarke T.	PC	Hastings	R.R. #1, Bancroft
Root, John	PC	Wellington-Dufferin	R.R. #1, Orton
Rowe, Russell D.	PC	Northumberland	546 Lakeshore Rd., Cobourg
Roy, Albert J.	L	Ottawa East	255 Montreal Rd., Vanier
Ruston, Richard F.	L	Essex-Kent	Box 4, South Woodslee

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Sargent, Edward	L	Grey-Bruce	Green Gables, Owen Sound
Scrivener, Mrs. Margaret	PC	St. David	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Shulman, Dr. Morton	NDP	High Park	378 Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto 3
Singer, Vernon, M.	L	Downsview	Suite 405, 365 Bay St., Toronto 1
Smith, Gordon E.	PC	Simcoe East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Smith, John R.	PC	Hamilton Mountain	42 Sunninghill Ave., Hamilton
Smith, Richard S.	L	Nipissing	676 McIntyre St. W., North Bay
Snow, Hon. James W.	PC	Halton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Spence, John P.	L	Kent	R.R. #2, Muirkirk
Stewart, Hon. Wm. A.	PC	Middlesex North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Stokes, Jack E.	NDP	Thunder Bay	Box 62, Schreiber
Taylor, James A.	PC	Prince Edward-Lennox	R.R. #2, Picton (Box 110)
Timbrell, Dennis R.	PC	Don Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Turner, John M.	PC	Peterborough	371 Park St. N., Peterborough
Villeneuve, Osie F.	PC	Glengarry	Box 27, Maxville
Walker, Gordon W.	PC	London North	69 Dundas St., London 12
Wardle, Thomas A.	PC	Beaches-Woodbine	11 Fallingbrook Woods, Scarborough
Welch, Hon. Robert	PC	Lincoln	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	PC	Scarborough North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
White, Hon. John	PC	London South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Winkler, Hon. Eric A.	PC	Grey South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wiseman, Douglas J.	PC	Lanark	40 Gore St., Perth
Worton, Harry	L	Wellington South	15 Queen St., Guelph
Yakabuski, Paul J.	PC	Renfrew South	P.O. Box 219, Barry's Bay
Yaremko, Hon. John	PC	Bellwoods	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Young, Fred	NDP	Yorkview	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

Monday, December 13, 1971

Motion that Mr. Reuter take the chair as Speaker, Mr. Davis, agreed to	3
Speech from the Throne, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	4
Introducing changes in ongoing fiscal policies, statement by Mr. McKeough	6
Tabling documents on intergovernmental economic co-operation, Mr. McKeough	7
Trial of Kingston Penitentiary inmates—Attorney General's involvement in, questions to Mr. Davis and Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lawlor	15
Sale of London Credit Bureau to American company, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	16
Federal-provincial employment loans programme—Ontario participation, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. R. F. Nixon	17
Local initiative programme—participation of provincial official, questions to Mr. McKeough and Mr. Bales, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald	17
Metro Centre Plan—Part 2 study, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Singer	18
Foreign investment in Ontario—committee to discuss report, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis	19
Transportation policy for Metro Toronto, particularly northwest quadrant, questions to Mr. MacNaughton and Mr. Bales, Mr. Givens, Mr. Lewis	19
Cost of prescriptions—changes to make Parcost more effective, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Cassidy	20
Ban on studded tires—exempting northwestern and northern Ontario, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Reid, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Shulman	21
Alleged OPP leniency during provincial election, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Worton	22
Stopping removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward county, questions to Mr. Bernier and Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Young, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid	23
Payments to Buckminster Fuller for studies produced, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Singer	24
Pollution index in Sudbury—highest reading and action taken, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Martel	25
Delay in property transfer notification—action re regional assessment offices, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Good	26
Meeting at Muskoka Sands—payment for, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Gisborn	26
Presenting report, Ontario arts council, Mr. Welch	27
Motion that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for printing of debates, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	27
Motion that Legislature dispense with customary Throne Speech debate, Mr. Davis, agreed to	27
Motion to appoint Mr. Rowe as Deputy Speaker and chairman of whole House, Mr. Davis, agreed to	27
Income Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, first reading	28
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, first reading	28
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, first reading	28
Relief of unemployment by municipalities, bill to facilitate, Mr. Bales, first reading	28
Health insurance commission and health insurance plan, bill to establish and provide for, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading	28

Hospital Services Insurance Act , bill to amend, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence	28
Hospital Services Commission Act , bill to amend, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading	28
Corporation Securities Registration Act , bill to amend, Mr. Carton, first reading	29
Teachers' Superannuation Act , bill to amend, Mr. Welch, first reading	29
Public Service Superannuation Act , bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading ...	30
Day Nurseries Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wells, first reading	30
Planning Act , bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading	31
Motion to adjourn , Mr. Winkler, agreed to	32
Appendix	33



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1971

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

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors with us today in the east gallery from the Herron Valley Junior High School of Toronto; and in the west gallery students from Our Lady of Lourdes Separate School of Toronto. In both galleries there are students from Sir John A. Macdonald High School from Hamilton.

A little later, at 3, in the east gallery there will be further students from St. Anthony's School of Beachville, St. Joseph's School of Thamesford and the Forest Hill Collegiate Institute of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the new Ontario government directory and guide which is on all members' desks today, I would just like to make a slight statement of explanation. This publication is a 1971 version of the directory and guide to services of the Ontario government—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Printed in Japan, too!

Hon. Mr. Auld:—last published in 1967. The new publication is a combination of the legislative and departmental telephone listings and a brief outline of the services provided by departments and commissions.

In addition to this guide the hon. members will have received—or will be receiving today—a new telephone directory which in addition to legislative and departmental listings has a complete alphabetical listing of telephone numbers. The hon. members will note that a better quality of paper has been used together with a newer type face and a format which we trust will be more effective and more readable. Extra copies of this publication will be available—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The pictures are no more attractive!

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Aren't they?

Hon. Mr. Auld:—at the Queen's Printer by mail or through the government bookstore.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There is a little hero worship in the first few pages.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no!

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour and Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Ontario cabinet has approved certain additional lottery licences and guidelines designed to prevent the proliferation of large lotteries in the province.

The new administrative provisions limit the number of large raffles operating in any area at a given time. They also set a ceiling on the value of prizes awarded and the administration costs which can be incurred. They will ensure a proper balance between the prizes offered and the total number and value of tickets sold.

Under an amendment to The Criminal Code of Canada, effective January 1, 1970, the province was given authority to regulate, license and control lotteries. Under this authority Ontario was permitted certain types of lottery operations, provided that a licence was obtained from either the municipal licensing officer in the cases where the total prizes did not exceed \$3,500, or from the province in the cases where the total prizes exceeded the \$3,500 mark.

The new policy guidelines which I am announcing today will apply only to the provincially licensed, province-wide sweepstake-type operations. It appears at the present time that most municipalities are having little or no difficulty in controlling the local groups carrying on small lottery operations. Municipal officials and law enforcement officers acquainted with local conditions and local organizations can police this activity adequately, operating within the framework of the broad guidelines laid down by The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Basically, the new policies will not affect the local raffles licensed by the municipality with a maximum prize of \$3,500. Nor will there be any changes at this time in the municipal- or regional-type raffle licensed by the province upon a recommendation of the

local council, where the maximum prize is over \$3,500, but which does not exceed \$10,000 in total.

However, for raffle lotteries with prizes in excess of \$10,000, the potential operating groups will be divided into five categories. These are: 1. Service clubs; 2. religious and educational groups; 3. health and welfare agencies; 4. amateur sports groups; and 5. cultural organizations.

Only one provincial lottery operation by each group at any one given time will be permitted.

Prizes will be limited to a maximum of \$100,000 per raffle lottery.

The new policy will permit single-event lotteries only, thereby ruling out any proposal which would involve a weekly or monthly, continuously-operating raffle lottery.

Along with these policy decisions which I am announcing, a new set of guidelines to implement this policy has been developed by the department. These will be enforced, of course, by our director of lotteries in the department, who can discuss with any group wishing to sponsor a lottery the application of these guidelines to their particular project. These guidelines are now being enforced, and will continue to apply in the future to all such raffle operations as I have described.

While strict controls are necessary with respect to some of the larger lottery schemes, the new policy will in no way restrict or infringe upon the method of operation of the many very worthwhile fund raising activities conducted by community-minded groups. The new requirements are designed to permit effective control while at the same time meeting the needs of the community.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

LOTTERIES POLICY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement just given by the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, I would like to ask him if, in the consideration leading to the new policy, there was any discussion in the department, or in the government, concerning the replacing of this policy with one in which there would be a lottery established under the auspices of the government itself?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I did not really participate in the interdepartmental workings of this particular policy statement, but I will check into that.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: In that portion of the policy dealing with the single-event lotteries only, will this mean that in the case of the lottery that the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Hamilton are planning to run in conjunction with the one which they ran last year, this policy will inhibit or restrict them in any way from continuing with that particular lottery?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am not aware of that particular one, Mr. Speaker, but this will not inhibit any particular organization.

For example, take the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Hamilton. If they can get the cooperation of the other chambers of commerce in other areas, and if they can apply to a municipality through that other local group, then they would be able to carry on the same type of operation providing these conditions are met.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister mentioned guidelines and having set a ceiling, has he a uniform guideline for administrative costs, a specific percentage that will be allowed to the groups running the lotteries?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this will depend upon a particular lottery itself.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if, as a matter of policy, a government-sponsored lottery has been completely rejected?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't say that it has been completely rejected. There has been some small amount of discussion. Certainly there is no move on the part of the government at this moment to get into having, shall we say, a government-sponsored lottery.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Premier. Have the negotiations with the government of Canada been completed on the location of the new international airport; and when can an announcement be expected on the location and the beginning of the work there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, obviously I can't answer the second part of the question, because the decision is that of the federal government. Also, I don't think the term negotiation is the best way to describe what communication has gone on between the province and the federal government. That would perhaps not be the best phrase to use, and quite frankly at this moment I can't tell the hon. member where it is going to be or when it is going to be announced.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Further to the part of the Premier's answer in which he questions the use of the word negotiation, for the information of myself and the members of the Legislature, could he tell the House if a proposed site has been communicated to the government of Ontario and whether the thing that is holding it up is who is going to put in the services and who is going to pay for this sort of ancillary development around the airport.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are two or three areas of interest to this government, as I communicated to the Prime Minister of Canada. So has the Minister of Transportation and Communications to the Minister of Transport of Canada on one specific issue, and that is the question of payment for services to the airport, in that obviously the geographic location has some bearing on the cost of a highway programme, water, sewage and what have you. To date there has been no determination by Ottawa as to who is to pay this cost. There are other items, such as the Toronto-centred region, which this government is concerned about, and I am sure that the department has certain other areas of concern. There has been no determination of either of the items that I mentioned.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Does the Prime Minister mean to say that it is up to the government of Canada to decide who will pay what costs? Or in fact wouldn't it be necessary and wouldn't in fact the Premier insist on negotiations, particularly on those costs which might accrue to our treasury?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we will make sure that the federal government treats this province the same way as it has other provinces in the payment for the costs of servicing any further airport development here in this province; but as I say, I think the decision is still a piece away from that determination.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Might I further ask if the Premier is concerned about the delay in these announcements?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think concern is the best way to express it. This government is as interested as the federal government in seeing this matter finalized, but in fairness I recognize the complexity of the issue and the difficulties which the federal government faces. The decision as to locating another large airport facility somewhere within the area of southern Ontario is a very difficult decision for them to make. Sure we would like to see it finalized, but I think in fairness I have to recognize it is not an easy one for them to make.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Supplementary question to the Prime Minister: On the new airport, is it true that the government of Canada is the one that has to make the final decision, and are they the ones who are holding it up at the present time?

Mr. Lawlor: That sounds tendentious.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Bail him out now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, yes, I would say without any question, with respect to one part of the question, it is the federal government's ultimate responsibility; and while I am not here to assess blame in any way I would say that the province—

An hon. member: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well I want to be charitable here this afternoon.

I would say that the federal government has not made certain decisions that are necessary to come to the ultimate decision of where the geographic location would be.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not going to be Owen Sound—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I don't think.

Mr. Sargent: I will further complicate the matter here. The last word, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Jamieson is that Ontario is holding the works up now. Ontario is the one that has to make the decision, he says.

Now, is that true or not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. Ontario is not the one that has to make the decision. The decision has to be made by the federal government; I am sure that is obvious to everybody.

Mr. Sargent: No, I am talking about the location.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The location is the decision of the federal government.

Mr. Sargent: He said it was Ontario's responsibility.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): He didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They wouldn't let us do it.

Mr. Sargent: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, go and ask them.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fairness to Mr. Jamieson, he hasn't said that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I am surprised that you, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent:—have not allowed the Prime Minister to introduce his new members to the House. We are very proud of the ones we have, I know the member for Scarborough West is of his.

Mr. Lewis: It would take them too long.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: We will waive the Premier's right to do that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who are you guys anyway, I don't recognize any of you.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I think you are writing his stuff again.

ONTARIO OFFICE IN WASHINGTON

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier prepared to make an announcement about the opening of an office in Washington. He said a few weeks ago he felt one was necessary, and surely in these trying

economic times if we are going to have one we might as well get going with it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, consideration of this matter is well under way and I hope to have an announcement to make very shortly.

PR AND INFORMATION COSTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a final question of the Premier. In view of our substantial deficit announced yesterday by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), is any effort being made to cut what might be considered by some, some of the smaller costs of government, those associated with public relations and information?

I refer specifically to the information that was sent out by the Premier, or those acting in his name, in connection with the reforming of the cabinet or the administration in general. We were treated to this kind of stuff—a new organization of government and the date and the logo. The booklet from the committee itself I thought was quite well put out and useful.

I would like to ask him in connection with these costs if, in fact, the implementation of this programme is going to be put before the Legislature. What is he going to do about the costs associated with the information? And in his former capacity as Minister of Education, will he tell the Committee on Government Productivity that there is an "n" in government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to answer the last part of the question first, I certainly will consult with the Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) to see whether there has been any change in spelling recently to move to a phonetic system. I don't think there has. I think there is still an "n" in government. While I recognize that one of the main thrusts of this committee was to achieve greater efficiency, I think by the deletion of an "n" in that word, as many times as it may be used in this House and elsewhere, I really don't think this is absolutely essential.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier never omitted it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I never omitted it. I had my letters checked very carefully in the former department. I should also point out that that material was not distributed by me personally. I just did not have the time to do so—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): We did not want to waste money.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): It would have been cheaper for the government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I think in fairness to the committee, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition must recognize this, this change in the structure of government is going to affect the lives of 65,000 plus civil servants in the Province of Ontario. I think it is important for their participation and their feeling of security that they be adequately informed. This is what the committee undertook to do and I think they have done it rather well.

As for an opportunity to discuss this in the House, Mr. Speaker, I would hope in the late winter or early spring session there will be a good opportunity to discuss these matters. There will of necessity be, I think, several bills related to possible changes in departmental names and functions.

In fact, I will be introducing a bill this afternoon that, legislatively, does just a minor part of this, and that is to provide for an amendment to The Executive Council Act to allow for the appointment of a Provincial Secretary, say of Social Development, of Justice and what have you. That is the first step, and legislatively it is a very minor one.

Of course it will take two or three months for the task forces, Mr. Speaker, to assess very carefully the recommendations of the report. I would hope that this House would take a very real interest in it and a good portion of the early discussions at least in the regular session could be devoted to this subject.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: I am sure that the Prime Minister would be glad to provide, for me at least if not for the rest of the members of the House, some assessment of the cost of preparing this presentation—sending it out in sealed envelopes to all parts of the province with phone communication that it be opened at a special appointed witching hour. I think it would be interesting to note just what the costs of that particular programme have been so far.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to get this information for the hon. member. I am sure that he is aware—

Mr. Sargent: Just like the logbook for the Premier's aircraft. Same thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and would be very sympathetic to the fact that the committee made every effort to see that this material was available to members of the civil service in a way that they would know about it before they read about it in the press.

A very real effort was made to see that this was done. I think it is fair to state that, by and large, the public servants of this province had some insight into this before they either read about it in the press or saw it on television. So this, I think, was a very credible objective and the committee did this quite well.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Where are the regulations for The Environmental Protection Act which received royal assent on July 28 and proclamation on August 11, 1971?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the regulations for the Act are all in effect, as I have indicated previously. The regulations for areas dealing with air, water and waste management are pretty well the same regulations that were in effect in previous Acts. The only area for which we have not completed regulations is the section dealing with litter.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: When will the regulations be proclaimed dealing with the novel sections of the Act, and when will the regulations be proclaimed which make alterations in the existing regulations, as the minister indicated would be the case when he introduced this "bill of rights for the environment"?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If there are any changes in the existing regulations that were adopted by the legislation itself they would be proclaimed, I would think, immediately. Those are being worked on; the sections are being updated.

But I will say as far as the particular section dealing with litter is concerned I cannot give the member a timetable on that. It is still being worked on. My original estimate was by the end of this year, and I am hoping to keep to that date.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, would

it be fair then to suggest to the minister that, notwithstanding all the pomp and ceremony that announced the new bill of rights for the environment, there was nothing new at all nor is there intended to be anything new?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): How right the member is!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. There are many new sections in the Act itself. As far as the regulations are concerned, these are continuously being updated under existing regulation as technology changes and our information changes. They will be, as I say, updated in any new regulations that will be incorporated into this legislation. But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that—

Mr. Haggerty: How about noise?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —the fact that there has not been a proclamation dealing with the sections other than litter has not inhibited the application or the enforcement of that Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of perhaps final supplementary, could the minister tell us if there are any—even one new regulation that has been passed as a result of this great new Act which he told us about last spring?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, there has been an updating of regulations dealing with the air management branch.

Mr. Singer: How many?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't know how many. But they are very specific, dealing with ambient air quality—

Mr. Lewis: Where are they?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —which is something, as I said, that is going on from time to time.

Mr. Singer: They are not proclaimed yet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park. A supplementary?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, a question of the minister, can we expect regulations to be forthcoming preventing the use of non-returnable bottles?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, this is under the section dealing with litter. I am hoping that some regulations dealing with this particular section will be proclaimed very shortly. This is something that we have been working on for some weeks now. That is one aspect

of the section on litter that we have been dealing with.

Mr. Shulman: A final supplementary, if I may: In as much as this is a fairly simple regulation, can we expect that before we prorogue for this session?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I beg to disagree with the hon. member. They are not simple regulations.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): No, no!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: These regulations are very complex—

Mr. Lewis: They were simple in British Columbia and Alberta.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —involving a great deal of consequences—

Mr. Singer: We are sick and tired of all this stuff.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —in the passing of any regulations.

Mr. Singer: Remember that day!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows there are regulations proclaimed dealing with no-deposit bottles in British Columbia. They have been in effect for about a year now. It is our information—this information is first hand—that those regulations have not been successful. They have not resulted in the abatement of litter whatsoever, nor in the encouragement of recycling of those particular products.

Mr. Singer: Better to have no regulations at all.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister then saying that his announced intention to place a ban on non-returnable bottles is now under siege in the cabinet, and that he will abandon it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No Mr. Speaker, there was never an announced ban by me or anybody in my department of no-deposit bottles.

Mr. Deans: Announced intention!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We have indicated an intention to deal with no-deposit bottles in some way or another.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Yes, one way or another!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Like the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is a very complex thing and we want to make sure that it is beneficial—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Kerr:—that there is some benefit from bringing in regulations dealing with this type of container—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Is it fair to say the minister made a deal?

Hon. Mr. Kerr:—and when we have all that information then we will do one thing or another.

Mr. Cassidy: When will that be?

PITS AND QUARRIES REGULATIONS

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs: Where are the regulations governing the legislation on pits and quarries given royal assent on July 28 and proclaimed on November 3, 1971?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question from the leader of the New Democratic Party, I want to say that the preparation of these regulations has been in my department for some considerable time.

Mr. Lewis: And in his predecessor's.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As the member is aware they are very, very complex.

Mr. MacDonald: What else is new?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They have been finalized and they will be before the government very, very shortly; and I hope to have them proclaimed in the very, very near future.

Mr. Stokes: The minister should pass notes along to his colleagues.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, can the minister give us a definition more explicitly of "very, very shortly" and of "very, very near future"? When will they go before cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would hope we would have this cleared before the end of the year. This is my hope.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, is this another supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: No.

Mr. Speaker: No, this was not supplementary.

REGULATIONS TO DAY NURSERIES ACT

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Social and Family Services. Where are the regulations governing the amendments to The Day Nurseries Act given royal assent on July 28, and proclaimed the same day?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the regulations under those amendments are ready and in fact will be submitted to cabinet within the next week. They were held up because we knew we had these changes in the Act which I have introduced at this session and the whole works are now ready to go together, except for the regulations for private home day care which will still be perhaps another month in the making.

POSITION OF DENTURISTS

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health: Has the minister yet come to an accord in his negotiations with the denturists; and if so what is the policy position of the government?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have not been negotiating with the denturists. I have had no communication with them for, I would think, five or six months. I have no response to that question.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware of the fact that the Royal College of Dental Surgeons has hired a corps of private detectives to gather information for raids on the dental clinics across the province?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not aware that they had, but in the absence of this role being filled by the ordinary police forces, I am not surprised that they have done so.

Mr. MacDonald: A further supplementary: In view of the fact that there are 40 dental clinics in operation across the province, has the minister satisfied himself that these dental clinics are a sufficient health hazard to justify tolerating this kind of activity?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The question is one of law, Mr. Speaker.

In a number of cases which were brought forward by way of prosecution last spring and summer—I think three in number—convictions were obtained by the Royal College against clinics for practising outside the law.

I would judge that they are proceeding basically on the same exercise. As minister I, no more than the denturists, am entitled to breach the laws that exist.

Mr. MacDonald: A final supplementary question: Does the existing law in the minister's view protect the people from a health hazard or is it protecting the vested interests?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is a question of speculation that presumably will be debated next year when amendments to The Dentistry Act and other health statutes will be brought before the House.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary Mr. Speaker: Is the minister prepared to bring in legislation to allow people to pay for dental services, who now resort to denturists because of a lack of income to pay for professional services?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can't picture legislation requiring me to allow people to pay, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: They have a money problem and that is why they go to the denturists, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Is the member sure?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, there is lots of evidence that should make the member sure too.

Mr. Lewis: Like the chiropractors of years ago.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: Has his department and the office of the superintendent of insurance been in negotiation about, or approved, the increase in premium rates

in the automobile insurance industry of a minimum of five per cent in the next year? What portion of those rates applies to the no-fault insurance scheme introduced by this government?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I have been looking into this matter in the last two or three days since I assumed this office and will have something further to report after two or three more days on the matter.

Insofar as the rates themselves are concerned, there was a press release some time ago on these. At that time, in my capacity as Minister of Labour, I had noticed them but was not that knowledgeable on them. Since I took over this portfolio I have been in touch with them and am working on it presently.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre has a supplementary.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary: Does the minister believe part of this rate increase that is proposed is due to the fact that there is a loophole in the legislation we passed at the last session, which apparently permits an accident victim to legally claim twice for damages, as outlined in a speech recently?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, insofar as these mandatory improved accident benefits are concerned, rather than the no-fault terminology, the disability payments are prorated with benefits for loss of time under other insurance contracts, and therefore there would be no double payments. The only time that this could happen would be on a death benefit; and I might mention that when this bill was passed and became law, it was Bill 81 it became law on July 28, that schedule C was enacted and the bill provided that schedule C might—schedule E that is—might be amended by regulations. I am taking care of this particular point prior to the implementation on January 1.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth was up with a supplementary

Mr. Deans: I think it was the hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Speaker: All right the hon. member for Yorkview was on his feet for a supplementary.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): A supplementary of the hon. minister: Has the minister discussed with the automobile industry and the insurance industry the possibility of better

standards for car bumpers and similar devices, which cause a great deal of damage and therefore raise insurance rates? This as a means of lowering insurance rates in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I have not discussed this particular point, but I thank the hon. member for bringing it to my attention.

Mr. Young: The minister will discuss this?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: Is the minister aware there has been a \$2 million rebate, or a five per cent rebate, on insurance rates in the state of Michigan; an 11 per cent rebate in the state of Massachusetts—that is with State Farm Insurance? What are we doing in Ontario in this regard? Will he check into it, why there are no rebates here in that amount of money?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am checking into the whole aspect, Mr. Speaker, of the rates.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park with a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Can the minister explain why automobile insurance rates are rising in Ontario with our so called no-fault insurance while in the American states which brought in no-fault insurance over a year ago the rates have been dropped by up to a third this year?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No Mr. Speaker, I can't explain it.

Mr. Cassidy: Talk to your friend.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South, a supplementary?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): No supplementary.

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

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the minister if he has made himself aware of the action taken by insurance companies in implementing the no-fault insurance as it pertains to snowmobiles where the rates, or the premiums, have more than doubled since legislation was passed dealing with no-fault accident insurance?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I have been busy, Mr. Speaker, with the automobile rates; I will look into the snowmobile now, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I think further questions on this would develop into a full scale debate. New questions.

LICENCE TO FIRM IN WHICH STRIKE-BREAKER IS PRINCIPAL

Mr. Lewis: A question Mr. Speaker, of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice: Has his department approved the licence of a firm named Canadian Specialized Services; one of whose principals, Mr. Rick Grange, is associated in formal strike-breaking activity through Canadian Driver Pool Limited?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have not reviewed that list for a few days, Mr. Speaker, and that name does not sound familiar to me; but I shall certainly let the hon. member know tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask, by way of supplementary to the minister, has he conducted any departmental investigation into the activities of the strike-breaking companies, both in picket line terms and in wire tap terms?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Police investigations are underway and have been underway for some time.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, will there be a report to the Legislature about the results of those investigations?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If there is no prosecution in the criminal courts, yes?

Mr. Singer: Well there is a prosecution and the minister knows about it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I mean generally speaking about an allied matter, that obviously the hon. member is not aware of, but the leader of the NDP may be aware of.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Conspiracy of Ontario telephone—

INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE-BREAKING FIRMS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Labour, has he conducted the investigations which he indicated he would conduct during his estimates last year into Canadian Driver

Pool Limited and similar companies engaged in professional strike-breaking? Does he have a departmental policy on it? What are his present feelings?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I undertook to look into the Canadian Driver Pool during my estimates, Mr. Speaker; and I did a check into incorporations; I did a check through the Attorney General's department into whether or not they were offering security services. I did as complete a check as I could and in no way were they contravening the law.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, could the minister then put them in a position of contravention of the law by moving an amendment to The Labour Relations Act outlawing strike breaking in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this is one area that I would not move into in Ontario, outlawing strike-breaking per se, and I have said this many times.

Mr. Renwick: Professional strike-breaking?

Mr. Deans: Professional strike-breaking?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, so it not be misunderstood, would the minister introduce a law to make professional strike-breaking illegal, that is men and women hired for the purpose of occupying jobs of others who are legitimately on strike and have observed all the requirements of The Ontario Labour Relations Act?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MacDonald: Speak to the Minister of Health, he wants to respect the law.

BENEFITS FOR RESIDENTS OF HOMES FOR THE AGED

Mr. Paterson: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Can the minister advise the members as to whether the benefits announced under the Ontario hospital coverage in relation to nursing homes are going to be extended to those residents of municipally-owned homes for the aged that require nursing care?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Categorically, Mr. Speaker, I can't say yes to that, although my own department and The Department of Social and Family Services are busy working

out a pattern of support so that we don't get anachronisms as between the two types of institutions.

At some point or other I think either the Minister of Social and Family Services or myself will answer that question categorically.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. As a supplementary, can the minister make this statement before the end of the calendar year in order that the counties, and so forth, can set up their programmes for the coming year?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Social and Family Services would comment on this. Perhaps he is closer to the picture than I am.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think this is going to have to await the outcome of the task force that's putting all these details together. If we can make the statement in that time period we certainly will do it. It will all be resolved before the programme comes into effect.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?
No supplementaries?

The hon. member—there are two hon. members there—the hon. member for Wentworth.

WCB FINANCING OF BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Deans: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Can the minister explain to the House the extent to which the Workmen's Compensation Board will be involved in the financing of the building undertaking at Yonge and Bloor Streets as permitted under section 3 of the order in council, No. 3197-71?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, insofar as this matter is concerned, there is a very lengthy explanation involved and I will refer it to the order paper.

Mr. Deans: Well, when might we expect to hear the lengthy explanation about the expenditures of trust funds by the Compensation Board which will inevitably result in a great deal of money going to the company involved?

Mr. M. Hamilton (Renfrew North): Two years from now! What involvement has the hon. member?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I can provide these fairly shortly, Mr. Speaker.

I might say that the Workmen's Compensation Board have an excellent investment record. Their trust funds are, from time to time, scrutinized by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and other people who are interested in their funds. I have every confidence in the investment policy of the Compensation Board.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question. Might I ask if it is the practice of the government in council to issue carte blanche statements which will permit boards or commissions of the government to enter into financial arrangements without knowing beforehand the extent of the involvement?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I was aware of the extent of the involvement of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Deans: Finally then, might I ask why the extent of the involvement doesn't appear on the face of the order in council as it was issued?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Because, Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Board, as other commissions have, probably, could have gone on their own and leased certain properties. In other words, they have the authority to make leases, but when it comes to selling or purchasing lands in conjunction therewith, they do require the order in council. That is why I became aware of it and that is why I looked into all the matters relating to this particular purchase.

Mr. Deans: I have one question flowing from that final one. This will be the last one.

Mr. Speaker: Is this another supplementary?

Mr. Deans: Am I correct in assuming from the statements that the minister makes that the board is involved not only in the leasing of the property, but is directly involved by way of investment and the erection of the buildings which will be erected on the property which they will lease to the company involved?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Board are lessees, and in addition they are owners of a particular piece of valuable property on which the rate of interest return is excellent.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there have been sufficient supplementaries.

Mr. Singer: Only by the member for Wentworth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There have been sufficient supplementaries on this topic. It has developed into a debate.

The hon. member for Rainy River.

SUBSIDY FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Can the minister indicate whether he has entered into another agreement with the federal government in regard to paying commercial fishermen a subsidy for the mercury-fish that they catch? Has this agreement been renewed with the federal government or will it be renewed?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, we have an existing agreement with the federal government to pay compensation to fishermen for polluted fish.

Mr. Reid: By way of supplementary, is the minister not aware that an announcement has been made that by the end of November, I believe, the payments would no longer be made, that the existing agreement had run out. Has any further conversation been going on between his department and the federal department to renew this agreement, as the fishermen have been informed that they will not be paid.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have heard that the fishermen have not been paid and I will be pleased to look into it, because we have made that commitment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

ALLEGED DISMISSAL OF UNION ORGANIZER

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): A question of the Minister of Labour: Is the minister aware of the situation that exists right now in the town of Chapleau where the employees of the Martel Lumber Company were attempting to organize a union; as the cards were being sent into The Department of

Labour for certification the chief filer for the company was fired. Coincidentally, he was a chief organizer of the attempt to form the union. At the same time the company shut down allegedly for repairs.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the minister is aware of this, and if so, what is he doing about it? And if he is not aware, will he look into it and report to the House.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What was the name of that company?

An hon. member: Martell!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will appreciate, there are many applications for certification. I will look into it if he will please send me the name and the location.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES FOR NUTRIENT REMOVAL

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the Minister of the Environment. Since the Ontario Water Resources Commission has ordered that all municipalities situated on waterways emptying into Lake Erie must, by the end of 1973, have facilities to remove 80 per cent of the phosphates and, as this is going to double the cost of sewage plant operation, would the minister inform the House as to what dialogue or action has taken place between his department and the federal government in regard to the potential or the possibility of subsidizing these municipalities for this expensive operation.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, first of all there is \$6 million that has been set aside for research for nutrient removal facilities—\$3 million from us and \$3 million from Ottawa. As for expenditures for nutrient removal facilities and the operating costs, this would be part of the overall cost of a project.

As the hon. member knows, at the present time the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation lends two-thirds of the value of the whole project with a 25 per cent forgivable clause. This will of course be increased to provide for the cost of nutrient removal. It is quite possible if these charges are extraordinarily onerous or even prohibitive, the province itself might have to increase

its lending arrangements with the various municipalities, particularly those municipalities in the Great Lakes basin that have been referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. Good: A supplementary question: Regarding the provincial involvement in this scheme, has any decision been made as to what portions would be forgivable or outright grants?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, it is hard to tie it in solely with nutrient removal facilities or the cost of phosphate removal. For example, I expect to advise the House, probably in a few days, that we have worked out a new formula for small municipalities. Instead of a 50 per cent subsidy we hope to go to about a 75 per cent subsidy to keep the costs down to around \$2.25 for both water and sewers. This is a form of subsidy or assistance for municipalities and therefore would include any costs for nutrient removal.

There isn't a specific subsidy programme just for nutrient removal, but because of the extra costs placed on a municipality we are going to have to have an overall increase in subsidies generally for water and sewage projects.

Mr. Good: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I might: Regarding the increased subsidy that the minister speaks of for small municipalities, would this be retroactive and applicable to municipalities that are now in the process of making installations?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It would depend on the rate being charged in those municipalities.

Mr. Good: What if it is exorbitant?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, if it is over the figure of—I am using my memory—if it is over the figure of approximately \$250 per home per year, this would be considered, yes.

Mr. Good: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce was attempting to get the floor some time ago.

PROVINCIAL INVOLVEMENT IN COMPUTER FIRM

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development: With regard to the bankruptcy proceedings in the amount of \$13 million for Consolidated Computer Limited of Toronto, what is the amount of the original loan?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, the Consolidated Computer situation at this moment is hopefully being resolved.

As far as the \$13 million is concerned, I am not too sure that is the figure. Our financial involvement at the moment is a maximum of \$500,000, and whether that has all been used up at this stage I cannot tell the hon. member. I can tell him, however, that we think this matter is being resolved for the benefit of keeping this very important Canadian company in business.

Incidentally, I should say it was an interim bankruptcy—it is not in bankruptcy as such—only for the purpose of getting these matters resolved so we could keep the company in business. It looks like we may have succeeded, but I just won't say it has succeeded at the moment because of the negotiations that are going on at the present time.

Mr. Sargent. A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that we have an interim financing problem now for \$2 million, how much are we involved in that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say it was \$2 million, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: I can tell him it is!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member knows—

Mr. Sargent: It has been in the press; there is nothing to hide.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I told the hon. member that our involvement at the moment, as far as Ontario funds are concerned, is to a maximum of \$500,000.

Mr. Sargent: Is the province a secured creditor?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member will wait a few days, it would—

Mr. Sargent: He doesn't know!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that.

Mr. Sargent: I am saying he doesn't know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suggested, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of making certain that we are able to keep this company in business—and I think we shall be able to do so—it would be better if the hon. mem-

ber perhaps could wait a few days, and we may be in a position—

Mr. Sargent: A final supplementary, then—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It may be better, as I suggest Mr. Speaker, not to engage in a public debate on this at least for a very short period of time in the hope that we can resolve this matter in a way in which I am sure the hon. member would hope it be resolved.

Mr. Sargent: Try to find out some facts then!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

PROGRAMME OF GRANTS FOR HOME IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Prime Minister: Last October 8 he promised a grant programme to provide incentives for home improvements. Can the Premier inform us what has happened to that programme and what minister is responsible for it, if in fact it still exists?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) will be responsible for this programme and will be dealing with it very shortly.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary: Can the Premier explain how it is expected to provide employment during the peak unemployment period when no details of the scheme have yet been announced?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course I would think it is very difficult for anyone to determine when the peak unemployment period is.

An hon. member: It occurs in July!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly it will be announced sometime in 1972, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be dealing with this very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question of the Premier. After two days of attempting I have a question of the Premier—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre was given a reply by

the Prime Minister and I think the nature of the answer would eliminate any possibility of a supplementary.

The hon. member for Sarnia.

MUNICIPAL BOARD DECISION ON ANNEXATION APPLICATION

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, I have a question of the Premier. Is the Premier aware of comments made by one Alderman Richard Ford in connection with the 23-page decision of the Ontario Municipal Board to resist the application of the city of Sarnia for annexation of parts of the county of Lambton, that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) influenced the Ontario Municipal Board in its decision. And having regard to the concurrent adverse publicity given a development in his own riding, would the Prime Minister entertain a judicial inquiry into the question of undue influence on the Ontario Municipal Board; or will he rise in his seat now and tell the people of Ontario that the Ontario Municipal Board is composed of people of integrity, objectivity and that they make their decisions on the basis of the evidence before them and under no duress or political influence? One of the two—a judicial inquiry or set the record straight.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The hon. member for Sarnia didn't have the courage to take a stand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is an example.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Great start for the member's leadership campaign.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have said it on many occasions and if it is any comfort to the member for Sarnia I will repeat it here again today. I have complete confidence in the capacity and integrity of the members of the Ontario Municipal Board in this province.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of one supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Twice saved by the bell.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.
Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the report of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 1970; the report of the Pension Commission of Ontario, 1970; the report of the Ontario Highway Transport Board, 1970.

Hon. Mr. Winkler presented the annual report of The Department of Revenue, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that commencing tomorrow and until further order this House will meet at 10:30 o'clock, a.m., each day and will rise for luncheon interval from 12:30 o'clock, p.m., until 2 o'clock, p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stokes: On a point of information, Mr. Speaker. When would the question period be—at 10:30 o'clock, a.m. or at 2 o'clock, p.m., as usual?

Mr. Speaker: The question period would come in the usual manner after the commencement of the sitting of the House.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the House resolve itself into committee of supply.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion I wonder if we are just going to get into the same routine. The House leader yesterday said "bills", so that means automatically we go into the committee of supply. I suppose if he says "supply" we can expect bills. Is that a fair comment?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): I would like to reply to that; that is not correct. I will make one apology because I did not have all the bills. All the bills could not be printed this morning.

I indicated to the House yesterday that we would deal with the bills standing in the name of the Minister of Health, and they are numbers 5, 6, 7 and 11, and—

Mr. Singer: And that is why the minister asked for supply.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —at the conclusion of the consideration of those bills we will consider supply.

Mr. Singer: Par for the course.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was what was said yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister indicate the reason for his motion to go into supply, since it is not—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, it is necessary in order to have the authority to bring them into the House today, that is the reason.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member for Downsview should have stayed in bed today.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

MANAGEMENT BOARD OF CABINET

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the management Board of Cabinet.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

POLICY AND PRIORITIES BOARD OF CABINET

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

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

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, the two bills that were introduced first are very similar to the ones introduced in the latter stages of the prior session. They establish by statute the management board which is one of the recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity—or now the Cronyn commission—and relate to the functions that exist now for Treasury Board plus some expanded functions.

The bill relating to the policy and priorities board is to put in statute form, once again, one of the recommendations. There is a policy and priorities committee of cabinet now functioning. This puts it on a statutory basis.

The third bill relates to a small amendment to The Executive Council Act which will permit the appointment of ministers—we are going to term them provincial secretaries—of the various policy areas.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not more of these. We have too many now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: These are the initial steps, Mr. Speaker, related to the report that the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to a few moments ago.

EXTRA-JUDICIAL SERVICES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, in line with the request from the Leader of the Opposition a few moments ago that we curtail some costs of government, I have just introduced for first reading two bills outlining similar amendments to The Surrogate Courts Act and The Extra-Judicial Services Act. As you are aware, sir, the federal government possesses the constitutional authority to make appointments to the Supreme Court and the county courts of Ontario. With this authority obviously goes the obligation on the federal government to pay the salaries of the judges appointed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But they are working for the province!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: However, in addition to this salary the judges of those courts have received a remuneration from the province as well. Ontario's salary contribution is now \$6,000 each per annum for Supreme Court judges and \$3,500 each per annum for county court judges.

The federal government has recently announced large increases in the salaries for both categories of judges to be effective January 1, 1972. Ontario subscribes to the principle of a national scale of salaries for all judges. We feel that adoption of such an objective would promote the maintenance of equality in the administration of justice right across Canada.

The net result to the judges of the federal increases, together with the amendments pro-

posed in these two bills, is a substantial raise in their salary levels. Supreme Court judges now receiving \$32,000 per annum will be increased to \$41,000 and county court judges from \$24,500 to \$30,000.

We feel those increases are fair and commensurate with the judges' positions of responsibility in the administration of justice. We are also hopeful that our action will advance our stated aim of national equality among the judges. It should also encourage the federal government eventually to assume complete responsibility for the full salaries of the judges it appoints.

Mr. Singer: We can see how influential that lobby is.

HUMAN RIGHTS CODE

Mr. Lewis moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, this bill adds the political opinion and the sex of a person to the grounds on which no person may discriminate against another in the manner set forth in the Act.

The matter of sex as an addition to the Act is something that we in the New Democratic Party have put forward a number of times. The addition of political opinion is intended to cover cases such as the Ron Haggart case, and intended to conform with the ILO convention giving political opinion that status, to which the Province of Ontario and the government of Canada were signatories in 1964—I am sorry, the Province of Ontario through the government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

HEALTH INSURANCE COMMISSION ACT

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 5, An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and to provide for the Advance Organization of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, I believe, should be discussed in conjunction with the

two ancillary bills. Although you no doubt will wish to deal with them separately for second reading, I hope you will permit my remarks to range, in principle of course, over the three bills.

In fact, what we are doing is implementing an announcement made by the government almost a year ago to bring the administration of OHSIP and hospital services under a single jurisdiction and making some other changes, most of which I think are good ones indeed.

I do, however, want to say something about the background involved with the decision taken by the government that will bring about a unification of the health services programmes under the title of a new organization called the Ontario Health Insurance Commission. Following the penchant for acronyms that the government has shown, I presume they are going to call it OHIC. Is the government really?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): I hope not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'll bet it does, OHIC!

However, the passage of this bill will accomplish what many reasonable citizens in this province, including myself and my colleagues in the Liberal Party, have been calling for for a good long time: a rationalization of the administration of the insurance of health services.

Hospitalization, I am sure you will recall, Mr. Speaker, used to be a prime political issue. An election in this province was fought on it in 1951. Not everyone could remember the circumstances here. It caught the interest of the Toronto Star, as I recall. The then leader of the Liberal Party, an estimable gentleman, the late Walter Thompson, put forward a strong advocacy of health, or at least of hospital insurance. I can remember at the time I had just begun teaching in Sault Ste. Marie and took part in the campaign. I remember being savagely attacked by people in that particular city—I don't know whether the mayor is here or not—because of the outrageous socialistic tendencies for anything that would in fact insure hospitalization coverage.

At that time, the government of the day, which was opposed to hospitalization, the Conservative government of that day, was triumphant as they sometimes tend to be, and the morality of the situation was apparently all on their side. Anybody who spoke about hospitalization in the Fifties was, of course,

doomed to the confinement of the political trash barrel that seemed to be the destiny of anybody opposed to the Conservatives in those days. If anybody wants to interject, this in the time!

Mr. Speaker, it was not until 1956 or 1957 that federal initiative, actually under the then Minister of Health, Paul Martin, now Senator Martin, passed federal legislation that persuaded the then Premier, Leslie Frost, that Ontario should participate. It was done quite smoothly as we might expect it would be under both Mr. Martin and Mr. Frost. I understand that the federal minister came down to visit the Premier here on one or two occasions.

The legislation was presented and nobody screamed that it was socialism, incipient or otherwise. We now realize that we simply could not get along in this province nor would we think of trying to get along, without the benefits of the hospital services insurance that we have grown accustomed to.

Since that time, OHSC has established its primacy, almost, with full supervision of all of our hospitals, particularly since they do have the approval of the budgets and pay the grants on a monthly basis depending on the rate of the expenditure associated with the approved budget. The total budget for OHSC this year approaches \$1 billion, and it is growing at the rate of approximately \$100 million a year. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to compare this with the OHSC budget just 10 years ago when it was \$200 million. In 10 years it has increased by a factor of five. In 1961 we paid \$200 million for our hospital facilities; this year it is about \$1 billion.

There have been some changes in policy of the Hospital Services Commission during that time. I think the hon. Minister of Revenue (Mr. Winkler) knows probably better than anyone else that OHSC made a foray into policy setting, particularly in his area of the country up in Grey county. They decided that, for the efficiency and better service of the people concerned, they were going to close down a few of the small hospitals in that area. They found that the people in the area were not making a local decision on the same criteria, and even the estimable Minister of Revenue had to backtrack in a hurry to save his political skin. Nevertheless, he did so. The smaller hospitals have, I believe, been maintained and they are still serving the communities in Durham, Hanover, and I am sure other towns in this area—Chesley and so on—and I think they are serving very well.

Frankly, I believe that this drawback from centralization was a good thing. There are still areas in the province where OHSC, in its wisdom, is prepared if it can—if it could, if it might withstand the political pressure—to centralize the service. I believe that the people in these smaller communities are wise in resisting this tendency, and I have a feeling that their representatives on all sides in this House will give the community every support in resisting this tendency.

Obviously you can't have open heart surgery in every hospital in this province, and we are quite prepared to have some of the more esoteric and elaborate procedures centralized. But for the basic care, the facilities that the people require that can be supervised by the local medical practitioners must be kept established in the smaller communities.

I think we should realize that federal support in our hospitalization programme is still substantial—that with the close to \$1 billion budget this year, the federal support amounts to about 41 per cent, the provincial support to about 29 per cent, and the premiums about 29 per cent. This is what it will be with the implementation of the programme that is designed to be administered under Bill 5 and the bill that will follow it later in 1972.

The most recent report available from OHSC—that is for 1970—indicates that the federal Treasury contributed about \$360 million, and the provincial Treasury about \$113 million. I think we must recognize that the federal treasury must accept the full responsibility, however—almost the full responsibility—for the mental hospitals, the so-called "Ontario Hospitals" and certain other services in which the federal government, through its programmes, does not participate.

I particularly want to commend OHSC for the provision of a good report to the Legislature through the minister. They have their annual report; the latest one available is 1970, which is not too seriously out of date. It comes in two parts; a general report for the use of most of us, plus a full statistical supplement which I am sure is very useful for those who want to inquire more closely into the trends in the province and certainly for those professionally involved in the field.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to compare this with the other half of the marriage partner, and that is OHSIP, which was established as of, I believe, October 1, 1969. It is not my intent, of course, to give any full historical

background. I wouldn't be competent so to do, nor do I want to spend the time of the Legislature. But in looking at the comparison of the two components that are going to be put together by this bill, I looked in my record for the reports of OHSIP and its predecessor OMSIP. I couldn't find anything there and sent to the library.

All that could be provided was the annual report of The Department of Health for 1969—which, by the way, is the most recent one available; it is somewhat out of date. We opened it at the section where OHSIP, the Ontario Health Services Insurance, is dealt with. There is a very meagre paragraph indeed, simply setting out the date of its inception and what its aims are. No figures, no report whatsoever.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very serious shortcoming indeed and one that I want to talk about just for a moment, because when we think about the development of the Medicare side, the payments for doctors' services, this too has an interesting political background.

You remember the great arguments at the federal level; Pearson and Judy LaMarsh were involved at one stage; the excellent report put out by Mr. Justice Hall; Mr. Diefenbaker's difficulty in dealing with that report at the time and the way it came upon us away back in 1963 when it was a substantial issue in that election.

Just before the 1963 election something called "OMSIP" was introduced, which was the government response to what they recognized—what the Conservative Party recognized—to be a demand for public insurance for doctors' services. The federal government passing Medicare legislation after lengthy and often acrimonious debate led the then leader of the government of Ontario to brand Medicare, as it was then known, as a Machiavellian fraud. I can remember the federal-provincial conference in which he used either that phrase or one similar to it. There are those in the Tory party who thought it was his finest hour but most of us know that it was not. His comments were prepared probably with the assistance of his then Treasurer who still believes it to be a Machiavellian fraud.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Quite right!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right! I knew he did. And then, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the same Treasurer, who still believed it to be a Machiavellian fraud, sat in his place

silent when his leader changed his mind simply four weeks later and announced to the House that he was accepting what he had called a Machiavellian fraud, which now, in his words, became one of the best programmes for the provision of medical insurance anywhere in the world. Once again I paraphrase his remarks, and I am sure that the former Treasurer who is listening to my remarks might want to make them a bit more precise.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I begin to wonder. I wonder why I came back in.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right! So, Mr. Speaker, we moved by a series of rather unplanned stages into what we might call Medicare in this province. I am not prepared by any means to say that the fault lies only with the government of Ontario; there was a great deal of backing and filling at the federal level. But still in those days when there was minority government in Ottawa with all of the political conflict, practically conflagration, that we remember—and which some people, they tell me, watch on television again, believe it or not, every Wednesday—we did get a national bill, the framework of which was accepted by every province, some of them more slowly than others.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton. It was referred to as a law of the land. The member is quite right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right. The former treasurer indicates that it is the law of the land and was at that time. However, I am sure he will remember that there was no part of that law that said a province had to participate and it was the decision taken by the government of Ontario to fit in with the programme at that time.

Now I intend to talk about the development of OMSIP and OHSIP over those years, because there were a lot of problems that many of us, as elected members in those days, recall. It boils down, of course, to servicing individual complaints, and that is one of the reasons we are elected, one of the things we do day to day without complaint, unless of course the problems are those of the government's own construction or lack of planning.

The minister will surely recall, although he wasn't the Minister of Health then, that OHSIP began its career fraught with many administrative problems indeed. It certainly would have been wise at that time to simply establish it as an adjunct to the Ontario

Hospital Services Commission, undoubtedly with a new name, but that was not the procedure taken. We kept it separate.

They established new quarters. They hired new staff. They bought new computers that were very, very troublesome. They did not take the experience of OHSC. They decided to go their own way. They did not even buy compatible equipment, and we are suffering financially and on the basis of service at a reduced level for those decisions even yet.

I remember the decision announced by the former Premier—it was in the spring or early summer; I guess it was in the spring—that we were going to go from what was called OMSIP, a voluntary organization covering at that time about 2.5 million insured, to OHSIP. It was going to be expanded to seven million between the beginning of the summer and October 1. At that time we agreed with the government that if they were going to take that course it would be necessary to maintain private insurance organizations in the field; because it would not be possible to have Medicare operating on a full Ontario basis with a fully government-operated programme with the kind of planning that had led to the decision which had reversed the old Machiavellian fraud concept in such a short time.

Well we know some of the conflicts that arose; that it was necessary for us to maintain private membership in both organizations; that it was necessary for us as privately insured families to pay a cheque for \$33 four times a year to something called HIRB, the Health Insurance Registration Board; and then, in the odd months, on a quarterly basis, we would pay to the Treasurer of Ontario a cheque for, I believe, \$43—something like that.

There seemed to be no co-ordination. The two premium notices arrived in separate envelopes, one green and one orange, as I recall. They both had computer cards differently marked and they should not be confused. Heaven help anybody who happened to write out a single cheque to cover both premiums and returned them in the same envelope, because it meant that the administration would smoke and fume for six months and anybody who had to get the services of a doctor or the ministrations of a hospital would be in trouble with the bureaucracy for a good long time indeed.

So we know what these problems are, and we welcome the decision of the government to move away from the administrative com-

plexity, the inefficiency and the waste that has earmarked and characterized the government's policy in this field from the very beginning.

Opposition politicians are often heard saying that programmes are too late. There was never a time when I could say this with more sincerity—this programme is late, too late. It has suffered from ineffectual administration from the top, from this minister and his predecessor, and I am not ignoring in this the former Treasurer himself whose advice to the government of the day was certainly poor advice indeed.

So Mr. Speaker, we have seen that the development in this way has been anything but in the best interests of the people of the province, and it is these people that we are here to serve.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Except to say it was inevitable. We did not sit back.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Don't go away mad!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It seems incredible, Mr. Speaker, that with the former Treasurer, who is now walking out of the chamber, we have not even had a responsible or reasonable financial report from OHSIP from the first day of its inception until now. All we have had have been misleading remarks from the Minister of Health, particularly in the months preceding the election, in which he decided to be the "white knight" to defend the people of the province against the maladministration of certain doctors.

There has been no financial report. There was simply the indication that perhaps \$200 million had been milched by the medical profession out of the fund. If the minister did not use the figure himself it was widely used in the press and he never denied it. He followed it up, I believe, with eight rhetorical questions put to some meeting somewhere in the province in which he questioned the professional ethics of the medical profession in using services for which they were billing more than was conscionable or professional. He had to backtrack from this to a certain extent, but in fact I believe his main function had been fulfilled. A new courageous spokesman in the government was there to defend the people against the encroachments of the medical profession and the high costs of Medicare.

It seems to me that this was a real red herring, because the costs of OHSIP have grown much faster than even the predictions

that have come from the government's advisers. In the supplementary estimates that we will be considering later in this short session, the government is asking for \$20 million extra for funds to pay for the requirements under the OHSIP programme which were unforeseen and unpredicted. These, of course, are the result of the utilization of the programme and the fact that the government and this minister—as certainly a major part of the government in this area—has never been able to bring forward a programme in which he can reasonably, rationally and fairly negotiate with the medical practitioners' professional organization. The law still requires that we pay 90 per cent of their fee, no matter what that fee schedule is.

The minister, in fact, repudiates even the use of the word "negotiation" as if there is something intrinsically bad about this and that there is something intrinsically good in having a law which says: "You doctors tell us what we owe you and we will pay, no matter what the amount will be."

It is not my intention—far from it, Mr. Speaker—to vilify the medical profession. I believe, and I say so most sincerely, that the minister was ill-advised and approaching irresponsibility in his remarks made during this year in this connection. I believe that his intent was largely political and I believe that really if that was his intent it obviously was successful.

I feel that the whole matter of the policy being applied through OHSIP is one that has been dealt with ineffectually by this minister and his predecessor and the whole government, in that we cannot continue without some rational basis of negotiation with the doctors' professional organization.

I say that all of this attitude developed toward the doctors at the behest of the Minister of Health himself. He is responsible; it was he who implied to the House that there had been a tremendous leakage from the funds of OHSIP. Certainly this supplementary estimate indicates that the best advice that the government had fell very much below the actual expenditure which we now must meet, on behalf of not only those served by the doctors but the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario.

It appears that the OHSIP claims are running, on an average, at \$40 million per month and that the income to the fund from all sources other than the subsidies from government is about \$30 million per month. It appears that the government has been

operating very much on an unplanned approach. Obviously, beginning a fairly new programme, Mr. Speaker, we must expect certain aspects to fall short of precision as far as planning is concerned, but a \$20 million shortfall is a surprising one indeed.

The announcement made by the Premier (Mr. Davis), the leader of the Conservative Party the day he called the election, in which he extended so-called free medical insurance to the pensioners, we will perhaps discuss on a more political basis on another occasion. I felt it was the crassest kind of political bribery. I believe it was a surprise to the planners in the medical profession. I frankly believe it was a surprise to the Minister of Health himself.

You know, it goes back to another occasion when shortly after the election of 1967, John Robarts, who was then Premier, announced that we were going to have county school boards. He did it up in Galt. I think one of the most surprised persons was the then Minister of Education, although he made a good face of it, of course, and said that he had been consulted. But whenever we got right down to the details he did not really know what the announcement was all about. He had to take the statement from the Premier that we were going to have county school boards and make it work as best he could.

It is too bad the then Treasurer has gone because he probably would not like me to say that it took the then Treasurer's blank cheque for \$50 million to get the then Minister of Education, the present Premier, over that rough spot in his political career.

There is some kind of irony in the fact that the Premier would do the same thing; that he would sit down probably with the people in the advertising agency—or Dalton Camp and associates, some of those boys—and they would say, "We have got to have one plum in this. It is fine to go on and say you are not making promises; you can call this a commitment—we are going to give free Medicare to our senior citizens."

Who could be against that? Who, in fact, could and would be? No one indeed. He made the announcement and I believe that it was a politically popular one. I did not hear anyone in any opposition party say that there was anything wrong with it, other than faint murmurings that perhaps someone should ask the Premier where he was going to get the \$127 million that it will cost. Obviously the answer is an easy one. We will simply add it to the deficit which at \$415

million was predicted as the largest since Confederation and which has since grown to \$553 million for this year alone. It is easy to pay those bills when you can simply put it on the tab.

However, there is agreement on all sides that senior citizens should be provided with this free service. As a matter of fact, this party believes that we should move away from direct premium payment entirely. Never in the name of free Medicare—obviously it is not free!

OHSIP itself is going to be \$500 million this year; hospitalization is going to be a full \$1 billion. In other words, for the provision of these services we are spending \$1.5 billion. This does not include the development of health resources, the new medical school at McMaster, the hospital construction of Ontario Hospitals and others.

In other words, we have a programme that is rapidly coming to rival the whole education establishment in its costs, including community colleges and universities. We have set in motion a programme, essential though it may be, which under this administration has become an expensive monstrosity where no controls that I can see have been put on either by this minister or any of his predecessors. And he is still not prepared to deal in a fair way with the medical profession.

The attempts by OHSC to control costs have been admirable but largely ineffectual. As a matter of fact, in the quite elaborate report that OHSC did bring forward I was interested to note the relatively small proportion of hospital costs associated with salaries; this has always been a bugbear in this province where employees of hospitals cannot strike—they have lost the right to strike—and still they are paid in many cases niggardly pay for their labours. This is something we have got to come to grips with.

The whole concept of modernizing our mental hospitals must be very much in the mind of the Minister of Health, and I hope we can look for programmes announced very early in the future for further commitments in that field. It looks as if our health expenditures are going to surpass our commitments to education in this province, and probably will do so within the next five years; that is commitments in dollars.

Well Mr. Speaker, in talking about this bill, the one that is supposed to—and I trust will—rationalize the administration of broadly based Medicare, I have said it is too late; I say it is very late. Obviously it is not too

late that we can make some improvements. It is certainly later than rational people would have wished.

The announcement by the Premier that the pensioners were going to be included in the free lists, so to speak, in effect moved forward the date of the amalgamation to April 1. We know that OHSIP billed with about a one-month prepayment, OHSC with three months' prepayment, and it appears that the new organization is going to follow, very wisely I believe, the OHSC concept. We had hoped—we have discussed this, and I am sure one of my colleagues will say something more about it—that we would stick to the social security numbering scheme that OHSIP had inaugurated, rather than using an entirely new set of numbers. But the problems of correlating the administration and particularly the computers is a tremendous one since the original policy decision went forward to keep these two organizations entirely separate and in fact at odds in some respects for so long.

The prediction that the cost of the provision of free Medicare will be \$127 million, I would predict, is far short of the mark. The minister is aware, I know, that the original statement did not cover all of the situation entirely. It is only recently that it has been made abundantly clear that if one of the parents in the family is eligible for free inclusion and coverage, then it will cover the spouse and the dependants. This certainly was not clear in the beginning. The fact that the OHSIP billing period is somewhat different from the OHSC billing period means in fact that the treasury of Ontario or the treasury of the insurance fund is going to miss out on about two months of premiums in the long run. Of course there will be a continuous flow of premium income, but the way it has been worked out it appears that up to \$60 million will be missed from the fund the way the announcement was made and the way the decision has been established to proceed. It appears then that the cost of the programme will not be \$127 million but nearer to \$200 million by the time it is implemented.

All of this is dependent on the decision of the Premier to go ahead on the very day an election was called, without the kind of planning which in my view could have inaugurated this change in a much smoother, more workmanlike, more efficient and less wasteful method.

So Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the bill. I am sure you will appreciate that we

support the principle of amalgamation. We believe that not only should pensioners be getting a premium free but in fact the retrogressive method of paying for medical services in the long run will have to be abandoned and it will be paid for on the broad tax base of the province with the participation of the government of Canada. The minister himself in the early weeks of his ministry said as much. He was brought up short by the head of the government, but I think probably the minister and the Liberal Party at least share this philosophy, and in the long run I know that both he and we will be seen to be right.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say something about the private companies that have been involved in OHSIP since its inception, October 1, 1969. There was a good deal of debate in the House at the time about their inclusion. I think we got into quite a lot of political trouble by agreeing with the government that we could not cover seven million people without having the companies in the administrative procedures that the government had brought forward. They are now to be phased out, I understand, and no private corporation will be involved with carrying this type of insurance after the date of April 1. I am not sure that that is correct but that is what I presume, although they may in fact be servicing some of the accounts for a little while after that.

But I believe that not only should it be totally government operated, as it now will be, but that it should be mandatory and obligatory. I don't believe any person in this province should have the right to take the risk not to be covered by hospitalization and medical insurance. I doubt if there would be any members here, other than those most recently elected, who would not have had the case where someone had come to them with a hospital bill which was not covered because they were not insured. I think that it should be a section of the statute that every resident of this province be automatically covered, and certainly that would fit in very conveniently with the method we put forward for funding the programme.

I can see that perhaps some millionaire somewhere in the province would like to have the right to say, "I am not going to fall prey to the socialist programmes of the present Conservative government. I am going to have the right to look after myself and my family." Maybe if he is a millionaire, and I think he would have to be a multimillionaire, he could stand the cost of lengthy illness

in this province, but the person who normally suffers is the person who is not aware of the heavy responsibility that he would have as an individual without coverage. Therefore the bill should be amended in order to make coverage complete and universal, as was contained really in the recommendations, now so many years old, of Mr. Justice Hall.

We believe further that the Minister of Health must accept the responsibility, through the new commission or directly, I believe, with the assistance of the elected members of this Legislature, to deal in a rational way through negotiation with the medical profession. I have mentioned that. I believe further that we must require a full reporting of the accounts of the commission. I believe that it has been irresponsible that the government would permit OHSIP to continue for so long without giving us the kind of financial accounting that surely would be required from any other corporation, most particularly, when we do not have the figures that would lead us to examine independently what the minister has charged in the last few months associated with the medical profession and its billing procedures in certain isolated cases.

I have said already that we believe the insurance should be universal and compulsory, and for this reason the bill is by no means complete. We are nowhere near coming to anything close to perfection, but this bill certainly moves in the direction of improvement. We intend to support it, Mr. Speaker, in principle.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Duszta (Parkdale): I would like to make a few remarks on the principle of this bill. I am glad to see that the government has recognized that fractioning of administration and involvement of profit-making insurance companies in running the health industry have been a major factor in escalating the health costs of the whole health plan. I am glad that they have moved toward some kind of rationalization.

The government's very slight nod toward premiums in relieving some of the more needy people, people over 65 and also people whose income is under \$2,000, is also to be commended, but all premiums are still a very regressive type of taxation. I can give you an example of it—how it affects, for example, a family which earns between \$6,000 and \$8,000 annually. They pay approximately 3.3 per cent of their income for health care, while the families with an income of \$25,000

per year pay only 1.1 per cent for health care.

The principle I would like to talk about is on the conceptual level, which is that the present way of organizing the health care delivery system in Ontario, which largely follows what is described as a medical model and in terms of financing depends upon the fee-for-service approach, is no longer a system which we can afford in terms of efficiency, humanity or cost.

So far the whole fee-for-service approach has favoured the physician and has been detrimental to the patient. Aside from escalating the total health costs in terms of hospitals, the fee-for-service itself, in favouring the physician, has added considerably to the cost of the total health scheme. The physicians' incomes have soared considerably since the introduction of the fee-for-service approach.

The fee-for-service tends, in fact, to do three things. 1. I think it escalates the cost because it rewards a fractioning of each service that the physician performs for a patient. 2. It tends to lay stress on the acute and immediately "do-able" things and is detrimental to any approach which stresses either chronic care or preventive care. 3. Again, it tends to leave the control and the power of the whole health field in the hands of a physician.

The logical extension of any system of a fee-for-service system is, in fact, that everyone who is involved with the health field should be paid a fee. If the physicians are paid a fee there is no reason why the physiotherapists, who have been demanding this for some time now, should not also be paid a fee. I think the moment we realize this and the moment this type of system is, in fact, applied generally, our costs would soar sky high. I object to the point that only one profession with a few ancillary professions has been rewarded in this way by having a fee-for-service system applied to them and not the others.

The shift from a fee-for-service, which is a payment after delivery, to a prepayment plan—for example, a capitation fee—must follow the changes which have already occurred and are now occurring in the health care delivery system. What I mean is that in Ontario we are somewhat behind in terms of organizing our health care system in comparison with other countries.

Almost everywhere now—even in the USA—people are moving toward a prepayment plan in respect of a fee-for-service. Ad-

mittedly, at the moment the only place in the USA they are really trying it is the Kaiser Permanente plan, but it is important for the future. In a number of European countries the system is, in fact, on a capitation level. This is estimated to decrease the costs considerably.

Our financial and organizational structure of the so-called health system, what I call the medical model system, must be changed to reflect what is the reality already occurring in the health field. What I am going to mention now is that it is not so much futile repetition, thinking this is what should occur underneath the structure under which we now operate. There are a number of changes which have occurred which are significantly different from what is, in fact, in operation. I can give you a series of points in which the health practice has now shifted from what we think it is to what in fact it should be or is going to be.

One, we have shifted in medical treatment from individual to group. We have shifted from a family doctor who has his patients to multidisciplinary group practice. What do I mean we have shifted? This is a shift that is going on underneath the official former organization and legislative framework. We have shifted from fee-for-service to the capitation fee; from the individual to team care. It is no longer feasible, in fact, to have one individual treated by another individual; almost invariably a whole team is involved in the treatment of one particular patient.

We have shifted from the hospital to the clinic base; developments in some of the hospitals in Toronto are significant of that—like the satellite clinic. The Western Hospital is now organizing a satellite clinic in the Parkdale district. The hospital, nevertheless, still keeps control of it. The shift from the clinic to home care or to community care is also occurring.

A patient who, up to now, it has been considered essential to treat in hospital, can be now treated at home if the resources are available. Incidentally, it is almost invariably cheaper to do it this way.

Also there is the increasing use of paramedical personnel in terms of paramedical technicians, mental health technicians, dental health nurses and other people. This has again been typical of jurisdictions other than this province, although admittedly in some of the Ontario hospitals, they have moved toward usage of non-medical people as primary care therapists.

In mental health fields, I think there is a recognition which is now codified in a series of studies in books that the hospital itself may be inimical to good health care.

The term "disease", in a mental health or a psychiatric hospital, is no longer an applicable term to use. It is in fact better to use a term like "a social problem," or otherwise describe what are the psychiatric problems.

The hospitals themselves, in an attempt to update their function—both the medical hospitals and the psychiatric hospitals—have moved from the position of being concerned with acute care. It is very slight, but they have moved from being concerned with acute care to providing care for long-term individuals and providing some aspect of preventive care. All an attempt, I think, to reduce the costs which occur when you concentrate too hard only on acute care.

Ontario has the highest percentage of beds per population of all the provinces—and a number of other countries, if I am correct about the figures. This used to be considered, I think, a major point of pride that we have been well provided for. Actually this is one of the major reasons the costs also escalate, because people tend to move toward the hospital, to deal with a number of problems in hospital, which should really be dealt with outside the hospital.

This type of organization because of the conflicting vested interests of various professions will involve a two-fold shift in planning. On one hand it is undoubtedly true that we may have to centralize further planning at the governmental level, and at the same time decentralize community control at the level of community clinics or local hospitals. There has not been enough centralized planning in terms of a health care delivery system in this province which allows some teaching hospitals to compete openly in terms of equipment, which is then only used five to 15 per cent of the time. This is something which can only be superimposed on this warring state of the teaching hospitals by governmental control.

The conceptual changes are in fact not represented in the present medically-oriented system of organizing health care. The government is not controlling costs and will not be able to do so in spite of the supplementary bills, unless it accepts the conceptual breakthrough which has occurred in the health field, and begins to approach the health field as something more than just a medical preserve. The lack of government planning in terms of allowing this competi-

tion, the lack of planning in terms of leaving the direction of the field in medical hands is inimical to any rational way of organizing health care.

The minister has suggested in his speech that the Ontario Council of Health will establish a committee with representation from such groups as hospitals and health professions, as well as other knowledgeable people, to represent the broader public interest.

When I look at the present composition of the Ontario Council of Health, I am struck that it is largely dominated by the physicians and by the members appointed by The Department of Health. It does not represent, in fact, what is now a burgeoning sector in the health field. It does not represent, I think, the large non-professional, indigenous groups, community groups, to any extent the paramedical professions; it does not represent the par nursing professions; it does not represent a series of major groups.

I would like to urge the minister, since this is a very preliminary bill and he has promised something much more comprehensive in the next session, that when he is, in fact, considering appointing—I am not sure whether it is a she or he, or somebody else is going to do it—but if he is considering appointing the members to this new committee, he must take into consideration the other disciplines.

I would urge him strongly to include people from—well, there is one sociologist present at the moment on the Ontario Council of Health. I am suggesting that the people who have done a lot of thinking, the theoreticians of the field, are no longer in the medical field and should be included from other departments; in fact, that the medical representation on that committee should be limited numerically to what they are and not to the power that they represent.

This is the limit of my remarks, since I do perceive that the three bills have been very provisional and that maybe the major criticism can be extended later if, in fact, these three bills are all that is proposed at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Essex South, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I beg your pardon. Essex South.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): From one Liberal to another.

Mr. Paterson: That is right. Especially down that way.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): There are so many of us.

Mr. Paterson: That is right, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak briefly on the several principles enunciated in Bill 5, which was presented to the Legislature yesterday. I think we, as Liberals, certainly accept the primary thought in this of putting the two different groups—the Ontario Hospital group and the Ontario Health group—under one administrative board. For as long as I have been a member, we have been advocating this. For eight years now, and possibly before I came down to the Legislature, we have consistently maintained the position that these two groups should be as one.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Hear, hear!

Mr. Paterson: We took that particular position this number of years ago for several reasons. Namely, we felt that the reduced administrative costs resulting from initiating this, at our estimate of a couple of years ago, would save the taxpayers approximately \$10 million.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): As far as the budget is concerned it is a collection agency.

Mr. Paterson: I am sure this figure can be updated from that \$10 million figure at the present time if these statistics were readily available.

Medicare, of course, Mr. Speaker, we realize was introduced by the government of Canada and the intent of this was to provide the lowest-cost Medicare insurance possible for all the people of Canada. We don't feel that the Province of Ontario has moved in the right direction and possibly this is why we have one of the highest, if not the highest, rates for premiums in our great country. But by doing one thing, by cutting these administrative costs, there can be substantial savings to the people in our province.

A second point, in relation to unification of the administration, is that by doing this, I feel it should eliminate some of the confusion with the public. This is in relation to having two numbers and two names that are very, very similar. Especially when the initials are used in describing them, many people are confused and can't tell which

programme is which. They don't know whether they are covered for hospital care or for health care. I think this confusion is one of the things that has really irritated the public and certainly has caused many people many anxious moments when they are unexpectedly taken sick or are in an accident and are not sure as to whether or not they are covered under the hospital care or the health care, or both. So we in this party feel that there should be one number when the government moves into this new programme. As my leader has said, we feel that it should be the federal social insurance number. Apparently the government is moving in a different direction, and this possibly might get further consideration.

A third point, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the principle of unification of the two services, is that there can be, and hopefully there will be, a greater degree of co-operation between these two branches, and that it will eliminate some of the red tape involved in clarification of situations that affect individuals. I am sure that we as members have experienced many of these frustrations. Fortunately, we can cut through some of the red tape much more easily than can individuals who phone and phone and phone and never get called back by some of the people in those branches.

Mr. Singer: If you can get the number and you don't get the recorded announcement.

Mr. Paterson: Hopefully, this will come about with the streamlining of the services.

The second principle contained in this bill is the authorization on the provision of insurance to persons over 65 and their dependants without payment of the premium. Basically, I think we can support this on the surface. I have some doubts based on the particular philosophy that our political party conventions have adopted in relation to this matter. This is in relation to premiums, which is the third principle of the bill—that is the principle of one premium to cover hospital and health care.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, on the surface this looks very commendable, but from my practical experience as a member I don't think it is going to work unless the existing regulations and the administrative procedures are changed. I am sure that the minister will agree that at the present time many persons with low incomes, or people who are unemployed, can get subsidized or free health care coverage. At the present time, they must pay the full premium in relation to hospital

coverage. Many people simply can't afford the hospital coverage; many do not have it. I hope that in the minister's remarks he will have the opportunity to dig up the figures just to show what the proportions are, to see how many hundreds or thousands of people do not have hospital care coverage simply because they cannot afford it; or is the minister going to change the philosophy with the amalgamation here and also afford to these people free hospital coverage or subsidized as the case may be, in addition to the health care services.

Of course, we members here again realize that compounding all these problems are the number of people who move from employer to employer, some employers paying the premiums, some not, and the employee not really knowing where he stands in relation to his health care services.

Then of course, too, we have the problem of illiteracy and human carelessness in relation to the remittances of their premiums.

This is why I have some misgivings in relation to the principle of one premium. This is why I feel, Mr. Speaker, that our party has been enunciating a programme that could resolve all these particular problems. It would add to the administrative efficiency; it would lessen even further the administrative costs that are now proposed and, in the view of all of us, it would eliminate the direct billing of individuals or employers and at the same time give every resident of this province continuous coverage—and this would be for both health and hospital provisions. This would help eliminate the fears, the frustrations and the anxieties that many people have with an unexpected illness and the uncertainty of whether their health care coverage has been paid and is in force.

Basically I am speaking of our party's position that was established in this Legislature on October 9, 1969, when we introduced The Health Insurance Premium Dispensation Act. If this same position had been carried forth, as was enunciated by the Minister of Health I think in the first two weeks that he was the minister, I do not think I would have this particular problem today. I might quote from the press articles of that time. There was an article in The Toronto Telegram, written by Eric Dowd:

**BERT LAWRENCE'S IDEAL:
TAXES WOULD PAY FOR MEDICARE**

Ontario's new Health Minister, Bert Lawrence, wants all Medicare premiums

scrapped eventually and the entire cost of Medicare paid out of taxes.

This is the ideal long-run solution for financing Medicare programmes—providing insurance for both doctors' bills and hospitalization, said Mr. Lawrence.

"Paying the whole of Medicare through taxes would mean more of the cost would be paid by the rich and less by the poor."

This basically was an endorsement of our party's position and we have maintained this position and maintain it today, I think the Toronto Daily Star of October 10, 1969, summarized our position in a very efficient manner; I might quote a couple of paragraphs:

The Ontario Liberals have just embarked on one of the neatest political manoeuvres the Legislature has seen in a long time. The manoeuvre was unveiled in the Legislature yesterday when the Liberals introduced a bill outlining a brand-new medical care plan for Ontario. There would be no more premiums. All services would be financed through a new income tax surcharge of 1 per cent and a 0.8 per cent tax on employers. The Liberals would also get rid of the existing network of private Medicare carriers and set up a single non-profit agency.

The Liberals can fairly claim to be the party which has formally presented the Legislature with a workable alternative. The Liberal plan—political manoeuvre or not—is effective, efficient and faithful to the Medicare principle. The government plan, which is none of these things, might have been very salvageable with a hefty reduction in premiums, but we doubt whether such thinking will work now that the public has been given a glimpse of what Medicare should be.

I guess the NDP have never forgotten that day when they were upstaged so badly.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are still calling for premiums.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The Liberals supported the last Act.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): It didn't seem to do either of us any good.

Mr. Paterson: That is right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am glad there's one philosopher in this game.

Mr. Paterson: I think I will read one last paragraph, if I might quote from this, Mr. Speaker:

Another difference is that the Liberal plan would be much cheaper than the government's. They estimate \$10 million would be saved if they start by abolishing the complicated machinery involved in collecting premiums. Even more money would be saved when high-cost private carriers were eliminated from Medicare. [And we can see that on the horizon now too.] This could mean another \$20 million or so being saved. What the Liberals are asking, in short, is that "swinging" Ontario be allowed to catch up with "backward" Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, which have no premiums.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): What was the date on that report?

Mr. Paterson: October 10, 1969.

An hon. member: Doesn't the minister remember it?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It was in the Telegram.

Mr. Singer: One of the days he was leading the House.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the first three principles of this bill for I feel that because the cost of health care has escalated, as my leader said up to almost \$1.5 billion—well over a third of our provincial budget—this is a major concern to all of us. I think we, as citizens of Ontario, can no longer consider that medical care is a further move toward socialism. I think this must be dispelled all across our province.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, well. Good for you.

Mr. Paterson: We as members know that individuals, regardless of their earning power—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): In other words, it now becomes acceptable Liberal policy.

Mr. Paterson: —regardless of their lifetime of savings—

Mr. Lewis: They are constantly reassuring themselves.

Mr. Paterson: —cannot afford to be outside of medical care plans.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): We are prepared to call it socialist.

Mr. MacDonald: Call it socialist because it was socialist.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Pay attention to him, fellows.

Mr. Paterson: Just listen!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: If we hadn't come up against the anti-Liberal vote in Ontario.

Mr. Paterson: The total basic medical coverage, as far as I am concerned, is simple social justice—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The NDP also had to carry the anti-Shulman vote. They had to carry the Shulman vote too; that was tough.

Mr. Paterson: From my experience in the past eight years, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: And then only by 166 votes—saved!

An hon. member: There might be another recount. Better watch it!

Mr. Paterson: —I can see that there is no dignity for those individuals on low incomes to have to apply for partial relief on premiums or not being able to afford this coverage at all. I think our solution would negate that.

So I would say if the Minister of Health can accept again the principles that we have enunciated, just as he did when he first took office, he can not only save the taxpayers millions of dollars in our province but he can give peace of mind to a lot of people in our province who really do not understand the complications and what goes on from day to day in the health care insurance coverage that they think they have.

Mr. Speaker, before completing my remarks I should pass comment very briefly on a fourth principle that is enunciated in Bill 5 and that is the proposition that employers must pass on to employees the benefits of premium reductions. Our party certainly endorses this principle and we hope that those people who are employers of people will live up to this expectation. I don't know what the mechanics of enforcement will be; hopefully, it won't require enforcing. But possibly other speakers today will develop this principle more fully.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that our party supports in full this last principle I have mentioned. We support the amalgamation of the health and hospital insurance branches under one division and we hope in the weeks and months to come, as this temporary legislation becomes law, that the minister can again review the position that he enunciated back when he first took office and move toward giving this social justice to all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to support this bill. I support it because obviously it's common sense to put the two administrations together, but reluctantly because the people who seem to administer OHSIP at the present time are not administering it in a very bright manner. In fact, there appears to be a great lacking in grey matter at the top. I am not suggesting at the ministerial top, because I have the greatest admiration for the minister and his good intentions, but certainly at the next level below there seems to be something lacking, and I would like to give you, sir—and perhaps you could pass them on to the minister—some examples of what is wrong with the present administration of OHSIP.

You may be aware, sir, at the present time there is a minor unpleasantness taking place in Asia between two of the nations there, and preceding this was a problem of refugees pouring into India, which resulted in a great cholera outbreak. Because of this cholera outbreak in India and Pakistan and other countries, the Minister of Health of this country advised anyone travelling to Asia to get cholera shots. Seems like common sense; good sense—apparently not shared by The Department of Health of Ontario. In their wisdom they passed a ruling down that such cholera shots were not to be paid for by OHSIP.

I thought when this first came to my attention that some minor functionary had made an error. Surely this couldn't be the policy of the Province of Ontario. I didn't really think that they wanted cholera brought back here to Ontario. And when it first came to my attention that one of the private insurance carriers, Associated Medical Services—AMS—was refusing to pay for such protection, I wrote a letter to Dr. Aldis, who is the head of OHSIP. I write many letters to Dr. Aldis. We have a great one-way correspondence. Dr. Aldis never answers me, but I send him many letters—

Mr. Ruston: I don't blame him for that.

Mr. Shulman:—and I get letters back from all sorts of other people and they always start off, "Dr. Aldis has asked me to reply to your letter"—and it never is the same person, it is always someone different. But this particular one—

Mr. Lewis: He understands the principle of delegation.

An hon. member: "Dear Mr. Shulman"?

Mr. Shulman:—this particular letter is from D. R. Kinloch, director of the medical branch.

Mr. Lewis: He is a bright man—I'm not being facetious.

Mr. Shulman: And when I wrote to him I said, "There appears to be some confusion, some misunderstanding. AMS is refusing to pay for cholera shots for people who have to go to Asia and yet the other insurance companies that are under OHSIP will pay for it. Could you please straighten AMS out?" He wrote me back and he said, "AMS is perfectly right and we are going to straighten out all the other insurance companies, the reason being, it says under section 383(c) subsection 482(d), that 'excluded from the plan are any service or examination for the purpose of a passport, visa or other similar document.' AMS obviously feels your claim falls within this area of exclusion. I agree."

Well it so happens that you do not need a cholera shot for a passport, visa, or other similar document. You need a cholera shot so you don't get cholera when you go to Asia.

Mr. MacDonald: And bring it back to Ontario!

Mr. Lewis: Oh, the compelling pieces of logic!

Mr. Shulman: But in their wisdom, the directors, the administrators at the level of the director of the medical branch, do not believe that cholera shots should be encouraged in this province. Well this is one example which makes me worry a little bit, if these are the people who are going to administer this new, great combined plan.

This isn't the only thing, Mr. Speaker. There are other incidents. Perhaps I should give you one or two others because I am beginning to worry a little bit about the people who are working for the Minister of Health. We have a very—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Don't worry.

Mr. Lewis: Has the member for Algoma been promoted?

Mr. Shulman:—generous payment scheme for doctors at the present time under OHSIP. They are allowed to charge \$6 for every office call, out of which they are paid \$5.40, which is quite reasonable because office calls are not too onerous, they don't take too much time. And then if you perform some service on top, some surgery, do a heart transplant or something, at the same time in the office, you can charge the fee for that particular service. You may not be aware, Mr. Speaker, but I am a doctor as well as a politician, and on occasion, I see the odd patient in my office to eke out my income—

Mr. Bullbrook: Could I borrow your towel?

Mr. Shulman:—and it is my custom, having been a member of PSI for many years before OHSIP came into existence, and having accepted the OHSIP fee in full from the time it came in, it has been my custom to charge the basic OHSIP fee, and I made a most interesting discovery. If someone comes to your office and has a wart, let us say, and you charge \$6 for looking at that wart, if you then make the mistake of removing the wart you are paid only \$4.50 instead of \$6 or 90 per cent of \$6. Instead of getting \$5.40, which you would get if you just looked at the wart and said, "You have a wart," you will get \$4.50 if you look at the wart and then proceed to take off the wart.

Well, I found this rather interesting so I have had a long series of letters—there must be at least eight of them—back and forth with Dr. Aldis.

He does not answer my letters but I do get replies to every one. This particular peculiar situation has confused me mightily and I have been trying to get enlightenment from the various people who have been writing me from OHSIP. I said, "Can you explain to me why that is?" Apparently the idea is if you do a service as well as look, you get paid the service fee. If unfortunately that service fee comes to a little bit less than the office call, you would, instead of getting the office visit, get the service visit.

I tried to reason with these gentlemen and I have had a very mixed bag of results because this happened, I guess, perhaps eight times. Now I no longer take out warts, may I say, I merely look at them. This has happened approximately eight times, so I have

written eight different letters and I have had answers from eight different people, seven of whom agreed—no, that is perhaps not fair—seven of the letters agreed with me and said, "Yes, you are quite right. We are sending you an extra \$5.40."

The eighth letter is the one that intrigues me the most because it said, "No, you are quite wrong. You are only entitled to \$4.50 as obviously you took off the wart."

I made the mistake of appealing this decision and spoke to numerous doctors up to and including senior doctors in departments and ultimately after much consultation, they said, "You are quite wrong and you are not getting any more money and that is it."

Now, of course, the idea is when you see a wart you refer it to a surgeon who will charge \$50 for taking off the wart—which means they will keep the general practitioner's income down to a reasonable level of perhaps \$100,000 a year and the surgeons can be allowed to do better.

I worry a little, Mr. Speaker. I worry a little about the administration of the OHSIP department. Again let me stress, not at the level of the Minister of Health. I know he is a very busy man; he is a very well-meaning man and he must delegate authority and perhaps he has to delegate it to the people hired by his predecessor. We know all about his predecessor. There were problems there.

When OHSIP came in—when was it, two years ago—I found it a little upsetting that they sent the money out holus-bolus. At first they had a scheme whereby in order to get the money out in a hurry, all a doctor had to do—he didn't have to put an OHSIP number down or anything—was put down "applied" on the card. All of those cards, no matter what the amount that was asked, were paid. I was intrigued and said, "Are you going to check those records and see if those doctors really performed any of those services?" They said, "We can't. We destroyed all those cards. We burnt them." I can't blame that on the minister. He wasn't there at the time—

An hon. member: Joey Smallwood did that—

Mr. Shulman: We proceeded a little further and I complained rather bitterly so they put in a check system to make sure that the services were really being rendered. This check system is a very good system. They will send out at random to numerous patients a statement of what moneys were paid on

their behalf to various doctors. It is a very effective system of controlling OHSIP costs.

Unfortunately they made one slight error when they set this system up. We all make errors. They decided they would not check any of the moneys paid through the private insurance companies but only the moneys paid through OHSIP directly. I was sort of intrigued by this. I presumed it is because we know that the insurance companies are all honourable people who would never make an error in sending funds out. I raised this matter with the minister last summer in his estimates—or last spring I guess it was.

I pointed out that there is an open pot there into which anyone can dip his hand and help himself. This is going to continue until next July because for the 30-odd insurance companies that are still participating in the plan, who send out umpteen millions of dollars every month, there is absolutely no check whatsoever—no spot check system whatsoever on the moneys being sent out!

If I send a bill in today—and perhaps I will just do that to test the minister—to the London Life Insurance Company for doing a heart transplant in my office, I'll bet you I will get paid next week because nobody is checking it.

These are little examples, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to you that I have some small qualms about the intelligence of the administration at the present time in OHSIP.

I would suggest to you, sir—and perhaps you would be kind enough to pass it on to the minister—that before we put such a huge administration into the hands of these same men, perhaps we should have some business management team come in and take a look to see who is business managing there. And see why in the world they make such stupid mistakes and what can be done about it—because this is going to become a far more major matter than it is at the present time, when the nursing homes come in under the scheme—and the nursing homes are coming in next year, if we are to believe the pronouncements of various aficionados of the government. When the nursing homes are coming in I have to worry a great deal, because I have here in front of me a statement from Barbara McGee, a senior nursing home inspector, who inspects not only nursing homes but the homes for special care to which patients are sent from the Ontario hospitals.

She says at the present time that particular plan is a failure—I'll quote her exact words in

a moment—in the department, and if they can't even administer something like that properly how can we trust them to administer a billion-dollar plan properly. Let me quote what she says:

Originally the idea behind homes for special care was to place discharged patients in a home-like atmosphere, but then the homes were filled with 25 or 30 patients and they just became smaller institutions.

In other words, all of this expenditure was for nothing. She says:

Older operators do not upgrade the standards of their homes. There is little in the existing legislation to force them to do so. Most of them seem quite content to let their residents sit instead of providing programmes that will motivate them. All they feel they have to provide is room and board.

If such a simple programme, such a relatively inexpensive programme, cannot be administered by the minister's department, how can we trust these same people to administer a programme which involves the largest expenditures of moneys that will take place in this province or in the whole of Canada for any single department?

Mr. Speaker, I could give further examples but there is no point in belabouring it. The situation is very simple. The idea of the bill, as with so many Conservative government bills, is good. It is a good idea, but the administration—the administration. We look across at them and we weep. There they are, 800 of them. They overwhelm us with their numbers, but they must—

Mr. Sargent: Not by the quality, though.

Mr. Shulman: The quality is somewhat lacking; it worries me. They put the few competent men in the ministry, but then there is nobody below to keep an eye on them.

I would like to make a suggestion, through you, sir; and perhaps you would pass on the message. Because there is a problem in the administration, why doesn't the Minister of Health take that fine Minister Without Portfolio from Quinte (Mr. Potter) that the government has, and why doesn't he make him his deputy and send him in to administer this plan, because the men who are administering it at the present time are not competent to do so and they have proved it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I won't be too lengthy in my comments on Bill 5, but I would like to say at the outset it would be pretty difficult for one to oppose the unification of two branches of government, or two departments, or two branches of a single department, which is a policy or a position that this party has taken for quite a few years. We are pleased to see that the government has followed the suggestions that have been made from this side, and even their own side of the House, in amalgamating or in unifying both the hospital and medical services.

Constituents have always had difficulty identifying which coverage they did have, or which of the coverages they complained about, when they presented their member with a problem. They never could identify the numbers properly of their hospital coverage or medical coverage. However, that is really insignificant, Mr. Speaker. The important thing, or one of the important principles, is that by unifying there is, or there will be, a substantial saving.

However, we on this side of the House would have preferred to have seen a premium-free health services scheme, one that would have been based principally on a person's ability to pay—in other words, it would be based on taxable income. However, the government in its wisdom prefers to present the scheme that it has presented this afternoon and our debate will have to be centred on the contents of the bill.

One of the principles of the bill is the payment of the premiums on a three-month basis in advance. To me, a three-month premium payment in advance is a little too steep for many of our citizens. It is all right for the individual who has his payments paid for by an employer, but for those living on marginal incomes, on limited incomes, who get no type of premium assistance, whose income is substantially lower than they themselves would like to have it, the payment of \$66 in one lump sum is extremely difficult to meet. I would have preferred to have seen the government make that on a two-month basis instead, a reduction of approximately 33 per cent. I think that that would have been easier, seeing that they are going to have to pay premiums, that the government is not going to have a premium-free scheme.

I also think that provision should be made in the bill to permit an individual, if he wishes to pay a year in advance to be allowed

to do so. So he could at one time in the course of a year have himself completely covered—that is the individual who is not paying under any type of scheme. The individual not associated with any employer, but who has to pay on his own, should be permitted to pay for the full year in advance.

The point I am trying to make is that premium payments today for too many people are substantially too high. And I think there should be some type of provision made for a substantial reduction in that case, and that is allowing them to pay every two months rather than every three months.

The next principle that I would like to bring to the minister's attention is the one of portability. One section of the bill states that the individual must reside in the Province of Ontario for a full year before he becomes eligible. Certain provinces in the Dominion now provide free health services, I would specifically refer to Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan. A resident moving from those three provinces, or any of the three provinces, should be able to enter the Ontario scheme immediately. There should be no waiting period whatsoever. He had been covered when he was a resident of the provinces I have mentioned, so on assuming residence in the Province of Ontario, he should not have to wait whatsoever. The portability section and principle in the bill should make provision for provinces that already provide free health services.

Mr. Speaker, those are the two principles I wanted to comment on. I hope the minister in his reply to us takes these two into consideration and provides for a reduction in premium payment from a three-month period, and likewise for the portability of health care services with provinces that already provide that type of service.

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

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly to the principle of this bill, and also to ask a question of the minister as to the intent of the statement announced yesterday, on the transferring of the planning I suppose one would say, and the formulating of regulations as they would affect the local hospital board. I would assume it would be the minister's intent not to take away from the autonomy of the local hospital board in any of the proposals. I would hope that when the minister comments that he might be able to give us some assurance accordingly.

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

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The things that this bill embodies were details that we argued about in the estimates for the last couple of years. The two ministers of health more or less agreed with what we were saying, but said they would let us know when they were prepared to move in this direction. We are not surprised that they chose to move just the day that the election was called. Nonetheless we are pleased that they did make that move.

Then, they made it clear to all the citizens of the province who were covered under OHSC and OHSIP that this legislation was to come before us by sending notification to all these people about two days before the election. It is a very interesting way to use—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Sure was!

Mr. Ferrier: —the civil service and public funds to get across the message of what they were going to do.

Now we are glad to see these two agencies combined into one and the move to do away with the designated agents three months earlier than originally was scheduled. Some of us don't feel that those designated agents should ever have been in there in the first place, but be that as it may we are glad to see them go that much more quickly than otherwise was scheduled.

I think the people of this province have been very much confused over the last few years. We have had OHSIP and we have had HIRB and OHSC and they got caught up in that bureaucratic nightmare if they ever had any correspondence with any of these bodies. **They must have become thoroughly confused** as to what each body's functions were and what kind of response they could expect to their questions.

I think that to get away from all those things and have one department dealing with the subject of health care and hospital care is a very wise move in the right direction.

Now we have been paying the administrative costs of three government agencies, and we have been paying administrative costs to designated agents. So of course this move will cut down on administration expenses in the collecting of premiums and in the paying of accounts, and one cannot help but feel that the public has paid a high bill for the previous kind of administration.

One wonders if the kind of computers that will be working in this new field will be a compatible kind of computer, one to the other, rather than the two or three that they had in the other departments which couldn't work together.

One has always felt that there would be better administration as to the collecting of premiums and the paying of accounts under one agency. I was somewhat surprised in talking with a medical secretary in my riding who said that she just threw up her hands in horror at the thought of having to deal with the government-run OHSIP as far as all their accounts were concerned. She said she had submitted some accounts up to five times and kept getting them back, that they did not seem to deal very efficiently with complaints, or that if things did not run absolutely as they were supposed to the department was unable to cope with these kinds of problems.

I would hope that the minister will see that the calibre of service that is given to the people of this province will be improved now that it is under the government's sole jurisdiction and under one government body. One is a little apprehensive about all these things being in the hands of a commission. Granted, the Ontario Hospital Services Commission has made information available to the members of this House and the people of this province on a much more adequate basis than we have ever had from OHSIP. But, are we moving a step away from being able to debate some of the issues as far as the location of hospitals and the kind of care that is being given there by handing this over completely to a commission? The minister shakes his head, so we do not need to pursue that any further.

Even though we have joined, or are in the process of joining, the bodies, we still have the highest premiums for health care of any province in Canada and one would hope that we would move before too long to the abolition of all premiums. Perhaps it cannot be done all at one point, but at least it can be done in a staged process. It is encouraging to note that we will likely have even small reductions in premiums for all the people of this province.

Now in granting premium-free health care to the old age pensioners this will cover a number who now have had to pay their own. There have been a number who have received some assistance through The Department of Social and Family Services, but obviously this did not meet the need. There

were a number of old age pensioners who thought on reaching the age of 65 that they were automatically covered for OHSIP and for OHSC premiums and so they never bothered to apply to any body. Then the time came when they did get sick and they did need hospital care or doctor's care, and they went to the hospital feeling that they were covered and incurred a high bill. To their utter amazement they found that they weren't covered at all; they did not realize that they had to apply.

This bill specifically states that the old age pensioner must apply. I think that this is going to cause some problems in the future as it has in the past. What will happen will be that a lot of these people, if they do not realize that they have to apply, will incur these bills and they will have to be picked up by the welfare agencies in the particular municipality. So I feel that this idea of them having to apply is a little bit unrealistic and I think it should be granted to them all without this condition being met. I feel that that's not the most practical way of handling it.

I think another thing at which we have to take a good look is the payment of medical bills and hospital bills for people receiving treatment in other jurisdictions. If you happen to be on a holiday and suffer the misfortune of getting sick or having an accident in another jurisdiction sometimes the cost of services in those jurisdictions is higher than in Ontario. If it happens to be in the United States they will pay about 75 per cent of the hospital bill, rather than the full bill.

I feel that if we have hospital insurance for the people of the province that the government should make a greater effort to cover the actual bills, rather than limit the amount to what will be paid in Ontario.

There is also the problem of people who have to go to a place like the Mayo clinic for a procedure which cannot be carried out in Ontario and yet is the kind of procedure—as I think of one case of a person in my own riding—where if the procedure was not carried out she would be dead. The procedure was carried out and now she is wrangling to get some of these bills paid and she is going to have to pay a terrific pile out of her own pocket. I feel that a more realistic approach should be taken by the people involved and that they should decide to look after our citizens on a much better basis.

With everything being under one roof it will provide, I hope, for a greater co-opera-

tion between the various health care disciplines. I would hope that this will enable the minister and his department to move into regional councils with a good deal more haste than at present. In some of our areas we have facilities that could be used in another way, but because we have no regional councils we are still putting nearly all our apples in the very expensive active treatment hospital bed. I think of moving into the less expensive convalescent beds and the providing of nursing home beds in certain areas—a real lack in my own area—as well as the setting up of home care programmes on a much more accelerated basis throughout the province. If we had this regional setup and we could rationalize beds into the various categories, it might just be possible that there could be some person in these areas who could allocate the specific type of bed that a person should be in so that costs could be cut down to a very realistic level in a number of these areas.

I would hope, as my colleague from Parkdale suggested, that we could move into a kind of group practice and community clinic principle through this particular legislation on a much more accelerated basis than we have in the past. I feel this would be a way of cutting down the cost of health insurance in this province. It would save on the use of hospital beds, if previous experience and the results of research that I have read are to be believed, I feel that it should be involved more in the preventive aspect: a lot of things could be carried on in a clinic that now have got to be carried on in a hospital, which means very costly equipment is tied up and so on.

I would hope there would be greater co-operation and a much better way of streamlining the system to get more for the dollar that is now put into health care than we now see in the health insurance schemes and health care delivery system of this province.

I wonder if the minister might care to comment in his remarks on whether there is any indication at this stage of the game—regarding legislation that was passed earlier—that doctors are billing OHSIP or the patient directly. Is there any indication of what is going on there at the present time?

One thinks of the question of hospital boards and wonders, as a result of this particular commission that is being set up and in the overall planning of the health care system of the province, if there might not be room for a more representative group to be involved on the hospital boards of this province.

There is also the possibility in joining these two schemes together that, where we now have bulk purchasing of drugs in our Ontario hospitals and for our hospital as a whole, we might be in a much easier position to move into providing the cost of prescription drugs in our insurance system and even having this bulk purchasing that we have talked about before; I believe it would certainly cut down on the cost of providing not only diagnostic and treatment care but also the therapy through drugs that a lot of our people require.

We are pleased with this legislation. As we say, it is long overdue; we wish it had have been brought in a couple of years ago. But we realize that some of these things are determined by electoral needs rather than by the particular needs of people at the time.

Regarding the delay until, I suppose, April 1, in bringing premium assistance for Ontario hospital insurance to needy people—people who are unemployed or have very low incomes, or even people who are sometimes on welfare temporarily and moving from job to job—we will welcome it at that time, but it still imposes a real hardship in the interval.

There will be a number of people between now and April 1 who will get themselves into the jackpot of running up a big hospital bill because they are not in a position to pay that \$11.00 a month premium for hospital care. They will find eventually that the credit bureau will be after them and they will have to pay a large bill over a long period of time. There have been far too many people who, because they have not been able to afford to pay for their Ontario hospital coverage, have let it lapse and the public purse has had to pick it up in a significant degree through the welfare departments. Also, a lot of people who have just suffered unemployment and begin to come out of it are hit with a big hospital bill that they have to pay over a period of time.

So I hope that the minister will do something about the administration and see that there is a better approach taken to the payment of bills than presently exists in OHSIP, and we will await with some interest the radical revision, that he suggested in his statement yesterday, he will be bringing forward in a few months' time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, briefly, I would like to say that we have been hearing a lot about the "think tanks" in the Committee on

Government Productivity where we are watching the executive groups make a threat to the legislative process.

In this area here, we have the people of the Province of Ontario know the "rickey-doing" they have been getting from this government in this area here, a very important area. I think at this point we are witnessing legislation that was, and always has been, our policy over here, as the minister knows, and the NDP too. And probably the only reason that this is before the House, or has not been before the House, and it is in this state, is because they had to pay off the insurance companies from the 1967 election. Even in the area of health they have been playing politics, but it has got to the point now that the people have seen through what you are doing and so you use that as a political football—

Mr. R. K. McNeill (Elgin): You can say that again!

Mr. Sargent: —to get elected. And you did a pretty good job with it.

The only area of concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill actually does what it says it will do in the area of taking the control away from the Hospital Services Commission. As I stand here—the new Minister of Revenue, the House leader, knows what I am talking about—I hope that we will have the autonomy in the area of health brought back to the legislative process.

I refer to the incredible situation where we have the Ontario Hospital Services Commission telling the people of Walkerton, Durham and Chesley, that they will have to close their hospitals because they are going to build a new \$4 million hospital in the area of the Minister of Revenue. And here we have the former Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) admitting to me that he was powerless to block the decisions of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission.

Mr. Lewis: He isn't listening. He is just pretending.

Mr. Sargent: It is all right. Never mind.

An hon. member: I'm sure he never worries.

Mr. Sargent: It is an incredible situation whereby we have—

Mr. Lewis: Apparently he doesn't.

Mr. Sargent: —a group of appointed political hacks who could not get a job at anything else so they get a job working with

OHSC making decisions affecting the lives of people in my area.

To make the story boil down in the area of time factor, the member, now Minister of Revenue, assured the people that if he got elected they would never close the hospital in Durham and Walkerton as long as he had a breath of life in his body. Well, we are still waiting to see what is going to happen to the Chesley hospital. They are still under the dagger of the OHSC going to close it. In his remarks I hope that the minister will relay to me and to the House that he is the boss in the area of health in this province and not the OHSC.

We have the area of the Chesley hospital, a hospital that they paid for with their own nickels and dimes. You did not pay for anything. But they pay the same taxes the people in Toronto pay and yet you ask them to drive 15 to 20 miles to get to a hospital. We are living in a snow belt and they are under the dagger of being closed. I make my plea to you as a fair minister—I respect the job you do—that you will be the boss, and not the OHSC, if this bill means anything, as I hope it does.

In other words I want you to assure the House that Chesley hospital will never be disturbed again. It is their hospital, their money; leave it alone, and don't try to close it.

Insofar as the mechanics of the bill are concerned I think that we are going to ask people to put up \$66 at the outset three months in advance. There are a hell of a lot of people in this province who do not have \$66.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right on!

Mr. Sargent: They will have to borrow the money somewhere. I am going to be coming back to the minister and I am going to be saying a lot of my people haven't got \$66. What do we do? That is his problem because, believe me, they have to be looked after too—if not in this area, they will be looked after on welfare. It is a consideration; my colleague from Windsor mentioned the fact that it should be two months in advance.

In the area of big business—there must be some reasoning for this—why can't the government finance its own programmes instead of having the people finance them? To set up a fund three months hence in any deal in any business programme to ask people to pay three months in advance, is a bold step. It would seem to me, if the minister is the defender of the people he says he is—

give the people a deal and say this is effective as of now and the people will start paying for one month or two months, but not three months.

Further, I do believe that there should be a portability clause in here because we are one nation. The boundaries of a province shouldn't be the guidelines to a man's health; that he should come to this province and be without health coverage for one year doesn't figure. With these remarks I say, on behalf of my leader, we support this bill.

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

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I want to add a brief comment to those that have been made by hon. members up to this point.

A number of principles have been deduced in this bill and many of them are rather important—such as, for example, the exorbitantly high premium cost which is going to be perpetuated in the Province of Ontario. I suggest to you that the core principle in this bill is that the government, after years of a piecemeal approach to meeting health needs, is finally going to rationalize the administration of at least those health needs which they are now considering, namely hospital and Medicare.

I was interested, for example, in the full significance—and perhaps it was missed—of one paragraph in the minister's statement yesterday. He said:

In order to provide for the integration, co-ordination and development of all health care services in Ontario, we will be placing the hospital management function presently carried out by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission under The Department of Health. When the management function of the hospital system has been taken into the main stream of the department, we will have for the first time one government department responsible for the provision and administration of unified health care services throughout Ontario. In addition through this legislation the insurance aspects of health care will be combined under one unit to cover a wide spectrum of benefits, including insurance arrangements for extended health care—the nursing home programme—which becomes effective April 1, 1972.

In short, the minister was really tidying up and driving home the point which is the underlying principle—that there is going to be

co-ordination, an integration of the administration of at least the small proportion of health services that this government is now concerned with. It hasn't touched drugs; it hasn't touched many other things that are beyond the purview of this bill.

However, the thing that disturbs me about the bill, or at least raises questions in my mind about this bill, is that it stops half way. It is explicit to this point. I would like to believe that implicit in it is a carrying forward of that principle—a co-ordination in the delivery of health services. If, indeed, the minister is going to save public moneys and if, indeed, his operation is going to be more efficient—and I believe it is by the actions implicit in this bill—then it seems to me that he shouldn't stop there. Indeed, he is stopping at the lesser half of the administrative line, so to speak, in the delivery of health services. All he is doing is co-ordinating and integrating at the provincial level. What we want to do, if we are going to get real saving in public costs and real efficiency in terms of delivering health services, is to carry that forward to the delivery of health services in the community.

Now I repeat, maybe it is implicit in what the minister has in mind. Perhaps when he says that this is a provisional bill, that it is on'y an interim bill, that come next year he is going to bring in a fuller measure, that he is going to move forward to that. If perchance he hasn't contemplated it I want to urge it upon him.

Because in an area that I won't take the time to detail today, I am rather mystified and disturbed by the ambivalence that exists within The Department of Health. I am thinking particularly in the delivery of mental health services. There is on the part of some people a recognition that you've got to get this unified approach or this co-ordinated approach in the delivery of health services. On the part of others one is led to believe that they are either doubtful or even opposed.

The result is the department is schizophrenic, and the result is that hospitals which are contemplating the establishment of psychiatric units can't find out what in heaven's name the government does want.

Well, without going into the detail today, because that's another principle of another matter, I would like to impress upon the minister our hope that the things implicit in this bill will become explicit by next spring: The kinds of things, for example, that are being not just contemplated but also legislated in the Province of Quebec. The Minister of

Health and Welfare there has brought in bills for the establishment of public and private corporations which will direct the delivery and co-ordinate the delivery of services in the community;

The kind of thing that has happened down through the years in the Province of Saskatchewan and now in the Province of Manitoba in group practices in community health clinics;

The kind of thing that has gone on through private initiative—ironically, for the most part from trade unions in the Soo and in St. Catharines with the development of community health clinics and has at least impressed itself sufficiently on this government that they have a study to find out what are the long-term benefits that might be more widely applied across the province.

All those kinds of things, I think are part of the concept, the conceptual pattern, that my colleague from Parkdale was referring to. I would like to believe that it is in this bill. If it is, it is in no better than an implicit stage and I would just elicit from the minister when he replies to what extent this kind of thing is in his mind and whether or not he is going to have it in the fuller bill next spring, since it obviously isn't in here now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too will be brief. I just want to refer to one principle in connection with the bill that I find most offensive and of which my leader has already spoken.

I am going to tell you just a short story if I may. That is, about three weeks ago an elderly lady came into my office. She had lost her husband, and I am administering that estate now; the estate has an asset position of \$3,800. Her husband died at age 89 and she is now getting dinners from a credit and collection agency in eastern Ontario for a bill from a hospital for \$1,400. The minister is aware of it because I have written to him and asked him if he might exercise some discretion in connection with this, to assist it.

The whole concept as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is that this has to be automatic. The offensive words in this statute that I hope you will remove eventually, are the words "who applies for and is eligible for."

People should not have to apply for the benefits accruing to them under this statute—people over the age of 65 years. The whole intent of Medicare as I see it, and I have

read about it, is that we help people in these circumstances.

I would like to see the Province of Ontario eventually become a place where we don't have widows with assets of \$3,800 finding themselves in a position of having to pay a hospital \$1,400. When I interrogated her about this, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, she said, "I didn't know that there was either health or hospital insurance available to me." They didn't know about it. This is the point that my leader wants to make. I would trust the New Democratic Party would support wholeheartedly that these people don't have to apply for this type of benefit, that they are automatically included in the plan. I see no reason, frankly, for the inclusion of the words "applying for."

That is the one thing that I wanted to carry forward, and perhaps the minister could assist me in my lack of understanding of putting the onus on the citizen. Why not put the onus on the government to take care of its responsibilities to these aged people, which is the manifest intention of the statute in the first place?

Other things could be said in connection with the lack of portability. I take it the minister is going to answer the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, that he is going to answer the question of why the three month's advance premium. I really feel that there are many people, perhaps literally hundreds of thousands of people in the Province of Ontario, who cannot undertake the burden of the \$66 payment. I think some alternative must be made available to them. I know there are many in my riding who cannot possibly afford it. The minister will probably speak about that.

I close by saying to him, however, I wonder whether, for example, on the question of portability there have been any dealings with the other provinces. This benefit of \$3.75 is now a taxable benefit. Has the minister conveyed to the federal government his displeasure in connection with the fact that the health services benefits are now taxable where they were not before. They shouldn't have done that and they shouldn't do it on January 1, 1972. What kind of circuitous stupidity is it for this government to give and for them to take away! Has the minister said anything to them in Ottawa about this? We would like to know.

I want to close in saying, that here we are on December 14, and the minister is expecting companies under union agreements to implement this by January 1. I suggest

to him it is a physical impossibility for many of them to do so. I want to ask him, has he delineated to the corporations themselves where the \$3.75 benefit accrues, because under some union agreements, as he recognizes, the companies have the right to opt out of the payment for hospital services, but not under health services? I do not think, therefore, that the benefit might accrue as the minister intended to accrue to the benefit of the employee himself. But I really am concerned, and I close in saying, I am concerned about this question that my leader raised, and that is the question of whether citizens are entitled automatically to be covered under the intention of this statute. I think I can say that one would hope that an amendment will be forthcoming, perhaps from the minister. I feel quite certain the amendment will be attempted by this party in that connection.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I only have one very brief comment in connection with the principle of the bill, and that is the power granted to the commission, or intended to be granted to the commission, to determine the eligibility of the persons who can become insured persons and the eligibility of persons who are entitled to premium assistance.

It seems to me that in the absence of some appeal procedure we are granting to the commission a very wide power affecting the ability of people to have health care either for hospital coverage or for medical coverage. There is in the province at the present time, so far as I can gather, no evidence of an appeal procedure. We did pass in the last session of the last Parliament The Judicial Review Procedures Act which, on my reading of it, if it had been proclaimed in force would provide that an appeal could be made by a person whose eligibility was denied by the commission, or by a person whose eligibility to premium assistance was denied by the commission. It would provide an opportunity to take the matter, by originating notice to the Supreme Court of the Province of Ontario, to the divisional court which is supposed to be established as a part of the Supreme Court of Ontario. I raise with the minister two or three questions. One is: Why is The Judicial Review Procedures Act not in force to provide some form of appeal? If it is not the minister's province to answer that particular question, why was the question of an appeal procedure not outlined in

the bill which he presented to us, because of the importance of the decision-making power granted to the commission to determine such questions of eligibility?

Thirdly, if, in fact, The Judicial Review Procedures Act is going to be proclaimed in force, it is not an indication that that is a rather over-elaborate procedure, necessary as it may be as a final resort, to determine a final question of eligibility—as to whether or not the minister should provide an intermediary procedure for review of decisions of the commission which affect the question of eligibility? In addition to the two items of eligibility, where power is given to the commission, I think the minister should consider giving a broader scope to the eligibility decisions of the commission.

Not only are there questions related to the eligibility for premium assistance and questions related to the eligibility of persons to become insured persons, there are also questions which will undoubtedly arise as to the eligibility of persons to be covered for particular services which they have received under the operations of the commission. There can be obvious disputes as to whether or not certain forms of care, either in hospital or in other institutions, or medical services are covered under the regulations in the statute which will be such an essential ingredient of this Act.

Therefore, I suggest to the minister that there must be, and must be provisions for, an adequate appeal procedure; or a statement by the minister that The Judicial Review Procedures Act will provide the avenue of appeal; or a statement by the minister that in the interval of time between now and when The Judicial Review Procedures Act comes into force the minister will clearly provide an avenue for appeal from decisions of the commission with respect to the whole question of eligibility. In my view, there can be very few rights of citizens more important than the right of the citizen, on payment of the premiums, to participate in this plan and to be covered for the services which it is designed to provide.

I would commend those particular comments to the minister in his reply and in any further amendment to this bill or in the final permanent bill which he will introduce.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points I thought the minister should deal with when he comes to reply on second reading.

The field has been amply covered by my colleagues, particularly by my leader, but there are some things here that bother me considerably, particularly in this day and age of super-cabinet ministers, super-chiefs, super-deputy ministers and parliamentary secretaries. I think that is a new phrase that the government is coining in some of the statutes.

One begins to wonder, Mr. Speaker, about the role of the member of the Legislature as more and more ministers bring in this vague kind of statute which substantially leaves the power to people we don't know and we haven't seen. We have nothing to say as to who they might be or as to what salaries are going to be paid.

I would think it would be important that the minister at this stage tell us who he has in mind—at least five persons are going to have this very substantial responsibility—what kind of qualifications they have and why he has chosen them; and in addition to that—

Mr. Sargent: And what powers?

Mr. Singer: I think it is very important, Mr. Speaker, that the minister outline to us the kind of emolument or pay that he is going to give them. This is a day of economy and his colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) earlier today chopped \$2,500 off the salaries of county court judges and \$3,000 off the salaries of Supreme Court judges. If, in the spirit of economy, Mr. Speaker, this is going to be the way government is run, I would like to know the kinds of salaries that the minister has in mind for these five persons, at least, to whom he is going to assign this very important responsibility.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled a bit about the commencement date the minister is aiming at. We get various statements announced during the campaign as to when this might happen, and when you look at the statute one of the sections says that they have power to provide services commencing on April 1, 1972.

I think it is somewhat important for all of the planning that has to go on, which has been touched on by other hon. members, that we should know whether this is a target date, whether July 1, which is another date they have thrown around, is in fact the target date, or when really they are going to get down to business. Or in fact, Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to be as vague as his colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr)

when it comes to dealing with various regulations for this environmental bill of rights, because this sort of thing can sit in the statutes for indefinite periods.

Frankly, even though the voters have spoken and given a fantastic mandate to the government, some of us are still here and are still suspicious about the intentions that are announced very vaguely in your statutes. We would like to see some kind of timing and scheduling firmly committed by the government and not the vague phrasing that is set out in the statute.

I wonder too, Mr. Speaker, about one of the subclauses that gives this new body the power to decide the eligibility of any person for participation and to collect premiums. I wonder if that really is the kind of power that should be given to an appointed body. Surely the Legislature should determine who is eligible; the eligibility of one person or another should not be determined at the whim of such a body and without the rules of the Legislature. As this statute is worded, the decision on eligibility is going to be made by this august body. Why should it not be made by the Legislature? If we decide that people are going to be eligible or not eligible, surely it is not beyond the initiative of the minister to have his legal advisers spell it out in the statute. Why should that be something that is assigned to an administrative body over whom we are going to have no control.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder as well about another section in the statute that seems to imply, if I understand it correctly, that once a person has reached 65 if he continues to be employed and he happens to have a contract with his employer, whereby his employer was contributing to part of his premiums, the employer still is obliged to pay. It seems to me to be giving with one hand and taking away with the other. As my colleague from Sarnia was saying a little while ago, "If you are going to give, give. And if you're not, don't." But is it fair and equitable that you say, "We are only going to give you half, and if we happen to have an employer on the hook, we are going to keep him on the hook"? It makes no sense. Really, the sensible way, as my leader outlined at the beginning of this debate, is to do away with these premiums; the people in Ontario are entitled to this kind of thing and it should be paid for out of the general revenues.

Those are some of the additional points that bother me, Mr. Speaker. There have

been a lot of long speeches in connection with this bill, and I would hope the minister will recognize by the time he comes to talk, and perhaps when we get in committee on this bill, that there are many vagaries in the bill that perhaps should be cleared up before the bill gets on and becomes law and before we enshrine another monster and set them out there somewhere to buy property and build buildings and make their own rules. Put a little more in the legislation so that the people of Ontario will know what the laws are, so the members of this Legislature will have had some say and so that a person will be able to go to the statute books and find out what goes on and not have to depend on the whim of some nameless and faceless civil servant.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, there are two items I would like to draw to your attention that may cause us trouble later on if they are not rectified now. To introduce one, I might refer to what happened during the election campaign.

A couple of constituents of mine—lifelong residents of the province except for a period of about a year—were told by the returning officer that they couldn't vote because they had not been resident in Ontario for the previous 12 months. They had been residents only about nine months, having been out of the country in another country for a period of about a year. We cleared that up with the clerk, but section 7, subsection 2 seems to me to be leading us into the same predicament where the members are going to have constituents who are ruled ineligible because of the wording of section 7, subsection 2. Perhaps that could be cleared up before we go into committee.

The other matter has been referred to by other members, that is, the changing of the numbers in an unsatisfactory fashion. At the present time, there are many people in Ontario who have three numbers they carry around—the OHSIP, the Ontario Hospital Services Commission and the social insurance number. The OHSIP number is, in many cases, the social insurance number is, in many of the OHSIP numbers are being phased into the social insurance numbers. Eventually as the insurance companies pass out of the picture, everybody would have been using the social insurance number as the OHSIP number.

What puzzles me is why the choice was made to go from the OHSIP number over to the hospital number. Most members have had many problems to deal with which would have been simplified if there had been only one number, the social insurance number, in the first place. I won't dwell on that but I hope the minister can explain or can report that he has changed to the social insurance number, or else explain why this has not been done.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, one thing I would like to bring to the attention of the minister in the establishment of this combined plan, is, to urge him, with regard to the administrative procedures of providing information, particularly to group collectors, as to which of their employees are, in fact, listed as being covered, even though they have been paid for, and for what kind of coverage, that is, single or family—information which is often incorrect—to assure that in this administration procedure the commission follows the practice of monthly reporting, or almost monthly reporting of OHSIP, rather than the post-audit practice of Ontario Hospital, from which information on who are members and what their coverage is, apparently, comes once every two years. The feeling that we are going to move from OHSIP numbers to Ontario Hospital numbers leaves me with the feeling that we will be moving from the monthly practice of OHSIP in providing information on coverage to the once-every-two-years post-audit system of Ontario Hospital, which would certainly be a step backward.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak?

The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words about the bill. It worries me. I read the bill and, of course, we are going to support it. But I frankly wonder what the final outcome of the amalgamation of the two departments is going to be. If it is simply going to be that they are going to be brought together and the new board, as it is structured—the new commission—is then going to administer the same old Acts and regulations, then we won't have solved many of the problems that I have had brought to my attention over the last four or more years.

It is fairly evident to me that what should have occurred is that the inadequacies in the

service that we presently provide should have been cleared up before we handed over the entire jurisdiction to one commission. What is going to happen in the next six, eight, or 10 months, or perhaps even a year, is that every time someone finds something wrong with either the medical or the hospital areas, the answer you will get back will be that "changes are taking place in the administration and we'll get around to dealing with that after these other restructuring changes have taken place." I frankly feel that the reports I have had and the complaints I have had justify some major changes in the health care programme of the Province of Ontario, rather than the changes being proposed by the minister, which may well be important changes but are nevertheless inconsequential at this time to the needs of the people.

What we have here is—and I want to use an example to point out what I am talking about—over the last year I have raised with the minister or his department, three separate occasions where problems have arisen; problems that were legitimately health problems, and yet problems which were denied by The Department of Health because of the very restricted interpretation which they place upon health as it applies to the residents of this province.

The first one was, of course, the one which involved a young girl and we went through the whole bit with the minister. The end result was no change. The end result was that the private sector someplace had to take up the slack and look after this child's needs.

The other two cases concern young women, and in both cases, in direct contradiction to what The Department of Health has said; in direct contradiction to what was said by the doctors involved—in fact, in direct contradiction to what is so obvious even to a layman like me, benefit was denied. Now unless the minister is prepared to make the kinds of changes that will resolve those very important problems, then all of the restructuring of the administration will have little effect. It will simply mean that we can say we have it all under one umbrella but we have still got all the problems with it.

Let me tell you about the one, because I want to read to you a letter which was received by a physician, a specialist, from the Ontario Hospital Services Commission and the minister will then perhaps understand what I am saying. It deals with the matter of cosmetic surgery, in-patient and/or out-patient, and I want to read simply one part. It says:

OHSC and OHSIP have adopted a uniform definition for purely cosmetic surgery (a) and no benefits are available under either plan for such services.

But under (b) there is an entirely different structure. It is for reconstructive surgery, and it says:

Reconstructive surgery is surgery to restore normal appearance and function to any area altered by disease, trauma or congenital deformity.

Now, I have presented to the department adequate backing for the claim that was put forward by one of these ladies—I suspect by both of them—and in each case it was denied.

After a considerable amount of discussion between myself and the doctor involved, and between myself and the person involved in The Department of Health, we finally got one of them accepted. But at this point, today there is a woman sitting with a \$550 bill waiting to hear from The Department of Health, as a result of inquiries made on her behalf six or eight weeks ago.

Her case falls four-square within the definition that I read under reconstructive surgery and yet she is unable to receive benefit. I suggest to you as the minister, through the Speaker, that it is time you cleaned up all of the inadequacies in your legislation and regulations and that you make a commitment to bring those regulations and that legislation into conformity with what is required by the people in this province; and that rather than concern yourself with the restructuring of the administration—which will have little, if any, benefit for the majority of people—you spend a great deal more time in restructuring the benefit area and making sure that people in this province can benefit from what should rightfully be their health programme.

The doctor wrote a letter and the letter was sent on to the department. I just want to read one tiny portion before I finish. He was dealing with this lady, this Mrs. X, and he said:

This is actually a tiny drop in a bucket that as far as I am concerned is now running over. Harassment and excessive paper work have made the appearance of government agencies in the medical field almost untenable.

He goes on to say a number of other things. He said he was completely fed up with being the fall guy in this triangle. He says, and it is true, that as long as people think they are

buying insurance the demand for service will continue to rise, but a declaration that the Health Services Insurance Board is set up to pay for only those basic needs that are life saving is not politically expedient, and yet it is true. And this is what we are dealing with. People believe that they are purchasing insurance in the province. They do not care whether it is under one administration or two, they do not care if it is under 10. What they want is insurance that will cover them in the time when they need it most—and you are not providing it, you are just not providing it. What you are doing is providing the most basic coverage for those people who are the most severely inhibited or the most severely injured. I suggest to you that this legislation is really a tiny step, a tiny step, toward making any impact at all in providing for the needs of the people, the health care needs of the people of this province.

The whole matter of the reduction of premium for the over 65s is something which I have a little difficulty rationalizing. I suspect that premium rates should be set according to ability to pay rather than according to age, but nevertheless I will accept it because I feel that the majority perhaps in that age category deserve it. But premium rates have to be established according to a person's income and ability to pay and you can't go around the province establishing them based on something called age, because age bears no relationship to income. Nevertheless, the sooner the minister reorganizes the department in such a way as to provide services the better the services will be, and then if he wants to go ahead and do these other things then that would be fine.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate before the minister replies? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I think I will just go through the reply member by member and at least make sure I cover it that way, although it will be somewhat disordered or disoriented as it goes along.

With regard to the Leader of the Opposition's comments, I am quite sensitive to any suggestion that this government does not or is not providing adequate information and figures. Insofar as OHSIP is concerned I shall certainly very seriously canvass a broadening of the scope of the kind of reporting it does to us and indeed to the public, because instinctively I would agree that with a scheme

of that sensitivity and of that scope the question of having statistical figures for research and for criticism is extremely significant.

On point number two the question has been raised three or four times as to why we don't just move right away into the so-called SIN number system—the social insurance number which all of us here have, I would think. The problem is simply a practical one; there has never been any question in my mind nor in that of those who advised me but that a system based on the so-called SIN numbers is what we want as soon as we can possibly get it in this province. We are not alone in that, insofar as other provincial jurisdictions are concerned, because all of us as provinces are pointing in this direction. It is a question of cybernetics, of the mechanics of the thing. The OHSIP coverage that included use of the social insurance numbers I think was 50 per cent or less; to get this thing moving, the hard core of numbers available through OHSC was substantially more. That is the only reason the OHSC numbers are being used. I say categorically our intention is to move to the social insurance numbers as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Double the work!

Mr. Cassidy: Does the minister mean he can't get enough numbers from them?

Mr. Deans: Can the minister explain that again? I don't understand it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, not all of the designated agencies use the SIN number as their number, which means that only about 50 per cent of the population of Ontario has coverage under the social insurance numbering system, whereas the OHSC numbering system is virtually complete.

Mr. Young: This is the result of a mistake, then, in allowing the private carriers to exist?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I don't think so. I suppose it was the fact that with separate schemes operating over the last number of years, with them having grown from different statutory sources and having developed different administration, as part of the critique mentioned earlier this afternoon, we simply ended up with two computer systems.

Mr. Deans: Why is it easier to move into the other later rather than sooner—if the transition has to be made?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think the answer is "soonest." This is a practical question. I can get advice from a computer expert at any time, but of course I have questioned it myself, and there is no question but that my advice is that if we are to do what we want to do and move immediately, the best vehicle we have for 1971-1972 is the OHSC numbering system. But, again, categorically I have been assured—and I know they are working on it in The Department of Treasury—that they will be able to provide The Department of Health with a numbering system based on the Canadian social insurance number soon. Beyond that, as far as I know, we are in the hands of the technicians and the experts in cybernetics.

Mr. Martel: Think of the jungle you are creating.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: With regard to mandatory coverage and the funding of the programme by way of taxation, I was pleased when the quote was read that the saving word "eventually" was there, which I suppose means that I can still stay here—

Mr. Ruston: Before the next election?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —on the Treasury benches, I would think, as I think was intimated, that if and when the day comes when we move our total support for some of these systems over to the tax side, that that probably is the time that the question of whether it be mandatory or not could be most easily dealt with.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Do you have any opposition in principle to it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: To it being mandatory?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, I think it ties in—at least, in thinking about it this afternoon, I think it ties in to an extent with the recommendation that has been made several times this afternoon, that the burden be borne by taxation. I am not sure, even to the extent of having a third of the operation financed by what we call a premium, I am not sure that it suits to have that system mandatory, so I am speculating here. But if we come to a totally tax supported thing, I would agree that I would think that ob-

viously we have moved out of the field of voluntary—

Mr. Bullbrook: You are financing the people over 65 out of general revenue under this statute.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, to the extent of two-thirds we are financing them out of general revenue, as Canadians—

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —federal and provincial, as we are today.

The member for Parkdale raised the question of the whole subject of fee-for-service. I don't think there is any need for me to speculate upon that, except to say that I would not picture the field of fee-for-service reimbursement increasing.

I cannot see any justification for seeing the fee-for-service system spread more widely through our health services. I think to the extent that we develop more community health centres, more community health clinics and more group practices, to that degree I think the percentage of physicians in this province, working on a fee for service, will be gradually drifting downwards. As to the question of the medical model; that, of course, is the great debate at the moment.

The whole question that was raised by the member for York South, as well, is very much in our minds. We read and see what Dr. Tulchinsky, for instance, proposes to do in Manitoba. We see what the hon. Mr. Castonguay is proposing to do in Quebec.

My own feeling, and I have expressed it in public before, is that Ontario might well avoid getting into a doctrinaire position, slapping a system of capitation or a total system of clinics down on the population. We might well spend the next several years encouraging community health clinics, such as the one in Ottawa, or extension of other facilities as we have done in Belleville.

In fact, I would personally suggest that for the next two or three years we should encourage every sensible and potentially viable experiment in relationship to systems of personal health care delivery at the community and neighbourhood level that we possibly can.

Mr. MacDonald: And five years from now you will have to rationalize it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Then I would think, in three years from now—or five, who can guess?—at that point, we rationalize it into models to fit our province.

The member for High Park dealt with a lot of minor points. I think he misunderstood the criticism that has been levied at the homes-for-special-care programme, because there it is not a question of a breakdown in administration, it is a question of an attack on the programme itself. The attack relates to the fact that the programme would not, in the minds of many, appear to have built into it express adequate responsibilities for therapeutic care of these people.

The criticism with which he was concerned and that he was reading to us from the newspaper, or whatever it was, is one that is not a question of the administration of it, it is a question of the spirit of it. There, I think that a critique is very important and should be listened to; namely that we treat too many of these people in too many of these homes as being residually in the system, and not really actively enough within the therapeutic and rehabilitation field of responsibilities.

His attack on my officials, or the officials of OHSIP, I think was unwarranted when one considers the legislative problems which have hit that institution or that plan over the years that many of us have been here. Particularly, reading a letter in this vein signed by Dr. Kinloch was a great error, because Dr. Kinloch is indeed one of the more valuable and better-trained administrators we have—not only in the programme but in the whole department.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville raised the question of whether or not people could pay a year in advance. That kind of refinement, I think, is one that I would like to take back to my people over the next couple of months, along with a lot of other suggestions for when we bring in our full legislation in the spring. That paying in advance should be a hardship for anyone, I can understand. As I think hon. members who have dealt with OHSIP or the department know, the whole philosophy of this government—and I am sure this Legislature—on coverage and protection under OHSIP is that it shall not lapse. I am not here to give the Treasury away by responding and saying—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): There is not too much left.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —we will not have it paid in advance, and then drive a cart right through the legislation. I can say that if people are in need of service—

Mr. Bullbrook: That is quite liberal. The minister has been quite liberal.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, I hate to use that word!

Mr. Bullbrook: That is understandable!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think, despite the criticism made by—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): The minister is not alone.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —the hon. member for Wentworth, when we get to the edges of coverage and eligibility we will always be exposed to being too technical, or not having gone far enough because that edge keeps moving. I would make this reply to the hon. member for Sarnia; that with a philosophy so consistently against lapse, I am sure that without a statutory amendment, none of us is going to find people faced with a premium they cannot pay under some circumstances.

As you know, at the moment people are often not covered at all when they get their service. But as long as we can find that they are basically of an intention to be covered—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Or wish they had been.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —that it is not against some principles of theirs, we see that they are covered. Now the—

Mr. B. Newman: Portability.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: On the question of portability: Portability becomes very significant under this legislation because of the nursing home programme. That is the hangup that requires us to be very careful, because we simply cannot have people pouring into Ontario to get the benefits of our April 1 nursing home programme without having some sensible residence control. Insofar as portability of other health benefits is concerned, yes. The provinces—all of us—have been sitting down for about a year now and will be meeting—that is why I am on my feet today, basically—later this week.

One of the items that is very close to the top of our agenda is the continuing discussion of compatibility among the 10 provinces. We have put proposals forward; BC has; the federal government has; and at least one or two of the Maritime provinces have. You can picture how each of them has a different problem and how it is difficult, although I think we are getting close to the point of success, to get compatibility which implies, in the form in which I use it, portability.

Mr. Sargent: Isn't there a floating cushion between Ottawa and all the provinces on this?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: This has been one proposal—that there be a slush fund set up by Ottawa to cover portability. I won't go into it at this time any more deeply, but you can see how BC has a different attitude toward it from ourselves and PEI. Everyone is trying to get portability and the federal government is, of course, interested in it as well.

The hon. member for Cochrane South asked about the changes; and I know the hon. member for York South asked about changes in the department. The present chairman of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, Mr. Stan Martin, will be taking over this key role that will develop now in The Department of Health.

In other words, as the member for York South so pointedly noticed, yesterday's statement is an extremely important statement, because as you can see the government will now have in its hands the basic structure for a totally rational beginning-to-end spectrum of personal health services. It will be no longer fractured and we start off happily with, I think, the best qualified person in the province to handle it, Mr. Martin, who has handled our hospitals and their planning management. He will be taking over the nursing home programme. He will be taking over the home care programme. He will be continuing, picking up on both sides, the convalescent and private hospitals.

Mr. Sargent: Where's the local autonomy?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: The local autonomy.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The local autonomy—and that is another point that was made—in my opinion should in no way be affected, and this is in response to an earlier question as well from—

Mr. Sargent: The member for Simcoe East.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes. I see no reason why the question of autonomy should be raised by this restructuring at all. It just need not be raised. But I will not, on the basis of getting this bill in or through, go to the point of categorically saying "Chesley for ever." Maybe Chesley will last for another generation, I would say to the member for Grey-Bruce, maybe two, but I don't think I can categorically write a blank cheque for the everlasting life of Chesley hospital.

Mr. Sargent: But the minister has clipped the powers of the OHSC?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, the OHSC has no more power in this field.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: To whom was the power transferred?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Essentially I would say to the minister.

Mr. Sargent: Let's get that straight.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The power is essentially now transferred to the Minister of Health, whom members have right here when they want him.

Mr. Bullbrook: Tell the Attorney General that; it is very important in justice, too.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: To the member for Downsview: I really don't think at this stage, or perhaps even in committee, I want to leap into how much they are going to be paid on this insurance commission. I haven't even given a thought as to who the membership would be. It must be remembered that the new commission is the residue of the old commission in the insurance field, although the motives and policy will be different. The kinds of things it will be doing are essentially those of a casualty company.

Mr. Singer: Is the minister going to reduce their salaries as his colleague did with the judges?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not think I want to get into that. The member raised the question of whether this was going to continue along in its skeletal form indefinitely, he will notice in the bill that they have a self-destruct mechanism in there. I think that is the term they use, isn't it?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mission Impossible!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have never heard it used in a legislative sense before, but—

Mr. Deans: Where is it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Section 11. This Act is repealed on July 1, 1972, unless sooner appealed.

Mr. Stokes: I hope that is not an impossible mission.

Mr. Cassidy: We are devising one for that party over there.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would like to set aside any misapprehension that might have come from other remarks of some of the hon. members opposite, particularly in the NDP, that the concept of unifying this whole system in any way means we are suddenly leaping to Dr. Tulchinsky's formula for a beautiful health care, to be applied in Manitoba. You know, that we are going to—

Mr. Deans: Great place!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It may be, but as I said earlier, we are going along the line, we are rationalizing it, but we are not obviously or implicitly building in in this legislation any acceptance of what I call the doctrinaire community clinic approach.

I think that is all I have to say.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the minister at least foresee greater co-ordination between the hospitals—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is obvious. I mean we have now a vehicle, a very creative vehicle, for the co-ordination of all health services—I think everyone in this House will know for the future, and more importantly for co-ordination of these health services with The Department of Social and Family Services and other agencies and functions of government.

Mr. Martel: And among the various hospitals in one municipality?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is not changed by this bill, but it certainly makes it—

Mr. Martel: It might be included.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It helps. In other words, all the hospitals, the whole health system, reports now basically to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Singer: What about determining eligibility?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill for ordered for third reading? No?

Committee of the whole House.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I think it was mentioned earlier, certainly by the Leader of the Opposition, that this debate

really related to three bills. Did I understand that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: If so, could we proceed in that manner?

Mr. Speaker: I think that may well be the impression; however, I believe we must deal with each bill separately.

Interjections by hon. members.

HEALTH SERVICES INSURANCE ACT

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 6, An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Committee of the whole House.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if I may, is it not close to the adjournment hour? Surely the House leader is not about to go into the committee at one minute to 6?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is the committee consideration going to be long?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think in consideration of what we understand, that we will adjourn.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, can the House leader give an indication of what bills we can expect first tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I think, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow we will move into committee of the whole House on Bill 5. Following that, we will do the supplementary estimates. I think then members of the House should prepare themselves to deal with Bill 11, item 11.

Mr. Sargent: What time is the minister coming in?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Why doesn't the member get here early himself and find out?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Licences and guidelines to prevent proliferation of large lotteries, statement by Mr. Carton	41
Lotteries policy—lotteries under government auspices, questions to Mr. Carton and Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Lawlor	42
Location of new airport—Ottawa negotiations and announcement expected, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Sargent	42
Washington office opening, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	44
PR and information costs and spelling error in brochure, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	44
Environmental Protection Act, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lewis	45
Pits and quarries regulations, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lewis	47
Day Nurseries Act, regulations to, question to Mr. Wells, Mr. Lewis	47
Denturists—negotiations with and government policy on, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Cassidy	47
Automobile insurance premium rates and no-fault insurance, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Young, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Stokes	48
Licence to Canadian Specialized Services in which strike-breaker is principal, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis	49
Investigation of strike-breaking firms including Canadian Driver Pool, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis	49
Benefits under hospital coverage re nursing homes extended to residents of municipal homes for aged, questions to Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence and Mr. Wells, Mr. Paterson	50
WCB financing of building construction at Yonge and Bloor, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Deans	50
Subsidy for commercial fishermen—another agreement with federal government, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Reid	51
Alleged dismissal of union organizer by Martel Lumber of Chapleau, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. Laughren	51
Assistance to municipalities for nutrient removal—dialogue with federal government, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Good	52
Provincial involvement with Consolidated Computer Ltd. and amount of original loan, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Sargent	52
Programme of grants for home improvement, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Cassidy	53
Municipal Board decision on application by Sarnia to annex part of Lambton, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Bullbrook	54
Presenting reports of Hydro, Pension Commission and Highway Transport Board, Mr. Yaremko	54
Presenting report, Revenue Department, Mr. Winkler	54
Management Board of Cabinet, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, first reading	55
Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, first reading	55

Executive Council Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	55
Extra-Judicial Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	55
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	55
Ontario Human Rights Code, bill to amend, Mr. Lewis, first reading	56
Ontario Health Insurance Commission, bill to establish, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, second reading	57
Health Services Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, second reading	86
Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, second reading	86
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	86



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, December 15, 1971

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1971

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning we have guests with us: In the east gallery students from St. Martha's Separate School of Downsview; and in the west gallery students from Tecumseh Senior Public School of Scarborough and George Brown College of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

HOUSING SITUATION IN ONTARIO

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development: Can he make a statement to the House on the housing situation in Ontario, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, since what we are experiencing here has been described recently by the president of CMHC as the worst housing shortage in Canada?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to make a statement as soon as I have an opportunity to prepare one, and I will in view of the hon. member's request.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Quite specifically, can he report on what activity is taking place in the Malvern site that has been pending for so many years?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would think, Mr. Speaker, in line with the statement I made at the last session at the last Parliament that things are well in hand and are proceeding in accordance with the plan which I announced at that time. However, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like a more detailed statement, I would be prepared to prepare that as well and provide it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Would the minister agree with the president of CMHC that the housing shortage in Metro is the worst in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister's statement will back that up, will it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would hope so.

FEEES FOR JURY DUTY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Is he concerned that the fees payable for jury duty are still at \$10 a day and are a substantial hardship, evidently, to those people who must give up their regular employment, for long trials particularly.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Yes, this is one of the matters which the Law Reform Commission is considering in its overall study of the administration of justice, and especially of the administration and ancillary matters of the courts.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, might the government use the money it is taking away from the judges and apply it for that purpose in a similar amendment?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am afraid we have already spent that money.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Add it to the deficit!

R.C. PRIVATE HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: Is there a procedure that might be used by Roman Catholic private high schools if they are going to abandon their function due to lack of funds, as is evidently the case in three of the five high schools in the Ottawa area?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): I think, Mr. Speaker, making specific reference to that situation, that the boards of governors of the private schools are apparently carrying on negotiations with the public school board.

There are no laid-down, established procedures as far as the department is concerned. If in fact the board of governors of any private school decided to cease operations, then naturally by the statute law of

this province, those students are the responsibility of the publicly elected boards, and therefore those boards would have to make the necessary arrangements for the transfer of the pupils.

So I think what apparently is happening in Ottawa is that the private school people are about to have a meeting with the public school board to arrange for the orderly transfer of those particular students to the jurisdiction of the public board.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: It is quite possible then that the facilities could be purchased by the public board and the Roman Catholic high schools go out of use entirely?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I suppose we already have some precedent for that when the French-language private schools in the secondary field negotiated with the public boards.

There are a number of alternatives. The public board could lease the facilities of the private school corporations rather than purchase them.

As I read that situation, however, I think the plan, or the proposed plan, would seem to be to lease the facilities for a while until such time as the public board could make some determination as to whether they presently have sufficient physical accommodation to look after all of the pupils in the private schools. So in that interim period they may well lease, but this would really be a decision for the board in any particular municipality to determine.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What financial arrangements is the minister prepared to make if Catholic high schools are taken over in Ottawa, considering that an additional local cost of something over \$1 million would be involved in a single year, with close to 2,000 students coming into the high school system?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As the hon. member would know, the budget of the board, of course, would reflect, if in fact this happened. The school board budget would reflect the added responsibility of having to look after that increase in student population and so therefore, budgetarily speaking, they would, in fact, be entitled to that additional money on a per pupil basis in the same way that they would look after any other increase in enrolment.

On the capital aspects of this, of course we are in the assumption stage, because there

really has been no formal determination that I can read at the moment as to whether any additional accommodation will be needed for these particular pupils, and how they will look after that will be for the board to determine.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I am referring to the \$1.25 million that would be required from local tax revenues in order to finance the operation of these schools in a single year. Is the minister prepared to make any transitional arrangements to cushion that impact on local taxpayers?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well Mr. Speaker, I thought I had handled that particular matter. How has the hon. member arrived at that figure of \$1 million-plus insofar as the charge on the local municipal people is concerned?

Mr. Cassidy: It is 60 per cent of the \$2-million operating cost of those schools.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well whatever the cost is as far as the increase in population is concerned—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Isn't the minister glad the member is here to tell him?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Pardon?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): They should change roles!

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well he just reads the Ottawa papers I would think!

Mr. Lewis: Well that is a commendable thing at times.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, I happen to be in Ottawa and I read the paper, and of course the point is—

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Just an overnight guest.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —that this is all hypothetical—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Overnight guest, eh? They started accusing me of that back in 1955.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —because I understand there haven't been any meetings at this particular time. But certainly when the opinion of the department is sought and all these things become a matter of fact, then we can deal with it on that basis.

Mr. Deans: A stumbling block!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the minister and his government—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

If the hon. member wishes to ask a supplementary, he will indicate so.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister and his government have in fact backed the schools into this situation, and it seems to me that they should—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Cassidy: Is the minister prepared to—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Tourism and Information) What is the question?

Mr. MacDonald: There was a question. Didn't the minister hear it?

Mr. Lewis: It was a clear question. Why did they back them into that situation?

COMMISSION ON FRENCH-LANGUAGE SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On another matter, but to the same minister, the Minister of Education: How does he justify the appointment of a one-man royal commission to look into the problems of French-language education in Ontario, particularly when that one man is not from the French community?

Mr. M. Hamilton (Renfrew North): Where is the question?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well Mr. Speaker, at the time of that particular discussion, as far as French-language instruction is concerned, there was a series of negotiations; and I was quite satisfied that the president of Trent University was acceptable in his capacity to serve as a one-man ministerial commission to look into French-language secondary education in the Province of Ontario. Indeed, I have no reason to believe that there was any question raised by either the French-speaking people of this province or the English-speaking people of this province that they would not be satisfied with a one-man commission. I asked a man I felt had the respect of the communities at large, and indeed I have every reason to believe that on the basis of the study and the course it has taken he is receiving full co-operation from all those who are interested in the study of this particular situation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question: Why did the minister feel he could not use his authority and prerogative to settle that matter in an obvious way at the time the problem was before us rather than appointing a commission to simply postpone the decision which was arrived at rather amicably and easily under these new circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the latter part of the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition would justify the procedures that have been taken. In other words, the people at the local level have arrived at these conclusions themselves without having somebody from some central body tell them what is best for their particular locality. Indeed, isn't that the spirit of a decentralized operation, and in the spirit of local autonomy? The hon. Leader of the Opposition confirmed during the course of the last consultation with the people that he believed too that there was some room in educational jurisdictions for local autonomy. Also cabinet ministers have to obey the law as well—and the law as it is now written does not require mandatorily that school boards have to accommodate French-language instruction in physically separate buildings. Therefore, I was faced at that time with the situation of the law being very specific with respect to the responsibilities on school boards to provide French language instruction—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He was faced with a political decision that he was afraid to come to grips with.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is not correct at all. Therefore, I thought—

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, it is!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —the time had come to have a review of the whole French-language secondary education system in the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, that time will come.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Therefore I asked Professor Symons if he would accept that responsibility, which he has done. And during the course of that study one of the school boards in the province resolved one of its problems on its own.

Mr. Lewis: Is Professor Symons bilingual?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing, a supplementary?

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Does the minister not agree that a simple statement from him at the time that he would amend

the Act to make the section mandatory would have solved all the problems and perhaps got over the discord that took place in my riding because of the indecision of his department and himself?

Mr. Speaker: This sort of question is simply developing the whole thing into a debate.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, let me comment on that. I am not going to allow the hon. member for Nipissing to get cheaply partisan in this House right now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Cheap politics, that is all it is!

Mr. Lewis: Only expensive partisanship will be allowed here.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am saying that there was no great indecision on the part of this department. There was a respect for the law as it then was; there was a tremendous respect for local autonomy, which that hon. member would be the first to criticize if I interfered with if it was going in some other direction.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is a thin explanation.

Hon. Mr. Welch: And I am quite satisfied that the procedures which we took were proper and fair to allow for a full discussion. There are all kinds of points of view to be expressed, and the hon. member should acknowledge that the duly elected board of education in his area have in fact resolved that problem themselves.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That's the stuff!

Mr. R. S. Smith: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the minister that I was not taking a cheap political point of view on this matter. The fact of the matter is that he did at the time of the question, and his inactivity and inability to step in and come to agreement with the board caused the dissension in my area—six months of dissension which we went through.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Welch: Where is the question?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I did not say it was a question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is a point of order.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But I have a supplementary question along with that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member clearly indicate the privilege about which he is speaking?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have already done that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: But he proceeded to make a speech after it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister advise me why his appointee as a commissioner did not take part in any of the discussions on the matter until a few weeks ago and over two months passed before he got directly involved in this situation himself?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, to speak to the point of privilege. I interjected my comments in connection with partisanship because I tell you quite sincerely that an issue as sensitive and as emotional as language in this province was no time for the hon. member, or any other member, to try to make marks in that situation. I felt I was acting quite responsibly by having public discussions in this matter. To have the department inject itself at that stage into resolving an emotional issue like that on one side or another was not, in my opinion, acting in the best public interest of this province at that time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: To show you how sincere we were to get this job done quickly, we set pretty strict deadlines with respect to the tabling of a report from the commissioner. In order for him to accomplish this particular work he had to ask staff to go round to do some of the preliminary fact-finding and discussion—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And he was busy in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —that he himself would follow up, which he has done. That is the explanation. —in order to get this job done as quickly as possible, to divide the responsibilities and to leave to staff some of the

basic study and the accumulation of the details upon which he then, in consultation with others, would arrive at his recommendations for the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When members get Welch mad they are in trouble.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Think a little bit beyond North Bay and Sturgeon Falls.

Mr. Speaker: I will permit one more supplementary. The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Just out of curiosity, in view of the sensitivity and emotion which surrounds the language question, is Professor Symons fully bilingual?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I don't think he is.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you don't think he is?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I don't think he is.

Mr. Lewis: Well that leads me to another supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, I am sorry, I said I would permit one more supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: All right, I have got a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Leader of the Opposition finished with his questions?

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

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

How did Professor Symons communicate with unilingual French-speaking people in the Province of Ontario without the delicacy, sensitivities and emotions of the French language in terms of educational rights?

Hon. Mr. Welch: In the establishment of his commission staff Professor Symons has a bilingual member of the secretariat, as well as—in fact, both of the principal secretaries to Professor Symons are bilingual.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, was it not possible to find in the Province of Ontario a commissioner who, because he would be fully bilingual would understand the nuances and the feelings, as expressed through the language, of the issue which he was investigating? Nowhere in Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied that for the situation which faced us at that time and for the assignment that I had in mind, Professor Symons was one of the best qualified men in this province to do so.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Secondly, the—

Mr. Lewis: He lacked a major qualification, obviously.

An hon. member: The member lacks lots of them!

Hon. Mr. Welch: ACFO and a number of the French language organizations in this province endorsed his appointment, and I am delighted with it because they feel that in Professor Symons they have a—

Mr. Lewis: Good, good!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —very fair-minded man who will see the whole situation.

CANADIANS TEACHING IN ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

Mr. Lewis: May I put a question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities, Mr. Speaker? Will the minister respond to the request of the university presidents that the province guarantee a minimum number of Canadian graduates teaching in Ontario universities?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Colleges and Universities): I am sorry I don't understand that question.

Mr. Hamilton: He doesn't either.

Mr. Lewis: In Ontario, as I understand it, the university presidents have now requested that the province guarantee through their loan programme, that a minimum number of Canadian graduates find posts in Ontario universities, because of Statistics Canada's information that the Canadian proportion is dropping while the relative number of American professors is increasing.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think I have not seen this particular request. Certainly I will consider it and I will make my decision known to the House.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, would the minister consider applying his

graduate loan cuts selectively rather than across the board in order to make it possible for Canadian graduates to fill posts which are now available?

Hon. Mr. White: The Ontario graduate fellowship programme, which was reduced in total from \$5 million to \$3.5 million this year, is being reconsidered by me and my officials. I think there are improvements to be made.

I have had conversations with the executive committee of the Council of Ontario Universities and I am persuaded that there are things other than equity involved in maintaining graduate fellowship awards. I would not expect to see those awards phased out entirely in a way that was forecast to some extent last spring. Here again, I have to say that the matter is under consideration and when the final determination is made I will inform the Legislature.

RIGHTS FOR TAXI DRIVERS

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour: Has he yet acted, as he indicated in the House on May 10 last, to amend The Labour Relations Act and The Employment Standards Act to incorporate rights for taxi drivers in Metropolitan Toronto and throughout Ontario?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour and Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have been looking at this all summer. The difficulty is to tie it down insofar as legislation is concerned. We have been examining every possible method and it is our intent, and I am hopeful that we will have this for presentation in the next session.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: If I understand the minister then, it is still his intention to provide amendments which will give collective bargaining rights to taxi drivers in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is my intention. But the difficulty is to tie it down so that we can do it in a way that it will have the effect we want. That is the difficulty—to put it into legislation. We have had many proposed amendments. We have examined them; we do not yet have the one that we are satisfied with and we are working on it presently. But we intend that.

TELEGRAM PUBLISHING COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. Lewis: May I then ask the Minister of Labour another question, Mr. Speaker? Has the minister informed the Telegram Publishing Company Limited that cutting off the weekly pay in lieu of notice payments to employees who have found new jobs since the Telegram stopped publishing October 30, is a contravention of The Employment Standards Act?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the whole question relating to the evening Telegram and its termination is to be examined by my department, by the employment standards branch, in January, at which time this whole matter will be gone into, relating not only to that particular matter but other collateral matters. It will be examined by my department and we have so advised everyone concerned that this will be done in January for determination of the matter.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Since in the month of January all the responsibilities will terminate—and after the event won't satisfy the employees—is the minister informing the Telegram Publishing Company that its refusal to pay vacation pay is a contravention of The Employment Standards Act?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge this has not been done.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will the minister direct the employment standards branch to prosecute the Telegram for telling its employees the paper would not pay severance pay unless they quit or resigned before October 30, although The Employment Standards Act makes it plain that severance pay is distinct from pay in lieu of notice? And why has the Telegram been allowed to get away with such direct contraventions of the minister's Act without a single response from government?

Mr. MacDonald: Yesterday the minister was going to uphold the law.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The answer, Mr. Speaker, shortly, is no.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary question; what special rights and privileges does the Telegram Publishing Company have in Ontario which allow it to contravene existing legislation with impunity and no response from the minister or his department? What is it that makes the Telegram have the right to avoid the review of the law?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Don't get carried away! Easy!

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I made it abundantly clear at the outset that the whole matter will be gone into in January by the employment standards branch, covering every aspect.

Mr. MacDonald: Why January? Why not now? The law has been breached now.

Mr. Lewis: Then by way of supplementary, since the violations have continued since October 30 and have been reported to the branch day in and day out, why is the minister waiting until January, when it may be impossible to retrieve the rights of the employees affected?

Mr. Deans: Three months later!

Mr. Lewis: How is it that John Bassett can dictate to that entire cabinet over there?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, it is time to intervene.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, no one dictates to my particular department.

Mr. MacDonald: Why isn't the minister upholding the law? It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

CANADIAN FILMS

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Trade and Development. Does the minister think he might be able to find—

Mr. MacDonald: Don't speak to us again about upholding the law.

Mr. Lewis:—a Canadian film to show at Cinesphere rather than all the major American productions which he is now using; "Mon Oncle Antoine" or one of the other films struggling for display?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it would be possible to find Canadian films, I am sure. Haven't there been any Canadian ones shown?

Mr. Lewis: Not in the money-making venture the minister is now engaged in. Why not give a Canadian vehicle for Canadian films?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I hope the hon. member is right that we are making a lot of money on them. I hope that turns out to be right. Does that answer his question?

JUDGE'S REMARKS ON INDIAN COMMUNITY

Mr. Lewis: One last question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Justice: Has the minister examined the behaviour of His Honour Judge George Collins, relating to the abusive and pejorative remarks he made from the bench about members of the Indian community in a recent case?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I have, and I am still investigating the matter. I am still, quite frankly, awaiting the actual transcript of what was said earlier. As my hon. friend knows, this is a matter that is still a fairly grey area, in that—

Mr. MacDonald: It doesn't sound very grey.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence:—it concerns a federal appointee. If he was a provincial judge, of course, the matter would immediately be referred to the machinery that has been set up under provincial legislation in respect of provincial judges. The federal government is now copying that machinery in respect of federal appointees but that machinery has not yet been set up. I have had discussions with the federal minister and I want to delay my further representations to him until I have actually seen the transcript. I have been trying in the last couple of days to find out what has been holding up that transcript.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the recent events in the court in Sudbury, and others relating to our first citizens, will the minister undertake with his counterpart in Ottawa a complete review of the judicial system as it affects our first citizens in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: A complete review of the judicial system of this province is being undertaken already.

Mr. Stokes: Particularly as it affects our first citizens?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It will affect everybody, I hope.

Mr. MacDonald: That will be interesting, because the minister's predecessor repudiated the idea that there was any discrimination.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

STORE HOURS LEGISLATION

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the minister considering introducing uniform provincial store hours legislation such as was recommended by both the union of Canadian retail employees and also by the Ontario Chamber of Commerce?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the cabinet met with the Chamber of Commerce recently and at that point the matter was raised, but they asked to submit a separate brief. They are making an appointment with us and we will receive it shortly, early in the New Year.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister has the answer to a question asked yesterday.

PR AND INFORMATION COSTS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was quite concerned about the cost of the COGP pamphlet. I undertook to get the cost for him. The total cost was \$10,025. There were 81,500 copies printed, which breaks down to 12.3 cents per copy, which I think is a minimum investment to inform the public servants of this province of the changes that are taking place.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Surely the Premier will recall that it was not the cost of the pamphlet particularly but the cost of the presentations that were arranged at a specific hour in all the county towns across the province? And the additional printed material, besides the pamphlet, which was to more or less sell the reconstruction of the cabinet as a step forward, which I believe it to be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this was done internally within the government's distribution system. As far as the meetings were concerned, these were meetings held for the benefit of the public service, but the cost or outlay to the province for the pamphlet constituted the major expenditure other than the full report itself. I would be

delighted to get that figure for the Leader of the Opposition. The long piece of material which he showed was to be used for bulletin boards; the cost there was quite minimal I am told. The bulk of the cost related to the distribution to the public servants related to the pamphlet and, as I say, it breaks down to about 12.3 cents per copy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the Premier going to have the misspelled printed material corrected—redone—and redistributed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition in his desire to effect economies—as is our desire here and we can do this, perhaps, more effectively than he can—I think that the public servants will understand what was meant by the word "government" without the "n". I think really it would be a misuse of public funds to have that entire pamphlet reprinted. Now if the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we do this—that is delightful—but I would have to tell him, no, we are not considering it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is his pedantry—from school teaching days.

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

SENIOR CITIZEN HOUSING IN TIMMINS

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Was it Ontario Housing's intention to have the job constructing 103 senior citizen units in Timmins begun and then closed down for the winter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there are many of these projects being built by the Ontario Housing Corporation, which is one of the reasons that Ontario has the best record of housing in North America—

An hon. member: Hear, hear! In the world!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It makes it, of course, difficult for me to have all the details at my fingertips as to each project. I will be glad to get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: The member is embarrassing the minister.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Ferrier: Would the minister inform us as to whether it is the policy of Ontario

Housing to close down all jobs in the wintertime once they have begun, especially in northern Ontario? Further, would he find out if this job can be begun again? Does he not think, when we are spending so much money on winter works programmes to provide employment for people and have to look to find specific jobs, that when we have a job that is already available and very much needed for the citizens of a community the money for winter works would be just as well or better spent on this kind of a project?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I answer that with a speech, Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, Mr. Speaker, if it is at all possible to keep these jobs going or have them begun in the winter, that would be advisable. As I have promised the hon. member, I will get the details in respect of this matter.

Of course, if the housing can be proceeded with during this particular time of year it should be. If it is not, there must be a good reason for it and I am going to find out, Mr. Speaker, and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

EGG INQUIRY REPORT

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

When is the egg inquiry report expected?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I can't give the hon. member a direct answer on that. The hearings are proceeding this week in London. I am not sure whether they will be concluded or not.

I believe they are on the 14th, 15th and 16th in London. Then they were to go to eastern Ontario and central Ontario. So I would hope sometime early in the new year, but I can't tell the member exactly when. I wish I knew, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: In order that I do not cut off any of the hon. members when they do have a supplementary, I would appreciate it if, when they arise with a supplementary, they would state immediately that it is a supplementary question.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Wasn't the original date for the report November 30, or around the end of November? And has the minister communicated either directly or indirectly with Judge Ross with respect to when the report will be coming in?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I certainly made it clear when we asked that the judicial inquiry be established that the report be prepared and presented to us just as quickly as possible. We had thought at the time it might be possible to have it much earlier.

As a matter of fact, the target date that I would have liked to have seen was November 30. But we learned as soon as the inquiry was set up, with the amount of detail they had to go through to get all the wheels in motion, to have the public hearings and to give the various individuals and organizations time to prepare written submissions, which were presented, and I believe have already been presented in many cases to the commissioner, that it was necessary to take that extra bit of time. I admit that it is disappointing, but nevertheless that is the case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent, a supplementary?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the minister: Does he contemplate any action on behalf of the people who have suffered greatly in the last year from the egg prices in the interim period of waiting for the report? Does he feel that the government may take any action to assist these people who have lost considerably in the last year?

Mr. Henderson: Ottawa!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to give an easy answer to that question. One could say no and sit down; but I have to say this, that I sympathize very much with those who have sustained loss in the egg business in the last year or year and a half. Unquestionably they have, but I would point out as well that the Egg and Fowl Board of Ontario has had a vote already on whether it should have a quota plan for egg production or not. It was voted down two or three years ago.

There has been great confusion within the industry itself as to what the proper approach should be. I think perhaps we have to recognize the fact that there doesn't seem to be

any real clear consensus among all egg producers in Ontario as to what should be done, and that certainly was the reason why the Egg and Fowl Board asked us to appoint the judicial inquiry, or establish the judicial inquiry, and this we did.

We hope the report will indicate the proper course of action that I trust will be acceptable to the majority of egg producers in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce, a supplementary?

Mr. Gaunt: Is it fair to say that none of the \$6 million allocated under the supplementary estimates is earmarked for the egg industry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

RESIGNATION OF TEACHERS RAINY RIVER-FORT FRANCES

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): I would like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. No doubt the minister is aware that a dispute in the Rainy River-Fort Frances board has resulted in the resignation of 84 teachers and three principals. I would like to ask the minister what steps his department is taking to ensure that the schooling of the 1,750 children involved will continue after the new year.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, may I answer the question in two ways? In the first place, I am not sure, that is my latest information is that the resignations to which the hon. member makes reference have not been formally accepted by the board as yet, although I may stand to be corrected in that particular situation. Secondly, I have every reason to believe that situation will resolve itself as between the parties before the end of the year.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: At the present time the board is advertising for that full complement of teachers, not only in Ontario but outside of the province. Is the department willing or considering giving any teachers who have not the qualifications considered appropriate in

Ontario, either letters of standing or letters of permission?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question by what I said before. It is a hypothetical question because I have reason to believe the matter will be resolved between the parties.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth.

PROPOSED PROVINCIAL PARK AT BRONTE CREEK

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works. I believe the Premier announced a new 1,500-acre provincial park at Bronte Creek. Could the minister inform the House how many of those 1,500 acres were purchased or under option on October 8? Also, how much of that land has now been purchased or is under option on this date?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member asked that question: I just happen to have the answer here.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That's a change.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As of October 8, we had under option—if the hon. member has a pencil—89.5 plus 87.5 plus 91.907 acres. At the moment we have under option 827.878 acres.

An hon. member: Just happened to have it at his fingertips.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

RESTRICTIONS ON BUILDING LOTS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the selling by development companies, real estate agents and others, of building lots on which the purchaser later finds that he is not permitted to build a home.

The question is: What steps is the minister taking to protect the citizens of this province from losing large sums of money because of building prohibitions of which neither they nor their lawyers could be aware?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, that is a local municipal problem and they should obtain the necessary information from the municipality.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Has the minister no advice for these townships as to how they might protect the citizens?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They should provide the information to the citizens when they inquire.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

PORT FACILITIES AT ERIEAU

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is it true that the minister made a visit to Eriean in Kent county a few weeks ago? If so, did he look at the port facilities, as I asked him to do during the last session?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, it is true that I did enjoy a visit to that delightful part of the Province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was greatly impressed with everything I saw—

Mr. Gaunt: Including its representative down there?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —including the port facilities.

Mr. MacDonald: The election is over, and the government lost it down there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Spence: A supplementary question: Has the minister made a decision on the port facilities?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I am not a very good judge of port facilities. I was impressed with what I saw, as the hon. member suggests, but that is as far as I can go.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister prepared to back the grain producers in Essex and Kent counties in their endeavours to secure proper port facilities and storage of their grain products to enable them to get more orderly marketing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a wide diversity of opinion among

not only grain producers but among grain handlers as to the wisdom of establishing deep water ports for Ontario grain production.

There are, as the hon. member knows, terminal elevator facilities in Ontario that are being used by the Ontario grain trade and we are advised by those in charge of the terminal facilities that if orders are placed early enough for space in those facilities, it will be provided for them. In fact, I know some of the grain handlers in the riding of Middlesex North had already booked space and have grain in storage in those elevators now. So it would lead me to the belief that if the grain trade and the industry itself really wants to use the terminal elevator facilities, they are available. It is only when they are not booked that grain comes in from western Canada to meet the demand of the feed trade in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

GUIDELINES FOR TENANTS

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Is the minister giving any consideration to the introduction of guidelines which would enable tenants to be certain that increased rents which are being charged to them represent only those items of costs which are legitimate for landlords to pass on to tenants?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge we are not, but I will take it under consideration.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, is the minister concerned with, or has he had in the consumers' protection branch of his department, any serious complaints with respect to the exorbitant rent increases occasioned from time to time in the lower parts of the city of Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been some complaints. I don't think it relates only to that part of Toronto; I think it relates to other districts as well and to other areas of the province, too.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

GOVERNMENT ACTION AGAINST DOW CHEMICAL

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney

General. I wonder if he could give us the latest progress report on the action of the government of Ontario against Dow Chemical and whether or not he can give us any assurance that the trial is likely to take place in the 20th or 21st century.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Which century?

Mr. Singer: Either one. Pick a century.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I look on our involvement in that matter as—

Mr. Lewis: Marginal.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence:—being that of lawyers retained by a client, and I am not so sure that the lawyer should make public announcements on what is happening. But—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Attorney General is the head lawyer.

Mr. Singer: I am not asking the chances of success, just when we are going to get it resolved.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: But certainly the government has been pressing its side. I haven't had a report in the last day or so about it. The government is pressing its position.

If my memory serves me correctly I do not believe the defendants have yet put in a statement of defence. On the other hand there—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Dow's fault again.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence:—may be reasons why we cannot move for judgement in default of that. But certainly the government is pressing its position and perhaps the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr), whom we sort of look upon as our client in this matter, could present a more up-to-date report on that.

Mr. Reid: He has a lot of terrible lawyers!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, either to the Attorney General or to his colleague the Minister of the Environment: Would either of those ministers care to hazard a guess as to within what time, give or take a year or two, we might expect a trial in this action?

Mr. Bullbrook: Is that enough latitude, a year or two?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of the Environment): Which minister?

Mr. Singer: Either one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: You are the Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would assume if things go along in a normal manner that the matter would be set down for trial sometime next year.

Mr. MacDonald: That is quite an assumption.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? Well, the hon. Attorney General has the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

LICENCE TO FIRM IN WHICH STRIKE-BREAKER IS PRINCIPAL

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: You are right, I do; yes.

Yesterday the hon. member for Scarborough West asked a question of me: Has my department approved the licence of a firm named Canadian Specialized Services, one of whose principals, Mr. Rick Grange, is associated in formal strike-breaking activity through Canadian Driver Pool Limited? I think I undertook to give the answer today.

First of all, the hon. member, and I think the House, should be aware that Mr. Richard Allan Grange is presently under a criminal charge and therefore I am restricted in what I can or should say. But on June 16 of this year, Mr. Richard Allan Grange submitted an application for a licence under the name of Canadian Specialized Services to supply private investigators and security guards to the public. On October 19—and I think that was after the charge was laid—Mr. Grange requested our officials to withdraw the same application.

Three days later our officials received an application for Canadian Specialized Security, with two of the principals being on the original request under that firm name. That has not been processed through the department as yet.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: What possible basis would there be to approve that kind of application when the minister's colleague has expressed his public repugnance about the ways in which these firms are used in formal strike-breaking?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I said that application has not been processed.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Do I take it then that the minister is indicating he will turn it down?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I am not indicating that at all. I do not think I can pre-judge a matter such as that when, at the moment in any event, there is no criminal conviction against anyone associated with that.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. I am not asking about those who—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is not Canadian Driver Pool.

Mr. Lewis: I am just asking when does the minister come to a decision whether or not to license a firm whose objects will obviously be to break strikes in Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I think we must drop this. We have exceeded the time allotted for the oral questions. The hon. member may ask his question tomorrow, if he likes, in a different manner.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Welch presented the report of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority for the year ended March 31, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the report of the Ontario Stockyards Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I beg your pardon. Introduction of bills, please.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. The hon. member for High Park.

MOTORIZED SNOW VEHICLES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Motorized Snow Vehicles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to prevent arms being carried or

game being driven from a snowmobile. It is to prevent an incident such as we had last year when a wolf was driven for many hours.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Before I assume the chair, the House might allow me a few brief remarks since this is the first opportunity since the events of a couple of days ago.

I wish to thank, first of all the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis), although he is absent, for moving my nomination to this position. I also express my thanks to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) for seconding my nomination, and for the general support which seemed to be coming from the House.

The job of presiding at any of the functions of the Legislature, as the people who have been here for a number of years realize—and the new members will soon come to realize—is not the easiest job in the world but, as I have done in the past, I assure you that I will always try to be fair and understanding, to give everyone a chance to say their bit, to ask their questions.

I think it is the well-founded duty and obligation of those in the Opposition, of course, to question the actions of the government just as it is also important that the members of the government and the ministry be given the same opportunity, equal opportunity, to provide the answers. We will try to be fair at all times.

I would like just, before I take my seat, to extend a welcome to the new members and offer my services. If there is any way in which I can be of assistance to them, either inside or outside the House, please feel free to call on me. Thank you very much.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED: That the money necessary for the purposes of The Ontario Health Insurance Organization Act, 1971, shall until April 1, 1972, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund as provided in Bill 5, An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and to provide for the Advance Organization of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Resolution concurred in.

ONTARIO HEALTH INSURANCE
ORGANIZATION ACT.

House in committee on Bill 5, The Ontario Health Insurance Organization Act, 1971.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 5, An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and to provide for the Advance Organization of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. Are there any questions, comments or amendments to any of the first five sections, and if so which section?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Section 4.

Mr. Chairman: Section 4.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question on section 4, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything before section 4?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Section 2, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 2? Section 1 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't in the House yesterday when the minister replied to my comments, but I understand that he did not reply to the specific comments I made about the personnel. I was wondering if he would care at this time to reply specifically to the problems of preventive medicine which apparently OHSIP is not universally accepting as necessary in medicine—in reference, for example, to the cholera situation.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): I think the point here that has been made by the hon. member as to the purpose is a very good one, namely that the assessment really should have nothing to do with the passport situation, that we are concerned, of course, with health. I think, to deal with the problem, we have to deal with it more broadly, and that is the pressure on our service, not only in relation to cholera, but as the hon. member will know in relation to quite a variety of other vaccines. We are under pressure in relation to, as I recall it, rubella. I think in the months that I have been there—

Mr. Shulman: You pay for rubella.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence:—we have done rubella—and there has been pressure in relation to a number of other vaccines in the same field. I think what I will have to do is simply undertake to review the coverage and then not deal with cholera specifically because, as I said, it brings up the whole question of the pressure on other vaccines and serums.

Mr. Shulman: Yes. If I may pursue this, I think perhaps this is the key point, that you are paying for some vaccinations and some serums and not others. This just doesn't make any sense to me at all. First of all the amount involved is minuscule. You only pay \$1.80 for such a visit, and in comparison to the amounts of money that are going through OHSIP, this is such a small thing. Yet for some reason you pick and choose.

You allow payment for rubella. You do not allow payment for smallpox. I presume that smallpox is just as serious a disease as measles. In fact, perhaps some might suggest it is more serious.

The whole policy just does not make any sense to me. I am asking the minister why he doesn't at this time say he is going to pay for all preventive vaccines—I don't mean the material—but pay for the shot, which is \$1.80. It doesn't make any sense to pay clerks to go down there and say: "We will pay for this shot and we won't pay for this shot." It is all preventive medicine.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I understand, Mr. Chairman, the point that the hon. member is making. But I am not prepared medically or technically at this point to respond scientifically as to why my people feel that the line has to be drawn in relation to some and not others. Perhaps I can undertake to the hon. member to review it again. I remember some six months ago having it reviewed in the department. I am most sympathetic to the point being made and let me respond on another occasion.

Mr. Chairman: Section 2 then stands as part of the bill. Carried?

Mr. Shulman: I would like to pursue section 2 for a moment if I may.

One more question: Why have the administrators not set up a check system on the private insurance companies' funds being paid out as they have with the OHSIP funds themselves—that is, money being paid to doctors? As you know, there is a spot check system on funds that go out through OHSIP

directly but not through all the other insurance companies, despite the complaints which we have been making periodically over a period of a year.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, I will check that with the chairman of the commission in a moment and reply during the course of the debate.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Leader of the Opposition on section 4:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, failing a full report of OHSIP presently, it is very difficult to find out just how many employees would be transferred to the jurisdiction of the new commission. Can the minister tell us how many are employed by OHSC and OHSIP and HIRB, and in his own department directly associated at this time? If he can't tell us specifically, just the general numbers of employees associated with health services.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, if the chairman will excuse me, I can find the figure from the chairman right now, if I may. I will answer both of those when I can get in touch with the chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right, that's fine.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on section 5, subsection (d), where the commission is going to determine the eligibility of those persons who might obtain premium assistance. I raised this point yesterday in relation to premiums assistance, whereby until now those who were on low incomes or unemployed could get free health care but they couldn't obtain hospital coverage. Under the announcement that was sent out, the department has indicated that both are going to be available to persons in that classification. Do you anticipate any change in the regulations pertaining to the qualifications that now exist, pertaining to the basic qualification for health care? Are these going to be ameliorated or kept basically the same?

Secondly, the minister might answer as to why this particular section doesn't come in force on January 1 and there is a waiting period until April 1 concerning this matter. I think we are going to go through a pretty tough period in the next months and there is going to be a lot of cases in this regard. It would certainly be helpful to The Department of Social and Family Services and so

forth, both at the county level and possibly the provincial level, if this particular section could be put in force as of January 1 instead of waiting until April, when hopefully the employment situation is going to get better in our province. Could the minister comment on these two aspects please?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't appreciate the problem really, because we will be carrying on the same pattern under the regulations—the same approach, the same assessment characteristics. Of course, as they arise—

Mr. Paterson: Might there be an occasion when people in this position on January 1 will be able to get free hospital care in addition to the health care?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Whether or not they can pay the premium?

Mr. Paterson: That is correct.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, as I mentioned yesterday, the philosophy of the operation of the old plan and the combined plan is against lapse. We have under the regulations, as you know, as was referred to yesterday, liberally interpreted out discretionary powers here on the premium assistance and the assessment of those who are having financial difficulty. I think we'll continue. It has not been a problem as far as I know nor do I contemplate this legislation making it so.

Mr. Paterson: Perhaps I haven't made myself clear or maybe I don't understand. Up to the present time a person who is on a low income or has no income can get free health care coverage upon application to OHSIP, but he can't get hospitalization coverage.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): If he has assets!

Mr. Paterson: No, if he has any assets at all he can't get this free of charge. This is the point I am trying to make—you are putting these two together, as of April 1. So basically these people are in the same position that during these cold winter months they can get the free health care. But now the minister is stating that upon application they can also get hospitalization free of charge if they have no income or no means whereby to pay for it. Is that it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes. The same assessment that was capable of being made under OHSIP will apply to the combined scheme. That will be a matter of—

Mr. Paterson: As of January 1?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: My understanding is so, yes; that there will be no change insofar as that appeal or entitlement is concerned.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We want a change. We want hospitalization to be on the same basis.

Mr. Paterson: That is right.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It will be.

Mr. Paterson: No, no, on your folder—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Where does it say that?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South has the floor.

Mr. Paterson: It does not say it in the Act. Mr. Chairman, the minister submitted a folder and it states, "Improved Premium Assistance." It starts out: "Effective April 1, 1972, all single persons and families with no taxable income will be eligible for 100 per cent assistance under the new combined health premium."

An hon. member: That is April 1.

Mr. Paterson: Second paragraph: "Effective April 1, eligibility for 50 per cent premium assistance will be broadened."

Personally, I feel that these benefits should accrue to these people as of January 1—

An hon. member: Now!

Mr. Paterson:—similar to the health care provisions for which they can now qualify.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Advance the date from April to January.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think the answer is that if they need direct assistance, as distinct from allowing them to pay the same amount on a different basis, presumably they can—it will be a much smaller group, of course, with the new legislation; and whether or not they can get assistance through Social and Family Services is a question.

Mr. Deans: They can't.

An hon. member: No.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: All I can say at the moment is that whether or not, in that three-month period, they get direct assistance, they will certainly be entitled to the postponement of premium payments as they were under OHSIP itself.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The minister is not sure?

Mr. Paterson: In other words we are going to have to continue to put appeals in on behalf of these people instead of the legislation itself being clear?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes. It is not understood that that has ever been a serious problem.

Mr. Paterson: That is more so with hospitals than doctors.

Mr. Deans: It is a matter of stepping it up.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Perhaps we can face it when we come to it, because—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Haggerty: Face it now. We are here now.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We can face this, of course, by regulation rather than in the statute that structures the commission itself. Let me assess this and deal with it by regulation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I have a general comment and an amendment to propose on clause 5 of the bill. My general comment relates to the point which I made yesterday and to which the minister did not refer during his reply. That is, under clause 5 of the bill, the determination of eligibility, either to become an insured person or to be eligible for premium assistance, is a determination by a commission making a judicial decision with respect to the rights of individuals.

I asked the minister at that time whether or not the appeal procedure from the determination of such questions is a matter which would come under The Judicial Review Procedure Act which, according to its long title, is An Act to Provide a Single Procedure for the Judicial Review of the Exercise or Failure to Exercise a Statutory Power. I recognize that Act has not as yet been proclaimed in force but I assume that it will be proclaimed in force promptly.

I pointed out in connection with it that the determination by this commission of eligibility in those two instances is clearly, in my view, the exercise of a statutory power of decision when one looks at the definition in The Judicial Review Procedure Act, which states that a "statutory power decision"

among other things means "the eligibility of any person to receive, or to have the continuation of a benefit, whether he is legally entitled thereto or not."

It would appear to me that the only appeal procedure from a determination adverse to an individual in the province on the question of eligibility would now have to fall by way of originating notice of motion to the divisional court of the high court of justice. It seems to me that, while that should be quite clearly the recourse of last resort, there should be some provision in this bill, whether by way of an internal review procedure or otherwise, similar to the appeal provisions of, say, the Workmen's Compensation Board, by adding a step within the commission whereby a decision adverse to a citizen as to his eligibility, could be appealed on an informal intra-departmental basis before a person would be forced to incur the expense of appealing by way of originating notice of motion to the divisional court of the high court of justice.

That is my general comment on the bill and I would ask the minister if he would comment on that before I move to the specific amendment which I have.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, the procedure for appeals and assessment of eligibility will be dealt with by regulation. At the moment, this is dealt with by regulation in the OHSIP legislation and those regulations will, when drawn, specifically incorporate, of course, the application of The Statutory Powers Procedure Act. As I recall, this was done in some other legislation, but under OHSIP we have a council advisory committee and an appeal system in relation to eligibility. I would think we will—not I would think, we will indeed—have this procedure set up by regulation, whereby the same form of appeal will be available as to eligibility.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out, first of all, that we want to make our position perfectly clear that the last resort appeal, if necessary, should be under the judicial review provisions of The Judicial Review Procedure Act. So I don't want to find that is eliminated as the last resort.

Secondly, I think that the minister will have some difficulty, if the statutory power is that the commission is empowered to determine eligibility, if he does not make a specific provision for an appeal procedure at a step below the action of the commission. It is

very difficult, if the commission itself decides eligibility, which is the power which is given by the statutes, then to say that in some way or other there is to be an appeal to somebody else. It can't be an appeal to the commission if the commission has itself made the initial determination. However, I think the minister understands my concern about it.

The second matter relates to an amendment. I propose, Mr. Chairman, to put the amendment, first of all, and then to comment on it. I move that sub-clause (1) of clause 5 of Bill 5, be amended by adding thereto the following: "(e) determine the eligibility for insurance coverage under the Plan in accordance with this or any other Act and the regulations thereunder."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my concern is that the commission has a very restricted power of determining eligibility. It can determine whether a person under certain specific rules is an insured person and it can determine eligibility for premium assistance.

I make the technical observation that in item (d) the commission should also probably have the ability to determine eligibility for exemptions from premium payment as well as the question of premium assistance, because of the clause later on in the bill dealing with persons 65 years of age or over, where there is a question whether or not a person would be entitled to exemption from premium; but again that is a technical matter.

The substance of the motion which I have put is that a person might very well be an insured person under the plan and there is no question that he is an insured person; but he may receive a type of treatment which is prescribed under another statute. The commission would have to determine, as is the case in most insurance coverages, whether the insured person, although an insured person, is entitled to the payments for this specific service which he has obtained or required.

Let me try to be specific about it in two examples. It would seem to me that there may very well be some type of surgical procedure which may, on one interpretation of a regulation under the Ontario Health Insurance Plan, be excluded from coverage. But there is a question to be determined as to whether that particular surgical procedure is one which is excluded or included under the Act. It seems to me that kind of decision is one which should fall within the jurisdiction of the commission.

Let me give a second example, one which has bothered us for a long, long time. We are not so certain that the proposal with respect to nursing homes will necessarily cover it. That is, that at the present time—and the minister will note in the amendment that I have referred to on determination of eligibility not only under this Act but under any other Act and any of the regulations thereunder—under The Public Hospitals Act, there is a regulation which determines the question as to whether or not a person, having reached the apparent limit of his recovery, requires medical care or special nursing care on the one hand; or whether, having reached the apparent limit of his recovery, requires only custodial care. That is a vexed question which has other ramifications but it doesn't appear to me that it would necessarily be solved by the extension to nursing homes of coverage under these Acts.

You may very well, in accordance with an overall plan for delivery of health services in the province, wish people to be at their homes and under home care, for example. The person may find that under some other statute, such as The Public Hospitals Act, he is excluded because, while he has reached the apparent limit of his recovery and needs custodial care, the custodial care can be provided in his home setting. The question may arise as to whether that person is entitled to be covered for the expense to which he is put for nursing service or care service within his home.

I don't intend to try to elaborate all the problems and all of the multitude of examples which could be given, but it does seem to me that this commission should be specifically empowered to determine the question of whether or not an insured person is or is not covered for a specific service which he has received and for which he has to pay. I think that this surely must commend itself to the minister because of the infinite number of alternative types of service which persons may require under a diversified and complex and responsive health care delivery service.

I would ask the minister if he would seriously consider adopting this particular amendment, with the usual regard for the fact that it may not be elegantly drafted for the purpose of meeting the problem, but the point is clear.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I had not considered the particular amendment prior to this morning, but I am concerned, as I listened to the argument being put forward by the member for Riverdale, that perhaps this question is better left to the section involving

regulations, because the complexity of the question itself is such that I think it requires regulation.

If I understand the amendment, this gives the commission very broad powers and I would think that what we should do is have this kind of detail a part of regulations. Because, for instance, the member mentioned the nursing home programme and home care. With regard to nursing homes, for instance, we are going to have to develop, insofar as eligibility is concerned, certain formulae that as a government, as a matter of policy, we feel are fair and equitable and adequate.

We are going to have to develop, for example, a medical points system of some sort, so that scientifically and medically we can draw the line between custodial and nursing care. We may also have to have some sort of points system involving the application of our home care programme.

So instinctively I feel that if these things are significant enough they should be a part of government policy and government decisions per se and as such. Therefore, rather than see this very wide field opened up to the commission, I would much sooner see this left as a matter of regulation requiring the executive council to review it and establish government policy from time to time in detail.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, again, I have no pride in the particular wording that is before the minister. The point I want to make is this. If the commission is to determine who is an insured person and who is a person entitled to premium assistance, including say exemption from premium payment, then it seems to me that the commission has to be the body which, subject only to appeal outside of it to the court—if necessary under the statute to which I referred earlier—has to determine in a specific instance whether or not the insurance coverage of the hospital and health services plan covers the person in a specific instance for a specific service or for a specific treatment which he might receive.

I think it would be essential that there be some language in the statute conferring that power of determination of eligibility, even though I agree with the minister that the specific rules under which eligibility is going to be interpreted would have to be set out in regulations, both under this Act and under whatever the other appropriate Acts are. But it does not seem to me that if the minister endeavoured to accomplish this solely by regulation it would be conceivably possible for the commission to take unto itself the determination, for example, of a question

which was posed by a regulation affecting coverage promulgated under another Act, such as The Public Hospitals Act.

Again, all I want to do is to make the point to the minister that this commission, in our judgement, has got to be able to determine—subject only to appeal to the court, if that should be necessary as a last resort, in accordance with McRuer's recommendations—eligibility as to whether or not a person is an insured person; eligibility with respect to the questions of premium assistance; and then eligibility with respect to a specific treatment or service which the citizen has received, to determine whether that is covered under the insurance coverage so that he can receive payment for it. I want to impress upon the minister that we would think here that the power of the commission would be hamstrung if we found that in the final analysis it could not make the decision as to whether or not there was or was not an insurance coverage for the particular service which a citizen has received.

I agree there are a multitude of circumstances where the question would have to come up. I am not underestimating the difficulty of it, but there has got to be a body to which that decision can go and the obvious one is to this commission.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question?

Those in favour of Mr. Renwick's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost and section 5 stands as part of the bill.

Does the hon. minister have the answers to the left-over questions?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: With regard to the figures that were asked for by the Leader of the Opposition, those questions related to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Staff numbers.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Staff numbers. HIRB is 1,614; OHSIP is 1,413; and OHSC is 443.

The question was asked by the member for High Park about checking on the designated agents. I am advised that the problem there is that with the designated agents, the group insurers, they have the group numbers and would not normally have the addresses of people enrolled. This is the obstacle in the kind of checking that he was referring to. I think those are the two questions.

Mr. Chairman: Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to. On section 6 I have a notice of an amendment by the hon. minister and another member. Would the hon. minister place his amendment first?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 2 of section 6 be amended by striking out "month" in the second line, and inserting in lieu thereof "period".

Mr. Chairman: Does this motion carry?

Mr. Deans: What does it read? Would you read the clause?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I should read the motion then. Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence moves that subsection (2) of section 6 be amended by striking out the word "month" in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period."

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 2 of section 6 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "paid", and adding thereto the words, "two months in advance of the period in respect of which the premium is paid; and that premiums may be paid in a lump sum six or 12 months in advance." This section would now read:

The prescribed premium for insurance under the plan shall be paid two months in advance of the period in respect of which the premium is paid, and that premiums may be paid in a lump sum six or 12 months in advance.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Paterson moves that subsection 2 of section 6 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "paid" and adding thereto the words, "two months in advance of the period in respect of which the premium is paid, and that premiums may be paid in a lump sum six or 12 months in advance."

Subsection 2 would now read:

The prescribed premium for insurance under the plan shall be paid two months in advance of the period in respect of which the premium is paid, and that premiums may be paid in a lump sum six or 12 months in advance.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, the reason I move this specific amendment is a case of hardship for some families, as was pointed out by my colleagues yesterday. I think we

can appreciate that with the combining of the two plans together there is going to be one billing—a billing which in my calculations is going to be considerably higher at a specific point in time. Rather than the monthly billing for individual premiums for the health care, plus the three-month billing on the hospital care, this is all going to come at once now. Certainly we appreciate the lower total cost of the billing, but it is still going to be very difficult for low-income families to crack out \$66 in a lump sum at each pay period.

I know my colleague from Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) mentioned the philosophy that possibly the commission or the government was working on the people's money. He has a point there. I think it is an insurance principle that you must pay in advance, although in any other type of business you pay for services as rendered. We accept the philosophy—at least I do—that you must pay in advance, but we feel that if this could be cut back to a two-month period where people would have to pay only \$44 I am sure that your department could handle the administration. It certainly would be much easier for persons on low incomes to meet this commitment.

The last part of the amendment of course conceivably can be done at the present time, but I felt it should be spelled out in the present legislation in order that those persons leaving our province for extended periods of time could pay in advance either six or 12 months in order to ensure that their coverage would not lapse while they were away from the province. Basically, these are the reasons for the amendment, and I am sure that some of my colleagues will speak to this.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to see if I understand it correctly. I am not thinking so much about the prepayment part as about the cutting of the time from three months to two months. As I understand it, at the present time the period is three months of coverage and you have to pay three months in advance, so in fact there is no grace period. No real saving to the individual, because once he makes the first prepayment then he is prepaying; it doesn't matter whether it is a prepayment or in arrears, he has got to make payment at regular intervals.

We are therefore not involved with that problem, but if the import of what the member for Essex South said is correct, then I take it that what he is really asking for is a 30-day grace period.

In other words, a person would receive his account, indicating that he would have to

pay by such-and-such a date, which now is three months prior to the date when the coverage comes in.

But sometimes people don't pay right on time and then the question arises as to the coverage, and while granting a period of grace will not necessarily mean that people will pay within the grace period, nevertheless it does cover a brief period of time where a person might overlook the payment.

In most insurance coverages in the private sector, as I understand it, one is allowed a period of grace, and if that is the effect of the member's amendment—if the period is going to remain at three months and he is saying that one will only have to pay two months in advance but will be billed in the normal course as one is now billed and there is a little bit of leeway as to the specific time in which one must make the payment—then it would appear to me that a 30-day grace period, which is what it is, would be a valid, worthwhile amendment. So far as prepayment is concerned, I am not so much concerned about that aspect of it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I originally brought up this suggestion in the second reading of the bill and it is our intent that rather than have the individual pay \$66 every three months, making four payments during the course of a year, he make six payments of \$44 every two months. In this way the burden would not be as heavy on the individual making the payments.

There are a lot of people who find it difficult to gather the \$66 to make that payment. The minister may come along and say that 99.1 per cent of the people now make their payments on the three-month period. That may be true, but a lot of those who do make that payment have to deprive themselves for some given period of time of certain other necessities, because they are hard-pressed and they don't want not to make the health service premium payments. It is absolutely essential to them that they be covered; they can't afford not to be covered.

I think the amendment by the member for Essex South certainly is a noteworthy one and should be given serious consideration by the hon. minister and accepted. Regarding the other suggestion, that the premium payments be permissible up to a year in advance, it is not common knowledge at all to people that they can make that type of payment. Those who travel for health reasons or other reasons

outside of their own jurisdiction and perhaps suffer the consequences of bad health in the country or the area in which they are visiting and cannot return home in time, return to find that their premium payments have lapsed and they have a waiting period once again before they can get into the scheme.

By permitting advance payments of perhaps any length of time, but at least one year, I think that we would accommodate those who do travel overseas or to other areas. They could pay their premium payments well in advance and have themselves covered for that period of time.

Both suggestions are worthy of implementation, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the minister takes them to heart.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: The argument that the member for Windsor-Walkerville makes is what I was going to inquire about. I am not sure really that we ought not to consider reducing it even further. It is extremely difficult for the majority of people to find the money. People cannot save money, try as they might.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Some don't make a lot of money!

Mr. Deans: It is the same amount—it doesn't matter. It is like saying that you pay the same amount in your rent yearly than if you were billed twice. It is a matter of saving, and people have a lot of difficulty saving money. I think the reduction in the required period from three months to two months is a good one. I think in fact they should be paying a month in advance and pay monthly, quite frankly.

The majority of people could find a way to raise the \$22 on a monthly basis, but when you come up—let us take this time of the year, the Christmas period. You get your bill for \$66 for the January, February and March payments to be made at the beginning of the year. At this period of the year people will have a great deal of difficulty in finding money to make those kind of payments. Try as they may, they have a great deal of difficulty in saving the money to make these kinds of payments. I think we should be making it as simple as we possibly can for the recipient to make his payments rather than make it as simple administratively as we possibly can.

I would think that if, in the case of rents, in the case of any other commitment that an individual takes on, if you borrow money you pay it back on a monthly basis. If you rent

an apartment, you pay for it on a monthly basis. If you purchase any commodity, you pay on a monthly basis. I think that we could do the same sort of thing with this; you simply pay one month in advance and you are then billed.

In the initial payment, you would pay two months and from that month on you would simply pay monthly. It would perhaps administratively be a little more difficult, but nevertheless it would be much easier for the lower income groups to find \$22 on a monthly basis than it would be to have them save the \$22 for the next month, or perhaps for three months, in order to raise the \$66 that they have to have to meet their commitment.

I would suggest to the minister that he give some serious consideration to this. I don't anticipate that he is going to make that kind of a change now, but I could suggest to him that he consider very seriously reducing the payment to a monthly basis and requiring simply one two-month payment at the starting point of the contract between the individual recipient and the health insurance programme.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: On the last point, Mr. Chairman, I really don't conceive of the \$22 once in a lifetime being that much of a load.

Mr. Deans: No. The \$22 once in a lifetime isn't. That is not what I said.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, but this was a point that you were following up on. The hon. member suggested a month-to-month payment. When you consider that 99.1 per cent of our population is at this moment under a quarterly system, that the total premium is going to be less than the combined premiums, that there is no premium to be paid for a family with taxable income of less than \$2,000 we are dealing, I feel, with minuscule percentages of our population.

The other thing is, and I would think the member would follow me on this, it is not a question of conveniencing our bureaucracy, or of making it administratively difficult to have it on a monthly basis, but really the cost of an unnecessary move to a monthly basis disturbs me. I personally would much sooner see that money spent on health benefits than spent on paper and stamps and non-productive showers of information.

Coming back to the amendment as moved, it is redundant in its latter respects, as was pointed out, because you can pay six months in advance now, or a year in advance. The point that people may not know about those

privileges I think is a good one and I think that around the first of April it would be a good time to circularize our total population. I think around that time of the coming year, we will also be giving them information with regard to the accessibility of the new regional offices. I think underlining, in a broadcast distribution, that these privileges do exist can answer the point raised by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. We shall do that.

The two months as against three months again, we are dealing with one month's difference. We are dealing with say \$22 once in a lifetime. We are dealing with this against the background of a point I tried to make yesterday, and I believe repeated this morning, and that is the whole policy is against lapse. I think the question, for instance of grace periods, would be retrogressive because as all members probably know, reinstatement is not a problem for people in the Province of Ontario. Lapse as a matter of policy is virtually non-existent unless the purpose is there, unless the purpose of the particular citizen is not be insured.

Mr. B. Newman: But the fear is there in the eyes of the person who has to raise the \$22 to pay each month, or \$66 each three months.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Let me assure the member that we are not going to allow any person's coverage to lapse on the basis of the \$22. We make these adjustments, we do reinstatements, we avoid lapse, in the most—I will use the word "generous" as distinct from "liberal" this time—most generous way because that is, and I think should be and I think we would all agree should be, the philosophy of our plan. The other point is, apart from the administrative costs—and I repeat the argument I made earlier—I would much sooner see that money going into health benefits than into extra paperwork. Another point—and it compounds the administrative difficulty—is that a very large percentage of our total percentage of coverage is, of course, by way of group coverage. The member raises the question here of employers and others holding back very substantial sums of money for a month. I don't think the member would want or I would want or any of us would want that.

Mr. Deans: The minister knows they won't be able to pay for a group except by the month.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: They would be able to hold back, presumably, on that first month, would they not?

Mr. Deans: The minister was against the monthly payments. In the group payment, not a monthly payment?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can check. There is three-monthly or monthly.

Mr. Deans: The single month.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The single month.

Mr. Deans: Why then can that not be fitted to the remainder of society who are not part of a group?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I came to it. We have the three-monthly system. We are organized on a three-monthly system. Our computers are set on a three-monthly system.

Mr. Deans: Except for groups, and that is the majority, the minister says.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't know if it is a majority or not, but I know it is a very large number. I do know, as I think we all allow, that we are interposing the cost of paper where we should be directing our attention to the provision of benefits.

Mr. Deans: That argument is fine.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, I want to raise something from a procedural point of view. I want to question the minister in connection with groups.

What I have to question him about is not germane to the amendment and I am afraid if the amendment carries he won't let me question him.

I brought up yesterday, if I might continue therefore, the question of the allocation of the saving under union contracts. As the minister is aware, the health benefits were non-taxable before the hospitalization benefits were taxable, so written in to many of the union contracts was the opting out by the employer of participation in the payment of the hospital premiums.

Now the minister has got a \$3.25 saving going to them. Has he directed them where it is to go?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, we haven't, except as the statute spells it out in those general terms. Of course, my understanding is that the application of The Labour Relations Act gives wide flexibility to the arbitrator to settle that kind of question. I understand that under OHSIP, which had the same application of section 37 of The Labour Relations Act, there have been hearings and the arbi-

trations have been held, and that means was an adequate way of overcoming the problem.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is content as a very liberal minister that there will be no harm done as a result of these provisions in union contracts to the employees themselves?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: There will be no change. We are just adopting the same approach that we have under OHSIP.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion? I will put the motion then.

Those in favour of Mr. Paterson's motion, will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

On section 7.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection (1) of section 7 be amended by striking out in the second line thereof the words, "and who applies and is eligible therefor," and that the section now read:

Any person who is 65 years of age or over and his spouse and dependants are entitled to receive insured services under the plan without the payment of a premium.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Paterson moves that subsection (1) of section 7 be amended by striking out in the second line thereof the words, "and who applies and is eligible therefor"; and that the section now read:

(1) Any person who is 65 years of age or over and his spouse and dependants are entitled to receive insured services under the plan without the payment of a premium.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, basically, is that we feel that persons of the age of 65 should not have to apply for this; that it should be an automatic situation whereby these premiums would be negated.

We feel that the provincial records in one or more departments already show the age group of these people. Certainly we have been in a position where they have had property rebates to the elderly, and these are based on the old age pension. I think the basis of this is the use of the federal social insurance number.

Here again, based on our discussions yesterday, it would open the avenue for the minister to programme in a large section of our

population using the social insurance numbers right off the bat and help facilitate the move in that direction in the future.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to support this amendment without reservation. The point is this.

From time to time during the course of the debates relative to this statute you—that is the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman—have with justification said that the minister in exercising his discretion and the commission itself from time to time, have been generous—that is the word that you now use—in avoiding any lapse, in assessing entitlement and matters of that nature.

I applaud you on a personal basis; and your predecessor, the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond), took that attitude. That is not the point and it begs the question.

The concern that we as members have is this, that no longer will anybody 80 years of age be coming to Bullbrook and saying, "I am worried. I have to go into the hospital and I don't know whether I have my coverage or not." This is partly the cause of the constant technical turmoil that we as members face—rightly or wrongly, I don't know whose fault it is—with the system, the bureaucracy. This is the only thing we are attempting to avoid.

We are attempting to say by statute to the people of Ontario who are over 65, "Have no fear any more. If you become ill your costs will be taken care off." That is the only purpose of this amendment.

The minister has been kind enough to discuss this with us before. The point that really caused us some resistance in bringing the amendment forward is the fact that we didn't want to cause you undue technical problems through computerization.

I say to you two things. Why not begin the utilization of the SIN numbers now with people over 65? You intend to do it, as you said yesterday, eventually for everybody. This is an opportunity to begin. Integrate into your system the uniform SIN numbers for people over 65.

Secondly, we can't accept the reply that you don't have the records available to you because it is obvious—and it was obvious during the last election campaign to everybody in the Province of Ontario over 65—that some department of government has that number. We say, therefore, on balance, we don't want to cause you technical problems, but we say that this government has that information available to them. We say to you

on balance, notwithstanding the charitable attitude taken by yourself as the minister, by the commission itself, let us say, *carte blanche*, to these people, don't worry any more, you are now taken care of.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I would like to support the amendment in this respect, because I feel that in the past there have been people who are eligible for services but who, through ignorance or a slip-up of some kind, have not applied for the particular service, or particular premium-free programme which was available to them. As a result they did not have it when they went to get it, though they assumed it was there. I feel that this would make it possible for all such people to have the service regardless of whether they apply or not. I think the stipulation that they must apply will mean that some will not do so, just because they assume that they have got it without the need to apply. I think that the Liberal amendment is a valid one and should be accepted.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment proposed by the member for Essex South, because it does strike me as being only logical that on reaching the ripe old age of 65 people should be entitled to free health services. I think that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: There may be a conflict of interest in some members speaking on this, Mr. Chairman, but it seemed strange to me that just prior to the last election the government found no difficulty in finding out just who those individuals were to whom they should be sending that \$50 cheque. Surely the statistics and the information is available to The Department of Health so that they likewise could come along and inform the individual on reaching his 65th birthday that now he will be receiving free health services coverage?

I think the minister should accept the amendment proposed by the member for Essex South. It is a laudable amendment and it stands to reason that it should be accepted. I know as a member in dealing with the ethnic community, there are a lot of people who don't realize that they don't have any type of health services coverage, even the medical or the hospitalization, and

you have to keep bringing it to their attention that they should be and must be covered, because they financially can't afford not to be. I think if it becomes automatic on reaching the age of 65 you would overcome some of the problems that are prevalent today among our senior citizens.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Any more discussion? We will be rising in a moment.

Mr. Paterson: He has two minutes.

Mr. Good: Then may I say this, it is obvious that the minister has someone else doing his constituency work or he would see the validity in this, because when there is a lapse of premiums—in fact in a case I am dealing with right now where the gentleman was in the hospital for three weeks before it was known to his family that he was not covered by Ontario hospital insurance—things of this nature would not occur.

It is in the area of old age, where people are just not capable or they forget to answer their mail and things are not done. Now everyone will be eligible for free premium assistance, but not all will realize this and not all will apply, so to make a blanket coverage would make very good sense to me and relieve a lot of apprehension in the minds of senior citizens.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I just want to make a brief comment, to underscore what has been said. To be specific about it, I want to relate to the minister a case I have had just recently where a person was on disabled pension. He came off disabled pension because it was thought that he was fit to get a job and physically able to get a job. He was not able to get a job; he went on welfare. He subsequently applied for old age security and got old age security.

When he was on welfare his hospitalization was being paid; when he came off he presumed that in some fashion the hospitalization would be carried on. It was not carried on.

He went into hospital some two years later and he incurred a fairly sizable bill, something in the neighbourhood of \$300. I had a letter from the Ontario Hospital Services Commission the other day; they said his hospitalization lapsed on July 1, 1968; they were prepared to pick it up but pointed out, and rightly so, that he would have to pay the

back premiums. Those back premiums amounted to some \$400. In other words it was cheaper for him to pay the hospital bill than it was to pay the lapsed premium.

This is the kind of situation in which we as members find ourselves from time to time. I really do not think that people should be faced with that kind of situation. If the minister were to accept this amendment the problem would be resolved.

I hope the minister will give some consideration to it because that is just one example. I am sure that I can pull a dozen such examples in the past 12 months out of my file. The commission is very good; it is very liberal and

very generous and considerate and we all appreciate it. The point is that this happens and it is a fact of the bureaucratic system under which the commission is set up that these things do happen. I urge the minister to reconsider.

I am through, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make that point with the minister.

Mr. Chairman: Can the minister conclude his reply in 30 seconds or shall we come back to this?

It being 12:30 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 15, 1971

Housing situation in Ontario—Toronto shortage, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon	91
Fees for jury duty creating hardship for jurors, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	91
RC private high schools closing due to lack of funds, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy	91
Appointing one-man commission on French-language secondary education, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon, Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Lewis	91
Canadians teaching in Ontario universities—guaranteed minimum, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Lewis	95
Rights for taxi drivers—amending Acts to incorporate, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis	96
Telegram Publishing Co. Ltd. and Employment Standards Act, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis	96
Finding Canadian films to show at Cinesphere, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis	97
Remarks of Judge George Collins on the Indian community, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stokes	97
Store hours legislation—province-wide unity, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. B. Newman	98
PR and information costs including COGP pamphlet, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	98
Senior citizen housing in Timmins—construction closedown for winter, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Ferrier	98
Egg inquiry report—when expected, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Ruston	99
Resignation of teachers in Rainy River - Fort Frances dispute, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Foulds	100
Proposed provincial park at Bronte Creek—land purchases, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Edighoffer	100
Restrictions on building lots prohibiting purchasers from building, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Burr	100
Port facilities at Ericau, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Spence, Mr. Paterson	101
Guidelines for tenants on rent increases, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Renwick	101
Government action against Dow Chemical—latest progress report, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Singer	101
Licence to Canadian Specialized Services in which strike-breaker is principal, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis	102
Presenting report, Educational Communications Authority, Mr. Welch	103
Presenting report, Stockyards Board, Mr. Yaremko	103
Motorized Snow Vehicles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading	103
Ontario Health Insurance Organization Act, 1971, bill intituled, in committee	104
Recess, 12:30 p.m.	115



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, December 15, 1971
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1971

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

House in committee on Bill 5, The Ontario Health Insurance Organization Act.

HEALTH INSURANCE ORGANIZATION ACT

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! When the committee rose at 12:30 o'clock, p.m. we were considering an amendment; I believe the minister was about to reply, or was there further discussion?

The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, if I might speak in favour of the motion very briefly, one can recall that just prior to the election—was it an hour before the election?—the Prime Minister had announced that citizens of this province over the age of 65 would be entitled to medical benefits without payment of premiums, and at that time the Premier had not made any comment about whether the people would be eligible on whether they would have to apply; he just said all citizens.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment, which is certainly made in good faith and with all objectivity, will assure that the minister keeps that promise, because I am sure when the citizens over that age were going to the polls—and I am sure this particular promise did not hurt—they were not asking themselves whether they would be eligible or whether they would have to apply to get free medical benefits without premiums. And I really can't see how anyone can be against this amendment.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, the minister realizes that in a large and complex department such as his, one of the problems that curtails efficiency is bureaucracy and surely this amendment will help alleviate this bureaucracy in some way.

I simply say, in closing, that I can't see how one can be against this amendment unless of course he is for retaining some degree of bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Eglinton.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with the last speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): But! But!

Mr. Reilly: I have no intention of walking right over; I am happy where I am. But I agree with him that almost every member would be in agreement that the government should keep its promise to the electorate and that there should be no difficulty for people 65 and older from the standpoint of their qualifying. I think everybody in this chamber would have to agree that at age 65, if the government has promised that they would qualify, then they should qualify and be able to qualify.

The only problem that is going through my mind as I talk to you is this: Do they know they are age 65? This is not a question of a philosophical argument. It's a technical argument. How do we qualify and how do the authorities know that the person is 65 years of age? And on the basis—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Because they are getting the old age security.

Mr. Reilly: —of a question of whether they should receive it at age 65, I would entirely agree. I would be interested in hearing the minister's comments and why we should not do it automatically.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): How about the old age pension?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have a slight extension to the proposed amendment. It does seem to me that for a great big, wealthy province like the Province of Ontario to require one year's residence before a person is eligible for this exemption from payment is a little bit small in connection with a government that adheres to the proposition about the Canadian constitution—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. This has nothing to do with this subsection.

Mr. Renwick: Yes it has, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: No, that is another subsection, I believe.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the amendment, as I understand it, is to eliminate the requirement that a person must apply and be eligible. I think that's the substance of the deletion of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: But your subject is covered under subsection 2.

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if I could bring it clearly within the terms of the amendment—there are two requirements the amendment states could be deleted and that is that you must apply and be eligible. If those words are deleted, then of necessity subsection 2 would have to be deleted because that is an eligibility requirement.

Therefore I simply say to the minister that surely one shouldn't introduce into a beneficial Act such as this terminology such as the words, "ordinarily resident," which have been imported from a very technical statute, The Income Tax Act—they came into the legal jargon of our world through The Income Tax Act—to now have it that a person has got to be ordinarily resident in Ontario for the previous 12 months in order to be eligible.

It would seem to me that a province which, for example, believes that its hospitals and its medical care is equal to none, should not impose barriers against elderly persons coming into Ontario to obtain the benefits of those benefits of those services and not be required to pay the exorbitant amounts which they would otherwise have to pay.

Secondly, it appears to me that there isn't going to be a great influx into the Province of Ontario of people just prior to attaining the age of 64 in order that they will have the benefits of free coverage when they reach the age of 65 years.

It strikes me as one of those rather picayune qualifications that this government tends to put into statutes which really is not going to affect one way or another the financial burden imposed by reason of exempting such persons from premium assistance. Would the minister not give consideration, out of the largeness of his heart to the elimination of such a picayune requirement from a big wealthy province such as this?

Mr. Chairman: Any further comment?
The hon. minister.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, on the last point, I dealt with it to a degree yesterday. Certainly I and the government will give consideration to this. We have been giving consideration to it along with nine other provinces and the federal government. At the last two provincial health ministers' conferences—and I know that it will come up again tomorrow at the federal-provincial health ministers' conference—we have discussed this whole question of compatibility between jurisdictions insofar as portability of benefits is concerned.

So the consideration is real. All 11 jurisdictions would like to ensure that we can get compatibility and portability built into our health system.

But the changes in Ontario and the extensions that are involved in our nursing home programme make it a little more serious, because that benefit will, to a degree, be almost unique. Certainly it places the Province of Ontario in a more vulnerable position than heretofore insofar as use of its coverage is concerned. But again, as the hon. member for Riverdale has said, certainly this and all other benefits should be, so far as Canadian citizens are concerned, made as compatible and as portable as possible.

Coming to the motion itself, I can agree with my colleague who has just spoken. Certainly the government, the Minister of Health agree with the spirit of this amendment in its entirety. I can categorically say that the only reason that I will ask my colleagues in this party not to support the amendment is administrative.

The fact is that OHSC and the system that is being introduced for this interim period, whether this interim period be months or a year or two, simply doesn't have in its computers—whether Municipal Affairs does or not—the ages of the people. Requiring them to apply is for the sole administrative purpose of giving us the knowledge as to age.

Again, as I mentioned yesterday, accepting totally the spirit of the amendment, we can see that it is not many months off, perhaps a year and a bit before we in this province—and I know other provinces are interested in it—will be able to have our whole system based on the social insurance number. The social insurance number is one which can carry a code, and that code can let us know when people are 65. Then we can delete any requirement for application the moment we

are properly identified with, and part of, a social insurance numbering system for the operation of our computers and our files.

The federal government, of course, has to be involved in this and they are interested in it and working on it—the experts in The Department of the Treasury. I recall at least six or seven months ago when my department, in conjunction with The Department of the Treasury and their cybernetic experts, were asked to sit down and go to work as fast as they could on preparing for us a health numbering system, based specifically on the social insurance numbers.

This again has been a part of the concern, the subject matter, of federal-provincial and interprovincial health ministers' conferences. This has been on the agenda of the two I have attended, where not only ourselves and not only the federal government but I think all other nine jurisdictions also want to put their health services systems on the basis of the social insurance number. When we get that, we get the age 65; and when we get the age 65, along with the spirit of this proposed amendment, we can get rid of the confusion, the lack of knowledge and the onus on the ordinary citizen.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Chairman, does the minister have some time in mind when that would be possible?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, it's not in my hands, but I would hope—now I am guessing here, because it is a highly technical field—that we would be capable of doing this in about 18 months. But here we have to rely also on the co-operation—and I am sure we will get it—of the federal government. I am sure we will get this co-operation. There is no jurisdictional jealousy here, because it will help everyone. So I am reaching for a figure when I say it will be 18 months before we will be using the SIN number system and with it, of course, the spirit of this amendment can be carried.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can put this thought to the minister. Even accepting the difficulties he foresees, would there not be a certain comfort to the public if he put in some other kind of an amendment—perhaps to the effect that, notwithstanding the fact that someone who is otherwise eligible has not applied, on establishing proof of their eligibility they will be able to get the benefits under it? Then we would find in the statute not an exclusion but an ability to be included.

The wording is very rough and loose, but I think it would be of some substantial assistance if we have a statutory provision. The way one reads this, notwithstanding the kindness and co-operation that is very often exercised by the minister's officials, there is the legal right to say, "If you haven't applied, you're not there." I am looking for some kind of saving clause to be put in to soften the phraseology of these words, "has applied and is eligible"—particularly the "has applied" bit—because, reading the words "has applied" as a lawyer, if someone has not applied they are obviously not entitled.

Administratively the department may be able to get around that, but if the minister says that is the department's general practice, and listening to this debate, why not put in some kind of a saving clause to soften the legal effect of the way this section is written?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, may I contemplate that because, as the hon. member knows, all these bills will be reworked for our next session. May I take the thought with me?

Mr. Singer: Yes, it is not just reworking it for the session. There is obviously a grave concern among my colleagues, members of the NDP, the hon. member for Eglinton and others about the precise wording of the statute. The minister has given an explanation, albeit some of us are not satisfied that it necessarily applies, but as to why he is not prepared to accept this amendment. It would seem to me that he would comfort some of the concerned people if he would put in a saving clause. In other words, let us have in the statute what he tells us his department's practice is.

He says the practice is such and such, and in my experience with the problems in my riding this has been the way I have been dealt with, so I don't quarrel with that. But I don't know that the next minister is going to be as kindly as this minister or that the next civil servant who is appointed is not going to interpret the statute the way it is written. Some technically minded civil servant or minister, or other official who reads that and says, "If you haven't applied you are out of luck," could, acting quite legally and within the terms of the statute, do a lot of harm in this province.

I am suggesting to the minister that before this day is out and before too long, let us set this thing over a bit and that he talk with his officials to see if he can't come

up with some happier wording. This is a genuine concern, Mr. Chairman, and I think the minister, being a reasonable man, perhaps can see the merit of this last suggestion.

Mr. Chairman: I will place the—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, before you put the motion, since this was my amendment and I assume it is not going to carry, might I ask of the minister if we as members can go back to our constituents and give an unequivocal statement that if you are 65 as of January 1 this coming year, and have been a resident of Ontario for at least the preceding calendar year, that you have coverage whether or not you have ever had it in your life before?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I think here I would be merely repeating the undertaking made by the Prime Minister and by the Treasurer heretofore, but if we should repeat it, let me categorically say yes.

Mr. Singer: The minister doesn't say it in the statute.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't say it in the statute, but of course the statute is drafted in an inconclusive form. It is, "anyone who applies and is . . ." There is no negative form in the statute, so in the matter of fine law and interpretation I am not quite sure that your proposal in any way strengthens it. But in any case, yes, you can categorically say that. I would be very tempted to say maybe I should go on here and say don't worry, but I figured that that one was the lousiest campaign we ever put across because it merely started everyone in the province worrying, so I will leave it there if I may.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): If I might, I would like to just add a few words, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the debate.

First, let me say to you that I accept without reservation the sincerity of the minister's approach and that of the member for Eglinton, and I imagine of most on the government side of the House, in connection with the intention of the original amendment. But, you know, the member for Downsview in my opinion makes a very valid point.

First, I say the following to you from a technical point of view: The Department of National Health and Welfare—on St. Clair Avenue I think it is—knows every person in

the Province of Ontario over 65 years of age. The minister could get that information within one week from them. I am sure they would cooperate with him fully in this connection, and so he can technically do it.

The second point I make is this, what we are trying to convey to the minister from this party is not the necessity of a number itself; it is the question, as I mentioned before, Mr. Chairman, of balance. We want to remove the possible trauma and, in removing that possible trauma just take out the words; don't give them a number for a while. But as the government of this province, as my colleague from Ottawa (Mr. Roy) said, you are saying, "The pronouncement by Premier Davis is now fulfilled; no eligibility, no application. People over 65, you are covered from now on. That is it."

Now the refinement of my colleague from Downsview. I ask the minister to think for a moment of this. He never did have in any statute before anything that restricted one tittle his discretion, but if we are going to give it—my colleague from Downsview is quite correct in this—the minister is now saying in a statute that for them to get premium-free assistance legally they must apply and be eligible for it. That is exactly what he is saying.

Now if the minister follows the laws of a minister of the Crown, this very section now restricts the discretion that he so generously exercised in the past, and this is what we are worried about. We don't want him to find himself getting a letter from my colleague from Downsview, wanting to exercise a discretion in favour of one of his constituents but looking at a statute and saying, "I am sorry, I can't exercise it any more, because they must have applied for it to get premium-free assistance."

I ask the minister to comment on that. We are trying to be really helpful to him in this connection as usual.

Mr. Chairman: Ready for the question? All those in favour of Mr.—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You were making some progress—until that last comment.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Ready for the question?

All those in favour of Mr. Paterson's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost and section 7 stands as part of the bill.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill and which section?

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Section 7(1).

Mr. Chairman: Section 7(1)? We just carried 7(1).

Mr. Bounsall: It is a further amendment to it, in the form of an addition.

Mr. Chairman: We just carried 7(1) and the whole of section 7 in fact.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

If not, shall the bill, as amended, be reported?

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, section 9.

Mr. Chairman: Section 9?

Mr. Paterson: Section 9. I might pass a few comments on 9(a), Mr. Chairman: "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may fix the premiums."

As I stated in my earlier comments, we are thankful that the total premium cost to the individual is going down, and I notice on the folder that went out to most households in Ontario that it gave a breakdown of the federal contributions and the premium revenues and the general provincial financing. It would appear to me that the province, through the general treasury, should be moving toward at least equalling the federal contribution. I assume that this is what is taking place, but maybe not as rapidly as some of us would like to see. I do feel that this should be an objective of the minister's department to lower again the claims that are charged to individuals and those companies that pay premiums on behalf of their employees.

Subsection (c) deals with the qualifications for premium assistance. Here again I ask the minister if he cannot possibly make a definitive statement in this regard as to whether, with the joining together of these two plans, these people who require premium assistance or free premiums under the age 65 age group are going to reap the benefits of free hospital coverage in addition to their health care as of January 1 when this bill is implemented, or do they have to wait on the hospital coverage until April 1, as is indicated in

the folder? I would appreciate some comment if possible.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister?

Shall section 9 then stand as part of the bill?

Section 9 agreed to.

Bill 5 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report it has come to certain resolutions.

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 resolution concurred in and one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 6, An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act.

Bill 7, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Bill 5, An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and to provide for the Advance Organization of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Mr. Chairman: This is a study of the supplementary expenditure estimates, 1971-1972. First, we will consider supplementary estimates for The Department of Agriculture and Food on page 2.

Any comments or explanations from the hon. minister?

On vote 102.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this estimate, if I may. The minister knows that during this past year, and even beyond

that, the prices to the farmer have been depressed, particularly in the areas of hog prices and egg prices.

I want to say something about the egg situation—not that the pork producers in the province are in any better, or very much better position financially, but I think the prices have gone up and the situation is easing there to a certain degree. Egg prices have eased up also but I think, in view of the very distressing situation, perhaps we should talk about that for just a few moments. During the past 18 months egg prices in the province have been extremely depressed and have resulted in deep financial trouble for all of the egg producers—and I underline that word “all”—in the province. I don’t think there is an egg producer in the Province of Ontario who has been making money over the past 18 months. Lest there is anyone in the House—I’m sure I don’t need to convince the minister of this, but perhaps there are those in the House who—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I have no way of knowing whether the direction of the member’s discussion has to do with the reason for the extra \$6 million. Perhaps the minister might enlighten us whether it does or not, because this is not a general discussion of all the estimates of the department; it is just simply this supplementary estimate of \$6 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, if I might speak to the comment that you have just made, when the Premier moved a resolution saying that we would not have a debate on the Speech from the Throne, it was generally understood that in these estimates we would have an opportunity to raise matters pertaining to the expenditures themselves. The minister himself has said the \$6 million will relate to assistance to the farm economy. My colleague from Huron-Bruce is talking about one area of the farm economy which he believes, and I would agree with him, does need either assistance or a good deal more thought on the part of this minister and in the expenditure of the \$6 million.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I don’t want to argue at all with what the Leader of the Opposition has said, but I think the point you have made isn’t necessarily in contradiction and is a very valid one. Surely the House is entitled to have some clear picture of how the government proposes to spend this \$6 million?

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: That, in effect, is what the chairman of the committee is now asking for. In fact, this is my puzzlement with regard to many of these estimates. Presumably the government and the Treasury Board have gone through their normal exacting inquiries before authorizing this appropriation, and if they have, surely the House is entitled to know specifically what the government intends to spend this money for. That will give us the kind of freedom that the Leader of the Opposition wants but it will also give us some knowledge so that we can be dealing with a substantive issue rather than just a grab bag.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have an explanation? Yes?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, may I just make a comment in defence of what I was saying, before the minister speaks, if I may? My position was that the minister had enunciated what the \$6 million was for in response to my question this morning.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Only one item?

Mr. Gaunt: All right, one item. I had a good idea of what it was for; maybe that’s the more accurate way to put it. Some of the capital grants included in the \$6 million will obviously go to egg producers, so I was using that as an umbrella under which I would put my comments.

Mr. Chairman: I think we should have an explanation of the \$6 million so our discussions can be more relevant to the item.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the \$6 million in the supplementary estimates is made up entirely of capital grant funds.

We have had an enormous run on the capital grants programme this last year; much over anything we have had in the past. We had a budget estimate of \$6 million in the estimates for this year. We will have exceeded that substantially and it will require an additional \$6 million until the end of the fiscal year, which will make a total of \$12 million for the capital grants programme which we hope will be sufficient to meet the demands on the capital grants programme in the province.

I believe part of the increased expenditure in capital grants is related to the fact that we have provided capital grants, as you

know, in the new programme that was introduced last April 1 on fixed equipment owned by farmers, such as pollution control equipment, bulk milk tanks, etc. We have increased the grants for partnerships. We have increased the grant itself from 33½ per cent on many items to 40 per cent.

We have as well provided \$5 per tree for the removal of diseased elm trees. This in itself has created a very substantial demand on the capital grants budget of our department. We felt impelled to request of the government that this extra \$6 million be asked for in the supplementary estimate which is now before the House for consideration.

Mr. Chairman: On the basis of that I feel the discussion should relate very closely to the explanation as enunciated by the hon. minister and deal very closely with the capital grants programme.

Mr. Gaunt: All right, Mr. Chairman. My position was that a good many egg producers in the province applied for and received capital grant money. I am simply setting out for you why egg producers perhaps need that capital grant money more than many other producers in the agricultural community.

Under that explanation I hope that I can make a few comments with respect to the industry and its need for more capital grants, albeit not for more buildings.

Mr. Chairman: I think you could relate it to that.

Mr. Gaunt: The egg prices in the province, as I indicated previously, have been extremely low. To give you an example: In the week ending January 9, the average weighted price for eggs across Canada was 23 cents; March 27, 18.9 cents; March 1, 24.4 cents; May 29, 21.3 cents; July 31, 17.1 cents; October 23, 21.4 cents and so on. When one considers the cost of production—it costs approximately 30 cents a dozen to produce these eggs—one can readily see that the producers in this province have been losing a great deal of money.

It has been said from time to time that goods egg prices wipe out bad times. I think a number of years ago that was true. I think that the cycle—the roller-coaster effect that we had in market prices—actually was charted to show that the good times did overbalance the bad times. In recent years this has not been the case; it has been just the opposite. The period of good prices has shortened and the period of depressed prices has length-

ened, so that in the overall picture producers generally have been worse off than they have ever been in the last number of years.

It has been said that producers would have to cut back approximately 25 per cent in their production in order to achieve good prices. To give you an idea, and this is only one example—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Was that 25 per cent?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, 25 per cent. To give you one idea of the amount of money that producers are losing, I have a financial statement from one producer who has agreed of his own volition to turn over his financial statement to me to indicate just how serious this matter is. On January 1, 1971, he had a loss of \$39,585 on 20,00 hens; on December 1, 1971, that had risen to \$61,110. In anyone's book that is a lot of money and amounts to roughly \$3 per hen.

I am told by those in the industry with whom I have talked that the average loss incurred by producers over the past 18 months in the Province of Ontario has been between \$2.50 to \$3 per hen.

In the Province of Ontario we have 13.7 million laying hens now and insofar as the 25 per cent cutback is concerned that would mean that the market can adequately cope with around 10 million. In other words, 10 million birds could supply the market adequately and at the same time achieve reasonable prices in the marketplace.

There have been some interesting developments in the egg industry over the past number of months from a government point of view. As the minister very well knows we were coming up to an egg vote in July and suddenly there were events taking place within the industry which necessitated that vote being put off. It is still waiting in the wings. It has been held in abeyance. Apparently the inquiry which was initiated by the minister in October is going to report before the minister does anything with respect to the vote or anything else insofar as assisting the industry itself is concerned.

I gather that the minister and the egg and fowl board were very concerned with respect to the 50 per cent increase in registrations which took place just the day before closing date. I, too, was very concerned about it and I happen to have some information which was gathered and has come to my attention indicating the type of farmer who was registered on that last day before registrations closed.

I have taken the liberty to show this to the minister, and I think both he and I would agree that these people who registered at the last minute were in no way or should in no way be considered as bona fide egg producers in the Province of Ontario. Most of them under ordinary circumstances would not have a vote in any egg vote because many of them had no hens at all. But they were registered and signed up and would have had a vote had the vote gone forward.

I think that this is most unfortunate. It has delayed the vote; there was no point in having the vote if it couldn't be won. That was the position of the egg and fowl board, a position which is quite tenable and quite proper under the circumstances.

The egg board welcomed the inquiry set up by the minister at the time because they were in a position where they had no alternative. It was either the inquiry or nothing. They felt that there was some difficulty in the industry even beyond their control and even beyond the obvious problem of overproduction, which I suppose really rests squarely at the doorstep of the producers themselves.

Over and beyond that there were other problems. I think generally the producers felt that the inquiry would at least bring some of these other aspects of the problem out into the open and get every card on the table.

The minister, I feel, is perhaps using the inquiry to do nothing. I hope that is a fair comment because that is the way it appears to many producers. I know the minister will say that he wants the benefit of what the good judge finds, and there is validity to that. But, at the same time, I think there are certain things in the industry that have to be done right now.

I mentioned that there were certain aspects to the industry which concerned producers over and beyond the over-production to which I made reference before. I want to quote some figures to indicate to the House one aspect of this problem.

For instance, in June, 1971—this past June—across Canada, there were 202,886 cases of eggs sold per week with an average weighted price to producers across Canada of 24.7 cents. For the week ending December 3, there were 201,837 cases sold at 30.4 cents. Note the comparison: 24.7 cents in the one case, 30.4 cents in the other case, but very little difference in the actual number of cases sold.

Even more revealing are the figures for Ontario for June 4. There were 90,653 cases

sold in Ontario for an average weighted price of 21.3 cents. For the week ending December 3, there were 94,450 cases sold for an average weighed price of 27.1 cents.

What has happened is that we have had approximately 4,000 cases more sold for the week ending December 3 than we had for the week ending June 4, but the price on June 4 was 21.3; the price on December 3 was 27.1 cents.

The interesting part in that whole equation is the fact that consumption has always been good and remained relatively static during that period. There was some slight fluctuation, as I gather, but not very much. So that it's almost a straight comparison of eggs produced and price received. The price has gone up seven to eight to 10 cents just recently and there is no explanation for it. Certainly one can't find an explanation for it on the basis on the number of eggs produced.

It is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, that just prior to the last vote—that was, what? Three years ago, I guess; something in that neighbourhood—the price went up six to eight cents a few days before the vote. Three to four days after the vote the price dropped right back again to its previous level.

When one considers that a four-cent increase in the price of eggs across the Province of Ontario will return to the producers in this province something in the neighbourhood of \$100,000, then we are talking big money when we are talking about even a few cents fluctuation in the price.

Really what I am saying is that there seems to be forces at work in the marketplace which go beyond the normal forces of supply and demand. One could put it another way and say someone, somewhere, seems to be manipulating that price.

I hope the inquiry will point out just exactly how the price of eggs is set—what forces are at work in the marketplace to set the price in the fashion in which it is set—and at least we can have some clear insight as to just what is going on. Because, on the basis of this information, it certainly looks as though there is something going on in the marketplace which up until this point really isn't understood and can't be explained.

I want to just make a few suggestions to the minister with respect to the egg situation. Many producers in my area—indeed, across the province, because I have talked to many producers outside my own riding about this situation—feel that something has to be done now even though the inquiry is still continuing.

The minister indicated that the inquiry perhaps wouldn't be reporting until the end of the year and it could very well be well into January, maybe even beyond. I think it is fair to say that the egg industry just can't wait that long.

What I would like to see the minister do is to see him, if he so wishes, come in on a temporary basis, with an agency marketing plan without a vote—and I say if he so wishes, on a temporary basis. So that—No. 1—the egg industry at least has some supportive machinery in the marketplace upon which it can fall in these trying times.

The second point is that unless Ontario gets in with the agency type plan, it cannot qualify under the national plan. Therefore, as I understand it, I would be fearful that the other provinces, the big producing provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, who do qualify under the plan, will be dumping eggs into Ontario and into our market if we don't take some action to set up an agency type plan to conform with and allow us to enter the national marketing plan.

Maybe the minister doesn't want to do that. Maybe he feels he can't live with that situation. But I put the proposition to him because I think it is valid; I think it is important that we do it. If he feels that he can't do that even on a temporary basis, then I think what we should be doing is to place—by way of a temporary measure once again—a moratorium on new building, particularly during the period of the inquiry and immediately thereafter.

I think also, as a second step, we should be setting up a system where the producer board can at least negotiate, or perhaps set, prices during the next period while the inquiry is going on and immediately following. I suggest those two things, provided the minister doesn't want to go ahead with the agency plan without a vote.

If he is prepared to do that, and I can tell him that all of us in this party would support him in that venture, then that is the better of the two alternatives, in my view. If he doesn't want to do that, then I suggest these two temporary measures should be given some thought, because I think they are valid.

Well, really, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your co-operation and your assistance. I would like to hear what the minister has to say with respect to those points.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth first.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: And we should try to really tie this into the capital grants programme as much as possible.

Mr. Deans: I can assure you, sir—

Mr. Chairman: Otherwise we could go on to every aspect of agriculture there is and it is a very broad subject.

Mr. Deans: You can rest assured that it is in keeping with my tradition. I am not going to stray one iota from the intent of the vote.

An hon. member: Because the member doesn't know anything about chickens!

Mr. Deans: In fact, I am pleased that the member from Huron-Bruce covered it so well, because it saves me from going into those very matters that I intended to raise with the minister.

Mr. Chairman: Try to get it back to the capital grants.

Mr. Deans: I want to say—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Say "Amen" and sit down.

Mr. Deans: No, no, I have a few other things I want to add as a supplement to the matters raised by the member for Huron-Bruce.

In introducing the changes on March 31 of this year, the minister said, and quite rightly so, that the intent of the change in the grant structure was to improve the techniques and the facilities, the purpose of the change being to improve the farmers' incomes. And I suppose the use to which the money has been put would to some extent be reflected in a change upward in individual farmers' incomes from prior to the time that this additional money was made available.

I would like to hear from the minister, of course, exactly what the money has been used for—what kinds of projects have been the most prevalent, what kinds of applications have been received by The Department of Agriculture and Food—in order that we can assess more accurately what it is that the farmers themselves feel are the needs, what it is that they want to have the money for.

In terms of the use of the money, I would like to know from the minister how much of the money was in fact applied to projects

that had been approved prior to the date of the implementation of this particular programme. I seem to recall, if I am not mistaken, that the new schedule of capital grants was to be available for all of the projects that had been approved back to the year 1967.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: New schedule?

Mr. Deans: Well, the new amount. It had been raised from \$2,500 to \$3,000—is this not the case?—and that in fact this was going to be approved on all projects dating back to 1967 and the new amount of 40 per cent across the board, rather than the staggered amounts, was what was to be applied on those as well as any future projects.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No.

Mr. Deans: Well, that was a misunderstanding?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Deans: What then did the minister mean when he said it would be applied to projects approved back to the year 1967? I am interested in knowing. The reason I ask is that I simply want to know how much money was used on new projects and how much in fact was used to facilitate debts that had been built up during that particular period.

I want to say to the minister that the goal of providing the farmer with a more adequate income of course is a goal that every single one of us in this House is striving to accomplish. I think that perhaps, alongside the old age pensioner, the farmer has been the hardest hit and the least rewarded for his efforts over as many years as one would like to recount.

I think there are many additional ways this could have been pursued by this government to meet the objectives the minister set out. It is quite evident there has been a long-time hard feeling among the farming community with regard to the amount of taxation that they're forced to pay, and this government should have—and could have—taken more positive steps than it took during the last two sessions of the Legislature to guarantee a lessening burden of taxation on the farm community.

In addition, it has been raised by the farmers in their own convention that there are other areas in which the government ought to have been involved that perhaps would have had a more direct effect on their income.

The capital grants programme, for all it is worth—and it is worth a considerable amount—is only of value if the farmer is able to proceed with capital expansion and capital expenditures. It provides very little for that farmer who in effect has a maximum plant operation and has no way of taking advantage of this money. Yet his situation vis-à-vis the income he receives hasn't been altered by the government.

I suggest that the complaints the farmers have brought forward, particularly the complaints about the difficulties in the area of farm machine repairs—perhaps not mentioned by the member for Huron-Bruce, but I am sure he would agree—are something that, if the government were to move into and to take some positive action on, to ensure the availability of replacement and initial farm implements and machinery at a cost that farmers could afford, would be as beneficial, or perhaps more beneficial, than forcing them into any great capital expenditures which they, perhaps, were not contemplating at this stage.

The other areas, of course, are the matters of the tremendous burden, the tremendous amount of pressure, placed on the farmers of the Ontario areas by the egg, apple and corn imports. This has been a matter of considerable discussion in the farm community for some period of time. It has been discussed in this House, not only today by the member for Huron-Bruce, but a number of times by many other members.

It seems evident that some fairly positive action is required to ensure that a farmer operating in the Province of Ontario is not subjected to the kinds of pressure that are obviously brought about by other interests outside of this province being able to bring their produce in at a lower price. I think that it is in those areas that the minister should be turning his thoughts. If he has not already turned them into those areas, he ought to, and I am sure he has.

I want to suggest to him, as I did at the beginning, that it would be interesting if he could have, at the time of placing this \$6 million expenditure before us, placed with us also a list—some kind of a compiling of all of the projects that are presently under way and those which qualify. I think it is only by having that kind of a document that one can accurately assess which areas of the farm community are being helped, and to whom, in the particular, the help is being given. I think that this is vital.

My suspicion, though it may not be well founded, is that in the area of the family farm, in the area of the perhaps marginal farm, there is little opportunity for the farmer to take advantage of this kind of capital grants programme. In fact, it is more advantageous—more available is a better word—to the farmer who is, in fact, the least needy, as opposed to those who are the most needy. I would say to the minister in dealing with this that there is no question, no question at all, about the need for government involvement in preserving and guaranteeing the continuation of the producing areas of this country.

I have made speeches in this House on numerous occasions about the Niagara fruit belt which I don't intend to make today. But, nevertheless, the problems which they have in many ways can't be solved by this kind of a programme. There are certain areas where they can—the ponding and perhaps, in some of the other areas of wells, and in a few of the actual structural grants that are available. But in general terms, the problems that they have are not problems that can be solved by a capital grants programme. They are rather problems that can only be solved by this government and the more senior government involving itself directly in protecting that farmer against the kind of intrusions that are being made by outside interests on his financial return.

I say to the minister that this programme obviously must go ahead—the programme is obviously being used, although I am not sure by whom—but that the whole area of assistance for the purpose of guaranteeing an increased income for farmers has got to take an entirely different tack from this one, and that we have got to become much more involved in assuring the farmer of this community that he is not going to have to bear the unbearable pressures of the continuing education tax, of the problem of the import and those kind of things that we are all so familiar with in this House.

I hope the minister will be able to give us a breakdown, nevertheless, of the use of the money and whether or not it has been used and—one final point—also to explain what it was he meant in his March 31 statement when he said about it being available for all of the projects that were approved back to the year 1967.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on these estimates. I must say to the minister that the agricultural industry does appreciate the

capital grants programme and it has assisted the agricultural industry to a great extent. The hon. member for Huron-Bruce has brought to your attention the plight of egg producers, but there are other segments of agriculture which, as the minister knows went through very difficult times this year—the hog producers and, of course, the corn producers in this province at harvest time this year. Some of them sold their corn below the cost of production. After reading your speech the night when you spoke to the Chatham Chamber of Commerce, rural and urban—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was a good speech?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): It read well!

Mr. Spence: It was a good speech.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Who wrote it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did.

Mr. Spence: When I saw the supplementary estimates of \$6 million, I thought you were going to do something about storage on our lakes or somewhere on lakes in southwestern Ontario. In your speech you said that you were going to increase the assistance for on-farm storage of grain. Also, you stated you might extend the grants programme to the grain industry so they could provide facilities for storage for the agricultural industry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I didn't!

Mr. Spence: This is what I read in the Chatham paper. The minister said that he would consider extending the programme to the grain industry to encourage it to provide such facilities to the farmers.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is the escalated write-off, the depreciation write-off.

Mr. Spence: I thought it was to assist—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Income tax depreciation.

Mr. Spence: I see. I was very encouraged that the minister was going to make the grants available so that we could have port facilities for the corn industry. However, I must say, as the minister is well aware, some of the corn producers in this province sold their corn at 90 cents a bushel at harvest time and now the corn is \$1.15. A lot of those farmers who had to sell their corn at harvest time sold it at the cost of production, which is a hardship on them.

I hope the minister takes this into consideration—that something has to be done before next year's harvest in order to not hurt those who have to have money at harvest time. I hope the minister will look into the port facilities or storage along the lakes so this will help those in this industry.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up any more of the time because I know that—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay on capital grants.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I want to discuss with the minister very briefly, through you, Mr. Chairman, a problem that has been brought to my attention by people who are concerned and interested in the plight of the farmer. I do not pretend for one minute that I know one iota about farming, but I did undertake to bring this to the attention of the minister.

It is the plight of several farmers who happen to have friends and relatives living in the north who don't participate in farming. The problem seems to be that when farmers go to the bank or to the government they get a limited amount of funds to build a barn or to get the necessary equipment to feed beef cattle. After they get the facility there is nowhere they can go to get the necessary capital in order to purchase stock.

They are left with the capital investment and no way of recovering any portion of that investment through the availability of extra capital in order to carry on their operation. This informant, who happens to come from the Ottawa Valley, said that there was a conference of all ministers of agriculture held on November 23 in Ottawa at which time there was an undertaking to liaise with one another and to come up with some kind of programme or some form of assistance to improve the income of the farmer and make it possible for him to operate efficiently and at a reasonable profit. This seemed to be the greatest inhibiting factor to them; the lack of available capital in order to carry through their original intention.

As I say, I don't presume to know anything at all about the plight of the farmer. I can sympathize with him on the basis of what I read but I certainly am not knowledgeable and don't pretend to be. But I am just wondering if the minister will indicate whether any portion of this expenditure of funds that he is asking for this afternoon will in any way assist the farmer toward that end?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Yes. Mr. Chairman, very briefly with regard to the estimates before us and the capital grants. The member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) gave a very good summary of some of the situations that go on in our farming now. I would have hoped when I saw the report of the Treasurer and the increased deficit that he is having—I was figuring on about \$0.5 billion—that perhaps there would have been a little more allowed in our agricultural areas, especially for funds for on-farm storage of corn. I think another thing that should be considered is advances on corn in storage, to avoid selling it in the fall of the year. I know there has been some discussion on this with Ottawa. I would like to see some method set up soon where farm storage could be had and also an advancement of about 50 per cent of the basic price, then have the grain held to stop the market fluctuations when it is so low in the fall of the year.

Now with regard to the capital grants, buildings and so forth, I have one case in particular. This building I am speaking of is a poultry building that was built, I believe, with some assistance from a capital grant a few years ago. I sent a copy of it with a question I asked the minister this morning with regard to egg prices. It is very brief and it is rather interesting, because it is a one-building operation and not what we would call a large operation, with 10,000 laying hens.

The hens were put in the building in August of 1970; they were laying for one year; they were sold in August 1971; and the average price of the eggs for the year was 20.3 cents per dozen.

The cost of the hens when they were put in the building was \$18,500, and feed cost \$32,000. The building costs, and rent and labour, figured out at \$5,600. So total expenditures were \$56,100.

Receipts for eggs came to \$31,000 and the hens sold on the completion of the year for \$1,776. So the total receipts were \$32,776. That gives us a loss of \$23,324 for the 12 months' of operation of one building that was built with the assistance of a capital grant about four years ago.

So the capital grants system as such is not necessarily the answer to our farm problems. One of the answers is proper marketing of our products after we produce them, and this seems to be our biggest problem now.

As the minister stated this morning, there is some conflict of opinion of different farmers and people connected with farming as to what method we should use in disposing of our product. But this has always been, I think, the weak point in our agriculture industry; our sales. We certainly need to take a new look at them.

I think it was mentioned that setting up an egg marketing agency immediately may be the answer. It is too bad that the report that we are having is holding up some of the things that maybe should be done right at this time. Yet I am sure that the report that is being studied now, or the commissioner studying the egg situation will probably have some good recommendations—we would hope—but what bothers me is the interim.

If we have people on small to medium-sized farms, or flock owners who have lost at the rate that is mentioned here—and these are figures taken from a financial statement and are similar to those the member for Huron-Bruce brought out—I am wondering if they can stand this loss. I would have hoped that the minister would have had, with the large budget as I mentioned a while ago—or the budget deficit that the Treasurer brought out—I think \$5 million of capital grants or \$5 million of assistance to our poultry producers over the last year would have really put them in a position so that they would be able to withstand the next few months until something concrete is brought out.

That is the disappointment that I have—that the minister does not have anything in here to cover them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly on this expenditure of \$6 million in The Department of Agriculture and Food, especially in relation to the capital grants programme. I think there are two or three points that I would like to make.

First, in the amount of money that is being appropriated are there more funds being asked for to enlarge the staff in this particular section? I ask this question because I know of one farmer whom I helped submit an application back in May. I believe it went through the county offices in June and about the tail-end of October the farmer received one grant, I believe, on the well. At the same time he had applied for \$1,000 capital grant on the henhouse and he still hasn't received this money. In fact, after about nine phone calls in the past few weeks we have deter-

mined that that particular application has been lost in the department. I spoke to the director of the branch and apparently it has been lost in the mountain of applications that is confronting these people. I just wondered if, in trying to expedite these particular matters, the minister is adding to the staff to process them more quickly.

I realize the problem isn't entirely within his department as these applications, once they are approved, have to go to Treasury Board and there is a subsequent delay over there for a number of weeks. This is a problem that I, as a member, face and no doubt, so do other members in the House.

The second part of the capital grants programme is the new one that was announced this past year in relation to tree removal. I would say this has been accepted very well, particularly in our part of Ontario.

Apparently there is some degree of discretion through the county rep as to what trees may be removed. Basically, the understanding is that they must have been in production during the calendar year before the grant will apply, but there are some discussions on the concessions as to the application of this particular programme and I guess they are being resolved.

I think the farm people in general, especially in the apple production business, are using this programme to get out of producing certain of the more popular varieties which are causing a glut on the market. I think this is good and we certainly support any moneys that are being appropriated here to help finance that particular section.

The only other thought I would like to put forth at this time is in support of my colleague from Kent. I think that in the capital grants programme possibly more specific emphasis should be placed on a plan for on-farm storage. I realize that they can qualify now under the building programme but I would hope that your department can look at this particular problem and relate it to the capital grants programme and give some emphasis to this particular section before harvest time next year and have these facilities available. As a businessman, I know I wouldn't go out and buy great quantities of any product if I didn't have a place to put them in the first place. I think this is something the farmer has neglected in his thinking: if he produces hundreds and thousands of bushels, all of a sudden he has no place to put them and so he dumps them on the market. If he could be encouraged to have on-the-farm storage as a result of this

capital grants programme being emphasized more fully, I think it would be a worthwhile project.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the comments that have been made. I must confess I wasn't aware that they would be as far-ranging on this particular estimate, but nevertheless it has been a very interesting debate.

Mr. Ruston: Enlightening.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it has been enlightening. I am not so sure it is so productive of the solutions that we would all cherish.

Mr. Ruston: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Before replying to the comments that have been made by the member for Huron-Bruce, let me congratulate him on being appointed, as I understand it, the agricultural critic of the official Opposition. One would be tempted, Mr. Chairman, to express the wish that the same fate doesn't befall him at the next election as did to his predecessor, so perhaps caution should be used by the agricultural critics of the two opposition parties because neither one of them is with us any longer.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Does the minister know he won by 8,000 votes?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I know, and one would have to say that we don't want to see that dissipated entirely—

Mr. Bullbrook: Against \$5 million spent he won by 8,000!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —just because he is the agricultural critic.

Mr. Bullbrook: I didn't think there would be a Tory candidate in that riding in 1975!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I didn't follow that riding as closely as my hon. friend from Sarnia did, but obviously by his figures he didn't follow it very closely either.

With regard to the egg price situation, there is no one in this House who does not recognize that the situation is as bad as it is. There is no question about that. I don't dispute any of the figures that have been advanced, but one of the things that does concern me very much is the fact that a comparatively small surplus has generated the problem.

In the years when egg prices were at a satisfactory level to the producer, we were able to dispose of something like 195,000 cases a week. We could use up to that many without getting into much difficulty, but once we got beyond that—once we got to that figure of something like 200,000 or 205,000 and particularly 210,000 or 215,000 and beyond that—we struck disaster. There was simply no place for these eggs to go.

It's fine for those people who want to say these things to say, "Well, use export markets," and I found it interesting to read some editorial opinion, expressed in western papers particularly, that emphasized the importance of finding export markets for the production of Ontario's fields and flocks and herds. That is fine; I am all for it. But there is no known market in the world today for eggs; even at the disastrous prices they were at during this past summer. There just isn't. Eggs were going into storage in various types of commodities; there was no place for them to go—anywhere else.

Now when we had a meeting of the various eastern Canada ministers in Montreal—in fact, it involved the minister and his staff from Manitoba as well—we came to the conclusion that there had to be some type of a plan that would work on a national basis. And quite frankly we had hoped that this matter would have been resolved back in 1968, because in Regina in 1968, Mr. Chairman, if I can go into this in some detail, we suggested to the newly appointed federal minister of Agriculture, the present minister, at the first meeting he attended after being sworn in just a few days earlier, that there should be some type of a national marketing plan established in Canada for eggs or poultry products.

I believe we were all in general agreement that this should be done, but we had no idea that the federal government would embark on the course of bringing forward an omnibus bill, including all agricultural commodities. I think that is where they generated the very stiff opposition that emerged from some of the commodity groups across Canada who wanted no part of supply management.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Tory beef producers!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, sure, the Tory beef producers. Someone mentions that. Let me say that this House with unanimous approval passed The Beef Cattle Marketing Act of Ontario in 1968 which specifically excluded the beef producers of Ontario from the

terms and conditions of The Farm Products Marketing Act. Now that happened in Ontario with the unanimous approval of this House, so let us not throw any bricks at the beef producers in this particular regard. I sympathize very much with their position, and they want no part of being involved in the business of quota production.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Might I ask the minister a question? Is he implying that the federal legislation would impose supply management and supply controls—production controls—on all agricultural products, or only those where the producers wanted it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The legislation does not spell that out. No, it doesn't. This is part of the problem that has held it up for so long. We specifically suggested at our meeting here in Toronto and again in Ottawa a week or two ago that we recommended—and this was the unanimous recommendation of all the ministers across Canada, albeit the minister from Manitoba was somewhat reluctant to go along with this idea and said so when he got home—that the legislation for supply management should apply to poultry and poultry products only and that any other commodity producers wishing to come under supply management under Bill C-176, the national marketing bill, should be incorporated in the federal legislation by resolution of the House of Commons.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Hasn't the minister and his colleagues, the other Ministers of Agriculture, also heartily recommended that the federal legislation be enacted without delay?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we have, but with that amendment and Mr. Olson has agreed to it. I am not saying there is anything basically wrong with national marketing legislation. I am not being critical of the federal minister.

We feel that if this is done the federal legislation will then provide the national marketing vehicle. So far there is only an agreement among producer organizations in the various provinces to implement voluntary restraint. That is all it is. There is no legislative authority whatever to implement any effective control other than by a gentleman's agreement within the provinces. This may work; I frankly hope it will but we have no assurance that it will. Frankly, I think there is only one way to make it work and that is to have national legislation.

The suggestion has been made that it was because of the number of late registra-

tions that the egg vote was cancelled in early September. We have to recognize that the proposed egg vote that was being planned for that date was entirely predicated on what had been done by the Ontario Broiler Chicken Producers Marketing Board and by other broiler boards across Canada, where they themselves were given the right to control sales of products within their own provinces. That meant that any product coming in from another province had to receive a permit or a licence from that particular commodity board before the commodity could be sold in that province.

Now the Supreme Court decision that was handed down on or about September 1 clearly set aside that prerogative of a commodity board in an individual province and described it as an interference of trade in agricultural food commodities. That changed the whole complexion of the proposed egg vote. There would not have been any use in having it on that basis, in my humble opinion, because if it had been voted in and the board found they did not have that authority they would not have been one bit better off afterward than they were before. To me, that had to be a consideration.

Then it was brought home to the Egg and Fowl Producers Marketing Board that they had two alternatives—rather than, as suggested by my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce, no alternative. There was an alternative. They had the alternative of going ahead with their vote but realizing this was the problem; or going ahead with their vote on the basis that everybody who had registered would have the right to vote.

My hon. friend suggests—and I agree with him—that there were many people who were not really egg producers. There were people on the list that he was good enough to show me this morning who didn't even own a hen and yet they were on that producers' list. Now there was no time between the day or two days prior to the holding of the vote to examine that list to know whether they were legitimate producers or whether they were not. They were not registered with the board previously, and obviously there was something wrong with the list. But who was to know? Who could determine in that length of time?

So the egg and fowl board, I think rather wisely, suggested that rather than go ahead with a list of voters that they weren't sure of as far as their being producers or not, and bearing in mind the fact that the Supreme Court decision had just been handed

down a few days before—which really negated part of their plan—they asked for a judicial inquiry.

I must confess we had some difficulty in getting a judge to handle the case as quickly as we would have liked to. We went right to work on it. Judge Ross accepted the job and is conducting the hearings right now, I believe this very day, in London. They will be held in other areas of the province at a later date.

My hon. friend from Huron-Bruce suggests that there be an egg plan implemented now without a vote, or that there be a moratorium placed on new buildings, plus the setting of egg prices. Now I suppose we can do that, and I appreciate the fact that he says his caucus will support that position. But to me it would be quite inconsistent for us to have accepted a written request of the egg and fowl board, Mr. Chairman, to implement this judicial inquiry, and with the inquiry under way to do what my hon. friend suggests would, to me, be flying in the face of what we asked His Honour to determine in the terms of reference that he was given; that is, to provide a consensus of opinion as to what was, in his opinion, as a completely unbiased observer and commissioner, to be in the best interests of the egg producers. To me, it would be premature to move on something like this at least until we get that report.

I admit quite readily that there is distress in the egg industry. There is no question of it. There has been great difficulty. With regard to the establishment of a moratorium on new buildings, to me that is simply setting quotas immediately, because as soon as we set a quota on new buildings we immediately designate those buildings that are already there as applicable for quota; and whether they will be applicable for quota in their entirety is something that I just don't know.

I must confess that there are many people in the egg industry who have grave reservations about the wisdom of establishing quotas and setting prices. There are many people who share the philosophy that if quotas are established, the price situation will take care of itself.

Frankly, I categorically suggest here, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion there is only one solution to this egg and poultry product situation in Canada, and that is to have supply management implemented at national level, with all of the provinces where these commodities are produced administering the

plan locally within their provincial borders. I subscribe to that position on those particular commodities.

Now with regard to what my friend from Wentworth suggested about the capital grants structure, and I regret that he hasn't seen fit—oh, he is here in the House—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He sees fit. He is always here. Always.

Mr. Stokes: Let the record show that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He asked me to explain how the new grant structure would apply on those claims which had been made prior to the implementation of the new programme on April 1, 1971. It simply means this: That those projects for which grants of one-third had been paid do not qualify for additional grants.

What does happen is this. A farmer who qualified for a grant of one-third, we'll say, on a new building—up to a maximum of \$1,500 for either a new building or for drainage on his farm—can now qualify, on any new building or new drainage project that he may introduce to his farm operation, for a 40 per cent grant up to a total of \$3,000. Do you follow me?

Now he can go on beyond that and he can claim up to \$5 a tree to a maximum of 100 diseased elm trees, if he wants to cut them down, or another \$500. So he gets a total of \$3,500.

Previously he could only get \$1,500 for drainage and buildings plus \$1,000 for a water supply. Perhaps it was a drilled well, or a dug well, or a farm pond, or moving the water from a pond or well. But on April 1, 1971 these two were put into one package; you can use it for any of those various things. Now that is the difference.

We also added, as my friend from Essex South remarked, the orchard or part orchard removal. I think it is \$2.50 a tree up to so many trees and from there on—I have not got the exact details here.

Mr. Gaunt: A tree, up to \$500.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I do not think that applies for orchards; maybe it does.

Mr. Gaunt: I am sorry. I was talking about dead elms.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The elm tree grant is \$5 up to 100 trees. The orchard one is a little different. I don't have the exact details of it right here, but it was asked for by the

fruit growers and particularly by the apple commission.

My friend from Wentworth asked who applies for these grants. I would say that family farmers are applying for the grants. There are very few corporate farms in Ontario, quite frankly. They do qualify, and if there is a partnership or a corporate farm structure that has a legal registered agreement it qualifies for a double grant. But there are very few of them, actually, so that the majority of the grants are coming in and the applications are coming in for the smaller grants first.

My friend from Kent suggested that we should be providing capital grants for storage facilities for grain. These capital grants are available for storage facilities for grain on the farm. This applies to corn cribs, to grain bins, to tanks, to whatever it may be that a farmer wants to put on his own farm. Quite frankly, I think this is part of the problem, that our farmers in Ontario received what to me was far less than they should have received for corn at harvest time this year. As I pointed out at Chatham on the evening that the member for Kent referred to, I think part of the problem is that we have introduced a new technology of harvesting corn by combine, that is, in a wet grain state, without adequate facilities to dry and store that corn on the farm.

Mr. Ruston: Right on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is part of the problem. So farmers, as someone suggested over there, have embarked on the idea of growing hundreds of acres of crop. It can be easily harvested with these combines and picker-shellers, but there is no place to handle it. That is why there are these incredible line-ups waiting to get this wet corn processed properly.

I frankly think that there wasn't so much wrong with the old way of handling corn in harvesting it on the cob and putting it in cob corn storage and feeding it out to the market in the natural dried state. That is the way most of the industry wants the corn anyway and, frankly, I think we are going to have to come back to that way of doing it to a much greater degree than we have done in the past.

I do not know whether there is anything more that I can add. Let me reply to the member for Essex South on the subject of more staff. We have increased the staff in our department in this particular area. That doesn't mean we have hired new people.

We have transferred people who may have been surplus to another branch to that group which has grown from three to 14. We are still not able to cope with the enormous amount of capital grant applications that have come in this year.

I have the programme for capital grants for our department this year and the breakdown. Right until the end of the fiscal year March 31, Mr. Chairman, we estimate that for fixed equipment we will need \$500,000; for orchard tree removal, \$500,000—this is a new grant—for elm tree removal, \$3.5 million—it was far beyond our expectations that people would use that grant to that extent—for construction and drainage, \$7.5 million, making a total of \$12 million.

There was \$6 million in our previous budget last spring. We are asking for another \$6 million today. I don't have the individual number of applications for each particular area. That is available in our office. I don't have it with me, but we can tell the members exactly how many came in for each one of those particular groups that have been dealt with to date. But I must confess, Mr. Chairman, I fancy there are a good many hundreds over there that haven't even had their envelopes opened. We admit we are a bit behind because we just simply haven't been able to cope with the enormous flood of those applications, but they will be dealt with; there is no question about that.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 102.

Mr. Gaunt: May I just ask the minister—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt:—one question with respect to the delay in payment of the capital grants referred to by my colleague from Essex South.

I understand that when the applications come in and when there is no problem associated with them, they can be dealt with in the normal way. The normal way, at the moment, happens to be that the department is processing applications that came in in September. They are now currently processing those and sending out the cheques to the farmers in response to those applications.

In some cases, where there have been problems, the money has been tied up even as far back as June of this year. I wonder if there is any way, in view of the fact that 250 capital grant applications are coming into the department daily, that that money,

or at least most of it, can get out to the farmers before the year ends. I am thinking of even up to the end of November.

If the department could deal with the applications for the months of September, October and November and get that money out to the farmers before the year ends it would be most helpful, I think, to all farmers. I am wondering if the department is in a position to put extra staff on the problem and perhaps extra equipment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I recognize the problem. I share the concern of my friend from Huron-Bruce. When I learned earlier in the summer that there was this enormous flood of applications coming in and we were not able to cope with it, I simply suggested to the deputy minister we get as much help as we could and get on with the job. There is, as I say, an increased staff working on that—from three to 14. They are still working on it. I think the fact that we have caught up to as current a situation as my friend mentioned is indicative that we have been able to accomplish things.

Just the other day I saw two huge mail bags being lugged in, with two men on each bag—more applications for capital grants. That gives you some indication of the enormity of the task. Many of these applications are coming in for \$100, \$125, \$150; they are not all \$3,000 applications, believe me. Every one of them has to be processed so it is not an easy job to cope with it, but I will take the words of advice from my hon. friend seriously and I can tell you that we will be discussing this as of tomorrow morning.

Mr. Gaunt: One final comment, and I really concur with my friend from Essex South in this; I am wondering if it would be possible for Treasury to give the capital grants some priority. They sit over there for a considerable length of time. I know. Calling the department, I am told on frequent occasions that the application has been approved, and has gone over to Treasury. Often it is two to three weeks and sometimes longer before Treasury gets that cheque out. I am wondering if the minister would talk to his colleague, the Treasurer. He is in the House perhaps—

Mr. Paterson: Let us hope he heard us!

Mr. Singer: He doesn't pay—

Mr. Gaunt: —he would take that comment in the light in which it was made. If some

priority could be given these grants it would be appreciated.

Vote 102 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the supplementary estimates of The Department of Agriculture and Food.

We now come to The Department of Correctional Services.

The hon. Minister of Health?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to the House leader and to the two opposition parties and I understand there is a consensus that Health take the next turn, if we may.

Mr. Chairman: That is fine. Is that agreed?

The supplementary estimates of The Department of Health on page 4, votes 702, 703 and 704. There is a typographical error to be corrected in the next section. Instead of 705 that should read 706; just change your copy accordingly.

On vote 102.

Mr. Chairman: Any questions or comments? The member for Cochrane South?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the money that is set aside in this vote is for provincial aid re homes for special care. I would imagine that most of these homes for special care are still considered to be nursing homes. I wonder what initiative is being taken by the department to provide these kinds of homes and facilities in areas where at present a suitable nursing home doesn't exist. I can think of my own community where, during the election, the nursing home closed down and the people that were involved had to be transferred to places like Hearst and Haileybury and Kirkland Lake and so on. This, in an area where there is, perhaps, some discussion by a private entrepreneur that he is going to open a nursing home. Yet the thing seems to be in limbo and nothing is taking place.

What is the minister's department specifically doing to try to bring this thing to a head in a community, such as my own, where there is a need for a nursing home, a need for a home for special care for people who are no longer going to be confined to the Ontario Hospitals per se, but in this programme? What is the minister doing and what kind of thing can we look forward to? Are we going to have to leave it to the whim of a private entrepreneur or can the minister

get a commitment to go ahead or can he bring enough pressure to bear so that other action is forthcoming?

I wonder if the minister could comment on that?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, the problem has been general in the province and not just affecting Cochrane South, in that with the new nursing home programme coming forward there was a holdup in the number of applications that we allowed through. That particular log-jam will be clearing within a matter of days.

The nominees and appointees to the new nursing home review board will be made known and appointed, of course, within a matter of days. As soon as that board is established, the department itself will start making its decisions and the flow will begin. I don't picture there being any difficulty in finding in the north—as well as other parts of the province but certainly in the north—entrepreneurs who will be interested in the member's area and in other areas, particularly in the north where nursing homes are needed.

The applications are coming in. They are coming in individually and from chain operations; from people looking just broadly at whole sections of the province, asking where there is a need. The pressure is all from these people to set up nursing homes. With the log-jam out of the way, with the applications moving, I think the problem of adequate facilities, both nursing homes or homes for special care, will be met this winter and spring.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, on this same point, I wonder if the minister could have a look at a situation in my riding. Possibly he will recall the distasteful situation when the Bartlett nursing home in the municipality of Leamington was closed and the residents moved out on the night before Christmas one year ago.

Since that period of time, this municipality, which is the largest municipality in Essex county, has been without the service of a nursing home. Applications were made by a group from Komoka who have two other fine nursing homes in southwestern Ontario to build a new 100-bed unit in that municipality and special legislation was passed by the council.

Subsequent to that, when the application reached the minister's office or that of his officials, this application was denied, not particularly because of the holdup on new nursing homes but because of the fact that some priority had been given to an intent of the Bartlett nursing home to build a 120-bed home in that municipality.

It is my understanding that certain decisions were reached, either Friday or Monday of this week, in relation to that particular application. I would ask the minister to have his officials look into this matter so that this large area of the county of Essex can be served by one or the other nursing homes as quickly as possible. It will be appreciated.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, what are the chains to which the minister referred in the establishment of nursing homes in Ontario?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can't be accurate on the names although I have carried them around for a number of days, but there is great interest shown by two large western Canadian chains. By "chain" I generally refer to the owners or proprietors of two, three, four or five nursing homes. There has also been interest in extended care nursing home operation in Ontario expressed by some American investors in New York, I know, in Minnesota, I think, and California, I believe.

For a number of months—one of the reasons, of course, was that it coincided with the general freeze—I have been trying to assess the significance of multiple ownership of nursing homes as a matter of policy. As I stand here at this moment, I am not going to propound any policy in relation to multiple ownership of nursing homes. I think we will just have to let them start flowing through our nursing home review board, keep a very careful eye on the situation and wait and see what develops.

But at the moment I feel we can free things up without making a categorical decision as to whether or not we are against chains per se or whether or not the question of economic nationalism also affects chain ownership.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I raised it for those dual reasons, the reasons of essential social validity and the probably lesser reason, in this case, of economic nationalism.

I've thought myself that much of the nursing home development under the American extended care financial grant explosion, which is what it has been, has sort of become the Holiday Inn of the nursing home apparatus. It's a very facile way to accumulate enormous sums of money on a chain basis without very scrupulous attention to the quality of care in the home, and I would be reluctant indeed if Ontario chose to follow that pattern.

I am rather more interested in the quality of care than I am in the source of capital, but I suspect that if we have multi-national subsidiaries in Ontario in nursing homes, then inevitably we will be questioning the quality of care from day one. These chain operations tend to have that effect.

I appreciate the minister's not expressing a categorical statement one way or the other; I am glad he is expressing a caution, because I for one and our party generally have been rather apprehensive about what has been happening to the quality of medical care since the dam was taken down and the funds were unleashed in nursing homes and in special care facilities generally.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, last spring in the estimates we debated to some degree the apparent freeze that had been placed on patients in Ontario Hospitals in going into the homes for special care programmes. The minister at that point didn't feel that there was very much of a freeze, but the complaints that had come to me suggested there was a backup in the various wards of Ontario Hospitals and so on.

I wonder why the minister is now coming in with this supplementary estimate for more money for homes for special care and if the apparent freeze now has been lifted and the various steps of advancement are following in a fairly orderly fashion.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The estimate referred to relates only to implementation of the increase in payments as authorized as of April 1 of this year when, for nursing home patients, we moved from \$10.50 to \$11, and for non-nursing care patients from \$5 to \$5.25. That specifically is encompassed within this sub-estimate.

The only comment I can make beyond that in relation to the homes for special care is that we are restudying the very nature of that programme, because I am personally

very uneasy over the fact—and I think I mentioned it yesterday—that the therapeutic ingredient which surely must be within our system from one end of the spectrum to the very end, may be receiving insufficient emphasis. So there are not going to be any very quick moves, as far as I am concerned, in relation to pressures upon them or relief of that pressure until we reassess the programme itself.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 702.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this vote I would like to ask the minister about the mentally retarded children's hospital at Cedar Springs. There seems to be a great shortage of beds. We have some cases where the mother has a heart condition. We find a great shortage of beds at the hospital. Is the minister making any space available or more beds available other places, or what course of action is he taking? Is he giving consideration to this?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The pressure on the system is great. I do not know how many applications involving real need exist, but I would bet that it is around 300 to 400 in the province at the moment. But really, as you would judge from the thinking of Walter Williston, the straight approach of increasing institutional facilities and adding beds is really a bankrupt policy. Our hope is that we can decrease the population, as we have been able to in the past year or two, but continue to decrease the proportionate number of people in our institutions and work strenuously to find community facilities or local facilities to replace them.

I think the member will find that the policy announced by the Minister of Social and Family Services (Hon. Mr. Wells) earlier this week will help in this; help us support—at the Children's Aid Society level and at the children's mental health facility level—these programmes to maintain the children within the community.

So my answer is it is going to be a tough job to reverse the pattern of service, of course, but I feel that it would be wrong to follow, as I said, the simply bankrupt policy of adding more beds in the big institutions.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if I might, as a matter of interest, ask the minister, in connection with the Williston report, has the tenor of his mail from those people involved in such tragic circumstances been in favour of what he categorizes as a bankrupt policy in the past?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The mail has not been great. From those who are interested in mental health—the mental health associations, the association for the retarded, some of the hospitals, some of the people in the health field—the response to the Williston report has been unquestionably in support. But in the last couple of months I can say that I probably had half a dozen letters from the mother of a child, which is really a misunderstanding of the overall policy that Williston puts forward. In other words, she feels that report and my own support of that report are keeping her child in her home under conditions that are destroying her health or destroying the family.

Those cases exist, but there haven't been half a dozen, and I think that we can respond to these people; we just do not respond to them in the same way.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I might say to the minister that we have some cases where the child is unmanageable and the doctors say that he should be in an institution; we also have cases where the mother develops a heart condition and the father is incapable of taking care of the child. It is an unusual situation in some cases, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would hope if the hon. member hasn't written to me, that he would. I know that members of this House, of all parties, do directly intervene in these tragic cases, and I feel relatively free to assist them when I can. It is usually just a question of time. In a really tragic case, instead of there being a two-year waiting period, sometimes we can get it shortened to six months.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 702. We are really on vote 703 in this last bit of discussion. Is there anything else on vote 702?

Mr. Paterson: Well, sir, the hon. member for Kent was speaking on retarded children's hospitals.

Mr. Chairman: That is really vote 703.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 702 carry? Carried.

Vote 702 agreed to.

On vote 703.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, to carry on this train of thought, I am sure many of us were pleased to read, as reported in the paper and attri-

buted to the Minister Without Portfolio, the member for Quinte, (Mr. Potter) a few weeks ago, that he thought motels possibly could be utilized to back up hospitals for chronic care patients. To follow on this same vein, as was suggested by the member for Kent, could not some of the pressure on these hospital schools, such as Cedar Springs, where hundreds are waiting to get in, could not some facilities in the communities, such as motels that possibly are not doing well, or hotels, if they met adequate standards suitable to the department, be used on a temporary basis to relieve some of the pressures from these distraught parents and take some of the pressure off? Do we have the trained personnel available to move into such facilities if we could accept that concept? I think it is worthwhile exploring.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is aware of the concern that the Rotary organizations have for crippled children; I am fairly certain that he likewise knows of the plan they have in the city of Windsor. Is he giving favourable consideration toward their establishment of a crippled children's centre as a community project?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not quite sure where that particular proposal stands, but when I get back to the office I will refresh my mind on it and be back in touch with the member. But I do know that as a matter of policy we do support and have supported the introduction of crippled children's facilities wherever possible. I know that we have given the go-ahead for a new facility in my own area in conjunction with the health sciences centre and the children's hospital. So on the broad policy basis, yes, we are supportive of that kind of proposal but I can't answer categorically with regard to the Windsor plan.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I think the hon. minister has answered the question because a facility similar to what the Rotary is contemplating in all of the larger municipalities is a much-needed facility.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): I would like to return a bit to the point raised, I think, by the Minister Without Portfolio, the member for Quinte, which is related to this item.

What has been proposed by the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells), which is maybe not a part of his department, is very exciting from the point of view of people who perhaps have worked in institutions. I am wearing my other hat at the moment.

I really would like to express some of the feelings of all the people who have worked in hospitals by saying that the move toward the community in terms of care for the mentally retarded, or for in fact acute cases in psychiatric or even medical problems, is something which is to be welcomed and pushed forward as much as possible.

I agree that sometimes individuals find cases—their own children—where they object they can't get them into an institution somewhere or they can't manage. Those cases will occur over and over again. But I think when the government is changing over to this—and that is why I really feel we must almost congratulate the beginning of this sort of approach—problems will occur and will have to be dealt on an individual basis. But on the whole the approach towards the community taking care of our psychiatric and other problems in that community is extremely valuable and to be applauded.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): I am concerned about this problem, too, the mental health programme, and I have made suggestions before in this House. I see there are further additional sums available here, \$31 million, or pretty near \$32 million in round figures, for the mental health programme in the Province of Ontario.

My concern is about what should we do with these youngsters from 14 on up to about 18. I find in particular in my riding in my area in Welland county, a Niagara regional municipality, that there is no place for them in our society today. We just seem to take these youngsters from 14 years of age and cast them aside and say there is no place for them. Yet when I go out through my riding I see a number of schools that are closed down—two, three and four-room schools—which could be used for such a programme in this particular area.

I say to the minister I wish he would get on to providing mental health care for these youngsters in my riding and perhaps throughout the Province of Ontario. But there is a serious problem there. There is a great number of youngsters and there is no place for them.

The other concern that I have, Mr. Chairman, is the matter of dealing with drug abuse patients. This again, I suppose, in the case of persons involved with drugs is a mental problem. It is interesting to note that I had a call from Dr. R. S. Twidle of Stevensville, Ontario, on November 12 concerning two patients. One becomes a little bit alarmed at the method that is applied to having patients admitted to the hospitals here in Ontario, the mental hospitals. So he wrote a letter to the medical director of Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital, Hamilton, Ontario. The subject is drug abuse patients. It reads:

During the past week I have had considerable trouble with a married couple who are both heavily on drugs. For a period of three or four days they have occupied considerable amounts of my time and also that of our local hospital with their problems, but were unable by virtue of this mental state to remain in the hospital of their own volition.

After subsequent consultation with our local psychiatrist, it was decided that the only means of offering help to this tragic couple was to invoke the provisions of The Mental Health Act which allows police officers to apprehend and transport to a psychiatric facility patients with mental disease causing disturbance to the community or to themselves. This was done and the patients were taken after arrest to Dr. J. H. Burns at the emergency hospital, the Welland County General Hospital, and at this point the whole therapeutic effort failed completely because your hospital completely declined to take these patients. As you are no doubt aware it is totally impossible to cope with the drug users in the community hospitals in open psychiatric facilities.

It is extremely disturbing to utilize a portion of the law designed to protect the patient who is incapable of protecting himself—and, incidentally, the public—and find out that this cannot function because of local rules made by part of the medical chain of command. It is equally irritating to find the problems out when one is being severely pressed by a given situation.

It would therefore be of use to the practising physician to know exactly how the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital stands in relation to medical care for this type of a problem and further, what alternative agency you might propose to remove these problems from our hands when they are so demanding and local facilities ill-equipped to meet their needs.

One can only go back to the minister, the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) of this province, and his programme when he said he was going to come out with certain programmes in the Province of Ontario, and particularly in the Toronto area, to implement such a rehabilitation programme, and I find no doubt it is required throughout the province, all of the Province of Ontario. Again I wonder, are you going to have any money allocated to such purposes as combatting drug abuse in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Not within these supplementary estimates, but I am sure there will be an increase in funds for this whole field this year, and I would think for many years ahead.

Without going into it deeply, I would caution the hon. member against what I think is a superficial and too easy approach to some of these problems, namely, to say institutionalize, or, let's build another institution or set up another institutional medium for people in this situation. I think it may be about time that those of us who are concerned within the province took a very hard look at the concept of institutionalization in relation to this kind of problem et al. I think that our salvation is probably to be found in the development of adequate agency work and, more importantly, the development of people in the community, in the area, who are skilled in treatment and therapy. I am much concerned that we get trapped into more bricks and mortar and an institutional approach to these problems.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I applaud the attitude. Would that it existed in some other government departments. We're now allocating \$10 million for capital works for day care, as though day care couldn't be effected in all kinds of more creative facilities where all we required was money to fix them up or to pay for skilled help, rather than the assumption that an institutional daycare centre will somehow provide a more advantageous setting for kids.

If, in fact, in some government departments there is the feeling that institutional settings are essentially destructive of some situations, or not the answer, what is the Minister of Health going to do within this sub-estimate about Cedar Springs, about Orillia, about Smiths Falls? What happens to those institutional monoliths and the kids

who are resident there? What happens to all the ideas advocated so long and hard by the superintendents that cottage units, even for the most difficult situations, be developed and the institutional framework be essentially abandoned? Where is the minister along that road?

Hon. A. B. Lawrence: We are along that road. As I mentioned earlier, our institutional population in the proportionate sense or a net sense, as I recall it, is dropping. The Picton development is a cottage setting that will certainly help a great deal and take a great deal of the load off that part of Ontario.

As I said, my remarks about institutions I think are particularly pertinent to the mental health field. I am not prepared to debate the daycare centres. The argument "too little, too late" I suppose can go on forever. But all signs I think are that we are moving with all deliberate haste in the direction of implementing the policies of Williston; the policies actually—to give credit where it is due—that were really set afoot by the then Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) about nine years ago, that were supported by the then Minister of Education and now Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Davis) and which are, I think it is fair to say, accelerating.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Lewis: May I follow—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: It would certainly have been news to Dr. Franks, the then superintendent of Smiths Falls, had he believed for a moment that the then Minister of Health agreed that the institutions weren't adequate settings, but I will take the minister's word for it. It's a pity the information wasn't conveyed!

Does the minister not see the day when the existing institutional arrangements would go? When he wouldn't have to bring in an estimate with Ontario Hospital schools at a given per diem rate being the features of the system of retardation treatment in Ontario? Because they are still the features. They are still the central focus of the whole arrangement, these major hospital schools. As long as they are there, and as long as there are waiting lists, and as long as members are put under the pressure of forcing an entry by a family which is distraught beyond belief, then we sustain the institutional structure.

It becomes almost self-defeating. We spend all our time frantically building a unit in Picton in the hope that we can pick up some of the excess, but when all is said and done the focus rivets right back to those institutions because they are there. They have thousands of beds. They have a whole auxiliary staff and everything is dependent on their functioning.

It seems to me that until the minister can persuade his department—or maybe that isn't the problem! Maybe the problem is a financial one. I should be rather more fair to Dr. Zarfus than that. Maybe it is a matter of persuading his colleagues that as long as those institutional arrangements are intrinsic to the whole system the department will never be able to break out of the pattern.

Somehow the minister has to break down those monoliths. That is the starting point—not the periphery, but the centre. Other than relaxing the patient load, I don't get the sense that the department is yet ready to deal with abandoning—that's really what it amounts to—the institutional core for mental retardation in Ontario.

That doesn't mean there won't be cottage units. That doesn't mean there won't be therapeutic settings. But not destructive therapeutic settings; not settings which are inherently non-functional as many of these settings tend to be. Maybe this isn't the time. Maybe when the estimates come more fully in 1972 is the time to pursue it, area by area, but I haven't yet heard that, even from this minister as much as he clearly wants to transform the system.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, when we were considering the health estimates last year we had a discussion of the use of the North-eastern Mental Health Centre in my riding.

Through the debate we were able to get a commitment from the minister and his officials that a greater proportion of that hospital would be used and more programmes would be implemented. If some of the money in the operations we are voting today is to pay for the extended use of the hospital and those programmes that were implemented, I would like to congratulate the minister. He certainly followed through and made sure that these kinds of things happen. I hope that he will continue to do that in the upcoming year.

I notice that we are giving extra money to community mental health facilities and I

think this is very important. In northeastern Ontario, when Dr. Phil Melville was the medical director of that mental health facility, he set up a programme whereby there were people in each of the communities who did a lot of preventive work. They met with people, counselled with people and made a serious effort—and I think with some real degree of success—to treat people in their own communities and to keep them from needing to be hospitalized.

I hope that what we are seeing here today—granted it's \$275,000, but still a significant amount—is that the kind of thing that was happening and has been happening in north-eastern Ontario under the regional leadership of Dr. Melville is spreading out in the province. I hope it will continue to escalate so that preventive work can be done and people can be treated in an earlier stage by people in their own community who have some expertise, and keep people out of our Ontario hospitals. Just yesterday I received a copy of a letter from the president of the mental health association in my own community of Timmins, who wrote to the minister requesting that consideration be given to the setting up of a counselling service under the mental health association and that particular hospital, so that a more intensive kind of work could be done in this particular regard.

I hope that he will give favourable consideration to that request. I think this kind of thing is very exciting, it is very valuable, and I hope that the minister supports it and will try to see that it is extended throughout the province. With preventive work people could be headed off earlier in terms of the development of a mental illness so that they don't need to be hospitalized. I wonder if it is the minister's intention to move more and more in this direction?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I reply at this point to both the leader of your party and to the hon. member, and that is to state quite firmly that the centrifugal policy, if you want to describe it as that, is clearly the policy that I support and my department supports. Figuratively speaking, I have said in public a number of times that I would like to take a bulldozer to our large institutions.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear. It is not so figurative.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, there is only one qualification, and that is that as

the members know there are a number, of the retarded in particular, who are so chronically retarded that an institutional setting is fair. Sadly, there are also, and they will be with us for a number of years, those who have been so long in the institution that the medium is their home; their lives are stamped by about 10 or 15 years in that setting. But apart from those two exceptions, I completely support the centrifugal reorganization of our mental health services.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Duksza: The minister talks of deliberate speed in some sense, and the number of pilot projects which have been originated by the department all over the place. Actually, the one that was referred to by the member for Cochrane South is at the moment undergoing somewhat of a contraction and change toward becoming more medically oriented, away from the preventive element.

Perhaps the minister has given notification of it somewhere else, but I am not sure, in fact, what kind of a project this is to which he has given \$275,000. It is called a "community mental health facility." Maybe the minister could enlighten us and tell us something about it that is definite, and the speed at which he is doing it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That relates to two items: \$250,000 for the Royal Ottawa Hospital to reorganize and rebuild—I may say from an architectural point of view—in a cottage-type arrangement. We have seen the primary plans from the architect and we are working on them. It will be an open facility, and if you know the old Ottawa San property, it is physically a beautiful spot. The other part of that is \$25,000 for Luther Wood village.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: I did not make the comment of who lived in Ottawa facetiously, Mr. Chairman. On the eve of the 1959 election, the then Premier of Ontario, while extolling his virtues in the Sudbury area, announced the development of a facility for mentally retarded to be constructed in the Sudbury area. I am not talking about the mausoleum-type thing that we have at Smiths Falls, but some adequate facility to take care of young people in the Sudbury area and that part of northern Ontario. It is now 1971. Twelve years have gone by and nothing has really

happened. I understand there is a government study now going on that is going to come up with a super-announcement some time in the immediate future. God only knows how long that is going to be, because it is 12 years since Les Frost announced that approval had been given for a facility in the Sudbury area.

I can well recall, Mr. Chairman, speaking last year to the mayors and reeves of that area. One of the men from the Soo was a councillor who got up to support what I have been pushing for years, and he broke down and cried—it is not a very pleasant sight to see a man crying in public—because just the day before he had placed his son in Smiths Falls, which meant there was no access between the family and the child whatsoever. He was simply heart-broken. The people in the area are heart-broken that after 12 years, since June 1959, we are really no further ahead, except for a couple of small local units established by a dedicated group of people for the assistance to the mentally retarded, than we were then. How long, Mr. Chairman, does it go on? And I hope the minister recognizes that despite the big blue machine's electing members all over this province, his party didn't elect anyone in the Sudbury area.

Mr. MacDonald: Another 12 years would seem likely.

Mr. Martel: That is part of the reason—the promises that have been made to that region and never fulfilled, and the mentally retarded still go on without services. How much longer, Mr. Chairman, until we get some type of facility—whether it is a cottage setting or so on—for the retarded in that area?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 703?

Mr. Martel: Well, maybe the minister wants to reply.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister wish to reply to the general question?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, I can't say how long in months or weeks or years. All I can say, most emphatically, is that this distribution of facilities, this outward movement of our services for the mentally retarded, is number one. There is no question of it—we are doing things about it. I would underline that fact.

The member mentioned 1959 and I remember, when I was elected in 1963, going to Smiths Falls; even then—and that was only

about nine years ago—Smiths Falls was still run on the basis that a child in Sudbury was better off in Smiths Falls with the line between that child and the family cut for life than he or she would be in a community or family setting. It is incredible to believe that only eight to nine years ago that was the philosophy, not only of government but also of us, the people in the province. That has changed.

As I say, the ice is going out; it is really only a question now of how much financial support we can throw behind it. But I would say that in not more than a few years—and this is not sort of an election promise—I believe it will be not more than two, three or four years before every area in this province, Sudbury included, will have regional, community, district supportive services.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 703 carried?

Vote 703 agreed to.

On vote 704 health.

Mr. Chairman: Services insurance programme amount of \$20 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The \$20 million is apparently due to the increased volume of claims associated with OHSIP. I believe that the matter, having been raised by the minister some months ago—last April, I believe, when he first became Minister of Health or at least took on this responsibility—left the impression with most of us here in the Legislature that there had been inadequate surveillance of the utilization by citizens of the province; but perhaps much more important, of the billing practices and professional practices of the medical profession.

Now to underestimate the requirement to pay doctors' fees in the fund by \$20 million, in my view, is a serious underestimation. It becomes more serious when we reflect on the minister's words, and perhaps more than that his attitude in the House and in the community, which was deeply critical of the doctors. We watched carefully as he, I believe, was forced then to go about Ontario speaking to groups of doctors to reassure them of his and the government's confidence in their professional conduct. I am not here to talk about that strange period of time, but we are here to be concerned with the \$20 million extra to be voted by the Legislature to pay for doctor's services through the OHSIP programme.

First, can he justify why the serious underestimation? Is he now confident that any unprofessional practices or even dishonest

practices on the part of anyone billing the fund have been corrected and that he now has means whereby he can control the leakage of these hundreds of millions—well, hundreds of thousands, many millions of dollars—from public funds?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It wasn't that I purported to leave the impression last summer that there was inadequate surveillance; there was clearly inadequate surveillance because there was an absence of it. There was no question of being superficial in the approach to that. I think that the amendments that were put through in the last session were very important, but essentially they are long run. The psychology of having adequate review, and the impact of our review procedures will not be felt within a month and probably will not have full impact until several years have passed.

I do take the increase in claims most seriously. The utilization figure is very worrisome, running it looks to me, extrapolating it on a full-year basis, to probably a six per cent jump; whereas the medical profession itself, our own department, and all the best advice we could get, as members recall, felt that utilization could be expected to increase about two per cent this year, and that the two per cent was the kind of figure that one would find in other jurisdictions with a total Medicare scheme. So I am in the midst of trying to assess where the impact came from to see our utilization increase this much.

It is difficult because there are two parts. Part of this figure, of course, can't be laid—the problem laid—at the doorstep of the physicians, because another part—and it may be the most important—has to be laid at the feet of the public themselves. Public utilization is increasing. All I can do is to say at this point that we will have to, all of us in government and out, tackle sooner or later the question of public utilization. But, beyond that, I want to meet with the Ontario Medical Association and others within the next few weeks to find out the answer, that I don't have, as to why their two per cent figure, which was a studied and should have been an expertly assessed figure, could triple. I just don't know; I know on some things, on some procedures and items, there has been a drop, but I do know on other items these are increases which are totally inexplicable to me.

Here we get into this question of criticizing the profession, for which members have chastized me half a dozen times.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that the tonsillectomy figure?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think they have gone down.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister without Portfolio): Don't mention that again.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: But consultations have leaped forward.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just one other question in this connection: Is there any indication now what percentage of the doctors intend to bill the fund directly, as opposed to those who are going to persist in billing the patients; that is along the lines of the amendment that was passed by the Legislature which set, I believe, November as the time when doctors would make their decisions?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we'll have a figure that will be worth relying on until about the end of January. I am told the claims will not be that far through the pipeline until about the end of January.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Duksza: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the minister means by six per cent. I am not a very good mathematician but I did a fast calculation between the estimates for 1970-1971 and those for 1971-1972 and added \$20 million to it. I get something like a 14 per cent increase in it. That is probably a considerable increase in terms of health costs.

I know that when an insurance Act comes in, such as when it came in in the United States, there is a gigantic increase in health costs because people who have needed service for a long time in fact rush in to have it done. We have had OHSIP here for some time now so this backlog part is now finished. But the costs are still escalating; they are escalating for what you pay to physicians and related groups in terms of OHSIP by 14 per cent. That is an incredible sum and I think we have to look very carefully and seriously again at what I mentioned, I think yesterday, that it possibly is related to the way we pay for the services and not related to the actual need. It is so very typical that if you pay a fee for service, people tend to do less than they need to, they tend to treat the acute one and forget the other ones—just the essential aspects of total health care.

Mr. Chairman: On that same item?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, on this item, I would like to know what evidence the minister has for increased utilization and why it should occur now when the plan has been in effect for some considerable time?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We don't know.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Really, Mr. Chairman, what I meant by my earlier answer is that I don't know, today as I stand here, and my staff doesn't know, but you can be sure that we accept the responsibility of finding out. There is no way we can have a system escalating, insofar as utilization is concerned, at six per cent, or in overall costs, as the former Treasurer might recall, our health escalation was 14 per cent last year and 13 per cent the year before. I may say quickly in parenthesis that I was shocked to find when I was in Sweden that the minister of health there in a very blase sort of way said, well he expected their costs in health care to leap 15 per cent next year and 15 per cent the year after.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You might as well expect it too.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: But he said I should take the message back to the Treasurer of Ontario that they are doing everything they can to keep it down.

Mr. Lewis: That is socialism for you. Always a little ahead.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder in this appropriation of \$20 million if there has been an increase in the amount necessitated by the inclusion of the chiropractors? Were the estimates of your department from the projected costs reasonably well maintained? Or do you have an indication whether people are utilizing this part of the medical profession to a greater extent than had been anticipated?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not able to answer that question accurately. I think utilization increases have been general, but the impact has been in relation to the services, of course, that matter most, which are proportionately those of physicians. I will find the answer and let you know.

I would expect in the next session, and certainly in the next estimates, this House will want, as the Leader of the Opposition raised yesterday, not only a definitive analysis of what is happening in our Medicare

costs, but also the kind of figures that he needs and we all need to take Medicare apart and look at it. I would certainly think this is an exercise for next winter or next spring.

Mr. Paterson: At the same time you are giving instructions to your staff to set this up could they look at the amount of free coverage granted to people under the provisions that have been available under health care? Is this part of this \$20 million—the free premium assistance? Is this included in that?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Oh no, that is the last item.

Mr. Paterson: It is in the last item?

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things I wish to comment on. I notice there is some payment to the health resources development programme. We had quite a long discussion last year about places for Ontario young people in our medical schools and the minister suggested that part of the problem was hospitals to provide clinical facilities for interns in the hospitals. I know there are young people who wanted to go to medical school this year and were well qualified and yet could not find a place. I am interested to know if that problem is being tackled further.

There is also the question of inclusion of this group of masseurs under OHSIP. We debated it last year. All the patients sent to this particular healing profession must be sent by a doctor. There is a small number and I am still receiving representations as to whether they are going to be included soon. I wonder if the minister has anything to say about that.

We in this party are still as concerned as ever about having the cost of prescription drugs covered under our OHSIP plan. We haven't lost any of our enthusiasm or our conviction that this should be done. We feel people can get the best diagnostic service possible and can get hospital treatment through their insurance. Yet if they need continuing therapy on drugs they must pay for it out of their own pocket. If they are extremely needy they can get some of this through the welfare department. I hope that this is—well, this is our position.

The final thing is that during the election we didn't receive a promise but we received a commitment that this government is going to move into the field of dental care for children starting at a particular age—perhaps five or six—and including another age each

year on. Now I wonder if the minister might be in a position to tell us when that commitment is going to be honoured. Will it be honoured on the first of the New Year?

Mr. Martel: In 1975.

Mr. Ferrier: Or do we have to wait until the new estimates come in some time after March 31, 1972?

Mr. Martel: In 1975.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The old phrase, "man proposes and God disposes" applies to a minister in a department. I can propose, but of course it requires the whole government to dispose!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): How did God get into this?

Mr. Lewis: We know you won 78 seats, but elevation ends at that point!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The commitment here relates to a clear statement of our priorities. As Minister of Health there is no question that dental care for children is a top priority and that an expansion of our programme to provide drugs for people who are really burdened by the cost of them is, again, a very high priority.

Wouldn't it be nice also to broaden the number of professions that come in under Medicare.

Mr. Ferrier: We agree with you.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: But as Minister of Health I am not going to purport to assess when we can afford it. Certainly insofar as drugs are concerned, the figures that are available to me suggest that we are not going to be able to afford to do anything in the way of a wholesale drug plan this year or probably next. I wouldn't know when we could afford it.

Dental care, if we want to sneak up on it and deal with a small population of children at a particularly restricted level, would be not very expensive. We might well start on that **very soon.**

You mentioned masseurs for instance. I think the main trick until we get control, or at least understanding, of more of our costs in this field, is to be very strict in allowing any more people within the four corners of Medicare. Certainly, as one of your colleagues mentioned the other day, would we indeed allow them in on a fee-for-service basis?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman!

Mr. Chairman: Is that on vote 704?

Mr. Martel: Yes, 704.

Mr. Chairman: This is a study of the supplementary estimates. We will not get into too many general questions or we will never get finished.

Mr. Martel: I will be right on.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you can call the members to order if we are out of line.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. We ask for a little co-operation.

Mr. Martel: One brief comment, Mr. Minister, if I could possibly give it, to enlighten the House. On the billing process; I have had occasion in the past three months to get involved with three different doctors' bills where there was overbilling, or where at least the patient felt he was overbilled.

Should there not be a system whereby when the cheque is being paid to the doctor for the services rendered a copy for the services be sent to the patient—as London Life used to do—and then the patient would know if he was being overbilled or billed for visits that he didn't make. I think it is probably the safest way of ensuring that there is no overbilling. I raised this matter last year, and I am not sure if it was you or your predecessor who indicated that the cost for mailing, or for the computers, would be too high.

You know, with all the nonsense mail we manage to get from various government agencies, if a little less of that was sent out we might have the cash or the wherewithal to submit to the patient, on maybe a six months basis, the copies of the bills which were paid on his behalf and the amounts. And it might just serve as a deterrent for not all the doctors, simply just a few who make it rather unpleasant for the rest of the medical profession.

Vote 704 agreed to.

On vote 706.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 706, Ontario Hospital Services programme in the amount of \$10 million. Shall this carry? The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I want to question, first, the additional \$10 million; and then I want to turn to three brief topics—

Mr. Bullbrook: Are you the health critic over there?

Mr. Martel: No, no. We have problems in our area.

Mr. Bullbrook: I just want to know, that is all.

Mr. Ferrier: Our people are well versed in a number of subjects.

Mr. Lawlor: We can speak on practically anything at any time.

Mr. Martel: I can well recall the Leader of the Opposition being a problem when he announced that United Steel wouldn't support the New Democratic candidate in Sudbury last time around—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 706.

Mr. Martel: —and I don't see a member for Sudbury from the Liberal Party any more.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: They saw that on television.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I said to vote for a candidate of their choice. I guess they did.

Mr. Martel: Well, no you didn't; no you didn't!

Mr. Chairman, if I might get back to the topic. The boards in the Sudbury district, as the Minister of Health knows, do not by their own constitutions allow very great representation from the populace in the area. For example, the city of Sudbury has contributed something in the neighbourhood of \$4.5 million toward the new hospital, but the council does not have a representative on the hospital board, despite the fact they have made pleas to have someone there. They maintain that their constitution doesn't allow it.

As the minister knows, the unions in the area have asked for representation and have not received any. I was at the meeting where the minister was asked to have some of these constitutions looked at to determine if there is a way of getting a greater representation from the area than just a few annointed people.

The second point I want to raise, Mr. Minister, is that at present the hospital situation in Sudbury is critical. It is not going to get any better with the completion of the new hospital. We are ultimately still going to have roughly the same number of beds.

The figures which were presented to your department in 1967 indicated a need at that time for a \$30 million expansion programme. The Ontario hospital commission has cut that to \$21 million, over a million of which has already been used for architect's fees, I am told.

The population has probably expanded by 15 or 16 per cent, and your staff has cut the need by \$9 million. For example, at the present time there are three orthopaedic surgeons with six beds at their command; in an area of high incidence of injury to back and so on because of the nature of the work, this is ridiculous. The doctors are being forced to send patients to Toronto for surgery; and of course the patients can't see their immediate relatives, they are here convalescing. And meanwhile nothing happens to really relieve the need. We will not even have the new hospital until 1974.

I've petitioned the minister on a dozen occasions to bring in at least some temporary relief. That has not occurred.

Mr. Chairman, with orthopaedic surgeons having six beds at their disposal, with the eye, ear, nose and throat specialists having a backlog of more than 100 people needing operations, with the heart specialists having a backlog of 45 patients, how much longer can the minister resist the pressure to put in temporary facilities at least for the convalescent? I just don't think it can go on any longer.

In fact, I was disturbed—that is why I called the minister some three weeks ago—when I learned that one avenue was open to us, and his department had held up approval for well over a year for an additional service in the Foley nursing home.

Mr. Chairman, it just can't go on. We have been at it now eight months and I think it is time we had some positive steps. Perhaps some of that \$10 million is to relieve the immediate situation while we resolve the long-term solution?

Not there? That is disappointing as usual; but it is certainly anticipated that possibly early in 1972 then, the minister will have some moneys allocated to relieve the short-term problem, which will run approximately 2½ years.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 706 carried?

Vote 706 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Health.

We will now study the supplementary estimates of The Department of Correctional Services.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might make a few introductory remarks to the members on the various items that are included in the supplementary estimates of The Department of Correctional Services. All of these are part of the government's overall winter works projects and consist of general maintenance projects, including the general repairs and renovations of our institutions throughout the province, many of which have been needed but haven't been undertaken because of the fact we didn't have the funds in our normal estimates. We are pleased to have some of these funds allocated to us so that we can get on with these needed repairs and renovations.

In vote 301, the \$24,500 for administrative and financial services are for some temporary help such as draftsmen and engineers to prepare the drawings and specifications for some of the projects. Vote 302, item 2, consists of the maintenance projects and renovations of our adults institutions; and vote 303, items 1 and 2, consists of the same thing for our juvenile institutions.

All told, there are 43 areas involved throughout the province and the work is pretty well spread throughout the whole Province of Ontario. We expect to employ approximately 350 people continuously through the winter works programme and that could go up to perhaps 500 to 550 at certain times during the winter.

With this brief explanation, I would be happy to answer, perhaps more fully, any questions hon. members might like to ask me in connection with the supplementary estimates.

On vote 301.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 301. The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to elaborate a little bit more on the statement that he is going to hire 350 more personnel. Is he going to take them from within the institutions themselves or is he going to go out on the street and hire somebody from there, through Canada Manpower.

Hon. Mr. Apps: These are people we expect to hire in various communities, but they are not employed by the institutions at the

present time; they will be an additional work force we expect to get from the various communities throughout the province.

Mr. Haggerty: Has the minister given any consideration to hiring some of those so-called rehabilitated persons who are going out on to the community to look for jobs? They can't obtain jobs and in a matter of two or three months they are charged for something and back into the institution? What type of a programme was the minister got to stop this?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I imagine that if these people are in the areas concerned and if they are out of work, they will have the same opportunity as anyone else who is unemployed to take advantage of the jobs that are being created. But we haven't any specific instructions to hire those people, because in many cases we don't even know where they are. We will get many, I would think, through Manpower services, and they may be able to refer them for any jobs that may be made available.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I am thinking about a particular instance in the city of Port Colborne of a youngster who had served his term in Brampton and went back home to the community and went looking for a job and he couldn't find one. I had a call, and I said why don't you try welfare? He went down to the welfare administrator in the county of Welland, or the region, and they said, "Well, we can't give you welfare because there are jobs available." Anybody knows that jobs are very scarce today.

Well then, I sent him back again and I said, "Well, why not hire him for this works programme along the highways that The Department of Social and Family Services is in charge of?" He was turned down for that. So what are these youngsters to do? Go out and get into mischief again and become involved in some charge of break and entry and end up back in the reform institutions? Or are you going to start hiring some of these persons and give them a chance in society?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I imagine if some of the work is being done in such a community and there is someone of that nature there, we will be glad to give him a job; but I cannot promise you specifically that some particular person is going to get a job.

I think we all realize that jobs are difficult to get. This is only a small portion of the overall winter works programme that is being developed by the government. It will

be made available in those areas, 43 of them throughout the province, where we are going to do this particular work. I would hope that if there are certain people such as you mention available for work, that they would certainly be given the opportunity to participate in these particular projects.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit confused about the spending estimates—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): You always are. That is nothing new.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): That is nothing new.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, looking across at some of you fellows back there is enough to confuse anybody.

Mr. Lawlor: You are the cause of it.

Mr. Ferrier: We have these items listed under—

Mr. MacDonald: He at least knows he is confused.

Mr. Ferrier: —rehabilitation of adults, adult offenders programme and rehabilitation of juveniles programme; and to me that kind of thing involves working with people who are in the institutions and doing something to help them to come back and try a different way of life. Now you are suggesting, I think, hiring of outside people to do building and this kind of thing, and if this is the case, I want to ask you this question—through the chairman, Mr. Minister—why isn't this under Public Works rather than in Correctional Services?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Anything that is very large would be under Public Works, and anything of a capital nature would of course be under Public Works. There are many smaller jobs that need to be done. A lot of the jails and the correctional institutions—particularly the jails, which as you know we took over in 1968—were pretty outdated, dilapidated. We have been trying to fix them up, and make them a little easier to be in if you have to be there. We haven't had the money before for a lot of these projects and this does give us an opportunity to renovate these institutions and fix them up a little bit better than they were before. I think that this is a very welcome thing as far as we are concerned, because we are able to make these places better and we are able to

provide jobs within the community while we are doing it.

Mr. Ferrier: Are you going to use any of the inmates in the institutions to help with some of the carpentry and this kind of thing, or are they going to be completely excluded?

Hon. Mr. Apps: This is over and above those projects. We are doing a continuous programme of renovations within the institutions, in which many of the people who are there take part, such as painting, cleaning and so forth. This is over and above that, projects in which we are trying to provide work for people who are unemployed in the communities. It is part of the general overall winter works programme to provide jobs for people in various areas throughout the province.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the opinions of the minister on the last report of this department—the statement of purpose report. The one thing that is of concern to me, Mr. Minister, is the fact that in the course of, I think the last four years, you have been suggesting—and I think that you have introduced—shift or rotating programmes for employees of the department. It has come to my attention in the last few months that this is not entirely accepted by the staff. In fact, I think it is fair to say that in the Guelph institution there are about 98 per cent of the staff who are satisfied with the present programme. I think that as you study that programme put out in the minister's last bulletin, or at least his last estimates, that he indicated it was important that the staff work with the inmates who are in there to try to consult with them and advise any time they have problems. I think it has worked very successfully.

I would ask the minister to give consideration, before he implements this, to taking another look at it, because as I understand it when he introduces this rotating shift, he is going to bring about the fact that some of the staff will be meeting with these inmates maybe only once a month rather than on a steady basis. I would like him to look at this and talk it over with the staff of his department on University Avenue to see if this is really in their best interests, because I think there has been enough information given now that it is not for the betterment of the people who are there as inmates.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): And the staff as well!

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to go into that very fully for the member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am still not certain in my own mind that I am clear as to what the minister is saying about the expenditures of moneys, which in one instance are \$35 million. The description here is care, treatment and training of adult offenders. When the minister talks about winter works programmes and providing of moneys for 450—and it may get up to 550 people—he is not, surely, speaking in reference to anything within that kind of programme with that kind of a name. Am I correct?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, this happens to be the vote under which that particular money is allocated. In other words, when we spend money on the general repair and renovations of our various jails and institutions, it comes under that particular vote. Granted—

Mr. MacDonald: And the minister calls it care, treatment and training?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Pardon?

Mr. MacDonald: The minister calls it care, treatment and training?

Hon. Mr. Apps: That is what it is called here, but it includes this type of expenditure. Obviously in the general estimates it also includes care and treatment of the offenders that we have.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Apps: But this is included within that particular vote.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. I think I see the picture, and what I would like to ask the minister is how much of this total of—let's take vote 302—\$35 million and change, how much is for winter works programme and how much of it is for what one would normally consider to be care, treatment and training of adult offenders?

Hon. Mr. Apps: It's all for winter works programme.

Mr. MacDonald: It's all for winter works programme?

Hon. Mr. Apps: It's all for winter works programme, yes. It's \$1,064,000.

Mr. Chairman: The supplementary estimate is \$1 million on vote 302, not \$35 million. On vote 301—

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, can I have that clarified with the minister? He said there is some \$1.6 million on winter works.

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, Mr. Chairman; on vote 302, item 2, there is \$1,064,000.

Mr. Worton: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Apps: The winter works programme in connection with our adult institutions includes jails, correctional centres and adult training centres.

Mr. Worton: Is this going to be spent on materials and the use of the inmates in these institutions, or is this strictly for outside contractors who are going to develop new buildings and repairs, and so forth?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, this will be broken down in the payments for labour and those materials that we need in order to do the jobs that we are planning to do.

Mr. Worton: But it would be outside labour that would be doing the work?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, it will be outside labour that will be doing it.

Vote 301 agreed to.

On vote 302.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 302. The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: There are two points I want to make, Mr. Chairman. One has to do with the way in which this money is allocated to various centres throughout Ontario. Just fairly recently the government brought into being the Napanee Detention Centre and it has got an ongoing programme which I would have hoped to say the least would be accelerated by way of a winter works programme because of the overwhelming need for jails to replace those which were closed up in that first venture.

You have a schedule of projects. I think, as I remember, the fifth project was St. Catharines; the sixth is Hamilton; the seventh is Toronto. Surely in Toronto, if you inspected the facilities you have at the Don jail—the detention conditions in Toronto at the present time are simply appalling. Anything that can be done to alleviate that by acceleration of funds and acceleration of a building pro-

gramme on a scale somewhat larger I admit than you are proposing here, would be, I suggest, highly beneficial.

When you are allocating this \$1 million at the present time in renovations of the existing medieval hovels such as you presently run, have you got it allocated in such a way that the money is being spent maximally in those areas where the detention centres come latterly rather than early. Is it all worked out according to a pattern of that kind, in the way of saving money at the same time?

There is no point in making extensive renovations to jail facilities which will be abandoned within, I trust, the foreseeable future. That is number one.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, has to do with complaints that have reached my ears, largely proceeding from the Mimico reform institution. Some guards tell me that you could provide extensive employment opportunities within your guard structure and the hiring of people to act as guards, if you changed your present programme completely. So far as the guards I've heard from are concerned the present methods in use are completely unpalatable to them.

It has happened that in the last two years—or maybe in lesser time than that, in 12 months—you have brought in a continental system of the work week. Men who have been content for many years to work, say through an evening shift or through a night shift or through an afternoon shift, are coercively required to work different shifts to suit the revolving way in which you have set it up. Their lives and their families' lives in other words are dislocated.

Other men, not wishing to work a particular shift—and there are many of them, having grown accustomed to the single one—book off and the other guard is expected to come on and serve time, double time, time and a half, with the added load on the Treasury involved in their doing that. I suggest to the minister that this is extremely extensive, causing a lack and a deterioration in morale within the guards themselves. So much so that you have had extensive resignations submitted, placed on your desk or the desk of whoever is responsible for this within your department.

You have a decreasing number of people prepared to serve as guards because of your employment policy. Instead of hiring new and vital young men anxious to do work in this particular area, which would spread the

work load around, and seek accommodation within your existing staff as guards—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I fail to see the connection between your topic of discussion, even though it is the—

Mr. Lawlor: You have grown extremely obtuse over the summer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 302.

Mr. Lawlor: You could always see the relevance of my remarks previously. On this particular occasion—

Mr. Chairman: No, we are talking about the renovations that are going on during the winter months.

Mr. Lawlor: We are spending great sums of money, some of which will go down the drain in the particular way that I am mentioning. I am suggesting to the minister, in full generosity, since I'm not the government, a way in which to increase employment without costing an extra dime and at the same time save money.

I am sure the minister is totally delighted to hear these recommendations and remarks and will take the matter up advisedly. In any case, I have said basically what I want to say under this head. I hope the minister takes it to heart and that his whole programme will be thereby given a greater degree of meaning than it has now.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the building of the detention centres such as Napanee, as the member knows the Napanee one was opened last year. We expect to open the Carleton Regional Detention Centre in Ottawa, this spring. The one in the Niagara Peninsula is well under way and we expect to have the one in the London area under way fairly shortly. Now there are three others with top priority—Hamilton, Toronto and the Milton-Brampton area, all of which are very badly needed. The member can rest assured that as fast as we can get the necessary approval to spend the money for these centres, these also will go ahead. At the same time there are many other jails throughout the province that are also in poor shape, and through our winter works programme we are endeavouring to raise the standard of that accommodation to a higher level than it is at the present time. That is why we welcome this opportunity to have this money to do that, and at the same time provide jobs while we are doing it.

The shift work is the same thing that was brought up by the hon. member for Wellington South. I will endeavour to go into that very thoroughly and to report back to him and, at the same time, to the hon. member for Lakeshore in that connection.

Let me assure the member that the money we have here will be well spent in trying to update the facilities that badly need updating in the various jails and institutions throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): One comment, Mr. Chairman, is in relation to what I note here is a rehabilitation programme. I think as long as we have—and this has been mentioned before—the archaic and deplorable conditions of the Carleton county jail as well as jails in many areas—and the minister has mentioned a number of areas now—we continue to have the same policy of having these people sort of all thrown in together. It doesn't really matter if a person is in for breaking and entering, for armed robbery or for anything else; they are all thrown in together and wait months in these jails for a trial. It is very difficult for us to have a proper rehabilitation programme later on in other institutions if these people are in these conditions in the jail.

The question I would like to ask is that when the minister mentions the fact that there will be construction of a new Carleton county jail in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, has he possibly considered accelerating the date of the construction of this institution as a winter works programme; in other words, bringing it forward rather than waiting for the spring when the peak unemployment is starting to go down?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, this really has no connection with our winter works programme. We have been endeavouring to impress upon The Department of Public Works the importance of getting this particular detention centre finished as quickly as possible. We expect to have it available some time in May, and when that is finished the member won't have to worry about the old dilapidated conditions of the Ottawa jail, which I think anybody who has visited will certainly realize is one that certainly should be replaced.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 302.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, somewhere in his planning the minister mentioned a new jail for Toronto. We have been hearing that for 20, 30, 40 years. I was glad to hear the minister at least mention it. Could he give us any idea as to the possible date—1980, 1990?

Mr. MacDonald: You mean it centres on how many dollars might be spent.

Mr. Singer: And how many dollars might be spent if the misers in the Treasury Board will ever give him some money?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister Without Portfolio): What has this got to do with winter works?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give any definite indication of when that will be built. As I indicated, it is one of the three top priorities.

Mr. Singer: That is good!

Hon. Mr. Apps: Each one of those institutions is in need of replacement.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 302. The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. MacDonald: Now that Kingston's needs have been met.

Mr. Lewis: I would think that Brampton's needs would be met quickly.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, this point could be cleared up very quickly. The question of replacing some of the dilapidated jails in the province is of interest to groups in every centre. The minister might be aware that the professional social workers of the Hamilton area are going to demonstrate, in a sense, by singing Christmas carols regularly outside the Barton Street jail until the minister makes up his mind when it takes its place on the priority list. Can the minister give us a quick run-down of how the different areas sit in priority to get the buildings replaced?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I know of the intended Christmas carol singing in front of the Barton Street jail. I don't think it is going to influence the decision as to when the Barton Street jail is going to be replaced, but I am sure it certainly will be a good thing to have the carol singing—

Mr. Singer: The minister is in favour of carol singing—that is good, that is appropriate.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Too bad the member isn't.

Hon. Mr. Apps:—for the people there who will hear it. As I say, I can't give the member for Hamilton East a definite answer.

As to when that will be built any more than I can give to the hon. member for Downsview a definite answer as to when the Toronto jail will be built. The only thing I can reiterate is that that is one of the three in the next priority list.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 302.

Mr. Gisborn: I only asked the minister, Mr. Chairman, to give us the priority positions of the various communities. You see, we do get confused on this side of the House when we listen to make-work programmes from the Treasury of this government and the need to stimulate our economy, the need to get people back to work, and we have a definite backlog on a very important need for new facilities in this regard and we cannot even be told when you are going to start. Something is wrong. The brains trust there had better to go back Muskoka Sands and have another session on the public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, again this has nothing to do with the estimates, but in order to clarify this, our programme is to plan one and build one each year. Now we are on schedule to plan a regional detention centre and build a regional detention centre each year.

Mr. Lewis: One regional detention centre a year.

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well I think that is not too bad.

Mr. Gisborn: How many are needed?

Hon. Mr. Apps: There are three that I think are needed more than any others. There are a lot of jails throughout the province that need to be upgraded. Whether they will be rebuilt or fixed up more than they are now is still a question that has to be decided.

Mr. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): How many?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Actually there are about 41 jails throughout the province and one regional detention centre at the present time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 302, winter works programme?

Mr. Lawlor: What else?

Mr. Singer: Whatever happened to London's priority?

Mr. Lawlor: I have my own winter works programme. I am working right now and—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

In exploration of this, I took it what you said previously is that the money would largely be expanded upon those jails which were not designated for regional detention centres in the future, to bring them up to some kind of par.

Now I would like to explore in those particular areas just for a moment if we could, just who is going to be employed and what impact that is going to have on those various communities. In other words, if you are going to change the plumbing facilities it may very well be that in the area in which you are involved the plumbers are pretty fairly engaged, or the electricians. Just how do you get to the unemployed, to the labourers and to others in order to make an impact upon the scene? How do you plan that?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, a great many of the areas in which we are planning these renovations are smaller areas throughout the province where normally in the winter time the building trades are very slack and the ordinary labourers haven't jobs. This is the direction in which we are trying to orient these particular projects, so that we can employ a great number of those people who are normally unemployed. Now there may be a few who might be able to get other jobs, or would have other jobs, but I think for the most part you will find that these will be people who have no employment during the wintertime.

Vote 302 agreed to.

On vote 303:

Mr. Chairman: On vote 303? Carried.

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Chairman, vote 303 is not carried.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. Lewis: What is the nature of the use of these funds in the juvenile institutions?

Hon. Mr. Apps: On the first vote of the 303 section, \$95,000, general administration; these are grants to the private training schools of St. John's and St. Joseph's in Uxbridge and Alfred to make renovations within their particular facilities. The other funds of \$251,500 are for the same thing for the various training schools.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister indicate the nature of these renovations? Are they simply decorative or structural?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I think they are both. There will be some structural changes, renovations. Some will take the form, I would think, of painting; some will update plumbing facilities and electrical facilities that need to be done but have not been done up to the present time.

Mr. Lewis: Have you thought of using any of the money for the purpose of demolition, for the purpose of doing away with the isolation or solitary detention cells for kids between the ages of 12 and 16?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, not in this particular vote. We have plans that may do something very similar to what the hon. member is saying at the present time, and those plans will be developed in due course. I am sure the leader of the NDP will be very pleased with them. I am not at liberty to divulge them at the present time, other than to say that we are planning in this connection not necessarily to do away with the training schools that we now have, but to augment them with other facilities.

Vote 303 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Correctional Services. We will now consider supplementary estimates of The Department of the Environment, in the amount of \$900,000. Does the minister have an explanation of the expenditure?

On vote 502.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Chairman, this programme is labour intensive to provide jobs for people who are otherwise unemployed during the winter. It fits into this particular vote 502 under the programme and it involves transfer payments to the various authorities that wish to take part in the programme. In other words, it is 100 per cent funded by the province.

As I say, it is labour intensive. It is similar in some degree to the SWEEP programmes that were conducted both by The Department of Lands and Forests and my department during the past summer, although this, of course, is not student oriented; it is for people who, I say, require employment and are not otherwise able to obtain a job.

We have had a good response from the authorities. As a matter of fact, nearly 80 per cent of the money has been requested. Of course, it is subject to the approval of this House, but we have got response from most of the authorities and we have requests for something over \$600,000 already.

We hope that it will employ approximately 385 casual workers for reservoir, channel and flood-plain clearing, and for the maintenance and development of conservation lands. As I say, the workers will be hired and employed by the various authorities which will be reimbursed by 100 per cent grants from the branch.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question in this regard? Is this grant applicable to other areas of the province that aren't covered by conservation authorities? Specifically, in this case, let us say Essex county. If they want to do some channel work or put up gabion walls, or this type of work, can they apply through the minister's branch for any specific undertaking?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No Mr. Chairman, I don't believe they could. As I say, a project would be planned and undertaken by the local authority and I would assume that this would be in their watershed. The member is referring to a particular area that is about to enter an agreement and form an authority.

Mr. Paterson: This is a further incentive as to why this should be done.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We approve; the director and the branch will approve these works. It is quite possible that works that would be outside the watershed, particularly in a certain stream, are so interrelated that it would be of some benefit to the authority that they be undertaken and the work under that circumstance could be approved. I am not ruling it out, but I think in most cases it would be within the watershed.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask one further question? Are there any works being undertaken on the lower Thames where there is a dike erosion problem which I know has been drawn to the minister's attention? Is the

minister aware of any major effort in that particular area?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, the lower Thames Valley has requested approval of projects dealing with dikes. I see an item here of about \$6,000 involving labour and some equipment rental for that particular purpose, so at least part of their request—this is a preliminary request, subject to, as I say, the money being allocated for the particular purpose the hon. member mentioned.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. H. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us at what rate of pay the people will be engaged?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I understand, Mr. Chairman, it is around \$3 an hour.

Mr. Burr: I am just wondering what is the social philosophy behind the whole winter works programme and would just ask the minister about it at this point. I have come across instances in the cutting down of the elm trees by another department whereby a man with a great many children has been employed and he has found that, because of the transportation and the need for winter clothes and winter boots, and the fact that he now has to pay his hospital insurance, his income tax, Canadian Pension, and all the other expenses, he is much behind financially, although he enjoys the opportunity to work.

Is this programme going to be restricted to those who are on Social and Family Services benefits, or are other unemployed people going to be able to participate? The minister may remember that in the elm cutting, which began a month or so ago, the unemployed were not eligible unless they were on welfare and it seemed to be rather hard on those people who were trying to stay off welfare that they were not eligible for this kind of work. Is there any restriction under this programme?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, anybody who is unemployed, and I think possibly registered with Manpower, whether he is on welfare or not, can apply, and assuming there are openings can obtain employment under this programme. The philosophy here is not strictly to take people off welfare; the main purpose is to provide jobs.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question? What amount has been applied for

by the Grand River Conservation Authority and what project is it planning?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might say to the hon. member that the Grand seems to be the most ambitious of all the authorities. It wants about three-quarters of the \$900,000 by the look of it, but it has applied for about \$127,000 so far. These are, as I say, preliminary approvals and they involve mainly flood-plain clearing, channel, and a certain amount of preliminary work dealing with the planned reservoir in the Guelph area on the Speed River.

Mr. Good: Are they into that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: I would like to remind the minister of the problem that exists at the Hamilton beach. We don't have to go into the details of the deterioration that is happening because of septic tanks and holding tanks, and the proposition as to whether we can afford to put the usual sewage disposal systems in. Couldn't an amount of this supplement, engineering and technical services, be applied to the investigation necessary in regard to that particular problem? Has the minister given it any thought since election time when we discussed it very thoroughly?

I am afraid that if the minister doesn't take the initiative, the situation will be left in limbo until it becomes serious enough that a crash programme has to be undertaken. Can the minister say something about using some of this makework, through engineering and technical investigation, to study and decide what is needed in this regard—whether it is absolutely necessary that we have to have sewers there to clean up the mess or whether we are going to leave it sit as it is?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, the main purpose is to provide projects that are mainly labour intensive, in other words most of the \$900,000 that we are discussing today will be in wages. It is required to purchase a certain amount of equipment and materials, but when I say "most," I am talking anywhere between 80 per cent to 100 per cent being for wages. To get a project moving like the one the hon. member mentions for Hamilton beach, which involves installation possibly of sewers—a water system—to get that moving this winter, early enough in the winter to make it a benefit under a programme like this is

doubtful. One would have a contractor, I suppose, with his usual number of men starting a project and with all the designing that is involved there on Hamilton beach, I can see him getting under way possibly, by April or May. I think that is in the vicinity of \$3 million, at least, if I am not mistaken, just for the sewers. So—the \$900,000 would have to be allocated probably for the whole project and, then one would not be too far along.

All I can say about that is the OWRC is still working with the city with the idea that the whole city share in the cost of the beach project, thereby minimizing the rate that will be charged to the people in that area and with the possibility that, if it could be considered as a separate project for the residents of the beach, there may be the possibility of some increase in subsidy or grant. But the philosophy, the idea, behind this project is to get people working as soon as possible.

As I say, the reaction that we have had has been most encouraging. The authorities are grabbing it in a hurry with an opportunity to keep not only their own administrative staff busy but also an opportunity to hire people who are looking for jobs in their particular watersheds.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: The minister doesn't understand what I meant. What we have to do there, first, and what we promised the people to do to clear up the problem, was to do the research and the engineering. I assume that technicians and engineers who do research get paid, and that has to be done first. The confusion was whether it would cost \$3 million, \$6 million or \$10 million; whether it was feasible to put sewers in that particular area. Initiative has to be taken to convince the municipal authorities that something has to be done, vis-a-vis the health department problem of seeing to it that the proper systems are installed.

What I am saying is what has to be done first is an engineering research job to bring about the feasibility of sewers and decide whether it is within the feasibility of paying an amount of money for that distance—so much per mile—engineering research would provide work, and I think there are some engineers and technicians who want some winter work available to do the research to convince the municipality it is feasible to put sewers in and they are necessary, so that when we get to that point we can say: "Here

it is. The money we need will be this." Then we can decide on the sharing.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the minister briefly what portion of the \$900,000 does he anticipate will be spent in northern Ontario and how many jobs might it create?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before, it has to be for the most part within an existing conservation authority watershed. In the hon. member's riding I don't think the entire riding, that I am aware of, is included in a conservation authority, so that normally it wouldn't qualify under this particular programme. It could be, as the hon. member mentioned in respect to Essex county, that in the case of some adjoining area that is interrelated, or affects shall we say, stream flow within the authority, within the watershed within a certain stream, that there is no reason why work outside of that area couldn't be done. But for the most part, the terms of reference, if you want to use that expression, are for work within the authority, within the watershed and those areas of responsibility such as flood-plain land, forest areas, recreational areas and things like that. This is where these people are to be put to work.

Mr. Stokes: On a point of clarification: Why wouldn't the Lakehead Conservation Authority qualify for such assistance when it covers the entire area surrounding the newly founded city of Thunder Bay? All of the criteria that you mention are there at present and should qualify in my opinion. I am just wondering why this has not been taken into consideration?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might say that we have more or less left the planning and the particular projects where these people will be put to work up to the local authorities. We approve the projects. We want to make sure that not only are the greatest number of people hired but they are doing something meaningful and useful. I can see, if the Thunder Bay Conservation Authority applied to us and said: "We would like to do a certain amount of work but it is just outside the watershed, although it is a worthwhile project, a true conservation project," I can see us approving that. I would think your approach could be made to the authority directly, really on that basis.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, a short time ago the minister was explaining the expenditure of this money to the member for Waterloo North, and I noticed that in his remarks he mentioned there was some of this money for preliminary studies in regard to the Guelph dam.

A week ago I received a copy of the correspondence addressed to the Premier and to the minister from the city of Guelph requesting assurance that this dam was going to be proceeded with. They did mention they just wanted it put on record that sufficient lands would be made available for recreational purposes. I know that your officials are giving serious consideration to the amount of land needed and giving it second thoughts. Do we have assurance that this dam will have high priority and will move ahead as quickly as possible?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Money has been set aside in our budget, certainly for the next fiscal year, for land acquisition for the Speed reservoir. Steps are now being undertaken to acquire the necessary land. As the hon. member implies there is some small controversy between the department and the authority about how much land should be acquired. There is a tendency by authorities to acquire a little more land than necessary to establish a structure of this kind. I suppose they want a certain amount of land for recreation and park purposes. We have to be careful, when we are under a new formula to finance dams and reservoirs, that only the land really needed for the structure is acquired, particularly where it is disrupting a number of land-owners who, particularly in this case, don't want to move.

Mr. Worton: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I want to go to the job creation aspects of the supplementary estimates of The Department of the Environment and ask the minister a couple of specific questions which concern me.

I gather from what the minister is saying in the first place that there are requests outstanding now which total more than the amounts he has budgeted for here. This suggests that maybe he got a poor draw when they were going around the cabinet table

deciding who would get how much, considering that one conservation authority has apparently come up with legitimate requests for \$600,000 or \$700,000 worth of work?

I would like to know when will the 385 jobs be available? Will they come in May and June—in April and May, rather—toward the end of the period of peak unemployment? Or will they in fact be concentrated during the January to March months which is when, as we know, the problem is going to be at its greatest?

Secondly, what, if any, lasting benefits can the minister see from most of the projects? Has he looked at the kind of things coming before him?

He has said that he wishes the work be meaningful; I think we would all agree with that. He has also said that one of the criteria applied was that it be as labour-intensive as possible. Unfortunately, if the work is going to be meaningful and have lasting benefits, labour-intensive work such as brush clearing and so on, where all you need is a pair of boots and an axe doesn't have much long-term value. In fact during the years that the winter works programme was conducted federally, they found that you could clear the same patch of brush three, four or five years in a row, and many municipalities did it. Is this in fact what is being put up to the minister, or can the citizens of Ontario go out to conservation authorities next summer, or a year or two hence, and in fact see that this effort to create employment this winter has had some benefits that go beyond putting income into the pockets of a very small number of workers?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I would say first of all, based on the requests for approval that we have had to date,—as I say the actual figure in dollars is \$674,607—so assuming that this item is approved before the hour of 6 o'clock, I think at least 300 people will be hired before the end of this year, and the other 85 immediately after. We will, of course, make a special effort that all these projects totalling the \$900,000 will be approved as soon as we have them.

As far as the work is concerned, it is not strictly a make-work project. Much of this work that will be done immediately is work that is normally done during the spring and summer. It will be a little more awkward to do it, particularly if we have a rough winter in some of the watersheds, but it will be worthwhile work. I am willing to say that in the spring anybody who wanted to view the

results of this particular programme could see some benefits and that the money has been well spent.

I think it is fair for me to say now, Mr. Chairman, that there is not going to be any great substantial increase in my budget for conservation authorities for the next fiscal year. Apparently we are all working within guidelines, so much of this money could be used, as I say, for beneficial projects that would normally be undertaken by the authorities during the spring and summer. It won't require, as the hon. member suggests, the purchase of a lot of different clothing or equipment as far as individual employees are concerned.

Mr. Deans: He said it would not.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, it would not, that is right. I don't think the relevant importance of a job is based on how much equipment you have to buy or the type of clothing you might have to wear. These people will all be living for the most part within the watershed; there is no problem of travelling or any expenses of that kind. So I think we will get full value, really, for the \$900,000.

SWEEP was a roaring success, I think you will all agree to that, and there is no reason why this should not be as well.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the member for Essex South made mention of the fact that there was no conservation authority in Essex county. Am I right in assuming, then, that as a result of not having a conservation authority, Essex county really would not have an opportunity to benefit by this scheme, as mentioned by the minister.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As I said to the previous question along this line, that if the authority—what is the closest one there, the lower Thames?

Mr. B. Newman: The lower Thames!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If the lower Thames authority, for example, said there was a project in the Essex area that was going to be of some benefit to its watershed, and the hon. member used the reconstruction of dikes as an example, I cannot see any reason why the authority might not apply to us for allocation of funds to be used outside the authority. That is assuming that it is of some benefit; it has to be of some benefit, it has

to be interrelated in some way. But as you know, in many of the streams or rivers, particularly from the point of view of channelling and flood-plain work, this is interrelated and could apply outside the boundaries of the authorities.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister mentioned the application has to come through an authority. Not having an authority in the county, then, would bar the county itself from taking advantage of this programme as far as the Grand Marais drain would be concerned and the cleaning up of that, and as far as Turkey Creek would be concerned. An area that has well over 6,000 unemployed and approximately the same number on welfare today certainly should be able to benefit by the programme. There should be some type of exception made so that it doesn't necessarily have to go through an authority but can go through the department itself. There can be some benefits from the programme if it does not have to go through an authority. Maybe, likewise, the minister could use the fact that there is no authority and the county is now losing benefits as a selling point in encouraging the county to get into a conservation authority.

Mr. Chairman: The member of Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that the \$900,000 that The Department of the Environment intends to spend on producing jobs to fight winter unemployment is probably significant in its example of the manner in which this government approaches the whole problem of finding employment for people in the province. Here we have a department, perhaps one of the top three in terms of its ability to find employment. There is probably no other department, perhaps with the exception of The Department of Trade and Development, that has so much available to it in terms of being able to go out into the province and find jobs that have to be done.

Right across this province there are people screaming about the necessity to clean up the environment and here we have The Department of the Environment about to spend something less than one per cent of this year's budget—something less than one per cent of its total budget for this year—on finding employment during this peak unemployment winter period.

It is just absolutely ridiculous. The minister is trying to tell us that this is going to be a meaningful programme when, in the face of

perhaps six or 6½ or maybe even seven per cent unemployment in the Province of Ontario, it is going to produce 385 jobs of 20 weeks duration.

Surely we could have expected more from a department such as this. Surely there are sufficient jobs of the type mentioned by my colleague from Hamilton East and mentioned by my colleague from Ottawa Centre to be done right across this province that could have justified expenditures by this department of \$10 million. And what do we have? Nine-hundred thousand dollars—a pitiful sum. It is a reflection, an accurate reflection, of the cabinet's attitude toward fighting perhaps the greatest single problem we have facing us in the province at this particular time.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: I think it is disgraceful. To come into this House and to even suggest, to even begin to suggest that 385 jobs is of any major importance at this point is ridiculous, when the minister should have been coming into this House and talking about producing 3,000 jobs for this winter works programme.

Mr. Cassidy: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: It is evident by the answer to my colleague from Ottawa Centre that even in the very isolated areas, reflected by the conservation authorities, there is a need for a least three, or perhaps four times the amount of money that the minister has requisitioned. There is no way that this minister and this government can justify stating on the one hand—as they did over the last two or three months—that they are about to embark on a massive winter works programme that will solve the unemployment difficulties of the people of this province, and then coming forward as perhaps the second major labour-intensive motivator in this province and handing us a \$900,000 expenditure.

I think the only thing that goes one step further is the very fact that there is nothing in the supplementary estimates in the area of Trade and Development to provide additional housing. I think that that is the only other thing that is more disgraceful than this \$900,000.

An. hon. member: They shut down the housing—

Mr. Deans: I think the minister should be ashamed to bring it in. I would like to know from the minister, how much did he actually ask for?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We inherited it.

Mr. Deans: How much in actual fact did he ask for in an effort to try and meet the need?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the member talking about? He doesn't even know what he is talking about. We couldn't spend any more money if we had it.

Mr. Lawlor: We'll get around to the Minister of Trade and Development. Just wait and see.

Mr. Deans: Is the minister satisfied with \$900,000 when obviously he is going to have demands of three or four times that amount? Can we expect to receive from him at the beginning of the year, requisitions for additional supplementary estimates in order to meet what will be the obvious needs? And is he prepared to finance the kind of undertakings asked for by my colleague from Hamilton East? Is he prepared to put up the money to do the exploratory work, if necessary, in order to meet the needs of some of the other areas of the environment that are being polluted? Is he prepared to put forward the moneys necessary for engineering in order to bring up the standards of some of the outlying areas of the metropolitan area here and around Hamilton so that we can find out what it will cost and can go ahead with the programmes that will enable us to cut down tremendously on the amounts of pollution that are now generated? This is where the jobs are going to be. There is no question that perhaps for 385 people some sort of saving grace is involved, but the actual truth of the matter is that it is a shameful exhibition on behalf of this government.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Same old sarcasm!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that was a great speech by the hon. member. Most of it is made up of irrelevancies. Certainly the hon. member knows—

Mr. Deans: Not as irrelevant as this estimate!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is completely irrelevant. The hon. member knows this is a supplementary item; it has nothing to do with sewage works or waterworks or engineering or design.

Mr. Lawlor: A pretty pitiful effort!

Mr. Deans: That is the problem. What has the minister done to try to solve the problem?

Mr. Lawlor: That is picayune.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The hon. member for Hamilton East was talking about something that has nothing to do with this item. We are talking about providing jobs in a short period of time on certain labour-intensive projects.

Mr. Deans: It has to do with producing jobs in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The objective of the overall programme, as the hon. member probably knows, is around 42,000 extra jobs next year; the Lands and Forests, supplementary estimates for example, will provide 3,000 jobs. This is only part of an overall programme. It deals with certain jobs within conservation areas, nothing to do with building works. This programme is an ongoing programme.

Mr. Deans: That is exactly the problem. It has nothing to do with the things that are relevant.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are doing things that are relevant. This is to pick up 385 people who are not working in any type of project and who want jobs immediately. The member knows what is involved from a time point of view in designing an engineering project. The submissions were ridiculous. Of course, I know—

Mr. Deans: Is the minister satisfied?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, no. I am never satisfied. I am never satisfied. I always ask the Treasurer for four times what I want, but one has to be responsible and reasonable—

Mr. Deans: You call that being responsible?

Hon. Mr. Kerr:—and certainly we have to make sure that the money is being spent properly. If, for example, I got \$2 million for a project of this kind, it is quite possible—

Mr. Deans: Could you spend it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I doubt it.

Mr. Deans: You doubt it? You don't think you could find 900 jobs?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I really doubt it, not in this type of a programme, no. And in all frankness and fairness not put those 900 people to work in meaningful jobs during the winter within the conservation authority?

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't think so?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I might be able to put 500 to work but I don't think I could spend \$2 million. I would rather have it spent in another way. I think it would be more beneficial. But this programme is to put people to work immediately and it will do that. I don't have anything more to say.

Mr. Lawlor: A total lack of imagination.

Mr. Deans: Shameful.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 502.

Mr. Gisborn: I wonder if the minister could explain to me what is meant by "engineering and technical services" if it does not relate to engineering projects as to feasibility of production. What does he mean by "engineering and technical services" right in his own estimates?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, this is under vote 502, renewable resources management programme, item 3. If members will look at their old budget statement, the estimates book, for example, for the current year, they will see that all types of works undertaken by conservation authorities are under this particular vote. Really, to a certain degree it is a misnomer as far as this particular project is concerned.

Mr. Gisborn: Thanks for telling me at this point.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 502. Carried?

Mr. Lawlor: That is a misnomer all right. That is the word for it.

Vote 502 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of the Environment.

Shall we rise and report? Or start the next department?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves 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 that it has reached certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I would first move the adjournment of the House, but prior to the motion being put I would like to say to the members that tomorrow we will complete the supplementary estimates and will continue with item 11 on today's order paper—Bill 11—because it is completely consistent with the minister's supplementary estimates. Then we will proceed to item 5 and then items 4 and 6—Bills, 2, 1 and 3 respectively. I think members will agree with me that we can be ready for any item that is on the order paper thereafter.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Do we sit tomorrow evening?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, we are considering sitting tomorrow evening.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Would the minister be able to tell us whether we are or not? It would be helpful.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. Deans: We are sitting tomorrow evening? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 15, 1971

Ontario Health Insurance Organization Act, 1971, bill intituled, reported	119
Third readings	123
Supplementary estimates, Agriculture and Food	123
Supplementary estimates, Health	136
Supplementary estimates, Correctional Services	148
Supplementary estimates, Environment	154
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	161



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, December 16, 1971

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1971

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Not much to shoot at!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Well, at least it is not a moving target.

CHANGES IN INDIAN RESIDENTIAL TRAINING FACILITIES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Provincial Secretary: Can he report to the House what role the Indian development branch in his department has played in the decision that the Indian residential training facilities in Brantford and in the north would be turned over to the Indian bands themselves for educational centres? Does the government intend to support financially this programme and does he know whether The Department of Colleges and Universities might have some role to play? I see that minister is here and I might refer it to him as well.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Secretary's department would not be directly involved in a matter of this kind unless it were to be providing some sort of intermediary role of communication. That matter would come directly within the purview, perhaps, of the other department. I shall check into the matter for the hon. member and bring it to the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: The minister, then, tells us that the Indian development branch had no role to play whatsoever in the decision nor in the plans for development?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not to my knowledge. They may have been informed, but they were not involved in any decision-making

process to my knowledge. However, I would like to be able to check into the matter and report my findings.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a similar question of the hon. Minister of Colleges and Universities: In the community colleges, the colleges of applied arts and technology branch, has there been a request for any financial assistance to this programme which would establish at least one Indian cultural centre of the community college type which would be under the jurisdiction of the Indian bands, but would draw students, not only from the Indian community but from the community as a whole?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Not to my knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, if I may add a word. I do recall some communication or seeing some presentation in this regard. Invariably, when these matters come up for discussion they are brought to the attention of the branch but as I say I shall check into the matter and report to my friend.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A supplementary: May I ask the Provincial Secretary if a request did not come in through the Union of Ontario Indians for assistance to the Wikwedoong cultural undertaking in Thunder Bay?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I will check into that for my hon. friend, too.

PROGRAMME TO ASSIST TOURIST OUTFITTERS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Has he now a programme to assist those tourist outfitters and others who have substantially lost business—and some of them have been forced out of business—because of the high level of mercury pollution in certain areas of north-western Ontario, in at least the Wabigoon and the English River systems? I noticed an announcement was made referring to Minaki

Lodge and I wondered if something else were being done for some of the other outfitters, such as the Ball Lake establishments and others.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, there are loans available under my colleague, the Minister of—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The same ones that the minister told us about last June?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, the one the member just referred to, a loan to Minaki Lodge was approved in the last week or so. With reference to the other resort the member mentioned, I wrote to that gentleman recently and suggested that he make application to The Department of Trade and Development which has issued loans and this programme has been organized for it.

AVAILABILITY OF DENTURES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the House leader: Does he know whether or not the government is going to make a statement, either in the House or elsewhere, having to do with the availability of dentures and the role of the dental profession in this regard, as predicted by the Toronto Sun the day before yesterday, and the Globe and Mail today?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, of course I do not have the answer to that question but I will certainly get the information for the Leader of the Opposition.

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

PSYCHIATRIC OBSERVATION OF ADOLESCENTS

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, a question first of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice: Has he launched any inquiries into the practice of referring adolescents from the courts to Penetang Ontario Hospital for psychiatric observation, given the alternatives of the Clarke Institute and the psychiatric wings of general hospitals and institutions which are rather less threatening and less formal for the purpose?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): My understanding of the problem—and it is

a problem—is it is always one of the availability of the trained personnel to deal with these matters, as well, of course, as the facilities themselves. Minors or infants, whatever the terminology now is, quite frequently are referred to and treated at the Clarke Institute. In certain cases—I wouldn't want to call them incorrigible or incurable or anything like that—I think the tougher cases in any event, certainly on occasion, have to go to Penetang.

The question was whether this is under review or consideration. Yes, it is always under review and under consideration. By that I am not trying to evade the question at all. There are certain financial restraints upon all of the departments at the moment and this includes The Department of Health under which the jurisdiction of that particular institution falls.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A supplementary, if I may. Inasmuch as these incorrigible cases, as you call them, include at least one lad who has never been—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I said I didn't want to call them incorrigible cases. I said tougher or rougher cases.

Mr. Shulman: All right! Inasmuch as these tough cases include at least one lad who has never been in any difficulty before this and who was sent to the Oak Ridge unit of Penetang, which is for the adult criminally insane, would the minister not agree that, at the very least, his department, in conjunction with The Department of Health, could set up a separate wing, either at the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, which has space available, or, if necessary, at any of the psychiatric hospitals where children of this nature could be looked after?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: These matters are not directly under my jurisdiction. I realize the difficulty the hon. member has in bringing this matter up today with my colleague, the Minister of Health, absent in Ottawa at the provincial health ministers' meetings. I shall certainly bring this to his attention on his return if he is not back in time for the member to question him in the House.

Mr. Shulman: In reference to this minister, if I may, as a further supplementary—I am now referring to the court referrals; those children referred by the courts at the request of the minister's Crown attorneys. The minister must take this responsibility. Will the minister not take some personal action here?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, yes. The Crown attorneys do have instructions—whenever there is a request to refer these matters—obviously, first of all, to find out what facilities and what space and what personnel are available.

I wouldn't want to give the commitment to the House that no further referrals would be made of infants to Penetang because in certain sad cases, I am afraid, we, at the moment, have no other place to send them. In some cases they are sent to the Clarke Institute when there is space available there as well. We try to fit them in wherever we can.

UNION CARBIDE PLANT REMOVAL

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of the Environment: Can he make a statement to the House on the situation of Union Carbide in Welland and perhaps reflect what all of that implies for public policy when companies, rather than meeting pollution control regulations, apparently pick up and move out of the province?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of the Environment): I think, Mr. Speaker, there is some uniqueness about the Union Carbide situation, particularly in Welland. These furnaces, these particular plants, are very, very old and according to the company, even before we served them with a ministerial order regarding correcting the emissions from these plants—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Like the study completed in 1968.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —there were plans under way either to discontinue, to a certain degree, the seven operations—I think there are seven furnaces in all—or to transfer part of this operation to Quebec.

There is no question that our ministerial order hastened their decision. Certainly they had to do certain things within a shorter period of time. They did indicate in their statement that because of control costs, this was part of the reason for their decision to move, coupled with other substantial reasons such as a federal grant.

Mr. Haggerty: What about Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't know if we can legislate, Mr. Speaker, to prohibit companies to move out of Ontario because they are requested to meet our antipollution regula-

tions and standards. This would, of course, certainly be substantially new policy.

The company, in this instance, is also using hydro rates as a reason. As a matter of fact they say it is the main reason—that the rate that they will get from Hydro Quebec is about 40 per cent less than our commission can provide in that area.

So, it is not entirely, as I say, because of an order from my department.

But certainly I feel that with our incentives and with the steps that we are prepared to take to assist these companies financially, any pollution requirement is not a justifiable reason in itself.

Mr. Lewis: There are various supplementaries that occur to me but the first is, as I understand it, 250 jobs are likely to be lost. Why was it not possible for Ontario Hydro to accommodate the company if that was the key factor? I wonder about that personally. But if that was the key factor, what negotiations were entered into with Union Carbide to maintain the plant in Welland?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous meetings with the company regarding hydro rates. Union Carbide is a member of the Niagara basic power users committee, and that company along with other companies in the peninsula has been meeting continuously with Hydro, and they have been submitting briefs. One of the reasons we set up Task Force Hydro was to consider this particular area as well as the whole structure and ramifications of electric energy in this province and the cost thereof.

It was my hope, and we had indicated this to the companies, that there would be no industrial rate increases in 1972, certainly prior to Task Force Hydro reporting. It was my hope that we were doing everything to accommodate them as far as rates were concerned, particularly for industrial users, firm power users such as Union Carbide, and that any decision to move should be postponed until Task Force Hydro, until the commission itself, makes up its mind about rates for industrial users in the province. But they felt that, as I say again, our ministerial order had to hasten their decision so that they had to make immediate plans to get construction under way at Beauharnois.

I don't think, in my personal opinion, even with the most generous of considerations for hydro users in the Niagara Peninsula, that we can compete with the rates that Hydro

Quebec is prepared to give the company in Quebec.

Mr. Lewis: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Given the extent of the government's accommodation to a company which for over 60 years has exacted privileges, exemptions, and profits from the Niagara Peninsula, and to which company the government has given over \$200,000 by way of forgivable loan, and which, now packs up and leaves the province and we lose 250 jobs in Ontario, what then has the government asked of Union Carbide in terms of its financial contribution to the relocation and retraining of the workers involved?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, a meeting is being arranged with the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and officials of the company. I hope to attend that meeting. I want to make it clear that, although the company apparently has made a decision and has issued a public release to this effect, because the decision affects a plant that will not be phased out or from which there will not be anybody laid off for at a least year, that there still can be some accommodation here; that there is still a possibility that the company will not close the number of furnaces that it has indicated it will; in other words, that it will meet us half way; that it will install the equipment to keep the best of the seven existing furnaces in operation longer than it anticipates at the present time.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Since Ontario Hydro provides power at cost and is reputed to have been providing power to industries at favourable prices, what conceivable explanation is there for the fact that Union Carbide alleges it is getting a contract at 40 per cent less from Quebec Hydro? Has the minister investigated that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the Province of Quebec is able to generate power more cheaply than Ontario because it does have a great quantity of hydro or water power.

Mr. MacDonald: Forty per cent less?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Beauharnois, as the member knows, is right at the heart of their main generating station for the Montreal area. I don't discount the fact that there may be a little extraordinary consideration here, coupled with the federal grant to encourage this industry to come there. I do not know how they operate their commission there. But I am sure this is a possibility. The province

needs industry desperately, and I suppose there are certain incentives and attractions put before companies to have them locate in that province.

As you know, industries in the Niagara Peninsula did enjoy some extra consideration because of their location years ago—particularly before the conversion—but now they are charged the same as other industrial users on our grid system and they feel that this has unduly discriminated against them and provided a hardship.

Mr. MacDonald: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If somewhat more generous or lax antipollution measures or regulations are the reason Union Carbide is moving from Ontario to Quebec, would the minister indicate what sort of communication his department normally has with other provinces, and particularly Quebec, with a view to getting standard regulations so that industries can't in effect be running from one place to another allegedly to get out of fulfilling their obligation to the public for antipollution measures?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I have been assured, Mr. Speaker, both by the company and by my counterpart in Quebec, Mr. Goldbloom, that their antipollution standards for this plant, as far as air quality is concerned, will be as strict as ours. Both Quebec and the federal government are now introducing and discussing and, I assume, approving legislation called The Clean Air Act, that will apply to this operation and to this plant.

My people tell me that their standards are as strict as ours, so I am satisfied this isn't a pollution-haven move in any way. I think there have been some incentives offered here, coupled with the fact that this is an old operation in Welland, and that has made the company do what it is doing.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary. The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Did the minister's office or his department ever have a firm commitment from Union Carbide that it was going to establish a pollution control abatement programme by 1972, as set out under the ministerial order of 1968?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The ministerial order, if I am correct, was issued in July, 1970, and, as the member may know, they appealed the timetable in that order; they wanted an extension from the final date of December, 1974.

This was granted by the appeal board and quite frankly I turned it down, so the deadline was still December, 1974.

There was no indication to the department that they were unhappy with the first compliance date, which was November, 1972. One of the provisions in the order was to close one of the furnaces down—it was impossible to do anything with it—but the three other furnaces were to meet our standards in November, 1972.

I would assume that after the handling of that appeal the company then made their decision regarding Beauharnois. They never indicated to us anything more than their appeal that they were unhappy with the dates, but I would assume they were unhappy with the ministerial order entirely.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: In view of what the minister has said about speaking to the Province of Quebec, I wonder whether the cabinet or the government has made a formal complaint to the federal government—

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: —in regard to the granting of aid to a company to move from one province and locate in another. Has the government written a formal letter of complaint to the federal government suggesting that grants in these kinds of situations not be made?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any formal complaint being made. I have had an opportunity to discuss this particular situation with both Mr. Goldbloom and Jack Davis. They can see the problems here. The Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Crossman) has indicated that he will be discussing this with the federal people.

Mr. Reid: When? By that time the company will be long gone.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I realize the problem here. There are other industries, for example, there is a Hamilton industry that is moving to Amherst. But there are certain ramifications of this that we should not oversimplify the whole thing. Apparently that industry, for example, just would not continue in Canada. It intended to close up in Hamilton, but then with the federal incentive and all that meant in Nova Scotia, it decided to move there.

I just don't want to appear, frankly, as

objecting to the fact that Quebec has got an industry, because Quebec needs industry.

Mr. Reid: So does Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member for Scarborough West completed his questions?

Mr. Lewis: No I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

ONTARIO LAND BANK

I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. What has happened to the Ontario land bank announced in the April, 1971, budget statement?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Two decisions were made. Legislation was not introduced prior to the House rising in the summer. At least two things flow from that. First of all we did not have the legislation ready. We are most anxious to have the views of the COGP report on the whole question of land management. As to whether the legislation will be ready—obviously I do not think it will be ready before the end of this fiscal year, but we will have had the report from COGP. Since we weren't proceeding in that direction, the member will notice in supplementary estimates that the—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): What is COGP?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —current account purchases through Lands and Forests, through Public Works, through Municipal Affairs, in terms of Wasaga Beach, were substantially stepped up. I do not say that the idea is dead but we still have some thinking through to do on it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, what I see in the estimates—I didn't see them when the Treasurer handed it down—in the financial statements, is that the \$20 million promise in the April, 1971, budget to rescue the Niagara Escarpment and to buy up all these recreational and conservation preserves in southern Ontario has been wiped out entirely. It is removed totally, the entire \$20 million. My question is, how brazen a sort of election stunt is the Treasurer prepared to pull in a budget when, in fact, most of the House believed that the money would be used for recreational acquisition? Where is the money now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, those are great political words from the leader of the New Democratic Party. At no time in

this House was it stated, at no time was the \$20 million necessarily related to, or any part of it, related to the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. Lewis: Sure it was. The Treasurer implied it. He indicated that the Premier—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It certainly was not.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, what happens to the land now which the Treasurer indicated and the Premier indicated would be acquired by the \$20 million for the saving of recreational areas for southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Premier and I did not indicate that the \$20 million would be used for the escarpment. I recognize that the leader of the party opposite was more than a little confused during the early fall months. He may be referring to the announcement made by the Prime Minister, I believe in September, sir, that a certain amount of money would be spent—my recollection is up to \$5 or \$6 million—

Mr. Lewis: It was never real. The question is—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Of course, the problem that the members of the New Democratic Party have in particular is that during the course of the election campaign we were saying things and doing things and they were making a lot of idle promises.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. Are there further supplementaries?

Mr. Lewis: The \$20 million then means no acquisition of the escarpment.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The minister's brass takes our breath away.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we continue with the question period I wonder if I could have the permission of the House to revert to statements. The provincial Treasurer has an important statement—a brief statement—he would like to make.

Do I have that agreement? Agreed. The provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think this announcement will be of some interest to the House and I do thank the House for allowing us to revert to statements.

The government has decided to insure all

of its employees under the new unemployment insurance plan, effective January 2, 1972. Prior to the introduction of the new plan, provincial government employees had the option of taking or rejecting unemployment insurance coverage. Now the Parliament of Canada has provided that in order for some provincial government employees to be insured, all must be insured. Parliament, in other words, has eliminated the option.

Since the Ontario government does not wish to deprive some of its employees of the benefits and the protection of unemployment insurance, particularly those who by choice will work in the government for a short period and then move on to another employer in the private sector and then perhaps encounter a layoff, there is no alternative but to bring all members of the service into the plan.

There are of course a number of positive elements associated with this decision. The new plan integrates reasonably well with the benefits package now enjoyed by employees. The provisions respecting sickness, maternity and retirement benefits will undoubtedly be of interest to members of the public service.

In view of its stable employment situation, the Ontario government and its employees will make contributions to the plan at the lowest rates from the outset. The federal authorities will require us to deduct a maximum of \$1.35 per week, depending upon salary, from the pay of the 12,000 or so employees now covered, but the maximum contribution for those who will be entering the scheme on January 2, between 50,000 and 55,000 employees, will be 54 cents, again depending upon salary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question, following his statement—

Mr. Speaker: We will now add three minutes to the question period; we will permit questions, of course, on this statement, but since both leaders of the Opposition parties have used their time for questions, we will now revert to the alternating programme.

The hon. member for St. David.

HOLIDAY SCHEDULE FOR GO TRANSIT

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In consideration of the additional travelling that occurs during the holiday season, especially

in the evening, and the desirability of encouraging such travellers to use public transport, especially if they contemplate the consumption of alcoholic beverages at social functions, does the minister contemplate extending the service of the GO trains beyond 12 o'clock midnight to facilitate the travel of such persons?

Mr. Reid: One hundred and seventeen would make use of it!

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, the matter of scheduling of the GO trains for holiday periods is immediately under consideration. I can't answer the hon. member specifically, but GO train schedules for the holiday period will be announced shortly.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, which I would appreciate not being taken as part of the question period if you judge it, Mr. Speaker, I just want to recall to the provincial Treasurer's mind Hansard, April 27, 1971, page 897, under discussion of "Purchases by Land Bank," originally raised by the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) when the Treasurer indicated, "It may be that this will eventually become a revolving fund." After he had outlined various uses, I interjected: "Like the Niagara Escarpment, perhaps?" Then:

Hon. Mr. McKeough: "The Niagara Escarpment, for example."

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Interjections are unofficial.

Mr. Lewis: No, it was clear throughout the debate that was part of the intention of the money.

Mr. MacDonald: So who is making the political speeches now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a supplementary question!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It's not a supplementary question.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It's not a supplementary question, it's quotes!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, then, speaking to the point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Deans: He misled the House. Apologize to the House.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The record will show, Mr. Speaker, the record will show—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He just read the record!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: He wants to apologize.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Deans: He must be consistent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the record will show that my friend, the leader of the New Democratic Party, said that in terms of \$20 million we have betrayed something to the people of Ontario and implied that I had said that the money was going to be spent entirely on the escarpment. What he is quoting to me—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What he is quoting to me is, "like the Niagara Escarpment," and that is the kind of twisting that made his party lose the election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Lewis: That was one of their commitments rather than a promise.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are doers over here. We are doers. The member will never have to worry about it.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will recall my request to indicate if there were supplementary questions. If not, the hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR SPADINA EXPRESSWAY LANDS

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): I almost forgot my question! A question of the Prime Minister: Regarding the subject matter and supporting material which he revealed in his press conference of October 12, having to do with the Buckminster Fuller conceptual plan for the vacant lands of the Spadina Expressway, has this material ever been formally communicated to the Metropolitan Toronto council, the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board or the councils of the boroughs of North York and York, so they might put it on their agendas for consideration and for their reply to the Premier as to what their sentiments are about this conceptual plan?

An hon. member: Here comes the answer!

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A good question.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there has been a task force established with representation from Metro and from The Department of Transportation and Communications; this material is available, of course, to the task force.

The task force up until this moment—and I understand its report is by and large completed—has been determining the question of the possible rapid transit route. I would think after that determination is made, consideration then would be given to the land utilization that forms that part of the former Spadina Expressway to which the hon. member is referring and about which the material was prepared for the government for consideration by Metro. But I would believe, Mr. Speaker, that the decision on the rapid transit portion of necessity would have to be made first, and I understand that this task force report is now well advanced.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the Premier implying that the decision about the implementation, or lack of it, by Metropolitan Toronto or the boroughs of York or North York will not be a decision of those elected councils but will rather be a decision of provincial civil servants and others? Is that what he's implying?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the task force contains representation from Metro. There has been a committee established in the task force related to the whole question of transportation in the metropolitan area. The decision as to whether Metropolitan Toronto wishes to move ahead with the development of the land, whether it relates to the proposals of the government, or the suggestions the government has made, of course is its decision and I thought I made this abundantly clear, not only at the time of the press conference, but in the questions a day or so ago by the member for Downsview, that we put this forward as a suggestion for land utilization. In the event Metro may find some other way of doing it, some other proposals that it would wish to undertake itself, of course, this government would be more than prepared to co-operate. I would repeat again that if Metropolitan Toronto determines it does not wish to utilize this, and it wishes the province to assume this responsibility, we are prepared to do so.

Mr. Singer: Mr Speaker, by way of further supplementary, could the Premier answer the simple question and in simple language for a simple person like myself. How can Metropolitan Toronto or North York, or York, possibly have an opinion about Buckminster Fuller's plans when none of those three councils has ever seen them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, the heads of all of those municipalities were present when the presentation was made, the documentation is available, it has been distributed, and as I say, and I'm not being critical of Metro or anything else, but the determination—surely even for the member for Downsview the logic of this situation might pervade, hopefully—

Mr. Lewis: Well, put it simply. Make it simple.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the determination of the rapid transit part is obviously the first decision that must be made and this is the direction that the task force—where there is representation from Metro—this is its first priority, quite obviously. Any decision that is made with respect to the land utilization of that portion that will not be used now for transportation facilities, of course will be made by the boroughs affected and by Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, can the Premier explain how instructions were given to Buckminster Fuller—

Hon. Mr. White: Is that simple enough for the member, by the way? Is that simple enough?

Mr. Singer —to prepare these plans without the prior determination of whatever the rapid transit route might be? How could they possibly be meaningful?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, you do certain things based on certain assumptions—

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and the government went ahead—well, of course, Mr. Speaker, we make pretty valid assumptions over here. There are some made across the House that quite obviously had a certain amount of invalidity—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Too simple for the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis:—particularly as it related to that particular issue, as I can recall it. I won't get into a discussion of it here on this occasion because I don't think it is any longer relevant.

But I think it was logical to assume, Mr. Speaker, whether or not our assumptions were correct, that any logical assessment of the situation will probably determine that the rapid transit portion from Lawrence Avenue south to Eglinton probably would follow the route that has been laid down at present. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this turns out to be incorrect then, of course, one has to reassess the plans that have been proposed for its utilization.

However, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that it may occur that the rapid transit portion the task force will recommend could conceivably follow the existing route.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is certainly clear.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Singer: How can anyone tell what the Premier is talking about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, if the hon. member can't, I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the hon. member for High Park.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member's leader understands. He nods his head in agreement. I think the member for York-Forest Hill understands.

FAMILY COURT PERSONNEL

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Why has the Attorney General's department refused essential help to the family court in Toronto? Specifically, why has the department refused to supply an Indian interpreter, despite the fact many Indian families have attended that court? And why has it insisted on allowing only one clerk typist for all six judges, which means they can't reply to their correspondence, which has produced problems which we have gone through before?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I will take that question as notice.

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

HOURS OF HOUSE SITTINGS

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the House leader. I would like to ask him to consider for the next session that will be coming perhaps in February or March, whenever it is, some time changes in this House. As you know we now sit for approximately three hours on Friday. I would like to ask him to consider that we sit an extra 45 minutes a day while we are in session and leave the members more time in their ridings on Fridays to work with their constituents during the next session.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion certainly has a lot of merit and I will discuss it with the authorities of the various parties and see if we can reach some agreement in that regard.

Mr. Lewis: Does the member mean we close Wednesdays and Fridays?

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

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister—

Mr. Lewis: Soon the government won't have to have a Legislature. It can just rule by decree.

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Transportation—

An hon. member: He is doing that now.

Mr. Singer: And buck Major Fuller.

Mr. Lewis: You know, that is why they say "King Billy".

Mr. Speaker: Order!

METRO CENTRE PLAN

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Has the minister's department reviewed the proposed transportation interchange in the Metro Centre development and reported to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) on what alterations, if any, it recommends to ensure the maximum possible mobility and convenience is achieved when the new complex is constructed at this transportation hub of the province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, not as yet, no.

Mr. Deacon: Supplementary: Is such a report being prepared for submission to the minister before he takes action on that centre?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is quite probable, Mr. Speaker, that staff are preparing a report; I have no knowledge of such a development. I have not seen a report on the matter yet.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: Would the minister ensure that such a report is made available to the Minister of Municipal Affairs on this very key point?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, of course.

Mr. Singer: Perhaps the minister could find out if Buckminster Fuller is available to help him. A fine fellow.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Singer: What is it the minister pays him? He never answered that question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What is the member's interest in Buckminster Fuller?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

WINTER WORKS LOAN PROGRAMME

Mr. Deans: A question of the provincial Treasurer: I would like to follow-up perhaps to the question of my leader to the provincial Treasurer. Could the Treasurer indicate why it is that of the \$17 million made available by the federal government to the province of Ontario for job production in the winter of this year, the province has seen fit to use only \$1.1 million?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the hon. member is referring to the amount that was made available by the federal government on the loan programme last winter—the winter of 1970-1971. It was offered to the—

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —municipalities and they took advantage of precisely \$1 million of it. They did not avail themselves of the other \$16 million.

Mr. Deans: Well, am I—correct—

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I might say I mentioned in the House that there is \$28 million allocated to Ontario this year. I indicated

to the House that it has also been offered to the municipalities—has been, really, since the date of announcement—and we suspect that they will not take advantage of a great amount of it. We have plans and will be using the money as a province this year to take advantage of the forgiveness factor wherever we can, if the municipalities do not use it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills.

O'CONNOR DRIVE COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Sir, my question is directed to the Minister of Trade and Development. It concerns the matter of a community centre in the O'Connor Drive public housing development. Could the minister tell us what progress is being made with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the financing of this project. When might he expect his department to begin construction?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did I hear the hon. member say the O'Connor community centre? Is that the one, O'Connor?

Mr. Timbrell: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I happen to be familiar with that one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ferrier: That is a switch from yesterday!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: That is the only one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe I'd better not answer it, Mr. Speaker. I am not too sure that it is the one I am going to speak about!

Mr. Reid: That we believe.

Mr. Singer: That has never stopped the minister before.

Mr. Reid: The less the minister knows, the longer the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Go ahead, have a good time! It is your time. Go ahead!

Mr. Reid: We get lots of long answers from over there.

Mr. Speaker: There are just a few minutes left!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I believe the situation is that Ontario Housing Corporation has applied to CMHC for participation in this project. CMHC, I think, agreed in principle but are questioning the portion of federal and provincial participation. I believe it was just this week our staff arranged a meeting with CMHC to try to straighten out the difference of opinion as to the degree of participation. Certainly, as far as Ontario Housing Corporation is concerned, we agree with it and are prepared to go ahead with it.

Mr. Timbrell: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The second part of my question was, since this has been before the community and before the council of the borough of North York for six to nine months, when the minister might expect his department to begin construction? Can we expect it within six months, let's say?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, obviously we can't proceed until we have an agreement as to the degree of participation between the two governments. I would hope that this could be resolved this week and, of course, if it is, construction could begin fairly soon.

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

WORKMEN'S ADVISORY

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Labour: Are any steps being taken to establish a workmen's advisory, independent of the Workmen's Compensation Board, to assist and advise claimants as recommended by both the McRuer report and Chief Justice McGillivray in the report of the royal commission on The Workmen's Compensation Act?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour and Financial and Commercial Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

COMMERCIAL FISHING DISPUTE

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: In the continuing dispute between commercial fishermen and tourist operators in the Killarney area, has the minister come to a decision regarding the commercial fishing line in the Grondine Point area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member say the Grondine Point area?

Mr. Germa: The Grondine Point commercial line in the Killarney area.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased to look into it, Mr. Speaker, and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Provincial Secretary has the answer to a question previously asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

CHANGES IN INDIAN RESIDENTIAL TRAINING FACILITIES

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. Leader of the Opposition the only information we have relating to the use of residential schools is with respect to the presentation which was made recently with respect to the Mohawk Institute, in which he probably has an interest. That recent presentation was made to the federal government.

My contacts with the group in the past have been communications and I think the hon. member and I have had conversations about that in the House in the past—that if some decision is made we, within the Indian community branch, will be very pleased to discuss any participation we may have in any cultural aspect of the use of that institute.

Mr. Speaker, there was a supplementary asked by the member for Thunder Bay with relationship to the Wikwedoong Cultural Society. They had placed before us a request with respect to a dance project and, subsequently, they had withdrawn their proposal. But a dance project is going ahead through the Confederation College Indian Association and we are assisting them in that regard. We have in the past assisted the Wikwedoong society with funds for an audio tape library. They may be coming forward with another proposal sometime in the future, and we will consider it at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development also has the answer to a question asked previously by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

CANADIAN FILMS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West asked yesterday if we might be able to find Canadian

films for use at Cinesphere. I promised to get the information today.

I am informed that the reason we show major international films at Cinesphere is because they are available in 70-millimetre size allowing us to utilize most of the giant screen. While there are some fine Canadian films available, that are now being shown on a first-run basis in Toronto, they would provide, of course, unfair competition if shown at Cinesphere.

Unfortunately, also, the Canadian-made films so far available are in 35-millimetre size only. As a result, we have found that this size of film uses such a small portion of the huge screen, that the surrounding white area of the screen is most distracting to the viewer. Further to this, due to the concave shape of the screen, masking it to the proportions of a 35-millimetre image, is impractical.

Naturally, sir, we are on the lookout for new Canadian films suitable for use at Cinesphere and, when available, we will, of course, be delighted to show them.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired. I might say at this time that we do have guests with us this morning who were not present at the opening but they have since arrived. In the east gallery are students from the Barton Secondary School in Hamilton.

Petitions

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the annual report of the Ontario Mental Health Foundation, 1970-1971; the annual report of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, 1970, and the annual report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The hon. member for High Park.

INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in the dying days of the last session a bill slipped through which made it against

the law of this province for any person to advise the public to buy cheaper insurance rather than expensive insurance. This bill is an attempt to repeal that unfortunate Act.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, and just very briefly, it is a custom in this House that, when matters of singular accomplishment are performed in members' ridings and in groups generally across the province, some recognition is given. I am not speaking on this occasion for a group from my riding, but I would like to note the evolution of a very distinguished group of cultural people that was demonstrated to a very select audience last evening.

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of all members of this House and their guests to express our appreciation to that group and, without becoming too specific, in that this would not be appropriate on this occasion, to say to them that I, for one, thought the choreography was excellent. The execution left something to be desired! There were a couple of T-shirts used and I should say to them if they are still there, I have several demands left.

I would also make the rather general observation that if the personification of Santa Claus is to appear again and become something of a tradition, I am sure all members share with me pleasure in the very real change that has taken place—his appearing in a blue rather than a red costume, and that this would continue to be part of the tradition for some years to come.

There was one area where the credibility of the performance was tested to a certain extent. I think this perhaps would be shared by other members in the House. The choir-master appeared with halo slightly tilted and with wings that perhaps were not entirely appropriate. That was the only part of the performance that, I think, might not pass the tests of the experts who were present on that occasion. I do say, most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that this might become something of an annual tradition—

Mr. Lewis: That is a point of personal observation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly, I personally enjoyed it!

Mr. Lewis: The Prime Minister is always bothered by choirmasters.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In that I cannot express the appreciation of one of my guests who never makes speeches, I was told at the performance last night, she also extends her

appreciation as well, Mr. Speaker, through you to the cultural group that performed last evening. For those who read Hansard—

Mr. MacDonald: You are using some terms very loosely here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For those who read Hansard very carefully, other than members of this House, if they are interested in contacting or having this group perform for them on some future occasion, I would suggest that any communications be generated through your office, Mr. Speaker, to the president of the press gallery who in turn might be able to arrange for a further performance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the Premier's remarks I felt that there were two matters of some interest. He said that the group would be available for further productions, but I presume that the Premier's colleague, the minister in charge of information services, was responsible for the full illumination and the recording of everything—from at least one angle—on the cameras that were present, and so that would be available.

I also had the impresssion, Mr. Speaker, which I don't know but I would expect you would share, that our guests had dressed up Santa Clause in blue because they felt that as far as they were concerned the real Santa Claus was standing in the front row.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it is not really necessary for me to comment on last night's performance because, as the Premier knows and certainly the Leader of the Opposition knows, I have been holding hands under the table with the particular group for some time!

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): It has finally come out, eh?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): May I ask the co-operation of the House very briefly to call item No. 1? It will probably save the House time in the course of the balance of the week.

Clerk of the House: The first order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

NOTICES OF MOTION

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED: That the income tax shall be paid by every individual who is resident in or had income earned in Ontario as follows:

1. 27.5 per cent of the tax payable under The Income Tax Act (Canada) in respect of the 1971 taxation year;

2. 30.5 per cent of the tax payable under The Income Tax Act (Canada) in respect of the 1972 taxation year,

as provided in Bill 1, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before the resolution is put and realizing the method which is used in the bill to accomplish the purpose, perhaps the minister would be prepared to comment on the reason for the 30.5 per cent of the tax payable under The Income Tax Act in respect of the 1972 taxation year, as distinct from the 27.5 per cent of the tax payable under The Income Tax Act in respect of the 1971 taxation year. I know the government would not want to leave the impression that they were increasing the tax in the province of Ontario by three points for the year 1972.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am sorry, I was trying to read the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for Riverdale repeat his question, please?

Mr. Renwick: The resolution which is before us would indicate there will be a three per cent increase in the personal income tax levied by the Province of Ontario for the year 1972. While I am aware of the contents of the bill which we will be debating later on with respect to amendments to The Income Tax Act, a word of explanation may be advisable from the government to assure that people understand that there is not, in fact, for the year 1972, a three per cent increase in the income tax in this province.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely correct and I think the hon. member is probably aware of the fact that as of January 1, 1972, the rate schedule has a different base, that base being equal to the present rate.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, that certainly clears it up.

Resolution concurred in.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends—

Mr. Lewis: The minister didn't understand a word of that!

Clerk of the House: —the following:

RESOLVED: That the duty levied under section 7 of The Succession Duty Act on any property passing on the death of any person shall be paid to Her Majesty for the use of Ontario,
as provided in Bill 3, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Resolution concurred in.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED: That the moneys necessary for the purposes of section 7 of The Teachers' Superannuation Act shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,
as provided in Bill 9, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Resolution concurred in.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED: That the moneys necessary for the purposes of subsection 1 of section 3 of The Executive Council Act shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,
as provided in Bill 15, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this resolution be concurred in?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): No, no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the minister to explain this.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Is that not the bill standing in the name of the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis)? Yes, it is. I am afraid I can't answer for him, but the provincial Treasurer might want to answer.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is a normal resolution. Presumably if the member has some question about it, it can properly be asked on second reading or in the committee of the whole on Bill 15.

This is essentially the Act which provides for the creation of the position of provincial secretaries in the policy fields and although the bill provides for the fact that these people will be paid, a resolution of the House is also necessary in the normal way. But, if there are any questions then—

Mr. Sargent: Does this involve amounts of money—orders in council?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. The salary of these gentlemen will be set—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Or ladies.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Or ladies—ladies or gentlemen—are actually set in Bill 15, and assuming that Bill 15 receives the approval of the House, then this resolution is necessary. If Bill 15 does not receive the approval of the House, then this resolution would fall, or would be meaningless.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, these resolutions are all resolutions voting moneys. All of them relate to bills which stand on the order paper for second reading.

It would appear to me to be more sensible in future and I'd suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that the resolutions for the authorization of the funds be dealt with after the bills are dealt with. Because we cannot adequately deal with the vote of moneys for the purposes of each of these bills until such time as we have dealt with the bills to which they refer.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Right. That is right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The hon. member is right and in the ordinary course of events this would not happen. I hoped I had made it clear initially. This is simply a mechanical thing that I have suggested this morning so that we are not jumping in and out of committee as the bills are dealt with. It does not preclude any consideration that any member wants to make when the bill is before us.

Mr. Renwick: Well my point, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. I assume that, when the bills are called for second reading, rather than delay the passage of these resolutions the ministers responsible for the bills will be able to give us at least a reasonable estimate of the moneys which are necessary for the purposes of each of those bills.

Mr. Sargent: The cart before the horse.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED: That the moneys necessary for the purposes of section 1 of The Extra-Judicial Services Act shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, as provided in Bill 16, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

Resolution concurred in.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED: That the moneys necessary for the purposes of subsection 4 of section 8 of The Surrogate Courts Act shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, as provided in Bill 17, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Resolution concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Winkler 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 certain resolutions concurred in and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. MacNaughton) regrettably was called out of the House and I would ask permission to proceed with The Department of Labour.

Clerk of the House: Estimates of The Department of Labour, vote 1004.

Mr. Chairman: Supplementary estimates of The Department of Labour, vote 1004, in the amount of \$2 million. The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to receive in the

mail this morning the announcement of the minister that he was moving into a \$3 million winter works programme. More specifically, I was interested in the section dealing with the industrial training branch to encourage small business to participate in on-the-job apprenticeship programmes.

In my own profession, I am involved in small business and the past two winters I have, on my own initiative, hired men for the winter months as a testing programme rather than to see them on unemployment insurance benefits. Just this past week, before the minister's announcement, I put in an application to the federal on-the-job training programme which will pay 75 per cent of the wages should my application be accepted.

Personally, I feel that this is one of the best ways to get people employed during our winter months in Canada which are so severe and which greatly restrict the possibilities of our work force, because it is only in a small industry, hiring one and two people at a time, that these people can be hired and paid for basically by industry and with new programmes being supplemented by government. I think that this is good. It will train people for various professions or types of work. It will get them off the unemployment insurance rolls which, I think, is a good objective.

Hopefully, if once they are trained and the economy continues to pick up, as it is in many sectors, these people will remain permanently in the work force, which is my hope and I am sure is the minister's, and that both the federal and this newly announced programme will have a desired effect because I can see that there are many hundreds of thousands of small businesses that could hire one or two people with these programmes and have a much greater effect possibly than all the winter works programmes which we have discussed in the past day or so which are being paid specifically out of the public purse.

In relation to your programme that has been announced, in which you are going to pay 50 per cent of the regulated wage rate for a maximum of 12 weeks, I wonder if in your explanation of this you could detail for me whether or not this dovetails with the federal programme? Specifically, in my instance when I am hiring a new employee under their programme, is there a duplication here? Should I be looking elsewhere and possibly going to hire an apprentice in a different field within my own business under

your programme? Just to see how the programme works! This is basically what I am interested in at this point, and I would appreciate your comments in this regard.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour and Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, there will be a larger pool of field workers. We are endeavouring in this programme to place 500 presently unemployed within the scope of the programme and they will be released to our field offices. There are 80 field officers who can be contacted in this programme. I would suggest to the hon. member or anyone interested in this programme that he contact his local field office who will explain it to him. We do pay 50 per cent but frankly I am not sure about the federal programme, whether there is duplication or not. But this is a programme of The Department of Labour through the industrial training branch.

Mr. Paterson: Basically, Mr. Chairman, the minister is stating that his field offices now have information available and that contact by any small business person to that office will give them the detailed information?

Hon. Mr. Carton: That is right, Mr. Chairman, because it's a winter works programme. Frankly, sir, we had a programme that we were hoping to bring in and had outlined in September. Then with the federal government bringing in its programme we had to re-adapt our particular programme. It is now winter and we want to get these started immediately. I would suggest that you contact the field office immediately; they have the knowledge and they will help with applicants.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, I want to say first of all that I have felt that part of the difficulties we have at this time with unemployment is a result of a pretty inadequate apprenticeship programme over the years. In fact, we have encouraged industries to seek qualified help outside Canada—to bring them in from other countries—rather than encouraging them to have a proper accredited apprenticeship programme within each industry.

I want to say to the minister that notwithstanding the relative value of the 500 jobs in this programme there is a massive job to be done in educating and encouraging industry

to being—and it is really the beginning, it is not even the continuation—a proper apprenticeship programme in Ontario. Even at this point in time, even with the unemployment that we have, there are many industries still advertising in other parts of the world for skilled help and encouraging those people to come to Canada. They are coming, and they are taking jobs which I am quite convinced are jobs that persons either leaving school at this particular point or out of school for a number of years could quite readily be trained to do.

I say to the minister that over this winter perhaps we cannot embark on a major programme to make that kind of a change. Nevertheless, I am hoping to see in the department a marked change in its attitude toward apprenticeships and a movement away—not away from—but an extension of the existing programmes that are in the areas of the construction trades and motor mechanics. And that there be a proper apprenticeship programme developed so that we can provide for those young people coming out of community colleges and out of high school some sort of hope that there will be a job for them and the job will be in fact not only a job that will provide them with some challenge, but will be a job that will provide them with some sort of future.

I just feel that the expenditure of \$2 million—the 500 jobs added to the 350 jobs yesterday—if you add them all together perhaps they come to something. But it is pretty short term and we are always going to be faced with the problems that we presently have. We are always going to be faced with them, as long as we seek our better technical minds and the better trained people outside of this province and outside of this country.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, if I may remark, I agree with the hon. member and I know that he will be interested in finding out that I have a task force at present compiling a report on the whole question of industrial training and apprenticeship. This will be forthcoming within the next few months.

In the past two or three months I have myself had many delegations on this particular subject of apprenticeship and I only wish the report were ready now. It will be ready in the next few months. And you are absolutely right; I believe that there is a need for a new approach.

Mr. Deans: If I may just pursue it one step further. I hope we don't get hung up

on the old-fashioned ideas of apprenticeships. I don't believe that a five-year apprenticeship, the first year a tea-making course, is of any particular value. Jobs change much more quickly today than they did in years gone by. The qualifications required and the kind of jobs that are going to be available will be vastly different from the jobs that we have trained people to do in past years.

We may well have to have, rather than what might be called an apprenticeship programme, a comprehensive, on-going retraining programme for individuals. We may have to place a rather greater responsibility on industry to assess its future needs and to make available to the province, for purposes of accreditation, the kinds of programmes, the kinds of ideas that they have about the changes that will take place within their particular spheres of endeavour.

What I am really saying, I suppose, is that I think that retraining and training is going to be an ongoing process from here on in and the changes will be very rapid. It no longer will be of much value to be a tool-maker because the toolmaking trade itself will change so quickly, over and over and over.

Perhaps over the last 50 or 100 years—or maybe even over the last thousand years, for all I know—a trade lasted a longer period of time. If one was a machinist by trade, that stood you in good stead throughout your lifetime. We have now reached a point in the changing workplace where you are lucky if it lasts 10 years.

We shouldn't get ourselves caught in the trap of having an apprenticeship programme with perhaps a five-year learning period, much of the period spent in doing useful tasks. A colleague of mine used the term a "gofer"—you know, "go for this," and, "go for that" and "go for" everything else. That seems to be what half of the apprenticeship period is used for.

We may have to have an entirely different way of accrediting the kinds of work that are available and the kinds of jobs that are going to be done, and maybe a shorter term. There will be a great turnover and there will be an ongoing educational process. And I am just hoping that will be taken into consideration at the time this is being looked into.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member I am sure will recall we discussed the block or the modular training and this is a step in the direction in which he is indicating apprenticeship should go.

The reasons that the member put forth are exactly the reasons why the task force is sitting. I think it is a changing world, a changing situation.

On the other hand, as I see it, one has to be careful not to start immediately causing concern in some of the established areas of training, because they do have some concern. It is a case of education and getting together and discussing with everyone concerned.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, I only have several brief comments that I believe I've raised with the minister in the past.

Is the task force looking at the educational levels required for apprenticeship? Having taught school for a number of years I grow more frustrated with the needs of the kiddies who might be on the very low—I don't mean very low IQ level, but let's say just under the normal or just below normal—that the needs continue to grow for academic education in order to qualify for an apprenticeship.

In other words, in most apprenticeships today the demand is for grade 12. This is a lot of nonsense and is ruling out a lot of students who are very versatile with their hands but academically just don't make it. The case that I believe I mentioned to the minister in the past was a grade 5 student who made a receiving and sending telegraphy set which most of us here could not do and yet to get by grade 12 academically was out of the question for him. I don't see a need for a plumber or a stonemason to have grade 12 academic education. I think we are becoming a class of snobs; that if you do not have an academic education, you're a bum.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The member should speak for himself.

Mr. Martel: This is going on every day and we are ruling out a lot of young people who would have a very good future in a trade simply because of the increased demand for academic education. I would hope that the task force would spell out rather clearly that there isn't the growing need. I realize that in certain fields, such as electronics, it might be imperative, but I for one certainly don't agree that it is necessary for many of the other trades and, hopefully, the task force will spell this out.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Does the minister want to reply here?

Hon. Mr. Carton: It is all right. Go ahead.

Mr. Foulds: I just want to emphasize a couple of comments of my colleagues from Wentworth and Sudbury East. I would like to see in the future the task force undertake in its programme some close collaboration with The Department of Education, because it seems to me that one of the things that we are going to have to get into is looking at a whole range of learning opportunities outside of the normal schooling, outside of the classroom. I think that one of the things that we ought not to forget is that a lot of the cost in the educational field should perhaps be borne more by industry, which some of the training more directly benefits in terms of the people who get into it.

Several years ago, there was a very prominent slogan: "Stay in school. The graduates get the jobs." That is no longer true. Perhaps the slogan should now be: "Get jobs, you slobs," or something. But, seriously, it seems to me that with the number of drop-outs that we are having on all levels of education and, particularly, the disillusion that is getting down into the lower levels of high school and even elementary school about their opportunities for having a fruitful contribution in terms of either labour or educational or professional personal expenditures, it seems to me that this programme needs to be expanded. There needs to be a very close collaboration with the educational field and with the colleges and universities. I would like to emphasize the point that industry take up its fair share of these expanded programmes.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, in answer to both the hon. members' comments, the terms of reference are quite wide. I won't take the time of the House to read them. They would cover these particular points that they were making. I would also point out that there have been briefs submitted by many interested people to this task force. I would suggest that I am sure that the unions themselves have presented many briefs. I have had delegations from the various unions on apprenticeship and, insofar as the member's remark about his concern with education, there may be a closer working liaison than we know in the near future.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): In the supplementary estimates the minister is asking for \$1.8 million with regard to training in industry, apprentice living allowances, apprentice tuition. What is the total budget for 1972 in this area?

Okay, that is all right. I don't know whether this is germane to this part of the discussion, but I think that we have to take a new look in the area of employment, not only of adults, but in the area of teenagers, say, from 18 to 20.

I know, last year, you said that you had 16,000 people as students gainfully employed in the amount of \$18 million. Then, on the incentive programme you talk about 300,000 man-days' work, giving them employment for probably two months. There is nothing in this—this is only a stop-gap, and I realize that no one has the answer to it. But what I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that for four decades now in this country we have seen unemployment among job-seeking teenagers grow worse. We have had these stop-gap programmes that we are talking about now to help youth find constructive occupations, but we must be more fundamental in approaching this problem.

I don't know whether you'll buy this, but one of the ways is to provide a statutory youth wage, which would encourage employers to fill jobs that now go unfilled because the job content does not need adults and the employer cannot afford to pay the adult rate.

The obvious place is in the area of minimum wage. We are talking here about the eventual goal of a \$2 minimum wage—I think our minimum wage now is \$1.75, is it?

Hon. Mr. Carton: It is \$1.65.

Mr. Sargent: It's \$1.65. Then I am recommending to the minister that we consider a \$1.20 rate for workers under 18. This would produce a 40-cent differential in the minimum wage. The youth rate would apply to full-time students under age 20 and to 18- and 19-year-olds for the first six months of their first job. Among young workers, for example, last year we had 75,000 people graduate across this country from universities and many thousands of them are still looking for work; the minister knows that. I am talking not in their area right now—I am talking possibly about the Grey county area—but about the younger groups, the 18-year-old age group.

Mr. Martel: They eat as much as us.

Mr. Sargent: Their unemployment picture has grown progressively worse in the last 20 years and no one is doing a thing about it, as much as we would like to—and I know the minister is concerned about it. For example, in 1956 the unemployment rate for 16- and 17-year-olds was 3.7 times greater than that for those aged 25 and over; by 1970 it was 5.2 times the adult rate. So in the last 20 years, Mr. Chairman, the population explosion has increased the number of teenagers at four times the rate of adults; there has been no comparable increase in the number of jobs available for the new entrants into the job market. So we have to stop all this stop-gap medicine we are trying to inject and do something permanent and final in this area.

We have to compensate for the disadvantages and the risks often associated with hiring young people. Some employers, Mr. Chairman, hesitate to hire teenagers because they have what they call unformed work habits or because they change jobs frequently, require special scheduling for part-time work and are inexperienced or lack career plans. I say to the minister—and I say it very sincerely—that lower rates for such younger workers would offset some of the disadvantages and would help to increase job opportunities for the greatly expanded number of teenagers who are seeking work.

I am not saying this in discrimination against youth. No way am I saying that they should be paid less money. But the factors on both sides of the picture are that there is a need for them to do these jobs for which adults are too expensive.

So I say that a lower minimum wage rate enhances youth employment opportunities. These pay rates would be a step forward towards easing the transition from school to work and would preserve jobs that are maybe likely to disappear, and jobs where machines might replace workers, or part-time jobs that are useful to employers but may simply not be worth the adult minimum wage of \$1.65.

So, there is a great need to look at this thing squarely and say, "The problem is still there. It won't go away and it is apparent we know what they are going through." I think we have to take a positive step toward that side of the picture.

If you need more money in your estimate for job training, for apprentice training, living allowances, well, let's do it. This is where the wealth of our nation lies—in our youth.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is a Liberal programme for contemporary child labour. I think this is what you would call it.

Mr. Sargent: I was hoping the hon. member for Scarborough West would interject something intelligent like that. I don't know the answer.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Why should youth be exploited like that?

Mr. Lewis: Why would the member exploit them?

Mr. Sargent: I knew the member would bring that up. I am not saying that they should be exploited. I don't know the answer. Does the hon. member for Scarborough West?

Put these kids to work. They would be happy to take a job of any kind. I know students who have graduated and taken jobs in factories. They can't get a \$10,000-a-year job, but give them a job for \$1.50 and they are happy to get it. I am not saying exploit them, please believe me. I don't believe that—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but not below a minimum wage.

Mr. Sargent: —not a bit of it. I want to say again that we are talking about labour, putting people back to work. I will say this again and again and again, we have in this province millions of square feet of vacant factory space and we are now watching modular housing going into building motels, et cetera. They are building modular housing in the United States; 30 per cent of their market is now in modular housing, building it by unskilled labour in vacant factory space.

We could solve all our unemployment, all our unemployment in this whole nation, by the need we can never fill which is housing. We can put them all to work. We have the facilities. We have the money. We have the manpower.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That's right.

Mr. Sargent: All we need now is someone like the minister someone in the government to say, "Let's go to work and give people jobs and give people housing," and you can solve it all in one way, by modular housing. It is the answer.

So don't talk to me about unemployment—that there are no jobs—because there is all kinds of money in Mortgage and Housing for housing—all kinds of money. There is all

kinds of space available. There are all kinds of men available and that is my answer to the need for putting people back to work.

An hon. member: This programme is no use.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that when unemployment rates increase, we tend to deal only in aggregates. We forget the individualization of the training programmes which is required in order to get from quantification and statistical figures to the individual person who wishes to have employment, wishes to be retrained, wishes to have a job, wishes to play his part in the economy of the province.

I had occasion during the last election to attend a relatively formal session of the Danforth Technical School with a representative from the party that supports the government and the Liberal Party. One of the questions which came from the floor indicated a degree of hostility about which I was not aware. I was not aware of the extent of the hostility at a time of rising unemployment against those who are in receipt of welfare assistance of one kind or another throughout the Metropolitan Toronto area.

You could sense in the question that was asked and the effort which I made to answer to it that there was a suppressed hostility, not particularly directed against me. The suggestion or the feeling was that there are large numbers of persons on public welfare who should be out working; who are freeloading on the system. That ranges, as the minister well knows, from all kinds of pejorative language about such persons through to the extreme of almost a compulsory obligation to take any job which is offered to them, otherwise the threat will be made that they will be cut off from the welfare systems.

Now, believing as I do that there is, in fact, a relatively marginal number of those persons on public assistance who may play the system for whatever the reasons—and maybe there are very good reasons behind that—there are, in addition, a substantial number of persons who have had little if any capital invested in their educations, compared to the capital which is invested by the province in the education of persons who go through to the community colleges or go through to the universities.

There are many of those persons who need retraining, who need rehabilitation, who need

an opportunity to get a worthwhile job—not just to go back into the labour force in the area where they have been and always will be vulnerable. As soon as there is any drop, out they go; and as soon as there is a rise in employment, if everything goes extremely well, they will be dragged back into the economy of the province in one way or another.

I have expressed in the House, and I continue to feel, that with the transfer of unemployment insurance to the federal government in the Forties as an aftermath of the depression, too much of the responsibility with respect to the individualization of manpower training and manpower location went to the federal government. I am not one who wants to balkanize this country at all but I think that there was an unwarranted abdication of the obligations of government in Ontario for the individualization of training and of rehabilitation procedures.

I therefore ask the minister, in whatever terms that task force may be operating, that one aspect of it very seriously relate to a collaboration with The Department of Social and Family Services for the purpose of ensuring that the avenues back into the economic life of the province available through this department in areas of training in industry, apprenticeship, either for living allowances or for tuition or for general rehabilitation, be one of the prime aims of any assessment of what can be done. I think it is most unfair to people who, for whatever the reasons, find themselves in receipt of public assistance, to find in addition that when there is an economic levelling off or turn-down or depression in the province, it generates a degree of hostility against them among those who are almost, in a sense; competitors with them for whatever jobs might possibly be available.

I know that the minister will have heard, as many other people have heard, the lament by people who are working in the lower-paid levels of industry in this province.: "Why should I be working when Mr. Smith down the street doesn't work and is in receipt of family allowances?" Or "He is in receipt of family allowances and is using the system, drawing unemployment insurance as well." It is an inference that the man is not only lazy and worthless but also a crook at the same time. I simply point out to the minister that there is a degree of hostility which seems to surface during times such as this, which I think is bad for the whole tone and morale of the community in which we live, and

which specifically requires a liaison effort between the minister's department—to the extent that he can individualize training and rehabilitation and the inculcation of skills through industrial training—and The Department of Social and Family Services, which is the one which is well aware through the representatives of that department of the various problems of individual specific families.

It seems to me that a role such as that will do a great deal to take out of the community this sense of hostility and frustration, which erupts on both sides of the coin—those on public assistance feeling that somehow or other they are always the losers when the downturn comes in the employment situation and those, on the other hand, who are scrambling to hold their jobs, or to get jobs, who feel that in some way or other they are being held back because persons on public welfare are lazy or no good or are freeloading on the system. I would ask the minister if he would take that under serious consideration in the work which is being done in industrial training in the province.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I think the comments of the hon. member for Riverdale have merit and I will make these views known to the task force and make sure there is some communication with The Department of Social and Family Services for this particular reason.

With respect to the member for Grey-Bruce, I would like to point out that basically his comments relate to unemployment generally rather than these specific programmes, I would also point out that there is an area of concern with respect to the minimum wage and any lowering of the minimum wage insofar as we may allow it, incidentally for students, for example. During the summer, as members know, there is a different rate applicable to students than the ordinary minimum wage rate. I think it was \$1.30 last summer, as opposed to \$1.65. There are other areas, too, apart from students, when you get into allowing someone to pay below the minimum wage. We have many requests for this, for example, for individuals who may be slightly handicapped. We have letters saying, "If we were allowed to pay them below the minimum wage we would give them gainful employment and we would therefore like to do this." It is a large area of concern.

Insofar as the minimum wage itself is concerned, there are certain pressures at present to raise the minimum wage. My own per-

sonal opinion at the moment is that the economic climate of today is not one in which we would raise the minimum wage, but this whole area, in answer to the member for Grey South, is a very difficult area. But I do appreciate his comments.

Mr. Sargent: Grey-Bruce.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Grey-Bruce. I do appreciate his comments.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, the problem of apprenticeship in Ontario is something with which I have had considerable experience, having served an apprenticeship myself—and, in fact, I did just take off my overalls on October 21 when I entered this House. I listened with interest to the academics in the House who seem not to know whereof they speak in that they have never experienced what really goes on in the apprenticeship system.

There are a couple of questions I would like to put to the minister. If, in fact, his programme is going to cover 50 per cent of the wage, what investigators or supervisors will he have, or how will he control these persons who hire these people so that, instead of this turning into a legitimate apprenticeship, it just doesn't turn into some sort of cheap labour. This is my experience in the past, that the apprenticeship system has in many instances been used only to supply industrialists with very cheap labour. As my colleague from Wentworth said, you turn into a "gofer." It is sometimes worse than that, it sometimes turns into damn near slave labour. So if the provincial government is putting public funds into this I would also hope that it would follow the funds with some investigative services to see that these people are not being exploited by their employers.

The second point I would like to raise—and I am familiar with almost every trade, whether it be construction or industry or whatever—is that I notice in his press release he indicates he is going to have an eight-week training course, and it boggles my mind to understand what sort of a trade you could teach a person in eight weeks.

Mr. Sargent: A politician perhaps.

Mr. Martel: I don't know why.

Mr. Germa: I just don't understand what sort of a programme the minister is talking about. Maybe he could inform us just what sort of a tradesman we are going to have

after eight weeks. I am quite certain we are not going to have a plumber, a machinist, an electrician or a bricklayer. I just can't understand what that would be about.

I would also like to ask the minister to reject the suggestion from the member for Grey-Bruce that by lowering the wage rate you therefore create jobs. This is probably the most ridiculous thinking I've ever heard. If there is a job of work to be done, the job of work will be done, and if there is no job of work to be done, then there is nothing to do. Making the job cheaper, if it is not necessary, will not cause it to be done. So I would ask the minister to reject that suggestion out of hand. In fact, the minimum wage rate, even at its present level of \$1.65 an hour, is really not a liveable wage.

I am also surprised by the comments in the House about our youths. I have worked in a shop for 35 years, and in our shops we have always had between 12 and 18 apprentices. They start about age 18, some of them at age 17, and this is the finest, the most committed and the most dedicated group of people I have ever witnessed in my life. Even though they were in fact being exploited, despite their employer, they did learn their trade and are now earning a living. So I think what is required is follow-up investigative services of the department to guarantee that this money is being spent in training and not just in slave labour.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, first of all, just to allay the fears of the hon. member for Sudbury, we don't always accept the suggestions from the other side of the House, even from the distinguished member for Grey-Bruce. I just wanted to allay any fears on that point about the minimum wage.

So far as this particular programme is concerned, I think—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: State your point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Somewhere along the line we have to face the fact that kids 16 to 18 cannot get jobs today, and I asked for a differential. But this party to the left, any chance it gets—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. That is not a point of order, it is a difference of opinion.

Mr. Sargent: The point of order is that the minister falls right in the trap and goes to bed with those guys right away.

They are playing politics, but I say, let's put those kids back to work some way. What the hell are we doing about it? Nobody is doing anything about it, and those guys play politics with it.

Mr. Chairman, Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor. You do not have a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, there are five different programmes in this press release, as the member knows, and perhaps the one he is concerning himself about mainly is the first one, the apprenticeship pre-employment training, when he mentions the eight weeks. This training will be conducted for The Department of Labour at the colleges of applied arts and technology, and this particular programme will be ending in April 1972. It is supplemental to the normal apprenticeship programme and will be phased to the anticipated CAAT intakes. The training will be offered in blocks of eight weeks, and it will be designed to provide the pre-apprentice with a broad theoretical background that will enhance his opportunity for employment in a particular field in which he wants to go. That is the purpose of this.

Bear in mind this is a winter works programme, and when we talk of eight or 12 weeks, that is a winter works programme. This is not an apprenticeship programme that is going to be outgoing. This is to take up the slack and provide employment during the eight- or 12-week period now.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1004. The member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Yes, to follow up on the comments the minister just made about winter works programmes, why is it we have to hide it in winter works? It is a problem that exists 12 months a year, not three months or four months.

The programme as I see it here is, in many instances, if they go into industry to receive this industrial training it gives them a length of time to qualify for unemployment insurance, and this is wrong. I find what is wrong with industrial training in the Province of Ontario under The Apprenticeship Act, is that it should be followed through The Department of Education, perhaps on a trimester system of education, where they can go into high school and work in the school **four months and come out and get a job in**

industry if they want to follow industrial trades, and with a better chance to qualify.

Mr. Sargent: Good idea.

Mr. Haggerty: This is where the European immigrants have an advantage over many youngsters coming out of our schools today in the Province of Ontario. They have that background of continuing in education and also in employment and it has a great advantage. If one looks at the way that the engineers come out of the University of Waterloo it is on the same basis of education. They work four months in the university and four months out in the field and that is where they get their experience.

Many of our students today come out of high school, they have the educational background, they get two years in college with additional educational background, but they haven't the experience, and this is the first thing that the employer asks. "What experience do you have?" They have no experience at all.

I can remember when I went through high school I entered into the machine shop apprenticeship, and the very first thing the foreman said to me was, "I want you to cut a keyway in this shaft on a milling machine" and he said, ".250." I said, "What do you mean .250?" He said, "You have just come out of high school. I said, "That's right." He said, "Did you not take decimals?" I took decimals but I did not know what I was ever going to use them for. I find the same thing today with education in schools today. They are given the basics, but they don't tell them why.

An hon. member: They don't tell them how to use them.

Mr. Haggerty: I can tell you today, if I was to work along with a person who wanted to be a welder, in two days I could tell you if that person was going to be a welder or not. You don't have to send him to school for six months. He can get it right in the field—job training. And any person that has the experience can tell if that person is going to be a welder or not. Many of them take the welder course in the schools and in the colleges and are not welders. They can do far better by being trained on the job. And I can see this as only an ad hoc programme and I just can't buy it.

The other question I would like to raise with the minister is, how many immigrants are coming in from the United States? I

understand there is quite an explosion of immigrants entering Canada from the United States, and often if one tries to enter the States from Canada you have to meet certain requirements—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, this really has nothing to do with the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, sure, it's apprenticeship.

Mr. Sargent: Pretty good question.

Mr. Chairman:—with the supplementary estimates before us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: That's federal, eh? Well, lay it on. You know what you are talking about.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Ruston: You guys have got to learn something about responsibility.

Mr. Haggerty:—perhaps I should refer you to the statement of the minister on page 3.

The second programme to cost \$520,000 will give 400 unemployed tradesmen an opportunity to become qualified journeymen. This project will include a 10-week course to assist immigrant tradesmen to improve language skills.

Perhaps I'm on to it. So this is what I am asking the minister: Just how many jobs are available for Canadians here in Canada? Let us look after our needs here first, without allowing further immigrants to come in from the United States.

You have the same problem if you want to enter the States; you can't do it unless you meet certain requirements that the job is there.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Haggerty: We are allowing immigrants to come into Canada when the jobs are not there. And I suggest to the minister that perhaps he should look into it, and make a study into this and just find out how many jobs there are available before we allow them to come in.

Mr. Martel: Why don't we infringe on the free enterprise system, and create some lasting work?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, firstly I would like to say that areas of responsibility,

whether we want to cloud them or not, are in fact areas of responsibility. Immigration has nothing to do with my department.

When the immigrants have arrived in our province then this is one of the areas of concern of our government. That is one of the reasons that this is one of the programmes which we have brought in and I think it is a good part of the overall programme. Insofar as the scholastic as opposed to the on-the-job training is concerned, in this programme that the members have before them there is sort of on-the-job training. This will be the answer to what the member is suggesting and it is part of this programme. Insofar as the remarks concerning The Department of Education are concerned, from time to time—and it may be so—I am told that this whole apprenticeship system should be, as the member stated, in The Department of Education. Perhaps it may be some day. Certainly, I think it is more closely allied to that but as long as it remains in The Department of Labour, of course, I will try to do the job properly.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Maybe before this estimate is carried, I might refer back to the remarks and one of the questions of the member for Sudbury regarding inspection.

I am sure if the minister and members of the House will look at the federal programme—if they will get an application form from the unemployment insurance or the Manpower offices, they will find that there is a very detailed programme. There are safeguards for the worker in that programme and I hope that The Department of Labour follows this.

These must be new people in addition to the regular work force of the employer at the present time. An employer can't knock one of them off to move one of these people in and get his wages subsidized. Further, a specific programme of training week by week either for a three-month or 12-month period,

whichever the employer wants to go into, must be laid out and presented to Canada Manpower and receive approval. There will be a bi-monthly inspection or more often than that.

I think there are certain safeguards in that programme. I would hope that the minister's department would be matching this although he is not matching the dollar contribution to the employer. I think it is a good thing to get people to work and hopefully this will succeed.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—does the minister want to answer that first?

Hon. Mr. Carton: It is all right.

Mr. Sargent: Before this goes to the vote, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister—he is trying to evolve programmes to put people to work and no one in the government, to my knowledge, yet has given the reason we cannot go into a crash programme on modular housing in this province! Where would the initiative start? In this department or The Department of Trade and Development or who the hell would start it there?

I mean, is there some area—if the minister can see merit in this thing, where would it start in the government? In his department or where? I would like to have the minister tell me why we can't tackle this, because it will work. It will put people to work, it will supply housing—it will answer all our needs. Why can't we do it?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest this would emanate from The Department of Trade and Development which at present has the portfolio there—Ontario Housing. It certainly would not start in my department.

Vote 1004 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Labour.

It being 12:30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, December 16, 1971

Indian residential training facilities turned over to Indian bands, questions to Mr. Yaremko and Mr. White, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Stokes	165
Programme to assist tourist outfitters with losses from mercury pollution, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Nixon	165
Availability of dentures and role of dental profession, question to Mr. Winkler, Mr. Nixon	166
Referring adolescents from courts to Penetang Ontario hospital for observation, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman	166
Union Carbide plant removal and pollution control regulations, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Reid	167
Ontario land bank—report on, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Lewis	169
Unemployment insurance coverage for all provincial government employees, statement by Mr. McKeough	170
Extending GO train service beyond midnight during holiday season, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mrs. Scrivener	170
Conceptual plan for Spadina Expressway lands, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Givens, Mr. Singer	171
Family court personnel—Indian interpreter, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman	173
Hours of House sittings, question to Mr. Winkler, Mr. W. Newman	173
Metro Centre plan—transportation interchange, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Deacon	173
Winter works loan programme—money not used by municipalities, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Deans	174
O'Connor Drive community centre in public housing development, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Timbrell	174
Workmen's advisory group to assist WCB claimants, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. Haggerty	175
Commercial fishing dispute in Killarney area, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Germa	175
Indian residential training facilities turned over to Indian bands, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Nixon	175
Finding Canadian films to show at Cinesphere, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stokes	175
Presenting reports, Mental Health Foundation, OHSC, and Liquor Control Board, Mr. Yaremko	176

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading	176
Resolution re The Income Tax Act, concurred in	177
Resolution re The Succession Duty Act, concurred in	178
Resolution re The Teachers' Superannuation Act, concurred in	178
Resolution re The Executive Council Act, concurred in	178
Resolution re The Extra-Judicial Services Act, concurred in	179
Resolution re The Surrogate Courts Act, concurred in	179
Supplementary estimates, Labour	179
Recess, 12:30 o'clock p.m.	188



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, December 16, 1971

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1971

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

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): In the absence—no, it is okay.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A point of privilege.

Mr. Chairman: A point of privilege? Yes.

Mr. Lewis: As is the custom of the House, the member rises on a point of privilege as quickly as he can make the point appropriately. I consider it an important point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, and I wish it to be referred to the Speaker for a ruling.

The question of privilege involves the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and, by the provincial Treasurer's words and the Premier's acquiescence, the Premier (Mr. Davis) as well, in a serious and, I believe, deliberate misleading of the House in a fashion which is indefensible. In this morning's question period, Hansard records the following exchange:

Mr. Lewis: . . . is that the \$20 million promise in the April, 1971, budget to rescue the Niagara Escarpment and to buy up all those recreational and conservation preserves in southern Ontario has been wiped out entirely.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, those are great political words from the leader of the New Democratic Party. At no time in this House was it stated, at no time was the \$20 million necessarily related to, or any part of it, related to the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. Lewis: Sure it was . . .

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It certainly was not.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, what happens to the land now which the Treasurer indicated and the Premier indicated would be acquired by that \$20 million for the saving of recreational areas for southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Premier and I did not indicate that the \$20 million would be used for the escarpment. I recognize that the leader of the party opposite was more than a little confused during the early fall months. He may be referring to the announcement made by the Prime Minister, I believe in September, sir, that a certain amount of money . . .

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read briefly from the statement a part of it referring to the announcement of September 28, 1971: A Statement by the Hon. William Davis, Prime Minister of Ontario, Purchase of Recreation Land along the Niagara Escarpment, Queen's Park, Tuesday, September 28.

I wish to announce that my government is taking action to accelerate the acquisition of large sections of Niagara Escarpment land to protect this extremely valuable recreation asset for present and future generations. Now that the commission of inquiry looking into matters relating to land acquisition is concluded, we intend to proceed in a more vigorous way to acquire additional land for recreation and related uses along the Niagara Escarpment.

This year's government budget makes provision for initial funding for a long-term recreational land acquisition programme. This programme is designed to acquire land for public use near our major population areas following evaluation of the recommendation in the Niagara Escarpment study by Professor Gertler and on the advice of the Parks Integration Board. The government will designate, during the next five years, a substantial proportion of this land acquisition fund to the purchase of escarpment property.

The Premier then went on to indicate the amount of money thus far spent and said, and I quote: "The programme will now be accelerated with additional funds from the \$20 million land banking fund which was also included in the last budget."

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It's pretty clear.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Doesn't the Premier know what his own policy is?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I think it is absolutely conclusive that the House was misled. I would like to ask, sir, for a retraction and an apology to which I think the House is entitled. Third, and most important, in the interests of public policy it now seems to us

that the Premier and the Treasurer have an obligation to tell us why:

- (a) the \$20 million was ever introduced;
- (b) when it was abandoned;
- (c) why it was abandoned; and

(d) how, in any realistic way, we can fulfil the absolute commitment made by the Premier to save the escarpment when the largest and single most important source of funds has been eliminated from the budget.

The episode constitutes a real violation of public trust on this matter.

An hon. member: Shame, shame!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A shameful exhibition.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the Treasurer I am sure, will be delighted to speak to this point of privilege. I will also add a few words.

As I recall the Treasurer's observation, he was referring to statements made in this Legislature, not to a statement made at a press conference which is what the—

Mr. Deans: That is a red herring.

Mr. Lewis: He did not say that on the second occasion!

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not a red herring whatsoever.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I will bring you the Hansard statements tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't interrupt the leader of the New Democratic Party when he was speaking. If he would just have the patience to listen to the observations that I have to make, I will refer to the statement that was made on September 28, which is the position of the government and which will be maintained. That is, "We will increase the annual expenditures for the acquisition of escarpment land from the current year's level of \$2.3 million to the order of \$4 million to \$5 million."

That is in the last paragraph on page 2. What the Treasurer indicated this morning Mr. Chairman, was that the government may determine some vehicle other than the proposed land bank scheme because it gets down to a question of financing. There is no question of the alteration of the government's intent to acquire land in the escarpment at the rates set out on page 2 of the press statement made on September 28.

It is abundantly clear there, Mr. Chairman, and that is the way it is going to be done. As to whether or not, as a result of COGP and other financial considerations, the vehicle used is necessarily the land bank fund, if it is finalized or not, really is not the relevant issue.

Mr. Lewis: Sure it is the relevant issue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it isn't. The relevant issue is the amount of funding that this government is prepared to allocate for certain specific projects. This government is prepared to increase the current year's expenditure of \$2.3 million for the next fiscal year to \$4 million or to \$5 million—hopefully we can make it \$5 million—to go ahead with acquisition of the escarpment land.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe \$20 million! Why doesn't the government set up a land bank and do it that way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, when the land bank was discussed, and I can recall some discussions of it, there were a number of suggestions made as to how it might be utilized; the question of the Toronto-centred region and other purposes. There was never any indication that the total sums from the land bank would be used for purchase of the escarpment land.

Mr. Chairman, while I do not quarrel with the hon. member wanting to raise a question of privilege, I think really if one wants to be technical, the statement here was not made in this Legislature. The really basic issue here is the amount of funding.

If the leader of the New Democratic Party is saying that the government should be allocating more money than this for the acquisition of escarpment land, fine and dandy, I do not quarrel with this. The government would like to allocate more funds to a number of programmes—but this is a commitment of the government and it is a commitment that will be met. Whether it is out of a land bank fund or whether it is through some other method of financing, I can't comment here this afternoon because I don't think it matters.

Mr. Lewis: Then speak to the Treasurer about it!

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is the issue—and this has never been debated; there is no question of equivocation on the part of the government—is that we are prepared to expend this extent of money at least in acquisition of

escarpment land. Surely that is what is at issue.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I think the point of privilege stands. The words in Hansard this morning are quite clear, however the Premier may wish to alter them in order to defend his irrepressible Treasurer, whose memory fails him from time to time.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Irresponsible Treasurer!

Mr. Lewis: May I just remind the Chairman, in the position I put to the Speaker, that in the answer to the problem of public policy I remind the Premier of the sentence which says, "The programme will now be accelerated with additional funds from the \$20-million land banking fund," which was also included in the last budget, which means that on September 28 that allegedly was his intention, despite all the observations of the Treasurer this morning. The paragraph which precedes that makes the same public commitment. When the government withdraws the \$20 million, it is clear that it has withdrawn the intention.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour this point any further and I recognize the leader of the New Democratic Party must salvage something from this situation. The fact that we determine—

Mr. Deans: Nonsense!

Mr. Lewis: I don't have to believe it. He isn't my Treasurer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the government may determine to finance purchases whether of the escarpment or other recreational land by some other vehicle.

Mr. Lewis: The decree of—

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, the proof will be there.

Mr. Stokes: They have to be believable.

Mr. Lewis: They are not believable any longer on the escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, this government has said what it will do—and it will do it. I have no apologies to make for it—if recommendations come through that there is a better way of financing this, if the land bank fund is not

the most appropriate way, we will take other avenues. The really important issue here is how much of the taxpayers' money we as a government are prepared to commit for this specific programme. It's here and we will do it. If the leader of the New Democratic Party says, "Mr. Prime Minister, spend many millions of dollars more," heavens above, Mr. Chairman, I could add that to the \$2 billion-plus total we were talking about last October.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the Treasurer indicates the government was never committed to it. Who are we to believe—the Treasurer or the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That would be \$2 billion-plus!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, as always we expect the normally penitent Treasurer, dressed in ashes and sackcloth, to tender the apology to the House. The Premier cannot rescue him with that kind of verbal gymnastics—he knows it—and it reflects on the government's seriousness about recreational land.

An. hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He needs no rescuing by me.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It is questionable whether this is a point of privilege or not. It is more apt, if anything, to be a point of order and we will refer it to Mr. Speaker for a ruling later.

Mr. Lewis: With respect, Mr. Chairman, I introduced it as a point of privilege based on my allegation that the provincial Treasurer misled the House. I thought it was adequately documented and I would like that referred.

Mr. Chairman: We will refer this to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, state your point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, as a member of this House I rise and object to the fact that the issue here clearly is that we cannot believe the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. That is not a point of privilege.

The hon. House leader.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. MacNaughton) I would ask you to call The Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the government can live with the escarpment. It will haunt them for the next four years.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Supplementary estimates for The Department of Lands and Forests. The Department of Lands and Forests, votes 1101 and 1102. Any discussion on vote 1101?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, I have some brief preliminary remarks. Supplementary estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests totalling \$12,324,000 are required to provide funds for two main purposes—\$6,824,000 for seasonal employment projects and \$5,500,000 for an acceleration of our recreational land acquisition programme.

More than 600 labour-intensive projects are being undertaken in all of the department's programmes and activities. In this respect, perhaps we should look at the whole of these supplementary estimates, excepting land acquisition, rather than on a programme basis.

Employment will be provided for approximately 3,000 persons in projects involving such activities as the removal of dead and dangerous trees in provincial parks, cutting firewood for campsites, improving and developing boat access points, snowmobile and canoe routes. Other work projects are deer range improvements; the construction of forest fire guards; forest stand improvements, including the thinning and pruning of crop trees and the removal of cull trees; development of seed production areas; and the construction of buildings for the use of junior forest rangers.

Also, a portion of the programme is designed to provide jobs for unemployed graduates, primarily youths with professional and technical skills related to resource management—that is in forestry, biology, geography, and like disciplines—plus clerical staff support.

About 625 persons will be hired in this category.

Also I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that over 75 per cent of this programme cost will be used for salaries and 40 per cent will be spent in northern Ontario. As I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, there are three votes—1101, 1102 and 1103—and except for the land acquisition part the employment programmes are covered under those three votes.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101.

The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I have a few things to say about this. I notice in our own area, with which the minister will be very familiar, that jobs have been created. Men have been working for a few weeks in various projects in the district of Cochrane.

There is one project that is going on south of Timmins where there is clearing to, I believe, a hydro dam around Peterlong Lake, I think it is called. There are 21 jobs on that particular project. We are pleased that some of them were unemployed people and some of them are people who have been on welfare.

There is some discussion that the \$2.50 an hour that is being paid by Lands and Forests will be less than what will be paid when the municipality's programme comes into effect and that some of them will be trying to be getting off Lands and Forests and going on to the municipality's programme. I suppose others will move in to take their place.

I understand to carry out this project that about 12 or more miles of the Papakomeka road south from Timmins is being kept open by The Department of Lands and Forests and there may be a commitment to go and do more brushing on that particular road so that it might be brought into better shape. I don't know whether this is part of the winter works project, but it is my understanding that it is.

Now the minister knows that on that particular road, some several miles further on down, is the Texmont Mine. This mine is in very critical shape now because the owner has informed me, and he has informed the work force, that this particular mine will be closed down tomorrow night because he does not intend to plough the road this winter. As a result there will be 100 miners out of work.

I've referred the matter to the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), who is chairman of that northern Ontario transportation commission, but I do know that the Minister of Lands and Forests is on

that particular board. I know he is familiar with the situation there and I know that his department is now involved, through this winter works programme with keeping a portion of that road ploughed open for the winter.

I would plead with the minister to use his influence to have his department, or to bring influence to bear on other ministers of the Crown who might have the responsibility, to have that road kept open for the winter, so that that mine does not have to close down with the loss of 100 jobs for the duration of the winter period. I plead with the minister to, if he has to, extend the programme or find some way to keep that road open. I ask that he exercise his responsibility, or what influence he has.

I wonder if we can hear some response from him to give us some assurance that everything possible will be done to preserve the jobs of those 100 miners, and that we can get action fairly soon.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the member's comments. As he has indicated, this matter has come to the attention of the Northern Ontario Resources Transportation Committee. If my memory serves me right, the secretary of the committee has written to the principals of the company requesting additional information.

I can appreciate what the member has said that the road should be kept open in order to keep employment for these 100 persons, but I do believe that assistance to keep that road open really should not come under this programme but maybe should come under the NORT committee. It is not one of the type of projects for which this special programme has been implemented.

I would be pleased to find out where the matter stands. I think it was brought to the committee's attention about a month ago. I cannot tell you at this stage where it stands but I would be pleased to let you know where it stands on the discussions between the committee and the company.

Mr. Ferrier: I wonder if I may pursue it for another moment. Can I get a commitment from the minister that he will make special inquiries and try to do all he can to expedite this matter, so that we can be assured that everything possible is being done within the terms of the legislation that we have, to try to preserve those jobs and that immediate action today or tomorrow will certainly be undertaken on this particular problem?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to assure the hon. member that we will do everything we can to keep that road open.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We on this side welcome the intimation from the minister that he is indeed spending a considerable portion of money on a winter works programme and that 40 per cent of it will be spent in northern Ontario.

It will add some economic stimulus to the area. He has indicated that it will provide in the neighbourhood of 3,000 jobs. It is unfortunate that we couldn't have had more detailed information on the exact nature of the expenditures and the kind of projects that will be undertaken. We would have been in a better position to assess whether or not the money was put to the best productive use possible.

I have had some consultations with the minister and members of his department, making suggestions as to how a viable and a meaningful winter works programme could have been undertaken. A productive one, that is, to provide employment opportunities for people who find it very difficult to get employment in areas where the entire economy is based on natural resources.

I welcome the indication from the minister that a considerable amount of money is to be spent on stand improvement. This is something that I have advocated as the critic for this department for the last three or four years. I am wondering, though, why at this point in time he couldn't have co-ordinated the expenditures of large sums of funds on things that would have created economic benefit. It would have indicated that he was coming to grips with a realistic resource management programme in the long haul.

I am thinking expressly of the need for more fish hatcheries because of the increased amount of pressure on our fish populations right across the province and, indeed, to a larger extent now in the north with greater transportation facilities. The north is opening up; people are having to go farther away for their recreation as it pertains to fish. I think it is common knowledge that our fish populations are being exposed to ever-increasing pressures from people, not only from southern Ontario but other jurisdictions. I think the minister could have justified a goodly amount of money for the

construction of two or three fish hatcheries in the north.

I think we could also have made provisions for more tree nurseries. I think the problem of a low survival rate in many areas of the province is due to the fact that the minister's nurseries as presently established are too far away from the stands that are going to be improved. It seems to me that there is a need and every justification, for construction and provision of more tree nurseries. This seems to be a way in which the minister could have taken advantage of the extra funds made available to the department—for the purpose that we have been talking about. I think we are in unanimous agreement that it is needed.

Another area where I thought the minister could have expended more of these funds is in areas of the province where he still has a responsibility for the maintenance of roads. I understand that our transportation and highway programme is in a state of flux now since The Department of Highways and the Department of Transport have been unified but we still have three jurisdictions within this government which are responsible for highways and roads.

We have The Department of Transportation and Communications, which is responsible for our main highways; we have this minister, the Minister of Lands and Forests, who is responsible for certain resources roads in the province, and then we have the NORT committee which is responsible for other roads.

I had a very unfortunate experience lately where I was bringing to the attention of various ministers of this government that there was a dire need for the upgrading of a particular section of road. I refer to the top end of tertiary road, Highway 800, stretching from Gull Bay to Armstrong. I communicated with three ministers, and it was a real act of Alphonse and Gaston. Nobody wanted to accept responsibility for the road.

The Department of Lands and Forests, I understand, makes the policy with regard to the maintenance and the upgrading of the road. The actual work is given to a private contractor through The Department of Transportation and Communications and the priorities are set by the NORT committee. So the lines of communication have to be cleared to a great extent, but I think that since you are responsible for certain roads in the area in the province, particularly in the north, that some of these funds could have been

allocated to improving our transportation facilities.

One other area where I would like to have seen more money made available is for training conservation officers and fish and game wardens, if that is the proper terminology. It is common knowledge that we are having a tremendous amount of pressure on our fish and wildlife and we have instances where we do have conservation officers who are responsible for sometimes 4,000 or 5,000 square miles of wilderness. It is just impossible for these people to enforce adequately our fish and game laws across the province. I would have hoped that some of the moneys that are shown here, in that \$12,324,000, would have been spent toward those things rather than used just on a seasonal basis. It is something that is so badly needed and we could have taken advantage of it. I do hope that when we come up with the regular estimates for this department these additional moneys will be reflected in the amount of money that will be spent by this department in fiscal year 1972-1973.

It seems to me that, say, another \$24 million or \$25 million could have been justified for the kind of activities for which this department and this minister are responsible. On each occasion when I speak to the minister or members of his staff, there is an almost complete unanimity and agreement on the things that should be done. Of course, once again it comes down to budgetary constraints, so that I think the minister should take advantage at every opportunity with this supplementary allocation of funds to justify to his colleagues on the Treasury benches that this is not just a one-shot effort; this is something that is needed so badly in proper management of our resources, whether they be forest resources or our fish and wildlife resources. I think there is an excellent case to be made for additional funds on a continuing and on a permanent basis to do the things that this minister would like to do.

As I say, I welcome the announcement that funds are going to be spent. We always wish that it could be more, but I hope that as a result of this the minister can make the best use of the funds during the winter months and in the process convince his colleagues that it is something worthwhile. It is not only creating employment but it is doing something that is badly needed by his department. Maybe we can get the additional funds voted to his department to do the kind of things that we all are agreed should be done.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Just a few brief comments, Mr. Chairman. I wish to thank the hon. member for his very constructive views. If he has not already received this, I will let him know of the type of projects that are being carried on in his district, the Geraldton-Thunder Bay area.

If the hon. member has any views on the type of project that he thinks should be carried on, keeping in mind the limitation of the budget and that these should be carried on during the winter months, we would be pleased to consider them.

We have a certain number that we have approved, but at the same time we have an open mind on this. We would be glad to look at any suggestions.

With reference to hatcheries, I think the hon. member—

Mr. Stokes: I have talked about hatcheries and the nursery.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With reference to the hatcheries, I think the hon. member will appreciate that hatcheries are major expenditures today. I would say that a modern hatchery is in the neighbourhood of \$1 million, maybe more. This takes considerable planning and I do not believe that it is the type of work that would come under this type of a programme. However, under the fish programmes, we have quite a number of programmes being carried out—data on surveys in lakes and streams and so forth. And, of course, there is improving a lot of our streams; cutting rushes and so forth.

With reference to Gull Bay; he referred to the road through the Gull Bay Indian reserve. I am pleased to say that this matter has been satisfactorily dealt with and the matter was discussed as recently as this morning. Approval for the construction of this road and a survey, of course, will be required. This is the road going through the Gull Bay Indian reserve, north of Armstrong.

With reference to conservation officers: I do not believe that in the wintertime we have a need for conservation officers, but it is our intention to train more of our own personnel to do this type of work. There is a tremendous demand for conservation officers, not only in the member's area but in other parts of Ontario. It is our intention, in view of the limitation of funds—we have limitations—that we will try to train some of our own personnel to do this type of work mainly during the summer and in the fall when they are required.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1101.

The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Just a couple of brief comments, Mr. Chairman, directed to the minister.

It is my understanding that in some of the jobs which have been created, as recently as two weeks ago the transportation has not been arranged—or it was not included even—the transportation of men to and from work. It seems a little strange to me, that being the case, that we can expect someone who might have been on welfare for a year to have adequate transportation facilities to become involved in a work project, let us say, 25 miles outside of the city of Sudbury.

This certainly was one of the problems that the minister's staff was having in the Sudbury area. I don't know if it has been cleared up yet. I know they were trying to obtain permission to go ahead with providing a truck or something like that to get the men to the site where they were cutting. It was a real problem.

It seems to me that for such a small thing we could be endangering a programme from going ahead and thus employing a number of people who otherwise would not work. I would hope that this matter has been cleared up and that the department will provide transportation.

The second point I want to raise, and I presume we are dealing with all three of these at once? I would just like to—

Mr. Chairman: We are not really.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right, Mr. Chairman. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be easier to deal with all the employment programmes over the three votes, except of course, land acquisition which comes under the last vote, 1103.

Mr. Martel: I merely want to put forth one project the minister and I have had correspondence over for some 3½ years. He now has some funds with which to move.

Is there any possibility that the minister would start the development of the park project at the north end of Lake Wanapitei? It is the only park facility—in fact, there is none really for the 20,000-odd people in that end of the Sudbury basin. A road has to be constructed into it. I think the overall cost was estimated by the minister's department at some \$640,000. The only drawback

in the last two years has been the lack of funds. The minister now has some funds; some could be expended in work on the development of the road and the actual park site in that area. I certainly, after listening to the minister indicate to my colleague from Thunder Bay that he make suggestions on proposed projects, would indicate if he has a little of that green stuff left over, he might designate some for that particular area.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in reference to this first matter about transportation. It is my understanding that transportation is provided. However, I will look into it and if the hon. member has a specific case he will be good enough to let me know.

With reference to a road north of Wanapitei, I have looked through and I don't see it here as one of our projects. I shall be pleased to look into it. If there is any other project that the member thinks has merit would he please let us know; we will be glad to see if it can be fitted in within this type of programme.

Mr. Martel: I just might pursue that. We have had a number of meetings with the minister over this project and he indicated, as late as this past spring, that because there was no money in the budget at that time that there would be moneys allocated for it in 1972. This was for the development of a complete park system at the far end of Wanapitei, which would service the municipalities of Capreol, Garson, the Hanmer Valley East township and portions of Sudbury.

If it was simply a case of a lack of money I would hope that it has not slipped the minister's mind, in view of the fact that we have had meetings and exchanged correspondence for the better part of 3½ years now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Est-ce que je peux demander au ministre quel pourcentage de ce montant global va être dépensé dans l'est de l'Ontario et quel va être le nombre d'emplois créés par cette dépense dans l'est?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: M. le Président, le nombre total d'emplois est de 2,625 pour toute la province. Cependant il me fera plaisir d'envoyer au député d'Ottawa Est le nombre de personnes employées dans les

environs d'Ottawa ou toute le région sud-est de l'Ontario.

Mr. Roy: Le ministre connaît l'est de l'Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: L'est de l'Ontario. Eastern Ontario. L'est de l'Ontario. Il me fera plaisir de lui?

Mr. Roy: D'ailleurs l'est de l'Ontario est représenté surtout par des conservateurs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. E. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the minister about the money allocated for research. Is there any thought within the department for that particular money or moneys to be allocated in the future, to be tied in with research conducted at, say, the forestry faculty at Lakehead University? Is there any co-operation seen or considered in that area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Research at Lakehead University? If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to briefly outline some of the research programmes. These are not given in any specific area.

I think the best thing to do, Mr. Chairman, would be to let the hon. member know, because I do not have the specifics. All I have under research are the programmes under the forestry section, the fisheries section and also the wildlife and technical divisions. I would be pleased to let the hon. member have them.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, in response to the minister's request for suggestions as to how he might institute further programmes, I would like to suggest that he investigate the feasibility of getting involved in maintenance of the so-called private roads.

Companies who are timbering under licence or cutting pulp all across northern Ontario do, in fact, construct roads. They make them available to the general public on a pass basis, and you have to sign a "save harmless" clause wherein the company which does, in fact, own the road is exempt from any liability were one to have an accident on this highway.

To stress the point I would like to recite just one instance of what happened on a particular private road with which the minister is probably familiar.

The road runs from Highway 144 through the E. B. Eddy Products Company timber limits and comes out at Sultan about 90 miles away; it is used quite extensively by the public on a pass basis from E. B. Eddy.

On this particular stretch of roadway, Mr. Chairman, there is a railway crossing, and a month or so ago I received a phone call from Chapleau telling me an automobile had been struck by a train at this particular level crossing. There was no warning system or device at this crossing.

Even though this is a private road, I still think that the minister who is responsible for timbering in this area should try to come to some agreement with these lumber operators so that whenever the public is granted permission to use these highways, they will be using these highways with some degree of safety. Fortunately in this instance there were no injuries involved, but I am familiar with this road and with this crossing—it is a dangerous crossing—and there are probably several hundred people a day using this private road.

So I would ask the minister to investigate getting involved in these roads. And while I am not particularly anxious to spend public funds to enhance a private operator's profit, I think the expenditure of public funds could be ameliorated by demanding usage of these roads by the general public.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, under The Public Lands Act we have legislation whereby we can enter into agreements with companies to share the costs of the maintenance of these roads. This was initiated about two years ago. At the present time we have in the neighbourhood of about 10 agreements and this is being increased continually. If the member has any roads such as the one he mentioned, I would be pleased to look into it. But regarding our present estimates, I do not believe this question is really relevant to the winter works programme. I think the roads the member is referring to are mainly for access during the spring, summer and fall months.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1101 carry?

Vote 1101 agreed to.

Shall vote 1102 carry?

Vote 1102 agreed to.

On vote 1103:

Mr. Stokes: On vote 1103, Mr. Chairman, I would like a little more detail than is offered here in the supplementary estimates. There is a sum of \$7.83 million for parks, and I assume the greatest portion of this is for land acquisition. Since this aspect of the amount of moneys that are being voted doesn't have a very high labour content, nevertheless it represents an expenditure of public funds and in view of the exchange we had a little earlier it may be worthwhile to find out more details.

In his opening remarks, the minister said \$5.5 million was going for land acquisition. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would give us a detailed account of where he expects to spend the money for land acquisition, since he must have had some idea when he asked for the money where he needed it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased to, Mr. Chairman. On page 12, under this vote 1103, item 3 says \$7,830,000—parks. The breakdown of this is \$5.5 million for parks acquisition and the balance is parks programmes. These parks programmes involve manual labour as well as professional, technical and clerical labour.

Mr. Stokes: Can the minister indicate—or is it unethical to discuss where he is spending the money when he is probably negotiating with other people? But can he give me some indication of what areas he intends to spend the money in and for what use he intends putting the land?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the largest expenditure, \$5.5 million, is broken down as follows: Bronte Creek Provincial Park, \$2.5 million; Wasaga Beach backlands, \$1 million—this is to provide mainly parking space; Erieau Beach, \$500,000 and the Niagara Escarpment, \$1.5 million.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could direct a question to the minister with regard to the possibility of acquiring the bird sanctuary north of Sudbury? I think the minister is very much aware that there has been a lot of correspondence in the last couple of years directed to his department regarding the purchase of this sanctuary. It is being operated now by a family which is losing money year after year and it is going to have to sell it perhaps to private developers. I urge the minister to give it consideration. It would cost no more than about \$100,000 to purchase it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, what we are asking to be approved is \$5.5 million. This is an addition to our present acquisition programme. In the estimates voted last spring the total for land acquisition was \$3.25 million. So I would be pleased to look into the matter that the hon. member refers to, this sanctuary near Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: The minister has a file a foot thick on it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But for this to be relevant today the \$5.5 million are specifically for those areas that I just outlined a few minutes ago.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Concerning land acquisition, in the minister's leadoff speech he said he was going to buy additional land for parks. I was just wondering what happened to that park proposal of 1968, the great announcement by the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar), who said that the government was going to purchase some 300 acres of land on Lake Erie? I believe there was a plan for expropriation filed in the county of Welland in 1969. To this day nothing has been done. The land has been frozen. Property owners who have been trying to sell their land cannot sell it for the simple reason that they have this document against their lands.

An hon. member: I remember something about it.

Mr. Haggerty: I was a little bit amazed during the last provincial election that in a little Conservative pamphlet the Premier was shown walking along the lakeshore. Perhaps a number of the members in this House have seen that.

I would like to see him try this down in the area of Welland county along the lakefront. I am afraid you would have to have a court injunction against him, as there are against other persons wanting to get down to the lakefront. I am sure the minister is aware that if there is a need for provincial parks, a public park, public access to the lakefront, it is in this particular area. I would like to know why there is the delay in purchasing this land. The minister has already filed expropriation procedures. He has the additional funds here. Why not get on with it and purchase the land now?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member that this is very desirable parkland and it is our intention to purchase it. I wish to remind the hon. member, as he knows, that the owner is unwilling to sell. Therefore, this makes any negotiations much more difficult. Also we have to keep in mind we have so many demands that, with the amount of money available, we have to do it on a priority basis. It does command a high priority, but at the same time there are other areas that command maybe just as high, if not a higher, priority. But briefly, we are still very interested and we intend to pursue acquiring it.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the minister is well aware that there is a great need for this provincial park in the area. I think we have to find some place for the people in that area for Ski-doo's and dune buggies. They have to have some place to burn up this energy. There is no other place—

Mr. Stokes: They are motorized snow vehicles.

Mr. Haggerty: I am pushing the product, let's put it this way. All right. But, anyway, there is a great need for this type of recreation in this area. I want to congratulate the Niagara Parks Commission, especially the chairman, for allowing motorized snowmobiles to use certain areas of the Niagara Parks system, but there are other places that are required, I think, particularly in this area here. We do have a number of American tourists coming over looking for such a place as this.

There is revenue that can be made from this park. It would create employment and I think the main theme in this new budget here, this mini-budget, is employment. If the minister was to purchase that park site now, he could have maybe 15 or 20 men working for a period of one to two years in developing it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a short question of the minister. In regard to the \$5.5 million; that is in excess of the previous estimate of about \$3 million for land acquisition. At that time, earlier in the year, there were priorities set on how that \$3.5 million or \$3.7 million—I don't know the exact amount—would be spent.

In the list that he has given us this afternoon of where the \$5.5 million will be spent, many of those areas were not just below the

priority areas that were established earlier in the year. There were some specific land purchases that I was told came just below the priority line, and would not be purchased this year because there were others of higher priority. These are not included in the list that the minister has mentioned this afternoon to be purchased by this \$5.5 million.

Can the minister explain to me if there is in existence more than one priority list and if it changes considerably from month to month? Just how are these decisions arrived at? Specifically, I note that there is very little in this \$5.5 million for the purchase of lands in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it is quite true. There is very little for lands in northern Ontario because the big demands for recreational lands are in southern Ontario where nine-tenths of our population is living. Briefly, Mr. Chairman; the report of the Toronto-centred region, millions of dollars; the Trent River-Severn canal, again millions of dollars; the Wasaga Beach; the access on Lake Erie—

An hon. member: Fifty Mile Point!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Fifty Mile Point. Add it all up. In all our studies—we have surveys, Mr. Chairman, that we send out, Tourism and Information and ourselves, and the demand for more park land is in the densely populated areas of southern Ontario.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I agree that this may be true, but on the other hand there are some lands in northern Ontario that have been on the priority list for a good number of years. Every year they come just below the line where the money runs out and people are told that next year they will likely come above that line and will be included.

This year the minister had \$3.7 million to start with. They were just below the line; the minister added \$5.5 million to that and they completely disappeared. Are the minister's decisions made strictly on public pressure or is this list of priorities that is established within the branch—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) is going to get him! The member is becoming partisan again.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am just asking him! I am just asking a question. I would like to find out how he arrived at that, other than these new studies that seem to have come from nowhere in the last six months since the previous estimates were passed.

I asked at that time and they were just below the line. The minister has more than doubled the amount of funds that are made available under this programme and they are still not above the line. It is rather hard to understand and I would like a fuller explanation from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am a northerner and I feel that northern Ontario is practically all parkland. Most of it, more than nine-tenths, is Crown land. I do believe that, as I said earlier, we are interested in public needs and these are greater in southern Ontario and that is why this commands a higher priority.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the minister that the most accessible lakes in northern Ontario are, generally, 85 per cent privately owned, and in those specific areas there is a need as great as there is in some parts of southern Ontario. For the minister to say it is 90 per cent public owned in northern Ontario and that this meets the criteria and the need, does not apply to those specific areas—such as the lake on which I live, which is largely privately owned and where public access is very limited. I know in the Sudbury area the same conditions prevail there for public access to the lake as prevail in most of southern Ontario. There is a need in some parts of northern Ontario, and I think the minister should recognise that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I would just like to add a little to what the member for Nipissing said. The minister will recall that on previous occasions here in the House attention has been called to the fact that there is a possibility that the department could for a reasonable amount of money have Manitoulin Island brought back under the wing of the Crown. I understand that there is a lot of American money floating around; they would just love to get their hands on land on Manitoulin Island presently privately held.

There is one instance where the minister should be actively pursuing the acquisition of this land on behalf of the Crown. It is not the real north, but it is the near north, and that is where the pressure is going to be the greatest.

Another area is along the north shore of Georgian Bay where I can recall the former member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) standing up in this House and making

impassioned pleas to the minister for the setting aside of land for a park. There is none really between Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: The Americans have bought it all.

Mr. Stokes: These are things to which the minister should be addressing himself, because the longer he procrastinates the more expensive this land is going to become. He is spending, I think, a minimum of \$10 million a year to acquire recreational land. Agreed the greatest amount of pressure is down here in the south, but the thing is the minister only has X number of dollars to spend, and I think he should be spending it where he is getting the best value for his dollar. It seems to me that those are the areas where he should be placing the most emphasis. As I say I would like to support my friend from Nipissing in the remarks that he makes.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question regarding Erieau Beach. Are these parks bought? Has the minister reached agreements on all these parks?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we are in the process of negotiations.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could inform us as to the progress of the acquisition of the land for the Bronte park; whether to this stage any acquisition has taken place, and how much of the total acreage we expect to bring into the parks programme has been acquired to this date.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to ask my colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Auld) to make this information available. I would say to the best of my knowledge that there has been considerable amount of acreage already acquired and there is a considerable amount that is under option. So, it is proceeding exceedingly well.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Chairman, a question on the Bronte Creek Provincial Park: I wonder if the minister could tell us whether that \$2.5 million is for the complete package or not?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Bronte Creek?

Mr. Edighoffer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, this \$2.5 million, Mr. Chairman, is for this current year. Next year with the total acquisition of Bronte Creek, it will be in the neighbourhood of \$4 million to \$5 million. This is for this year; next year there will have been additional money.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1103 carried?

Vote 1103 agreed to.

This completes study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Supplementary estimates for The Department of Transportation and Communications, page 6, vote 802.

Does the hon. minister have an opening explanation?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): No.

Mr. Chairman: We will carry on with vote 802.

Vote 802 carried?

Vote 802 agreed to.

On vote 803:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Vote 803, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I see that these estimates include the sum of some \$14 million for municipal subsidies. It would seem to me in the absence of any other information that the logical place to put that \$14 million would be in a municipal subsidy to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto for the continuation of the construction of the Spadina Expressway.

I don't know if the minister knows, Mr. Chairman, what havoc he has wrought not only to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and to the people who are directly affected by this unusual and arbitrary and, I think, very bad decision that was made—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think I should rise on a point of order at this point in time. There is nothing, not one copper, in these estimates to be involved in expenditures in the terms that the hon. member is advancing on the Spadina Expressway. I think it is out of order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the minister's opinion that it is out of order, it is my submission that it clearly is in order. The estimates are here. The minister is requesting, Mr. Chairman, a \$14 million allocation for municipal subsidies. The department pays municipal subsidies to a variety of municipalities. There is no other detail in it and surely it is open to any member of this House to suggest how that money should, in fact, be allocated and the way in which it can best be used to the advantage of all of the citizens in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: I am talking on the point of order! If the minister will just subside until I'm through, he can have his chance. I didn't interrupt him.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I want to speak to the chairman. I am not speaking to the member at all.

Mr. Chairman: Are you discussing the minister's point of order?

Mr. Singer: I am discussing the minister's point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: You may discuss the point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right then. I will come back to it again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think that has been the practice all the way through these estimates—that when a particular sum of money is asked for by a minister and it can be allocated to a particular function of that department, it has been in order to discuss it.

Let me take your mind back, Mr. Chairman, to the discussion on agriculture where there was \$6 million asked for by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) for administration. Many members talked about the problems of eggs and chickens which had no relationship to what the minister had in mind, but that was discussed and it was accepted by you as being in order. There were long discussions about wet and dry corn, which again is not indicated particularly, but you accepted those remarks as being in order and I think you were right.

Now, I can't see, Mr. Chairman, any difference in the basis here, because—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is laying an egg now.

Mr. Singer:—if there is \$14 million being asked for by the minister as a municipal subsidy—and a municipal subsidy could be a grant to the Spadina Road extension or to any other particular road—why can't it properly be discussed?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, Mr. Chairman. On the same point of order, I would detail for the hon. member the expenditures proposed in these supplementary estimates that make up the \$14 million and prove to him categorically that there is nothing in here for the Spadina Expressway. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Why isn't that part of the estimates?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I propose to try to show the chairman the extent to which I think my observation is in order, and that the hon. member is out of order.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): He is completely out of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is out of order to talk about something that isn't in the estimates, but all he has here is—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Who has the floor?

Mr. Singer: \$14 million.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but I propose to break down that \$14 million into detail.

Mr. Martel: We asked the minister to do that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right.

Mr. Singer: No.

Mr. Chairman: May I rule on the point of order please?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, you will rule on it, sir, in due course.

Mr. Chairman: It has been customary in the rules of procedures of the House to not restrict discussion completely to exactly the

money that is being spent. If an hon. member wishes to promote another project or issue where he thinks the money should be spent better, he has that privilege to do so, providing it isn't a complete argument that takes up most of the afternoon, shall we say. He can promote, as we have in the past few moments, the buying of certain extra lands for parks and what have you, but just within limitations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Very good.

Mr. Chairman: To rule out of order, if I might just continue, any complete—

Mr. Martel: Does the government want to challenge his rule?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will hear from the leader.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would have to rule out of order any complete discussion of the whole theory and philosophy of the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We will have to raise it again to make it complete.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I too have listened—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I had the floor and I yielded to the minister on a point of order, so I would suggest the minister is out of order now.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister would like to make an opening statement and we could hear that first.

Mr. Singer: No, he was asked that originally.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Three words: "Spadina is dead."

Mr. Chairman: I feel it would save time if the minister did outline—

Mr. Martel: I asked him to do that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, the minister was given an opportunity to make an opening statement—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Hey, I am still on my feet, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: He refused, and he then rose on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I don't recall having yielded the floor to the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: —and I sat down to listen to his point of order. I have the floor now and I refuse to yield to the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said I didn't recall having yielded the floor to the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Bullbrook: The chairman wants to speak.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: For the chairman, but not for the hon. member, I'll sit down.

Mr. Chairman: The minister is still speaking to the point of order. You have the floor, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Singer: On what?

Mr. Martel: No, no. He has not got the floor!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. There is no point in making an opening statement on these things. It is broken down into several votes; two votes have been carried already—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the minister is not talking on a point of order. He is now making a statement to elaborate what is here in the estimates. He missed that opportunity and I had the floor. I submit to you, sir, that he is out of order and I ask you to rule that way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) is getting so disgusted he is on his way back to Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I now propose, sir, if I may, to detail the amounts—

Mr. Singer: No, no!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —making up this total of \$14 million and ask you to rule as to whether it has any relationship to the Spadina Expressway or not.

Mr. Singer: No, no.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have stated, sir, if I may speak to the point of order, that you permitted wide-ranging debates on corn, eggs, chicken and everything else, and I say that was out of order too, if I may be permitted to do so.

Some hon. members: No, no!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I say it was: These are supplementary estimates, I would remind you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martel: Challenge the Chair!

Mr. Deans: The minister's opinion is neither sought nor required.

Mr. Martel: A terrible display by the minister!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You're laying an egg!

An hon. member: Quack, quack, quack.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. To settle this I believe we should allow the minister to give a breakdown of the \$6 million so we can discuss that in particular.

Mr. Martel: I asked him to do that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Mr. Singer: You have no basis on which you can take away my right to speak. I was speaking before the minister rose to a point of order. You have made a ruling on the point of order and that is now dealt with. I presume the minister accepts it, as I do. Accordingly, I am entitled to continue speaking.

Mr. Chairman: No. Order, please.

Mr. Singer: You have no right to interrupt me in mid-speech to let someone else come in.

An hon. member: Let's go to the Spadina.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What does the member mean he has no right? He has a perfect right.

Mr. Chairman: I believe, for the expedition of the business of the House, it would be in order for the minister to speak now—

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to accept that.

Mr. Chairman: I rule that!

Mr. Singer: Well, I don't care what you rule, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. Singer: —I was speaking first and I refuse to accept that. I am going to stand here, and if you want to name me, then go ahead and name me. You have no right to interrupt me while I am speaking and to put the minister in instead.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Control him!

Mr. Singer: You have absolutely no right to do that!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member is embarrassing his leader and he is embarrassing the member for Sarnia.

Mr. Singer: No, I am embarrassing the Treasurer and his colleague.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: It's about time the Treasurer began to understand the rules too.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't he apologize?

Mr. Martel: Don't mislead the House again today. Once is enough.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Is the minister still speaking to the point of order?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, sir. If I may, in support of the point of order, detail for you the breakdown of these expenditures—

Mr. Singer: Point of order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —in support of my point of order—

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You have ruled on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if you can find one copper in the \$14 million that has any relationship to the Spadina Expressway, then of course, if you can find that, sir, and you rule accordingly, I shall abide by your ruling.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He has already ruled on that.

Mr. Singer: He has already ruled that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He ruled it in order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The expenditures are made up—

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the way the thing works. You have already

ruled on the point of order and the minister persists in trying to get his statement in now that he recognizes what your ruling is, and he is out of order. You have no right, and I say it with the greatest respect—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not true.

Mr. Stokes: Isn't the minister a lawyer?

Mr. Singer: —you have no right to ask me to sit down and let the minister come in when I was on my feet before he raised the point of order.

An hon. member: With the greatest of respect, of course.

Mr. Martel: He was on the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Always with the greatest of respect.

Mr. Martel: Don't let him bully you. You are the chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is the minister still speaking to the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have come to get you!

Mr. Singer: Of course, I hope they arrest me.

Mr. Stokes: Call in the reinforcements!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I draw to your attention—

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, absolutely not. I sat down because you said it was a point of order, and I will not—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, this time I am not going to sit down!

Mr. Singer: Well, neither will I!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let's all stand up!

Mr. Singer: I'll accept the ruling of the chairman. I certainly won't accept the minister's.

Mr. Cassidy: Round 4.

Mr. Singer: The chairman has ruled that—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I didn't hear any such ruling at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, perhaps you should repeat your ruling so that the hon. minister can hear it. He said he did not hear it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How did the Leader of the Opposition get the floor?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Easy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do I still have the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. No, I have the floor.

There seems to be an impasse at the present time. I ruled that in the case of a brief discussion on the promotion of some particular project, which any member would like to promote in his riding, or any place outside his riding as far as that goes, that the member would be able to do so. We have allowed that in the past, not only in this session but in past sessions, but I still say that I would rule out of order any prolonged discussion on any one project because I think that if there are not funds provided for it and if the minister can't be convinced in a few short—

Mr. Singer: Oh come on, you can't do that either.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. —convinced in a few short sentences to maybe change his expected expenditure or proposed expenditure, then it should not be prolonged to a great length. But we have to have a bit of freedom to promote some pet project in our discussions and I would allow the hon. member for Downsview a brief discussion on any project for which he would propose to have money spent.

With that ruling I will call on the member for Downsview.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is nothing much out of order about this, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The chairman just called on the member for Downsview.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I remind you, sir, if I may, that no member of the opposition benches has any right to talk about proposed expenditures of funds in the first place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: On a point of order. Surely, Mr. Chairman, for any member of this House, and least of all or most of all a member of the cabinet, a member of the council, to suggest that we can't talk about proposed

expenditures—Mr. Chairman, I think he should withdraw that remark. The minister should know better. I am embarrassed for him, I really am, that he could make a statement of that character.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for Downsview please continue?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, with great respect for the hon. member, he has been waiting for two days to get into this exercise. If you so rule, let him go ahead.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He wouldn't come into the House. The House leader couldn't get him to come in.

Mr. Cassidy: That was real generosity.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let him go ahead, along with the hon. member for Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): That's right. I have been listening to chickens and eggs for two days now, I want my say.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, the member for Downsview has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then we will hear the other point of view from the member's leader after that.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I started to say—and certainly keeping your admonitions in mind, my remarks will be brief as they usually are—it would be my suggestion that the \$14 million that the minister now asks us for would be much better spent than anything they might have in mind if they were spent in Metropolitan Toronto to build and complete the Spadina Road extension. Now let me tell you why, Mr. Chairman.

I think that the government has lost sight of what is at stake. The Premier a few days ago expressed, as he should have, great concern about possible changes to the automobile plants. He was concerned about the jobs that might have been at stake in Oshawa, Windsor, Oakville, in St. Thomas and other places that produce automobiles, and employ citizens of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If the member had a shovel he could dig the whole thing himself right now.

Mr. Singer: Now I presume from that, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier had in mind that it is important to our economy—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Give him a pick and shovel and let him go up there and dig it out.

Mr. Singer:—that we continue to manufacture automobiles. But by the same token the Premier and his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, apparently think it is a good idea to manufacture automobiles as long as nobody uses them. Now the philosophy seems to be a bit mixed up, a bit convoluted, and a bit inconsistent, because if it is important to our economy that we keep people working producing automobiles—and I agree that it is—then surely, Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that the automobile is an important part of the way of life here in the Province of Ontario and that automobiles are important to people as well as people being important for automobiles.

What did the government do in its decision to stop Spadina after all these years: To stop Spadina after this particular minister's having in fact signed a contract saying it must continue? The minister continues to sit there even though morally he has breached his own written word, his own given word, and put his signature to it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was that the irrevocable word?

Mr. Singer: That was the minister, yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Come off that kick.

Mr. Singer: What they have done, Mr. Chairman, is to begin the throttling of the whole of the core of the Province of Ontario. Our capital city, two million plus, is now being told by this government, "No, you cannot have a reasonable system of expressways and combined rapid transit. You must wait for the follies of Buckminster Fuller to be unfolded."

We don't know what Bucky said, how much he charged or how long he worked at it, but we must have, as the Tory candidate in Downsview said in the last election, these pyramid buildings that people will wonder at and come to see as they go to see the Eiffel Tower in Paris. Could the minister explain—his leader couldn't explain this morning—just how Buckminster Fuller's ideas fit in with local planning and local services and local densities and decisions of the OMB and even his own contract? I am sure the minister can't. The Prime Minister couldn't, so can the minister?

Could the minister tell us how we are possibly going to cope with the advent into Metropolitan Toronto every day of in excess of 200,000 vehicles that come from beyond the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto?

The minister has seen the latest reports. He will recognize that over the north and from beyond the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto every day 128,000 vehicles enter into Metropolitan Toronto; from the west 32,000 and from the east 28,000. In round figures 200,000 vehicles come into Metropolitan Toronto from outside every day.

Where do they go? They go through what is presently a most inadequate and overcrowded and outdated system of roads, and it gets worse. When you get over into the west end; when you get to Keele Street and Dufferin Street and Bathurst Street and Yonge Street, what do you find?

You find that those streets are operating to capacity and in excess of their normal capacity every day. It gets worse; the rush hours are spread out; they are lengthening. Instead of taking half-an-hour or an hour they are moving to an hour-and-a-half and two hours, and it gets worse every day.

There are an extra 20,000 new motor vehicle registrations in Metropolitan Toronto every year. We are talking about the Toronto-Dominion Centre; there is a new tower that is planned, the announcement was just revealed the other day—Commerce Court, the Metro Centre that we talked about in this House, the Four Seasons complex on the south side of Queen Street, the Temple Building and other things. Is the government against all of this kind of development? Is the government against this kind of progress and, if it isn't, then how does it possibly anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that people are going to get backwards and forwards to work in these new buildings and to make these things a success—the commercial enterprises, the industrial enterprises?

I had a gentleman tell me just a few days ago—his factory is located in my riding in the northwest sector—that he has to watch his trucks sit on a road entering on to Marlee for over half an hour before they can break into the traffic. How then can he justify his production costs when he has to keep a truck sitting on a side road, trying to get out of his factory to deliver his finished goods into the markets of Ontario? How can this be done? Does the government want to drive these people out of business because it is denying them privileges?

What about the residents, Mr. Chairman? Marlee is an ordinary two-lane road between Dufferin Street and Bathurst Street. It happens to be at the southerly extension of what was the Spadina Road extension. You pick it up as you come south of Lawrence Avenue. Marlee, an ordinary two-lane street that runs through a substantially residential area, now carries in a 24-hour period more traffic than Yonge Street does at Lawrence Avenue in the same 24-hour period. Does this make any sense? Is this any service for people, that you talked about?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the government having made their decision—and the election is over and it is finished—has to sit down and begin to contemplate the kind of problems that have been created by saying no more expressways within Metropolitan Toronto, and stopping one on which it had already spent \$140 million. Who is the government hurting? It is hurting our industries. It is hurting the automobile industry. It is hurting the local industries. It is hurting the people. It is hurting the expansion of Metropolitan Toronto.

As for the ordinary residents who live there are concerned, their property has depreciated in value. They have no means of getting up and down, and in and out. Commerce has stopped. What answer, Mr. Chairman, is there other than another look at what goes on? I don't think a person like the hon. minister, even though he gets difficult on occasion, is too big to say, "Maybe we were precipitous in our decision. Maybe we should have another look at it—"

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Don't count on that.

Mr. Singer: "—maybe we should let this thing get finished, and maybe we should take advantage of what is available here in Ontario and allow it"—as the government did in London—it inserted itself into the London discussions on was the expressway going to go north of the city or south of the city. The government stood fast and said, "No, it is going to go through the city." And there it is—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Who said that?

Mr. Singer: The decision to go through the city was because the council wanted it to go through the city and the government accepted and respected the opinion of the London council, as I say it should have.

All the metropolitan councils, the borough councils—North York, York and the others—

Toronto, have all said "Yes, finish it." The council of Metropolitan Toronto has said, "Yes, finish it." All of the planning intelligence that has gone on for 15 years says "Yes, let's finish it" and the minister and his colleagues say "No, let's stop."

Yet we look at this \$14 million. Here, Mr. Chairman, is the opportunity where they can begin to rectify a serious wrong. The election is over so it is no longer an election issue. If the government gained any votes out of it, which I don't think it did, the people perhaps can wonder about whether or not in changing its mind the government is right. I don't think the government gained any votes out of it, I think they lost votes because of this decision.

But that is not the issue—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why does the member bring it up then?

Mr. Singer: All right. The issue is, is the government prepared to do things for people? What, in fact, it is doing is stultifying North York, Toronto and—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If it is not an issue, why does the member discuss it?

Mr. Singer: —the Province of Ontario. The minister is making our city such that it will be impossible to move about in it and he has no alternative. Sure, he talks about rapid transit, and he talks about a special technical committee that is studying routes. What are the routes going to be?

He is going to have a choice between putting the rapid transit down the Spadina road bed—the \$140 million road bed—or he could put it down Bathurst Street. Imagine what would happen if they tear up Bathurst Street, either for rapid transit or even for the stations! Bathurst Street is one of the worst streets in Metropolitan Toronto. Or he can put it halfway between. Those are his three alternatives. If he puts it halfway between, somebody is going to have to embark on another programme of land acquisition.

Now if the Spadina was bad by itself, why would the government want to put rapid transit down alone unless there is complementary road transit to go along with it? And the other two suggested routes, to my mind at least, are positively ludicrous. Even if somebody finally does determine that there will be rapid transit and it will be on a certain specified route, how long is it going to be before anybody is going to be able to use it?

We haven't even had a technical decision on where the route might be. And after that technical decision is put forward, it is going to have to be wrestled with by a number of political bodies, municipal councils and others, and by the time that route is finally decided, I would say my estimate of six months or a year is a conservative one.

Having done that, somebody is going to have to be commissioned to draw a whole new set of drawings. Those drawings are not simple. You just don't get Bucky Fuller in and he doesn't put a few hen scratches on a piece of paper and say, "Here is how we are going to build a new subway." It is going to take another year to get the drawings done and then you call your contracts. If anybody can possibly travel on any new rapid transit system in that area within seven years, Mr. Chairman, it would be, in fact, a miracle.

I beg the government, I beseech the members, to look at what they have done and to reverse it before in fact they have destroyed the heartland of the province, the place where the money comes from, the place where there is expansion and before they have really hurt so many people in such a realistic way.

Surely the minister can understand that kind of a plea? Surely the minister can, who had the wisdom some years ago to sign the contract that he did! It is under his own hand; himself, he, signed it. I can understand why he did that a few years ago and perhaps can ruminate just a bit on the wisdom, or lack of it, of the most recent decision.

I do not think anybody is going to think any the less of him if he changes his mind again. In fact, he could go down in history, Mr. Chairman; he could do down in history as a man of some vision if he would bring all his personal power to bear—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is a very touching appeal, I will tell you.

Mr. Singer: —on the government to reverse the decision and to start off by putting this \$14 million into the continuation of the Spadina Road extension.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Hear, hear.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Chairman, I believe the recent discussion is in violation of rule 16(a), subsection 2(i).

An hon. member: What is this?

An hon. member: I wondered why he was here.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is this a point of order? Is that what the member is after?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It's a point of order, yes.

Mr. Singer: How many rulings did we get on this thing?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, I would like you to take this into consideration and give us a ruling on whether it is, or is not.

Mr. Singer: It was already ruled on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Right on—the last speech was right on.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You don't have to appeal a ruling to discuss things with the chairman. It is not necessary.

Mr. Singer: Oh yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not necessary to appeal a ruling to discuss things with the chairman, I say to the House leader over there.

Mr. Deans: The ruling was made.

Mr. Chairman: I ruled a few moments ago that any member has been allowed this in the past, and within limitation we will accept that procedure,—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the assistant deputy whip want to appeal?

Mr. Chairman:—to make a proposal which he feels is beneficial, if it is along the lines of the topic under discussion, or the money being spent.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, may I further submit to you, sir, that the matter under discussion is the supplementary estimates and the supplementary estimates do not cover the subject matter being discussed by previous members.

Mr. Martel: They do so.

Mr. Deans: Are you all going to reintroduce the argument?

Mr. Chairman: Well, I ruled on that a few moments ago. It related to the same proposition and the procedure we have been follow-

ing where, for instance, in the acquisition of parks a few moments ago, it seemed reasonable for a member to be able to press his point for certain moneys to be spent in a particular part of Ontario, within reason.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This was a ruling?

Mr. Chairman:—within reason. The member is now finished. He thought some of this money which was being allotted should be directed to a particular project and we have allowed him to present his point. He did it very briefly. I appreciate that.

Mr. Bullbrook: Just as usual.

Mr. Martel: Maybe the minister will give us the list now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I support his ruling 100 per cent. I don't agree with it, but I support it.

Mr. Martel: Why not give us the list?

Mr. Chairman: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, you realize the disadvantage that I have in being a new boy here. I haven't been able to ascertain the style of this chamber but I am rapidly forming a judgement as to what I think of this place.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Does the member want to give up?

Mr. Givens: I would like the minister to listen to me. That is what I have been saving it for. I think that somewhere down the line, Mr. Chairman, one needs a supply of nasty pills in here. The decorum is entirely different from what I have become accustomed to elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is another place.

Mr. Martel: There was a dictator there.

An hon. member: That was City Hall.

Mr. Givens: When I saw this amount of \$14 million here, it just seemed to me that this was an inordinate amount of money to be put in the estimates and it must have something to do with the construction of roads because that is what it says. And I have always regarded the Minister of Transportation and Communications as a very amiable, very pragmatic and practical man—

An hon. member: That must be some other guy.

Mr. Deans: That was when George Gomme was here.

Mr. Givens:—and I understand that as the signatory of the irrevocable agreement that my hon. friend from Downsview referred to—he was a down-to-earth guy and I understand that part of it—that when the announcement was made on June 3, the scuttlebutt was around that the minister was one man who thought that this was a terrible breach of faith. And if he wishes to deny that, of course, he can do so—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What a horrible complaint for anybody to make.

Mr. Givens: That is what I heard from some very close friends of the minister; that he didn't like the decision.

Now, the minister said during the course of the remarks made by the hon. member for Downsview: "Don't bet on that Vern"—in other words, that the Spadina could never be reopened. And the Prime Minister this morning made some remark—and I do not know whether to take him seriously or not in the light of what he said about remarks made in press conferences—you know, that probably they are not as valid as statements made in the chamber here.

He said something about the whole subject matter being irrelevant, but I don't think it is irrelevant when the minister is putting \$14 million into the estimates and this is the last chance we are going to have to discuss it, because I am told—again through scuttlebutt—that the next meeting of this assembly will not take place probably until next March. So when are we going to discuss this \$14 million, if not today? And give the benefit of our advice to the minister as to perhaps how he should use this \$14 million. The minister talks about a technical committee being constituted, Mr. Chairman. How many people are there in this province who know anything about rapid transit? There are a handful of people in his department who know about expressways; there are a handful of people in the Toronto Transit Commission and the metropolitan corporation and perhaps two or three consulting firms. Outside of Bucky Fuller with his phantasmagoria that he came with for that vacant land I call the "Davis Ditch," that is all there is.

I would take it, Mr. Chairman, that this technical committee the minister has formed is not a new committee. It is a technical committee composed of the personnel I have

made reference to, and they have already discussed and dismissed the various alternatives they had with respect to the Spadina Expressway over the past 15 years. This is not a new technical committee; this is a hoary old technical committee that he is talking about.

The ladies who were down to see the Prime Minister yesterday didn't come away thinking the discussion was irrelevant; they were evidently left with some hope. Whether that hope will be misplaced or not, they will be down again, because this is a problem, this is a cancer that won't be removed. I don't envy the minister, because he is going to have to put Humpty-Dumpty together again which all the king's horses and all the king's men weren't able to do—he is going to have to put him together again. And it will be very much the original Humpty-Dumpty when we are through because there are certain facts of life that have not altered and I want to make reference to one or two.

The Premier said on October 12, when he gave that press statement—and I quote him directly:

We are determined to reverse the seemingly inexorable commitment to resolving the transportation problems of Metro Toronto by the construction of expressways.

The implication of this statement is clear and unequivocal; that Metro has gone crazy building expressways. I remember when Metro started in 1953, and there was close liaison between the then Premier, Leslie Frost, and Fred Gardiner who was the chairman of Metro, and we had a two-lane bridge across the Humber at the lakeshore. Since then 62 miles of expressways have been constructed in Metro, and this provincial government built 42 miles of that 62 miles of expressway—Highway 400, which incidentally was supposed to have been extended down to the lakeshore, and that was abandoned because the Spadina Expressway was to take its place. You know that as a fact. Highway 400—

Mr. Stokes: That is where all the money went.

Mr. Givens:—Highway 401 and the Queen Elizabeth Way. That was 42 miles—now please listen to me—and only 20 miles of expressway, Mr. Chairman, have been built by Metro out of these 62. Only 20 miles out of the 62 were built by Metro, and Metro has built 21 miles of subway without the assistance of the province.

Indeed, do you gentlemen know, through the Chair, that the metropolitan corporation imposed a two-mill capital levy on the taxpayers of Metropolitan Toronto over and above everything else? The assessment of this metropolitan area is \$6.5 billion; that yields about \$13 million that is being used for subway purposes and which was never contributed to by this provincial government. Indeed, the provincial government would never contribute to the subsidization of subways, and this is why there was the stew. It was not until the Spadina Expressway that the provincial government contributed to the land acquisition of the median strip—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I don't want to intrude in the remarks of the hon. member, but when he says there has been no provincial contribution to subways, of course he is in error. He is wrong.

Mr. Lawlor: It was negligible.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, at the time that the Yonge Street subway was built—

Mr. Worton: Not at the time this was built.

Mr. Givens:—there was no contribution at all. The first contribution was half the cost of land acquisition of the median strip which comprised about seven per cent of the capital cost of construction of the Spadina. This was the big deal that was made between Frost and Gardiner at the time. Subsequently the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) came across with a contribution toward the Bloor Street subway which comprised about 17 per cent of the cost. If the minister investigates, he will find that my facts are straight.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, 21 miles of subway were built by Metro, plus the five miles of the new extension from Eglinton to Finch—that is 26 miles—and another six miles will be built if, as and when the Spadina Expressway rapid transit gets going which, apparently from the remarks that were made by the Premier today, will happen in any event.

I don't envy the minister; when he starts changing that alignment and wants to go down the west side of Bathurst, the people will want it on the east side, those on the east side will want it down the centre, and the people down the centre will want it to be tunnelled. This is what happened with the Yonge Street extension. He will have to make that decision because he has arrogated unto himself that authority now.

So, in Metro there are 20 miles of expressway versus 32 miles of rapid transit; no other city in the world has such a balanced system of rapid transit and expressway, and to imply that Metro has gone expressway crazy is absolutely false.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the provincial authorities realize what they are doing, and I would like the minister to listen to me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am listening.

Mr. Givens: My hon. friend from Downsview made reference to this. Opposite the new city hall a hotel will be opening; within about the next two or three months there will be about 15,000 people coming there every night. They have one concert hall that seats 5,000 people for a meeting. The hotel behind the city hall will be finished, the Thomson building is practically fully occupied and the Temple building will be finished shortly. The minister is going to have to discuss with his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales), the construction of the Metro Centre, which will have one parking lot for about 8,000 cars. Eaton's is talking about a \$200-million complex of office buildings. There will be 50,000 people coming to Metro Centre. The Royal Bank has announced that they are going to build a complex which is even bigger than the Commerce Court. Commerce Court hasn't been occupied yet.

There is going to be a third tower to the Toronto-Dominion Centre and if members listened to the news this morning, they will find that car sales in the United States and Canada are up a whopping 23 per cent this year. What was the first thing that President Nixon of the United States did when he wanted to stimulate their economy? He removed the seven per cent excise tax on the manufacture and sale of cars.

Now, when the minister discusses the Metro Centre with his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I suggest, with great respect, that unless he determines and discovers how he is going to move cars and people and commercial vehicles and service vehicles, which now comprise 55 per cent of the vehicular population of this province, certainly of this metropolitan area—with Highway 27 overloaded, the Gardiner Expressway overloaded and the Don Valley Expressway overloaded—how is he going to get them in and out?

All these people cannot be handled by rapid transit. We have to have a combination, a balance of the two. Now the minister says

he is going to give 50 per cent to rapid transit. Fine—and that isn't enough! Because if he wants to emphasize rapid public transit, he has to contribute more to give the municipalities of this province an advantage in order to build public transit.

Now, either the government stops the manufacture of cars, puts an embargo on the sale of cars, restricts traffic downtown, stops this development—and I want to say to you, sir, that a lot of builders and developers who have contributed very mightily to the “big blue machine” I hear so much of around here, were people who were sure that the minister and the Premier, after the election when they got this terrific mandate, were going to change their minds. They said so to me and they are going to say that to the minister. This is not going to die down. I would suggest that false pride shouldn't get the better of the minister and that he should look at these facts of life and act accordingly.

If these buildings are to go elsewhere, Mr. Chairman, into the suburbs; Pembroke, other cities; Sherway Plaza or that plaza in Scarborough up at Ellesmere and Midland, the minister is going to have a proliferation of cars. He is going to build more highways than he ever did before. We should keep this kind of construction in the downtown part of Toronto where we can have a combination of rapid transit and vehicular traffic, because the minister cannot afford to build mall-to-mall expressways and he can't afford to build mall-to-mall rapid transit subways.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with the government for the good and for the sake of this great metropolitan area—

Mr. Sargent: Is that your parliamentary secretary?

Mr. Givens: —which this government conceived and nurtured. The government brought it in; it now comprises a population of 2¼ million people on 240 square miles. It has become the most prosperous area probably in the world. Do you know that in this city for the past 20 years, in each and every year, at least 60,000 new residents have come to live and locate in Metropolitan Toronto over the past 20 years—the most sought-after city anywhere in the world, certainly in Canada. People are coming from all the other provinces; people are coming from the States—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are proud of it.

Mr. Givens: If the minister wants to continue to be proud of it, he can't just say, “Stop the world, I want to get off.” He has to take these things into cognizance. If you are going to build these developments and if you are going to build these buildings and if you are going to squawk about the auto pact—because you know, it is going to jeopardize the manufacture and sale of cars—the minister can't suck, whistle and talk out of both sides of his mouth at the same time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Givens: So let us not kid the troops, gentlemen. There is that two mill capital levy in Toronto. You are throwing in \$14 million here. Sam Cass has a mittful of money that he hasn't spent for over two years waiting for the government to make up its mind. So the money is available.

The government talks about a winter works project. If it simply went ahead with the rapid transit part of the Spadina Expressway, it would create another 2,000 jobs in Metropolitan Toronto. Why doesn't it do it?

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the government will concede a bit of that pride and face the facts of life and proceed with the construction of roads—not just expressways. Stop threatening people that “If you keep this up this city is going to become like New York or Los Angeles.” The basic conditions of this area are so healthy and so viable that they cannot become like Los Angeles or New York. There are different conditions here entirely. What the government has done is to botch up the whole transportation grid for Metropolitan Toronto just before the election, and for what purpose?

Mr. Worton: The minister has been listening to Henry Morgan.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member was against it.

Mr. Givens: Think it over. I will tell the minister this, sir, about that Buckminster Fuller's phantasmagoria. If he thinks he can put that over: if he thinks that he can change the density of the area that I represent from a 25 to 100 per cent increase—from 25 to 270 people per acre. This is what he is going to do if he takes Bucky Fuller's phantasmagoria and puts it into effect. He is going to change the density there of people from 25 people an acre to 270 people an acre. The government is going to have such resistance at it's never bargained for—not from us,

but from the people who will be lined up on the front lawn here to protest.

Mr. Worton: It ain't the way it is done up in Exeter.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exeter is in great shape.

Mr. Givens: I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the government will take some of these things into consideration and do the things that will be best for the Metropolitan Toronto area and, indirectly, what is best for the whole Province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, you can probably see the tears in my eyes from where you are sitting after such pleadings from the members of the opposition party.

An hon. member: That is what you are.

Mr. Germa: It gives rise to the thought that, all across Ontario, Toronto is known as hog town. This parochial attitude that I have heard from the last two speakers, probably gives reason for this thought from all over Ontario that—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: —Toronto is Ontario and whatever is good for Toronto is necessarily good for the rest of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Germa: I would like the minister to reject that theory absolutely and completely.

Mr. Martel: Why doesn't the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs get in on the act?

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I might bring you up to a few of the facts of life. It is not very often I come down to the banana belt here and I was not too familiar with the area. They don't call it the banana belt in northern Ontario because of the weather; it is because of the people. I am now living in Mississauga, which is about 25 miles west of here, and I arrive here in the morning in 25 to 30 minutes. In the city of Sudbury Mr. Chairman—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): The only wise decision the member made.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: See what you got us into, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Does this have to do with vote 803?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: He is right on the point now.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. We are discussing the matter of municipal subsidy throughout the road construction programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I think if you would allow me for another minute I think I could make my point and tie this into the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. Germa: —\$14 million municipal subsidy which my friends think should be all dumped into that big ditch known as the Spadina Expressway.

I was citing the time element. I think when we are talking about roads, we have to think about convenience to people and various people across the province. As I said just a moment ago, I can travel 25 miles from the western limits of the city of Toronto to this Legislature in about 30 minutes. In the city of Sudbury which I represent I live three miles from my workplace and it took me 45 minutes to get to my workplace, so don't tell me that the city of Toronto needs the \$14 million.

Mr. Martel: Has the hon. minister got that? One little bypass.

Mr. Sargent: Why didn't the member take a car?

Mr. Martel: He could walk faster.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, there is one tremendous pothole in the Province of Ontario where the minister could dump this \$14 million. Do you know what is in the bottom of this pothole? It is the "big blue machine"! It came to wreckage on the rocks of Sudbury. If he would dump about \$14 million in on top of the blue machine we could probably get some transportation in the city of Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Naughton: I have a mind to stop what we are going to do for Sudbury now.

Mr. Stokes: That sounds threatening.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is not very nice talk.

Mr. Bullbrook: I wouldn't say that about Sarnia.

Mr. Markle: You never heard that from the former member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha)? He never found out there was a pothole in the Sudbury area.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, there is one project in the city of Sudbury that could quite easily gobble up the whole \$14 million. It is causing problems—traffic congestion such as you have never seen around this district—and this is the Canadian Pacific Railway.

If the minister would just dive in and buy out the Canadian Pacific Railway and chase them out of the downtown core of the city of Sudbury, he would save himself millions of dollars of subsidies in road construction. Every time we go to try and turn around in the city of Sudbury we have to deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is one suggestion for the minister.

Mr. Chairman, I am also at a loss to understand why certain roads, particularly a road like the Queen Elizabeth Way, do get away with a 100 per cent subsidy. There is no charge against the municipality. Yet we had a project in Sudbury which had to be put on the shelf—the minister is familiar with it—the Brady Street Expressway, a \$28 million project wherein the city of Sudbury was supposed to put up 25 per cent of the cost.

Because of the high cost and because of our lack of a financial base, we had to reject the project. Now the government is going ahead with a bypass system which, in fact, three traffic studies over the past 20 years have proved will not solve our problem in that the city of Sudbury is a commercial centre and it services probably 25 outlying towns. What we do need in the city of Sudbury is a throughway. The bypass will not work but because of the cost involved we just have to settle for second best.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other projects under the road construction section of this vote. I would refer the minister to Highway 144, north of the city of Sudbury—

Mr. Martel: That is the Sante Fe trail where the ministers won't run a bus service because it is so bad.

Mr. Germa: This is one of the few highways which has a beginning and has an end but has no centre. I think this is where the minister should take a look at spending public funds.

Northern Ontario has been neglected, Mr. Chairman. Certainly we do not have proper representation in this House but I think that we have to consider that the people of northern Ontario have larger distances to travel and that they should be given some consideration.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now we want a highway in Parkdale, I suppose?

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, I saw that the whole issue of the Spadina Expressway has given such a wonderful opportunity for the Prime Minister to be so decisive, to prove once and for all how decisive he is, by stopping it. Now he can respond to all the needs which seem to be surrounding him, especially from the members of the Liberal Party, and show how human he is and restart the building of the highway. Really, I am standing up to speak because I am amazed by a certain amount of bathos and pomposity which has been exhibited by the member for Downsview and, I think, the member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Lawlor: That shouldn't surprise you! Just stick around!

Mr. Dukszta: This does not surprise me but I think something should be stated about some of the misunderstanding of the nature of what is an integrated transportation system for any large city. Now I am from Toronto and I shall speak about Toronto specifically. I tend to think that this is an important matter as far as our municipal politics are concerned.

The assumption that those two speakers from the Liberal Party made is that the car is in fact more important than people.

I am not going to say that there is a conflict between a car and people, because I think it's ridiculous to say this, the car is an essential part of our life. But to concentrate totally on the car and the needs of the car suggests that we live in the Fifties and are not living now in the Seventies.

Any large city, if you look at it, which has concentrated on allowing the car into the centre of the city has suffered grossly from it. I am just thinking of one major example, which is Boston, which in the same sort of rash attitude toward expressways which I

think is exhibited by some of our city politicians at the moment, have built an expressway and cut off the beautiful old part of Boston from its natural seaway. Now we are proposing to do the same thing—at least it is proposed by the people who are still speaking about what I consider now a dead issue, which is to build a highway right into the heart of Metro and destroy some of the more attractive and interesting parts of our city, to divide it into something almost like the way Los Angeles was divided.

Just a point of caution to people who believe that building of an expressway solves the traffic problems, it does not. There was an interesting experiment in Hyde Park in London a couple of years ago. They built an underpass in the area near Piccadilly in an attempt to solve traffic tieups and they ended up congesting the city completely. What we will do is we will bring into the city an enormous amount of traffic.

Now in that sense I will join the member for York-Forest Hill in urging the government to extend the rapid transit system. This city does not have the best rapid transit system in the world. It is a very inferior one in comparison to others. I was travelling north yesterday to do a TV programme; by bus and by every possible way and it takes hours to get out of the city.

So let us concentrate and give the money, which is obviously available—the \$14 million—as an attempt to give subsidies to the cities to build subway systems, not expressways!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the discussion has been long on rhetoric from the benches over there, and rather short on facts from the minister. I hope very much the minister will have learned his lesson after this particular consideration of his estimates and that he will never again come before this House without making a preliminary statement in which he seeks to explain what it is he is asking for.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Oh, he's up to that old trick again is he?

Mr. Cassidy: He has been sitting there very silently on vote 802 and vote 803 and simply letting people talk. Now, my understanding is that in some cases the minister may in fact be bound to pay out money under municipal subsidies, but we don't know if this is so because the minister has not

said a word. I would like very much to know where this money is going, to which regions of the province, to which municipalities?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I tried to tell the chairman for about half an hour and didn't get anywhere.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister could have gotten up any time—of course, he could.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am still here, still at my desk.

An hon. member: Give us the good news!

Mr. Cassidy: I would like to know whether in fact the money is going into the municipalities because they have been eager to spend with provincial help; or whether it is sent out to municipalities because the province's estimating was out of line; or whether it is going into municipalities because the province's efforts to control municipal spending on highways have in fact not yet begun to work—or may just never work at all.

Now it was my understanding that The Department of Transportation and Communications has been trying in a very sophisticated way to limit municipal spending and to prorate it and so on, but I come down here and I see that in fact it is doing nothing of the sort and that its spending is going up by 15 per cent in one year. Now we have no facts, but perhaps the minister can tell us—

Mr. Bullbrook: Sit down and let him give some facts then. Five minutes to say the same thing.

Mr. Cassidy: Another point I would like to ask the minister is—

Mr. Martel: I didn't hear the member for Sarnia talking when the—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have some nice things to say about Sarnia.

Mr. Cassidy: The other point is that it is some months now since the—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member's colleague is interfering with him now.

Mr. Cassidy: It is some months, Mr. Chairman, since the government took on the power to grant subsidies to public transportation. I would also like to know how much of this fund is designated for public transportation, and whether the minister can in fact give us some indication of what is happening with that particular programme. Is the government

going to the various transit authorities around the province and encouraging them to expand their services, or is it in fact sitting back in a way which Tories tend to do? Is it simply sitting back and hoping they will—

Mr. Lawlor: The way he sits back!

Mr. Cassidy: —come along and not encouraging innovation by local authorities. Let's have some facts from the minister.

Mr. Martel: Come on, give it to us now.

Mr. Deans: Give us some facts!

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. minister wish to reply now?

Mr. Martel: Come on, give it to us now.

Mr. Deans: Give us some facts.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like to say a few words, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Is the minister going to make a summation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am going to respond a little bit.

Mr. Sargent: Go ahead then, sir.

Mr. Martel: Don't be bashful.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. Martel: Don't be bashful.

Mr. Foulds: Let's hear it from the minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I would remind you, Mr. Chairman, and hon. members that if I had been prepared to deal with the various items that are on the supplementary estimates—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister wasn't prepared.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, but I was. I really was.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister said, if he had been prepared.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I say the hon. member for Ottawa is making assumptions. He will get to know us better in due course. But I do say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in the rush to get into a certain vote which permitted people to talk about the Spadina Expressway, they passed the first two votes just out of hand. There wasn't a word about them. They're passed. They're done, so I

hardly need to speak about them at all, do I, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Singer: The first vote.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The first—802, items 1 and 7—both passed; 802, two items.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are not interested in those.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Two items, not interested in them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, wait until they tell your constituents.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But I am going to take a moment to tell the members about item 7 of 802 because I think it is very important—concern expressed about the municipalities. There is a very substantial amount of money—

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, let's have something straight. I was out of the House for a moment, having waited here as the minister's critic on behalf of this party for several days—if I may have the floor, just for a moment. Now, do I understand that 801 and 802 are passed, is that what the minister is saying?

Mr. Stokes: No.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: 802 is passed.

Mr. Chairman: 802.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: 802, three items, passed, so we could get on with Spadina.

Mr. Sargent: There isn't any 801.

Mr. Foulds: We are talking about 803, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: 802 is the minister's first vote.

An hon. member: There is nothing under 801 in these estimates.

Mr. Sargent: Is 802 passed?

Mr. Chairman: We are on 803.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Those fellows had better wake up over there.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thank you. Well 802 having been passed then, I thought I

might deal briefly with the details that make up the \$14 million, as I attempted to do earlier. It calls for accelerated construction projects. I will detail some of them.

Highway 400 widening accelerated; seven projects, \$2,045,000—accomplishing two things: providing seven projects, seven contracts, a good deal of employment, much-needed widening accelerated on Highway 400.

E. C. Rowe Expressway in Windsor, one project, \$840,000. These are accelerated projects. They probably wouldn't have been introduced until the next capital construction year. We have accelerated them to make work.

Highway 7 in Toronto district, one project, \$130,000. Highway 50 in Toronto district, \$145,000. Highway 31 in the Ottawa district, a project involving \$100,000. Highway 101 in New Liskeard, one project, \$70,000. Some work on Highway 68 in the Sudbury district that can be done at this time of year, \$50,000. Six other projects in various districts. These are by district I would say to you, Mr. Chairman. Six other projects in various districts, \$366,000.

Mr. Sargent: Anything on Highway 10? Where is Highway 10 there?

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): That is not on the map any more.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Highway 10 runs northerly and terminates at Owen Sound, I believe.

Mr. Sargent: I got the answer. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is where Highway 10 is.

Mr. Sargent: He is still as thick as ever.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Some people still call it "Dry Gulch."

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): It starts in a good place though.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, six other projects in various districts, \$366,000, for a total of \$3,746,000. These are accelerated construction projects to make work.

An hon. member: Tell us where those six others are.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They were all acceleration of normal programmes due to favourable construction weather that were planned for the next construction season—

\$3 million brought into this current construction season to make work:

Day labour projects to employ some 500 men on road hazard protection, brushing, picnic sites, and so forth, \$1.5 million;

Purchase of a ferry to Wolfe Island and docking improvements, \$350,000—

Mr. Martel: Oh, I wonder where that is.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton:—additional subsidies, \$7.5 million under the new legislation which permits subsidy to Metro on a subway, rolling stock and stations, as well as road bed, \$7.5 million in the current year rather than in the next capital construction year or subsidy year; supplementary construction by-laws for municipalities—and here are a few of them: Sarnia, Galt, Guelph, Hamilton, Collingwood, Kingston township, Amherst Island township, for a total of \$6.5 million.

The next is under vote 805, tree removal programme. It includes most highways and districts up to and including North Bay to employ some 2,800 men to cut down some 500,000 trees. That makes up the \$14 million that has been referred to.

Mr. Martel: What percentage of that is for northern Ontario?

An hon. member: How many trees?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There have been some references made, shall we say, to Sudbury. I will get around to the Spadina yet, I say to the hon. member for York-Forest Hill. I will get around to that.

Reference to Sudbury—

Mr. Martel: Right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. members for Sudbury and Sudbury East will recall that not too many months ago, I believe in August, I went to Sudbury and spent a day with the mayor and members of his council, particularly the transportation committee, and agreed to accelerate—

Mr. Martel: They didn't invite us.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton:—a total works project in Sudbury which had previously been planned for five years to three years, recognizing the need for some improvements in Sudbury. I don't propose to categorize that. The hon. member for Sudbury who sits here, I believe, represented the city on council. I would think he would have been aware of this.

Mr. Deans: And you still didn't spend it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would think he would have been aware of it.

Mr. Martel: What are the things the minister mentioned?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Then why is he critical of what we are doing in Sudbury? Why is he critical of it?

Mr. Germa: The point is the minister is raising the debt of the city of Sudbury from \$32 million to \$51 million in three years.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are not raising the debt. This is at the request of and with the concurrence of Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: It will be a debt for 40 years, when we have such antiquated tax laws.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I simply don't understand this attitude. I can think of many other cities that would be happy to have this kind of a programme and, it makes me wonder why we bothered.

Mr. Martel: A \$51 million debt makes us all happy.

Mr. Germa: Is the minister saying that they don't want it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It makes me wonder. If the member doesn't want it, if Sudbury doesn't want it, let me know.

Mr. Martel: Give it to Owen Sound.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me know.

Mr. Germa: We need more money. We can't afford our per capita. We can't afford our percentage.

Mr. Martel: Maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs should come in for this one.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, I see. I just want to say to the hon. member for Sudbury, maybe he had better tell that to the council, not me. Council was the one that pursued it with me and we accommodated its request.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

An hon. member: He thinks he is in the House of Commons.

Mr. Martel: Tell him not to mislead the House then.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I believe the hon. member for York-Forest Hill made some references to the fact that Toronto gets no connecting subsidies in comparison with cities other than Toronto. The city of Toronto has no connecting links, I would point out, none at all. The member said we built three roads in Toronto—Highway 401, if you wish, Highway 27 and the Queen Elizabeth. I would remind the hon. member that there are no connecting links, subsidies or grants in the city of Toronto or Metro, none at all. Sudbury, for instance, benefits from these things to the extent of 75 per cent. The best Metro gets on any road, other than the ones we built for it—those three that I specifically mentioned—is 50 per cent on the roads. It is something for other urban municipalities to remember, to be fair.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We always like to be fair on this side.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Fair, but not right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Reference to Buckminster Fuller—or Bucky, as he is referred to in this House—I am not prepared to comment on; I don't really know what he proposed—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I never even looked at it.

Mr. Singer: That is logical! That is good!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And I have not seen it yet.

Mr. MacDonald: That is how much importance the minister placed on it. That was for election purposes. The minister hasn't looked at it yet!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, he hasn't. He didn't have an opportunity to look at it, and I haven't so I can't comment. I am being honest.

Mr. MacDonald: I can't really blame the minister. It was an election effort, not a building effort.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: To get on to the Spadina matter. I can appreciate the concern

of the hon. member for Downsview and the hon. member for York-Forest Hill. I can appreciate the concern that has been expressed in terms that would wring one's heart, you might say. I have got to appreciate that, but I have to remind everybody, every member of this House, that there were certain decisions taken.

In the first instance, a decision by the OMB was appealed to the cabinet, and in June the cabinet made a decision. Even more important, I would remind everybody in this House the people of Ontario, including Toronto, made a decision on October 21. Memories are very short around here.

Mr. Givens: The minister is worried about the socialists, that is why he wants that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why not? It seems to make a difference which side of the House it comes from.

Mr. Bullbrook: The government plays right into the NDP hands when it does things like that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not very likely.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would just say to you, Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks, those immortal words spoken by the hon. members for Downsview and Forest Hill will be imprinted on Hansard for all time. I have no comments to make on that.

Mr. Givens: York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 803.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister a question? In one of the figures, he gave \$7.5 million for assistance to the subway. Could he read that again! I didn't quite follow him on that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, to the hon. member; the new Act that was dealt with in the last session of the last Parliament made certain amendments that permit subsidy to Metro for subway rolling stock and stations—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A great step forward.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —as well as roadways. It is an all-encompassing 50 per cent grant as the hon. member will recall. That is the \$7.5 million.

Mr. Singer: I understand the basis on which the minister has a statutory authority to do it, but my question now, as I think

I have the reference clear in my mind, is how does he really believe it is going to speed up the construction of that subway? That subway is the extension of the Yonge Street subway from Eglinton north. It is going to be open in stages. It isn't due to open—it won't be ready for use for a year or a year and a half.

An hon. member: Five!

Mr. Singer: Two years. The putting in of another \$7.5 million really is not going to speed anything up because the rolling stock isn't going to roll for two years. The \$7.5 million, insofar as putting more people to work now is concerned, the expenditure of it at this point is a little questionable, in my mind.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Chairman, arising out of the widening of Highway 400 to six lanes—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Does the minister wish to answer the question?

Mr. Martel: What are you talking about—order?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Does the hon. minister want to answer that question about the \$7.5 million?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No. The money can be utilized by Metro for the purchase of the equipment I referred to. Things have to be ordered; stock has to be made available.

Mr. Singer: But it doesn't have to be paid for in the next few months. It has got nowhere to roll for the next two years.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh no, this amount of money can be spent.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Do you think they are going to order it unless they know where they are getting the dough from?

Hon. MacNaughton: I think I would have to leave it to your good common sense to determine that if Metro is prepared to match it then they must be able to spend it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Don't leave it to his good common sense, whatever you do.

Mr. Givens: The \$7.5 million is in the 1972 capital budget for capital payment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will be paid out by December 31. It is what we are here for. This is supplementary to the 1971 budget.

Mr. Givens: Arising out of the widening of Highway 400 to six lanes, is the joint technical committee considering the southerly continuation of 400 instead of having all the lanes pour into 401? Is that within its frame of reference?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, this is a highway widening programme that is much overdue. It is a four-lane highway now. It is being widened to provide extra capacity. It is a programme that is being done now to make work, rather than bring it in in next year's capital construction budget.

Mr. Givens: In reviewing the transportation policy for the metropolitan area, is the joint technical committee contemplating extending the 400 southerly from the 401, where it ends now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The joint technical committee has been totally preoccupied up to this point in time since the announcement about Spadina with the alternatives to the Spadina Expressway. Prior to that they were working on and will rework overall transportation planning, not only in Metro, but the parameters of Metro which also affect Metro. This is a committee that was proposed, and I give full credit, by Chairman Albert Campbell, which we concurred in. That committee will continue to operate in the broad total transportation parameters of Toronto and environs.

Mr. Givens: I would have thought that 400 would be included in the parameters of Metro. All I am asking is whether the minister is considering continuing 400 southerly. He has widened it now down to the 401. Will it go south of that? Are they considering that?

An hon. member: He has already answered it.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): He has told the member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just to clarify this, I can't be specific about 400 or any other road in this total concept of planning that is under way. I have no knowledge of that; the reports haven't been brought down. As I mentioned the other day the reports on the alternatives for the Spadina Expressway are ready for presentation to the three government levels—the province, Metro, the TTC—in a matter of days. I can't be precise about it, but I would say in a matter of days. The other concept I am talking about is

the broad, overall transportation planning in Metro and its environs. I can't be specific about that yet, because the committee has been formed, they have been working, but they have presented nothing detailed to the three government levels that I am aware of.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Roy: He said Ottawa East. Oh, I'm sorry—

Mr. Sargent: I didn't know the member was up there.

Mr. Roy: I don't want to start fighting with Ed. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, when the minister gave the allocations in various areas I noticed he said about the eastern part of the province, the Ottawa area in any event, that \$100,000 was for Highway 31. Is any of this money for accelerated programmes directed toward Highway 417, to his knowledge?

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): It is already accelerated.

Mr. Roy: Accelerated from what? When is it going to be finished?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The 417?

Mr. Roy: Yes, 417.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I don't know if I can give the hon. member a detailed progress report. As I understand it, all contracts have been let except one in the extreme east end of 417. They are all let; they are all under work now. I would have to get a report from the various contractors that are operating on 417 to be precise about it. I don't have that at the moment. But 417 is all under contract except one section.

Mr. Roy: What I was wondering, Mr. Chairman is, how much time are we going to save? When is it going to be completed? Instead of one year, to what year? How many years are we going to save on it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would point out to the hon. member that as I said before these sections are all in the hands of contractors. The contract documents spell out certain time limits for completion. The contractor is subject to liquidated damages if he fails to meet the time limit in the contract, so that it is in the hands of the contractor. When he may finish the job I

can't say. He has his time limitations; he has his allocation of funds.

Mr. Roy: Yes, I'm sorry, but surely the minister must have some projection on how much time he can save.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I would have to say, to clarify this once again, once the contract is awarded we cannot accelerate the work. It is in the hands of the contractor against the documents that have been given to him. It is his time then.

Mr. Roy: Just one further question, Mr. Chairman, in relation to Highway 416. As the minister is probably aware, there is some controversy about where this highway should enter the Ottawa area. Is he considering at all having a survey in the newspapers, as he did for 417, to get public reaction in relation to Highway 416? Is he considering this approach?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, the technical co-ordinating committee that is involved in Ottawa, which is composed of course of representatives of the department, the city and the region, has been instructed—directed if that is a good word—to make available to the people in Ottawa our present plans and alternatives for the project that the hon. member is referring to, so that the people will have as full an awareness of it as possible.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I might, Mr. Chairman, I want to—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce was on his feet.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh I am sorry, I am sorry.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I can sympathize with the member for Sudbury about this feeling about hogtown Toronto. When I first came into the House I had a real feeling about hogtown Toronto and lawyers, and I feel we have had too many lawyers and too much hogtown.

I am mellowing in both cases, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You qualify on both counts.

Mr. Sargent: Because I think that when I see the way the people of Toronto have been treated by this government, I do sympathize with the people of Toronto. So I say hogtown has had its problems, to lose its autonomy. When it cannot run its own show, I do sympathize with Toronto.

But I want to say with regard to this vote in the new department called Transportation and Communications, we are cut off completely almost up our way in Grey and Bruce. As the minister is on the fringe he knows what we are going through. With regard to Highway 10, it is the biggest joke in the province of Ontario. The reason they got it going was because the new House leader wanted to get some action before the election so he threw about five miles of highway in there but he has still got about the worst mess in Ontario there yet.

Our railroads are cut off and we have got that goat path still going north there and no way of getting down. The minister knows the situation we have in the area of Bruce; for a person who wants to get to Toronto it is a two-day trip if he can get a bus system to connect with Owen Sound.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): You need an airplane.

Mr. Sargent: So, getting to airplanes. Oh yes, before I talk about airplanes; the government had its meeting in the Talisman lodge. We were all invited there; you remember fellows, we were all invited there before the election to a meeting in Talisman?

Mr. Martel: We were all invited and cancelled out.

Mr. Sargent: I am glad you fellows went up there because you had a chance to know what I am talking about, and I know what I am talking about. When you went up that Highway 10—you all saw that—but the beautiful part of this is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The beautiful part of this is what happened there in Talisman—you have got to know this, this is beautiful. A friend of John Robarts, a Mr. Graydon in Labatts, could not get a licence there so he got a vote and they were turned down 300 to 13, no liquor, but of course John Parmenter gave them a licence anyway. On top of that, three months later they had a licence to open there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: All right. A few days later they needed a road there so the minister gives them a \$3 million road, to the ski lodges there. So they go up there for their convention before the election and I imagine Mr. Graydon picked up the cheque because the opposition was not invited, we were not

invited. So he picks up the cheque, and what happens last week? They are going to build another half-million-dollar road there to the ski lodge. I am sorry, the figure is \$400,000. This is all a beautiful pattern of what we are talking about in democracy.

So we are isolated; no railroads, a goat path going into Owen Sound; the people in Bruce county cannot get to Toronto, there is no bus system, so what do we do? The minister is living pretty close to this and he knows we are stuck and they say it is going to continue to be Sargent's fault because that is the reason they don't get these things because he is in the opposition, and I would hate to believe that you—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Who would say such nasty things?

Mr. Sargent: You people said that. You said it in a full-page ad and the funny part of it is, that on election day the Walkerton Herald-Times carried the dirtiest story about me by you people that I have ever read in politics. I will read it to the House one day. The minister should be in the House the day I read that because I want to tell them some things about him too. I think some day we have to take the gloves off and talk truth here.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the member doing now?

Mr. Sargent: I want to ask a few things about norOntair. There was a fellow sat in this chair right here—no I will not go into that, it might hurt the hon. minister, I am sorry. But a few days after the minister took him apart in the House he died. He had told the member he should not be drawing his salary in the House because he lived in Rainy River. The minister took him apart and the guy died a week later because you almost broke his heart with what you said.

So I do not know the way you fellows operate, but today we have seen the pattern. You are throwing at us the fact that since the people elected you, you can do anything you want to do. Well, you are going to find out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I know, but he deserves it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I understand norOntair was given two aircraft for \$1, is that right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Sargent: That is my understanding—and that after three years the government will pick up all their losses. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not quite.

An hon. member: The government pays all the losses.

Mr. Sargent: The government will pick up all their losses after three years; in other words, you are trying to get an idea of what subsidized air transport will do. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right. We have a demonstration project on.

Mr. Sargent: So, as far as I am concerned, it will be at least two years before we know what you can do for us by way of airways in western Ontario. I would like to get into a dialogue with the minister in this regard because it is very important to us.

Since we have the new programme from Ottawa that will provide \$10 million for local airports, would the minister let us know what he is going to do in that regard for our area, and if he will get us a test pattern soon for air transport in our area?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member is quite correct. In October we launched a demonstration project, using White River Air Services to conduct the experimental operation for us. It is a three-year experimental service; I have explained it in the House before, but I will do it again. During the period, two communities will be added; it starts off with four—Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie, two flights each way daily, and it will serve Timmins and Earlton. During the trial period, probably within the first 12 months, it is proposed to add the communities of Kirkland Lake and Chapleau. If the demonstration information comes out earlier than we originally anticipated and lends itself to further expansion, this can also be accommodated during the trial period.

It's quite correct that the aircraft have been supplied; they have been purchased from de Havilland and are on loan to White River Air Services. They are flying established schedules that will be adjustable to prove how the scheduling works. The rates charged are the same as Air Canada. Over the three-year period if the operation breaks even, everybody is home free. We have guaranteed that if it operates at a loss, to provide us with the information we need to expand this type of service elsewhere we will subsidize the losses. The present information reaching us in terms of patronage would

indicate that it will be a self-sustaining and probably a profit-making operation; so there will not be any subsidy.

Mr. Martel: The government will sell it then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, the member said that; I didn't.

Mr. Martel: Oh no, I asked that in Sudbury when they were there. If it loses money, we will keep it, after the three years, but if it makes money, we'll get rid of it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nobody has said that yet.

Mr. Martel: No, the minister doesn't want to answer that question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I will just divert for a moment, with the hon. member's permission. Does the hon. member not believe that it is worthy of some subsidization to determine the viability of such a service in that area of the province where it is needed, and does he not also believe that it may warrant some subsidization to provide that type of service in that area in the province? If he doesn't believe that, let him say so, because the people up there think it is great.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I am going to answer the minister. I am certainly all for installing the service, by all means; what I object to is that if it makes money, we will probably sell it, but if it loses money the people of Ontario will subsidize it. We don't play the game that way; we keep it. If we are subsidizing along the line, we keep it. If it loses money, White River will never buy it from us; the minister knows it.

Mr. Ferrier: If it makes money, why shouldn't we make money?

Mr. Martel: Why shouldn't we make the largess? If we're going back to back it originally, and there's money to be made, let us keep the money to expand the service.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe even to Owen Sound, where it won't be profitable.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Maybe, who knows.

The lessons we can learn from this experimental service may lead us into many other areas of the province. As a matter of fact, it's hoped that it will.

Mr. MacDonald: We'll cross that bridge if it's making money.

Mr. Martel: That is not the point at all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I must say, Mr. Chairman, to these hon. members that I am much more interested in the service being provided to the people than the other considerations raised by the hon. member for Sudbury East—and so are the people, by the way.

Mr. Ferrier: The people don't support the minister's party up there anyway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, they are rather misguided, I agree. That is one of those lonesome areas of this province.

Mr. Martel: The "big blue machine" crashed!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They have not seen the light of day.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It has yet—you are quite right—to see the light of day. There are only a couple of them in the province.

However, that is not the subject matter we are discussing here today, Mr. Chairman.

I think I attempted to answer the hon. member for Grey-Bruce's question in my comments to the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sargent: I am not opposed to the subsidy, I just want to know if we are going to get a lick of it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will just repeat, as I said before, that the purpose of this trial job is to determine the extent to which it can be replicated. I can't be specific, but it is hoped to expand this type of service in other areas of the province. I can't be categorical about it, but that's why this experiment is being undertaken.

An hon. member: Especially in the northwest.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803 carried? The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the minister: I have attended three or four meetings recently with his staff in Sudbury in respect to the bypass, and in those discussions the point has always come up in respect to Highway 69 north that the Ontario Provincial Police maintain extra patrols on it because of the high incidence of accidents. I am just wondering if he could not

find a little extra from the largess that he is bestowing on southern Ontario, and I listened as he read out the various allocations, to provide the necessary funds to widen that road to four lanes.

By the way, the minister's own staff agrees the highest accident rate in the entire area is on that piece of highway; possibly he could find something to accelerate either engineering or actual construction of that nine miles which must be brought to a four-lane at least.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well I can't make any such commitment as that. We have been given an allocation of funds by the Treasury Board, as all departments have, and they do not include anything for Highway 69. It would be nonsense for me to say that it does. The hon. member himself referred to that lonesome area up there. Maybe communications aren't very good right now, I don't know, but I have no funds for that road.

Mr. Martel: Well, the minister will—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well Elie, sit back for four years!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, very briefly if I might, the deputy minister of the minister's department was kind enough yesterday, after a phone call—the member for Ottawa Centre might be edified in knowing that the minister has a deputy minister without too many peers in that particular stratum of government, and a phone call to him at any time will give any member of this House information that is not within the privy of only the minister himself.

Yesterday he gave me information about where the minister was going to spend the money.

I want to say to you, if I might, quickly. First of all, one has to question whether buying a ferry for the Wolfe Island run is really going to affect the unemployment situation in the Province of Ontario; but may I say this to you, that is only indicative of this whole charade.

With the exception, really, of the municipal subsidy programme, if this is an attempt on the part of any government of any conscience to come to grips with the unemployment or economic situation in this province, then I would want the people of Ontario to be given another opportunity very soon to make their evaluation, because in point of fact the acceleration of highway contracts won't do

us much good at all and the minister knows it. And in point of fact the government can cut and burn all the dead elm trees in the Province of Ontario and it doesn't come to grips with the essential sickness that we have here in this province.

And even recognizing to a great extent that the federal government is more responsible for rectifying that problem than is this government, the members opposite were the ones who during the course of the last election pontificated on the hustings and said that they would bring the economy around.

They are not going to do it by buying a ferry for Wolfe Island!

Now, back to the estimates, if I might.

The minister did make a statement before the ATA about a month ago and I want to record my feeling of total support for him. It is germane, Mr. Chairman, because we are building more highways and as we build more highways there are going to be more vehicles using them. I cannot be objective in my statement here because I put about 50,000 miles a year on my car coming back and forth from Sarnia.

The minister has to do something about public commercial vehicles on the highways of the Province of Ontario. They have their entitlement; they have their right; but they are there by way of statutory privilege, as the minister knows.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And the member heard me say something about that.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right, and this is why I am supporting the minister. But I want him to have some liaison with the man who sits beside him. He has got to do something to protect the private motor vehicle operator on our highways. I tell the minister I personally am fed up with following lines of trailer trucks for miles and miles without any consideration on their part. I am sick and tired, during inclement weather, being passed by vehicle after vehicle without any consideration for the size of their vehicles or the possible damage it might do to the small car.

I want to say this to the minister, I suggest this to him; I would go this far, speaking personally: I would make it mandatory in the rules of the road—what is this section under the rules of the road not permitting overtaking vehicles to pass? I would make the second offence on that \$1,000, and I would tell them, were I Minister of Transportation and Communications, I would speak to these people, I would let Smith Transport know

that if there was a second offence they are going to lose part of their licence. The time has come that we have got to do that. The minister just cannot subject the people of Ontario to this type of treatment any more, recognizing totally, as we must, that it is an absolutely essential element in the vitality of the economy of this province—the transportation industry.

One has to wonder on balance whether the minister is really doing us a service in not integrating a master plan on transportation to utilize more the railways of this province and less the highways of this province in the economic sphere. That is a judgement he will make; I think he is attempting to make that type of judgment now.

I applaud what he said before, but please say something to the Attorney General. Make the OPP do something about this. We have got to have protection for the private citizens, whose right it is to use the highways, not a privilege under licence.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I rose about the same time as the member for Sarnia and I want to add my word to his appeal in this regard. I expect that he was talking about the 401. I want to talk about the Queen Elizabeth between here and Hamilton, and it may be in this estimate that by providing \$1,000 to buy signs and post them that trucks and slow-going traffic can be confined to the two outside lanes. We have lost the purpose of the increased speed limit from 60 to 70. Now, as we understand it, the habit is 75 and this is passed off, but the moving of traffic is not helped at all by the increase in the speed limit for the passenger car, because a slow-moving truck will get out on the inside lane and hold up the rest of the traffic as the member for Sarnia has suggested.

On any of the triple-lane highways in the United States they have the differential, which we were a long time getting to, but they also have confinement to the two outside lanes for passing and for slow traffic. Near-accidents are caused by this practice. The slow driver, the 60-mile-an-hour driver, gets out in the third lane, the traffic piles up behind him and the trucks are in the other two lanes. I think this should be a must on those commuter highways, and that one is a commuter highway.

I don't know for what reason we ever raised the speed limit to 70. I think it should have been reduced to 50 for truck traffic and

left at 60 for passenger car traffic. Almost every night you can find rear-end collisions and traffic backed up on the Gardiner Expressway and in the commuter area from there to Hamilton. I would appeal to the minister to take this into consideration.

I get disturbed, and I have said and felt in the last two years that the Automotive Transportation Association has supplanted the insurance industry as being the toughest and most effective lobby on this government. I read a statement by the minister not long ago where he told them in a speech that they were treated most generously by this government. They were treated most generously—the trucking industry—and he says in this great document:

I am committed to regular consultation with you to discuss policy questions. We will sit down and say to them their drivers must obey the traffic laws in this province by restricting their speeds to the posted speed and confine them to the two outside lanes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right. I have already done that, as the hon. member for Sarnia has mentioned and he heard it said in rather forcible terms. We propose to watch the progress following the admonition that was handed down. I think I indicated in my remarks to about 1,000 people representing the ATA that if they didn't behave we would have to enforce sterner rules. First, we have asked them to co-operate. If they co-operate and there is a decided improvement in terms of their conduct on the highways of the province all well and good. If not, we have the means to deal with it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: I understand that there is not too much of the money in this programme being expended on northern Ontario projects, one of the reasons probably being that the weather is such that highway construction there closes down for some months during the very cold winter periods.

One might suggest to the minister that while more money is being spent in the south in this supplementary estimate that he is projecting here, perhaps when we come to the summer construction programme more money proportionately could then be spent in the north to develop some of the projects up there that need to be developed.

In line with the problem of passing transports and so on, I understand that in some

jurisdictions of this country provision is made at intervals for passing lanes to be built on curves and hills and various places like that. I wonder if the minister's department, on a highway like Highway 11 and other highways, which at present are two lanes, is actively giving consideration to constructing these passing lanes at specific intervals so that the problem can be overcome in a lot of areas. I wonder if he would care to comment on that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is little that can be said on that. The sharing of the capital construction budget in the province is done as equitably as is possible. I think I have substantiated in this House on a number of occasions that the value of expenditures in the north equates very favourably with the expenditures in the south or anywhere else. On a population basis—

Mr. Martel: Per capita, yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —a road mileage basis or whatever you like. I really have no more comments to make than that.

Mr. Deans: Not on the basis of need.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to react to that. Surely the minister doesn't expend money in his department on a per capita basis—he does it on the basis of need? Just because we have 50,000 living in northern Ontario, which is geographically four-fifths of the province, he doesn't say that we should be satisfied wholly and solely on a per capita basis?

If it wasn't for the economic benefits that accrue to this part of the province as a result of the exploitation of the resources in the north, it could close up, including the Spadina Expressway. The resource exploitation of northern Ontario draws about \$2 billion worth of new wealth and there is nobody who knows it any better than his colleague, the Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, from Kenora.

If the minister thinks that we are going to be satisfied with a per capita base grant to satisfy the transportation and communication needs of the north I think he has got his priorities all twisted.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I didn't say that.

Mr. Stokes: I had more confidence in this minister to look after the needs of transportation and communications in northern Ontario than any one of his predecessors. I have a great deal of faith in him but when he starts

making statements like that I have reason to question it.

He made a lot of statements during his estimates last year about how he was going to approach the needs of people of the north, given that, you know, the future of all of Canada is in our north. I think there is nobody who realizes that more than he. But for him to say we don't need any reaction from him to the comments of—

Mr. Martel: Communication is bad, he said.

Mr. Stokes: —my colleague from Cochrane South, is not in keeping with what he said. I hope it is not in keeping with the philosophy of this department and the direction he thinks it should take.

Mr. Martel: Communication is bad in the north.

Hon. Mr. Naughton: No, I said it equates with population, road mileage and a variety of things. There was a member of this Legislature some years ago—he chose not to contest his riding this time—who proposed that we should spend money in the north on the same basis as we spend it in the south. I believe the Sudbury paper took half a page of editorial to tell him how short he would get off if that was the basis upon which it was done.

Mr. Deans: That is not what you are doing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Agreed, agreed! It is on that basis, I suggest to you, that in relative terms there is more money spent on the basis I am talking about; which is not the way to do it, but on relative terms it is done that way.

Mr. Stokes: And well there might be!

Mr. Ferrier: Well there should be!

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803 carried?

Vote 803 agreed to.

On vote 805:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: I want to speak specifically on one very small item on page 7. It is under Ontario seasonal employment services, the sum of \$63,000.

I would suggest that is probably an extremely small sum. We haven't heard from the minister what services are being provided.

I assume that because it is a seasonal employment programme that the new services are towing services for those people who have skidded off the roads of northern Ontario because the minister has refused them the right of studded tires. If it is not for that service, I recommend to the minister that it be so used and that he expand the amount.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, in relation to the Ontario seasonal employment section in the highways estimates, one can certainly envisage a number of jobs that can be carried out along the highway, such as were initiated a year ago during our winter months. I would ask the minister if he has ever given thought to a labour intensive operation, which basically is the purpose of this whole thing, in relation to the filling of the gabion baskets for varying purposes along highways that have a close proximity to lakes or rivers where there is the possibility of erosion, where there are gullies and so forth, in addition to the tree cutting programme that has been carried out? I have specifically suggested the initiation of such a programme along the Detroit River in the Amherstburg area where there is a serious erosion problem. The minister is probably aware that last year, on the east side of Point Pelee National Park, The Department of Lands and Forests carried out extensive work in this line all through the winter months and it has proved reasonably successful. I just thought if the minister's department is looking for ways and methods to put the unemployed to work and is looking for projects, this might be a worthwhile application.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As I mentioned earlier in response to suggested expenditures of funds, in these supplementary estimates we are asking the House to vote us \$36 million, and these funds are allocated. Whether that is a project that is included or not I cannot say, but there are similar remedial work projects.

There is always a winter work programme in the normal highways estimates. These are over and above that, and whether that specific one is in there I cannot tell you, but there are many remedial works programmes here that provide winter work.

Someone suggested that it wasn't a very great deal of money. I don't have the figures on the ripple effect of these works but they produce a very substantial number of jobs beyond the immediate jobs that come out. Because of course there is money here for the purchase of heavy equipment, there is money

here for the municipalities, there is money across the board for materials to be purchased—bearing piles, electrical cables, catch basins, plough blades and everything else, all of which have a ripple effect in terms of employment.

Somebody has to make them, so the equipment purchase side as well as the direct labour aspect of it is job creative.

We think it is a mighty good effort and I ask the House to approve these funds. That is the purpose of the exercise.

Vote 805 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Transportation and Communications.

The supplementary estimates for The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs. Does the hon. minister have an explanatory statement he wishes to give in connection with the supplementary estimates?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a brief résumé here, or statement with regard to this programme which I will ask the members of the House to vote on. I will just read the statement.

Mr. Chairman, my department's exploration and assistance programme under vote 1302 is now in its 15th week and has undertaken to assist 42 mineral exploration projects in Red Lake, Kirkland Lake, Geraldton, Beardmore and the Cobalt-Gowganda areas. These projects total nearly \$1.7 million and they are a new mineral exploration effort for which we agreed to reimburse up to one-third or approximately \$557,000.

This programme is intended primarily to benefit the economy of some of the old gold mining and silver mining camps in this province which are facing the hardships of unemployment brought about by the closure of many of the mines. Most of the mines have operated for many years and have provided a reliable economic base for the establishment of permanent communities of significant size.

In 1948 there were something like 87 gold mines operating in Canada. Today there are 26, of which 11 are in Ontario. Closure in most cases is due to the natural exhaustion of the ore. Geologists and mining people throughout the industry are virtually unanimous in recommending old mining areas as prime prospecting ground for new mines. The discovery of the \$2 billion base metal ore body of the Texas Gulf Sulphur Com-

pany in the gold mining community of Timmins a few years ago is certainly a prime example, and because of it, that area does not need our assistance today.

We would like to accomplish the same benefit in other depressed mining communities where the people have few other employment opportunities. Accordingly, we have designated four areas surrounding these communities having the greatest need, and we have said we will assist ground exploration programmes which we approve within these areas. Our assistance is limited to one-third of the actual cost of each programme up to \$100,000, paid as a reimbursement upon receipt of satisfactory proof of expenditure, and of course, all technical reports.

Our agreement also provides for return to the government of all moneys, in the event a mine is subsequently brought into production as a direct result of our aid. It is gratifying to see the overwhelming acceptance of this programme to date. Not only have we stimulated \$1.7 million worth of new exploration effort that is employing many local people and using local services, but it is particularly significant that most of this work will be done during the winter months when unemployment is usually at its worst in the north.

We hope that employment, generated by the new exploration work, is only the first benefit for the people of these communities. The discovery of new ore bodies would result in the development of new mines, and of course that would be a continued development to each of these areas.

The record of our assistance programme in the four areas to date is as follows:

In the Red Lake area, we have six exploration projects approved and under way. The total exploration costs were something like \$281,110, of which we committed, under this programme, \$93,703.33.

In the Kirkland Lake area, we have 13 exploration projects now under way. The total exploration costs were \$499,064, of which \$163,688 will come out of this particular programme.

In the Geraldton-Beardmore area, 12 exploration programmes are now under way, totalling \$491,016 in exploration costs. Of this, \$163,672 will come out of this exploration programme.

In the Cobalt-Gowganda area, we have 11 exploration projects under way at this particular time. The total exploration costs are

\$421,176.92. Here again, from this project we are putting in \$136,423.09.

Gentlemen, I would be only too pleased to answer any questions you may have about this particular programme.

On vote 1302:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister for undertaking this kind of a programme. It is something that we in this party have advocated for the last two years. We are quite gratified to see that he has heeded our requests and has come up with a programme that will in some small measure at least provide incentive to prospectors and small mining companies to foster the orderly and the humane exploitation of the mineral wealth that we have in such abundance in the areas that are so designated.

We are in favour of reasonable and practical concessions designated to assist exploration. However, we do oppose granting sums of money to large companies. He has not given us a breakdown on the specific nature of the 42 projects that he has outlined whereby \$1.7 million will be expended, about \$560,000 of which will be made available through the provincial Treasury. We think that it is a worthwhile effort to foster the kind of development, particularly in the areas that they mentioned. We have no quarrel at all with the areas that are so designated. I do not think anybody who knows the areas at all would question the wisdom of those choices.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Perhaps Rainy River would.

Mr. Stokes: I am not aware of the geological situation in Rainy River. I do not know of any major mines they have had there. I do not know of any—

Mr. Reid: Ever heard of Steep Rock?

Mr. Stokes: That is not based on gold mines. We have iron ore coming out of our ears. I think the member for Rainy River knows this.

I do, however, want to know what the department intends doing about the large amounts of ore—base metal, iron—that have been held by fairly large mining companies over the years. Let us look at Shebandowan where that find was delineated in 1938, and just now we are reaching a point where we

are going to derive some economic benefit from it. I think of the Little Longlac property where there is, I am told, commercial ore right on the outskirts of Geraldton, one of the very communities that this exploration assistance programme was designed to assist. I understand that Algoma Steel has taken on option on it. I think that the minister could be directing his attention toward some kind of programme that will encourage companies like Algoma Steel to exploit that resource on the doorstep of a community that needs it so badly, rather than allowing our much needed capital into an industry that has such a high degree of capital intensity.

I think we should be focusing attention on those areas where there is a known ore reserve and making it possible through some form of incentive to exploit those, rather than having to make the decision as to whether or not they will allow new communities to spring up 40 to 50 miles away from existing communities at a tremendous outlay from the provincial Treasury, from the pockets of small entrepreneurs, and other people who are, of necessity, going to establish in the area.

I think it is high time that we look at what the socio-economic conditions are going to be. Let us look at the Sturgeon Lake area, for instance, where there is a battle going on now at Sioux Lookout, which is asking quite forcefully for a connecting link between Highway 599 and Sioux Lookout, so Sioux Lookout can get some economic benefit from the exploitation of the reserves at Sturgeon Lake. Meanwhile, the provincial government seems to be fostering the kind of development down at Ignace, where we do have an economic base now that does need a little bit of bolstering, and it looks now as though anybody who is going to make his living as a result of the exploitation of those resources is going to use the town of Ignace as the dormitory community.

I am just wondering if the minister is putting the emphasis on the exploitation of known ore reserves reasonably close to existing communities, rather than allowing a helter-skelter exploitation of our resources in wilderness areas where it is going to necessitate the establishment of new communities, providing more problems for this government and people who, of necessity, are going to have to move to those areas.

I am wondering how many jobs are going to be created directly as a result of the projects that the minister has authorized to date. The minister mentions that about

\$550,000 is coming from this programme. We hopefully will use all of the \$1 million that the minister is asking for. But I am just wondering what the economic impact is going to be. Is it going to be labour intensive or is the money that is going to be expended to go for machinery or highly skilled technicians. I would just like to know if he has reached that point in this programme where he might be able to give us some idea of the economic impact it is going to have, over and above the possibility of outlining new ore bodies that might be of commercial value.

I am wondering if any of this money at all will be spent or allocated for research. I understand that a lot of the ore bodies that we have outlined in the province today are lying idle and dormant, and provide no economic stimulus to our economy because of the nature of the ore itself. It seems to me that we do need funds for research into maximum utilization of existing ore, over and above the need to find new ore bodies to keep pace with world demand and world markets.

Several months ago in a speech in Thunder Bay the minister did say that he was going after \$10 million to \$15 million to start a meaningful programme of exploration. I hope that he did mention that precise figure, or in the environs of \$10 million to \$15 million, when he was discussing this programme with his colleagues. I know they are pretty tight-fisted, but knowing the persuasive capacity of the minister I do hope that when we get around to his regular estimates, he will indeed be able to prevail upon his colleagues on the cabinet benches—or whatever we are going to call them when they come up with the government reorganization—to come up with something substantially in excess of the \$1 million in keeping with the potential for the orderly exploitation of our mineral wealth in this province and the creation of jobs and a greater degree of viability.

I do hope, too, that he will be able to prevail upon his colleagues to provide more research capital to establish smelters—something that he has discussed in many talks in the north. Hopefully we will get a much greater degree of processing of our mineral wealth, so that the people in the north, where the resource is, will have an opportunity to benefit from that exploitation, and many more of the jobs created as a result of our mineral wealth will stay in the north, to provide economic benefit and some viability to the communities that owe their existence to the mining industry.

I do hope that the minister will, as I say, continue on with this kind of programme and that he will expand on it on a much more regular basis. If we do get into it in a meaningful way, and if mines are the result of it, I hope that much more of the new wealth that is created will go toward existing communities, which are charged with the responsibility of providing essential services to people who will be working in the mining industry.

I welcome and heartily endorse the expenditure of this kind of money, but if anything of a meaningful nature does result, I do hope all the benefits don't accrue to people elsewhere as a result of our export of our mineral wealth in its raw form. And I hope that if he does get into it in a meaningful way, the minister, on behalf of the people of this province, will take some equity so we will be assured of our fair share of the economic benefits that are bound to result from this kind of a programme. We will support it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Chairman. May I first thank the hon. member for Thunder Bay for his very complimentary remarks. I am more than pleased. Of course, I expected he would be in favour of this very exciting and imaginative programme that certainly has been overwhelmingly accepted by the mining industry.

Mr. Stokes: I advocated it. I could not do otherwise. It was imaginative on our part.

Mr. Reid: Didn't the member get enough compliments from the minister?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just want to point out to him that each application, of course, is limited to \$100,000, and it does provide access for even the smallest of the junior mining companies. As an example, in the Red Lake area Cochenour Willans Gold Mines Limited has one programme involving a total commitment of \$97,500. That is its commitment, and we will commit \$32,500 from this programme. In that same area, we have an individual, Clayton Fuller Pine, who has a \$750 commitment, of which he will get a reimbursement of \$250. That shows you the magnitude and the broad scope of the programme.

In the member's own riding, Algoma Development Company has one programme for \$8,400, for which it will be reimbursed \$2,800. Also Carling Copper Mines Limited

has a total programme of \$95,000, of which it will receive \$31,666. I just point out to him that it is very broad in nature and certainly is available to anyone interested in doing any surface work in these designated areas.

The idea of promoting the mineral rights in these specific areas is because we are finding that the major mining companies are shying away from the old gold areas—they feel that these areas have been gone over with a fine-tooth comb. Granted, they have been gone over very closely and very carefully for gold and precious metals, but after the discovery of Texas Gulf and in consultation with my geologists and other officials, they feel the place to look for other ore bodies is where there is a known ore body already.

We are interested in providing work for the local individuals, of course, and we are interested in making sure that if there should be a mineral discovery in these specific area, it would develop and use the services of that specific community. This is why we have designated certain areas. One may say they are too large or too long or they don't suit the terrain, but we have taken into consideration the size of the community and the geology of that particular area and we have designated the townships accordingly.

So if there is a major mineral discovery, then the services of that community would be established and the government would not be called upon to build a new community or a new mining community. I think this was one of the prime purposes of moving in this direction.

I should mention to the member for Thunder Bay that we are concerned, of course, with large companies holding large tracts of land throughout the Province of Ontario, and my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), who was the former Minister of Mines, introduced some rather stunning increases for the ground rent, for leases, of as much as 500 per cent.

That was something like two years ago and it is having a real effect on land being given up because of the high cost of maintaining it and keeping it in good standing.

I hope to be able to release, possibly early in the New Year, statistics that show that the increase in rents has done exactly what we were wanting to do—that is, to bring back to the Crown, a lot of the lands that were being held by the major mining companies, so that other people can go in to do a little surface exploration and possibly develop it along the lines that we would like.

I am sure the member for Thunder Bay is also aware of the iron ore problems that we have in Canada, and in Ontario, and indeed, around the world. This is a problem that, of course, we are besieged with. Iron ore now is available right around the world. It is a very competitive market and it all boils down to economics. Certainly we in this department are doing everything we can to promote the development of certain iron ore bodies in the Province of Ontario, and I might say we are in very close consultation with the developers of the Lake St. Joe property at this very time.

I can't agree with the member's comments with regard to a battle raging between Ignace and Sioux Lookout as to the establishment of a community there. I think the government has made a very wise decision in telling the company at Mattagami that if they proceeded with a town site at that particular mine site, it would be totally their responsibility. There are facilities at Ignace that could be developed, and certainly with the road connection going in at Sioux Lookout there are facilities that could be used there also.

Mr. Reid: How about a road between Atikokan and Ignace?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I think that will come and I mentioned this in Dryden just the other day. I was saying at the Rotary Club that when that ore body at Lake St. Joe moves on into development, and I hope this will happen in the next five years, it will necessitate a highway link between Ignace and Atikokan. Certainly it will in my opinion.

Mr. Reid: Is that a promise?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, it is a statement.

Mr. Reid: What is the difference?

Mr. Ruston: The Premier will find out.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would point out to the member that there is no portion of these funds allocated to research in the real sense of the word. It is strictly for the encouragement of mineral exploration in the four designated areas of northwestern Ontario. I would make reference to the study being conducted or undertaken by The Department of Trade and Development and my own department of Mines and Northern Affairs, with regard to the possibility of establishing a copper smelter and refinery in northwestern Ontario.

We have a large number of small mining operations in that area now. I refer to South

Bay, Mattagami, Shebandowan, Geco, and there are more on the drawing boards right now, but there is not one of them that is really strong enough, independently, to operate to develop and to promote the construction of a copper smelter. Possibly collectively, they could construct a custom smelter and refinery and this is something we are moving along and it will be in full swing early in the New Year.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1302? The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: One final comment. I suggested this to the minister; if anything major develops as a result of this programme, does he plan on taking any equity in anything that results from it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, we do not plan to take any equity should a major discovery be made, and we have made it very clear that any moneys that were granted to the individual companies from this exploration programme would be turned back to the government and, of course, any information that they obtain during their surface discovery will be public information. This is very clear in the agreement with the individual companies.

Mr. Stokes: Is it part of the agreement that if a mine is found, and it does become profitable, that they will return the initial amount of money that was made available?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That is correct.

Vote 1302 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs.

Shall we proceed with The Department of Municipal Affairs?

On vote 1407:

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have an opening explanatory statement with regard to this amount of money.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to do that. The supplementary estimates for the department come to \$28.5 million and that amount is made up of two different programmes. The first relates to the municipal employment incentive programme, or winter employment measures, and the second one relates to additional grants to regional government. The hon. members may recall that last spring, or last summer, we passed a

Regional Municipal Grants Act amendment which permitted the government to make additional grants to the regional governments of Ottawa-Carleton, Niagara, York and the district of Muskoka, subject to various conditions as might be worked out.

I would deal with those two programmes. The \$28,500,000 is divided; \$25 million under the winter employment measures and \$3,500,000 under the regional grants assistance.

In the first case, the Treasurer in dealing with his statement of Monday last gave a substantial amount of information concerning it, but there are some other facets and perhaps the latest information that I might provide. The programme last year, which was begun in March, provided for \$7.5 million. That was divided among the various municipalities of the province and made available to them. The programme went to the end of June and we have received a substantial number of requests from municipalities for a similar programme for this year.

In dealing with last year's programme, when the final figures have been made out or arrived at, we found that of the whole allocation, \$6.3 million was in fact utilized by the municipalities in their projects and of the 900-odd municipalities, 697 took advantage of that, creating work for about 7,000 people throughout the province.

This year the programme has been substantially enlarged and I think with good effect. By doing it early this fall, we were able to advise the municipalities of the moneys that would be made available to meet their requests for such a programme. I met with the provincial-municipal liaison committee at the end of October to place our suggestions before them as to the programme and changes that might be made. I received certain recommendations from them, but by and large concurrence with the changes as we had proposed them for this year.

The programme has been enlarged to include not only municipalities and Indian bands but also school boards and conservation authorities and other commissions. We have given an initial allocation to the municipalities and none of them will receive less in an allocation than they actually used last year. But each municipality in the province, whether it used the moneys last year or not, was advised of an initial amount so that it could go forward with plans if it so wished.

We have set a time limit to December 31 for the use of the money—or at least for submission of plans for the use of the money.

We have done that so that they will make their plans and get on with the job and we can confirm the projects. The programme itself would run from December 1 to May 31, but in meeting with them I advised that if any municipality's programme was approved prior to December 1, we would backdate it into November so they would have the advantage of that.

As of the present time, of the \$25 million, we have allocated a total of \$22 million—\$17 million to the municipalities and Indian bands, and through the municipalities' various boards and commissions, and \$5 million for work by school boards and the conservation authorities. At the present time, under the provincial programme, some 300 municipalities have submitted programmes to us for approval and those take up allocations of about just over \$8 million.

We have had requests from a number of municipalities whose programmes use up all of the allotment for an additional \$3 million and those programmes will be considered.

After December 31, moneys that have not been used by municipalities by way of a programme submission we will reallocate to other municipalities, if the need arises. We believe that under this arrangement there will be a substantial amount of work made available to the municipalities through their programmes to provide employment for many people, not just in manual labour field, strictly the labour field.

It is to be made available for work on a broader base than last year—for example, some research work, perhaps planning studies, some clerical work and so on. They are not strictly limited to cutting trees, et cetera or doing works in parks.

That covers the main programme. This is quite distinct from the federal programme and the two programmes do not mesh entirely. What I have suggested be done is that where they might use the federal programme and the amount which may be paid under it is somewhat less than under the provincial programme, we might arrange for a stacking arrangement. They would take as much as they could under the federal programme and we might assist the municipality for amounts over and above that.

There is one other matter I would just mention. There is a bill before the Legislature at the moment permitting municipalities to do work on private homes or private property with the consent of the owner of the

property, subject to the municipality obtaining consent from the department in reference to a programme of that nature. That legislation will complement this winter works programme.

In dealing with the additional grants to regional municipalities, all of the municipalities received some additional assistance but in line with the intent and principle of the amendments in the legislation, the assistance takes a different form, or took a different form, in each area according to the needs of the particular region.

In Ottawa-Carleton we have undertaken to assist the regional municipality with the financing of the Watts Creek sewage treatment plant. That was a very substantial amount of money which they could not finance otherwise.

In the Niagara region we made certain changes in reference to the transitional grant arrangements and the same thing applied in York and the district of Muskoka. There were certain additional moneys made available to some of the municipalities within Ottawa-Carleton on a change-tax basis, whereby the taxes were recalculated taking into account the levies that had been made over a comparative period of years.

In the regional municipalities of Niagara, York and Muskoka, as a condition of the grants, we imposed certain percentages on their budgets, percentage increases on their budgets. In some areas, we would permit them to increase their budgets by a certain percentage up to 15 per cent. We absorbed through the moneys paid to them the equivalent of 10 per cent of their budgets as additional assistance. In all, the regional municipalities received a total of just over \$3.5 million or the equivalent of \$3.5 million, and then Ottawa-Carleton received \$1,350,000 more that was allocated to it in reference to the sewage treatment plant. So the total allocation came to \$3.5 million additional moneys that have been put into the budget for these purposes.

If there are questions from the various hon. members, I will be pleased to answer them.

Mr. Chairman: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A few questions: First I would like to know why both the programmes are listed under tax diminution. Surely the one that gives provincial funds to the regions would diminish the local taxes and perhaps that style of nomenclature would

be all right, but why is it the employment incentive programmes are put under the same catchall phrase?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is handled through the tax diminution section of the department and it comes under that vote within the estimates of the department.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right!

Well Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask further about the payments under The Regional Municipal Grants Act. The minister went down to the Niagara region and up to York and visited, I think finally, the region of Muskoka, with the funds that had been approved by the bill but never voted by the House, just in the period between the end of the session and the calling of the election.

It must have been quite a popular thing to do, to go down to Niagara with a million dollars in his pocket to assist them; but I was wondering: Is this going to be a continuing and recurring item, or in fact will the funds payable under The Regional Municipal Grants Act be a decreasing amount as the regions have a tax base which will enable them to fulfil the cost of their own services?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The transitional grants as originally provided decrease each year by about 20 per cent, and I anticipate the assistance under this programme will decrease a certain amount each year—that is my intention. It is provided in the legislation that we can make these payments over a period of five years, it is limited to that. I hope and anticipate the need for this additional assistance will decrease.

I used the figure 20 per cent because that was the way it was in the transitional grant arrangement. Whether it will be held at that or whether it will be more I don't know, but certainly it is my intention to do it in that way.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It would not be a recurring special estimate; it would be in the regular budget of the department, particularly as you go on with regionalization in other areas.

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is correct. It was brought in as a supplementary because the bill was passed in July of last year after the budget was brought down.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With reference to the \$25 million, the experience in previous years of winter works has been that some municipalities will tend to use the funds to hire

those employees they have been using in other projects during the summer months and then simply allow this particular grant to pay the salaries, or a large part of the salaries, during the winter months. Is the minister convinced that in fact this is new employment that the \$25 million is fostering, or is there a large component which is simply used by many municipalities as a grant to maintain the regular work force?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The programme brought in last March had a condition that projects not be work that was planned in their normal budget. Certainly under the old winter works scheme, with which the member and I are quite familiar, that is what used to happen. They would lay people off and then engage them again. But under this arrangement we have been strict in that regard in that they have to certify it is not a programme included in their normal budget; and under the province's arrangement, it is work to be carried out by the municipality itself rather than through contract arrangements. We have recommended that those who are employed should be in the relative area of 60 per cent from those who are receiving welfare assistance and 40 per cent from those seeking work, particularly through the Manpower centres.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the new legislation we will be discussing tonight or tomorrow to allow work to be done on private property, mostly for the removal of dead trees?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That might be a programme but there can be other programmes as well; whatever the municipality would wish to bring forward.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But in the concept of the programme, when you and your advisers were discussing it, would one of the main projects that the municipalities might do on private property be to embark on a programme whereby they could go on to private property and clear off the many dead trees that are there?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, when I met the provincial-municipal liaison committee, this was one of their chief requests, not covered under our previous plan, that ways be found whereby they could do just that. They could cut down trees, and so on, and perhaps demolish or take down buildings or burn buildings, the ones that needed to be demolished. The tree programme was certainly raised by them as one thing they would like to do and assist the owners of property.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The last thing I want to raise with the minister, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the dovetailing of the federal programme. I am not sure whether it is properly called the local initiatives programme or not, but the one that does, at least, channel through the Department of Municipal Affairs. The Treasurer, in answering a question either today or yesterday, said that he did not believe the municipalities would make use of very much of the federal money in that the province itself would utilize it because there is that flexibility.

I am sure there are a number of reasons for this, but would it not be a better use of these funds if they were channelled as far as possible to the municipalities where in small numbers, but in many areas, more people could be employed?

Hon. Mr. Bales: There are really three federal programmes. One is called the local initiatives programme which has a total of \$50 million put into it. That is to be made available to the municipalities across the country. We are co-operating with them. There are forms that have been provided by the federal people, and we have transferred or sent those on to the municipalities. As a matter of fact, we sent the two programmes out together as an information sheet.

Under that programme they make application to us and we transmit it to the federal department and they make the decision as to approval or otherwise of the programme. They have asked that we should carry out the inspections on their behalf with reference to that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You do not approve them?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We do not approve them, no. We transmit them to the federal people for the municipalities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why don't they mail them in directly?

Hon. Mr. Bales: They really asked that they work through the provinces. This is a standard arrangement that they should do that, since they are dealing with the municipalities. May I say—of that \$50 million that it is not allocated—and I answered a question about this the other day—so much to each province. Rather the federal people will approve programmes as they come in.

Up to the end of last week—and I get a report each week—we have transmitted on behalf of the municipalities 51 projects but none had at that point been approved. Then

there are community programmes and the community programmes are available to other than municipalities and are handled directly by the Manpower offices. Applications are made directly to them and they deal with those approvals on an individual basis. We have no part in that.

The third programme is the federal employment loans programme which is a capital works programme and the work must be carried out by March, 1973. Under that programme, \$28 million—I believe it is \$28 million—will be made available or set aside for Ontario and the municipalities can apply for loans in that regard. I have sent out to all of the municipalities the particulars of the matter as given to us by the federal people. The money is made available to the province and we, in turn, have made it available to the municipalities. We could keep it all for provincial works if we so wished but we felt it best to make it available the other way.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, if I might pursue one point the minister has made, in that he says that the province does not have to approve the federal local initiatives programme. Then he says that as yet the federal government has not approved any project that he knows of. I am wondering if there might not be a misunderstanding here, because the information I have here from Manpower and Immigration on the local initiatives programme under section 8 says:

Application from municipalities must have the concurrence of the appropriate provincial or territorial government and should be submitted to its office as soon as possible at the address below.

And the address below is given as The Department of Municipal Affairs, so it would appear that the department must approve any project going from the municipalities to the federal programme.

I am wondering if the minister is not approving them and maybe that is why they are not being approved down in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, the arrangement that we have worked out with the federal government on this, notwithstanding what may be on their sheet, is that when we receive an application for approval of a programme under the local initiative arrangement, we transmit it directly, and we see that they go out at once so there is no delay, to the federal people.

We do not approve them. We feel it is their money and it is up to them to approve it in whatever programme they wish. We do not wish to be in the position of limiting that matter. The moneys are available and we feel this shouldn't have to have two approvals. If it is a federal programme then let them approve it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for giving us rather a more full statement about his supplementary estimates than has come from the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I think though that I still would like to ask him a few questions. Rather than asking them one by one I will ask him to make a few notes and maybe come up with some answers afterward, because this programme which we are being asked to vote \$25 million for, the municipal employment incentive programme is in fact the guts, the main part of the government's employment creation programme over the winter.

According to the figures that we have had from the hon. Treasurer, about 30,000 jobs are to be created under this programme this winter; that is something like three-quarters of the jobs that are to be created in winter works by the government. That is an awful lot and I am not yet sure from the figures that the minister gave that he has convinced me that the jobs will in fact be created.

If I listened correctly, I understand that while about \$22 million has been allocated to municipalities and school boards and so on, applications have come in for only about half that amount, or about \$11 million. If I understand correctly as well, the department has now been given an additional \$10 million which will come out of the 1972-1973 estimates, but which will raise the value of this programme to a total of \$35 million, rather than the \$25 million originally announced.

That means, in other words, that close to Christmas, past the middle of December, we can see applications, that is jobs actually planned, for about one-third of the 30,000 people who it was expected would be employed during the winter under this provincial/municipal incentive programme.

We know that once Christmas is passed the unemployment problem in this province becomes very severe, very quickly, and I think all members of this House would have hoped to see more evidence that many of

those 30,000 jobs would be created, would start to be there right after Christmas; starting now or starting on January 1.

However, that is not the evidence we have before us. Now it is hard to blame the minister alone for some of the problems that have cropped up with the programme this year. I suggest that it really is the fault of the government and of his Premier for not deciding until a very late date and under great pressure, with the election a couple of weeks ahead, to undertake any kind of winter employment problem for 1971-1972. However the fact is he didn't really get the go-ahead until October 8 when the Premier did announce the programme and did tell him the funds were available.

After that various correspondence has come from the minister informing municipalities, and by the beginning of December they did have a pretty good idea of what was available to them, both from the provincial-municipal programme and also from the federal-provincial-municipal programme, and it is not his fault that the federal government was also very slow in coming off the mark and didn't announce its programme until October 14.

However, I think that at the least we should try and learn from the mistakes that have been made this year. There is really no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for a government which last spring could have consulted its economic experts and forecasters and could have foreseen the very severe level of seasonal unemployment we would have this winter. There is just no excuse for that government not to decide until October 8 that in fact it would go ahead with the seasonal unemployment programme this winter; there is just no excuse for not going ahead with the planning during the months of May and June and July of this year when municipalities could in fact have been contacted and could have been told there was every likelihood there would be some kind of employment programme and these would be the general guidelines: If you don't want to waste people's time just cutting brush and digging dirt and painting fire hydrants and that sort of thing, then now is the time to get your programmes ready, to put them on the shelf; and the chances are 80 or 90 or 100 per cent we will make funds available for you in the early fall and we would like you to be ready.

That didn't happen though, Mr. Chairman; the municipalities did not know. They repeatedly asked, as the minister has already said, and it wasn't until October they were told in general terms that something would

happen, it wasn't until the end of October that the provincial-municipal liaison committee met to iron out some of the difficulties that had been experienced in the plan of last year.

It wasn't until November 4, I think it is, that the first correspondence from the department came out to make clear exactly what was available; and the federal programme details were not released by the department until seven weeks after that programme was announced—that is they were not released until early December.

It just isn't good enough; and I do hope the lesson is learned and that if the forecasts are that we will have seasonal unemployment over the winter of 1972-1973, the preparation is done this coming spring and in the early summer and municipalities are told that since the government considers them a very good means of providing employment, they are warned and given time to prepare, rather than being asked to respond at the last minute.

The minister is surely aware of the kind of problems municipalities have in responding quickly. He is also aware I think, from his own memorandum, of really the futile nature of many of the projects which are of necessity going to come forward from municipalities in order to try and use up the funds which are being made available from the provincial government; if that is, they are going to be used up at all.

As you have seen already, after six weeks approximately, municipalities have only in fact spoken up for a third of the funds the minister intends to make available.

This is from the memorandum which was sent out in November by the minister, outlining some of the projects which it was considered would be useful to make employment over the winter: "Brush clearing; clearing creeks; exterior painting of buildings."

I ask the minister to explain how he expects exterior painting of buildings to be carried on in January, February or March, or even April of the coming year in Ontario municipalities—unless there is a banana belt by Windsor of which I am unaware. I can't see that as being a feasible thing; that or sodding, which I believe refers to grass and not other activities.

An hon. member: Maybe you are getting special attention!

Mr. Cassidy: I really cannot see how, with the springtime conditions, that any sodding

can usefully take place before the last month of this programme; and that, Mr. Chairman, is not really when it was intended to create employment.

Snow clearing—well everybody will agree snow clearing is something which can be done in the wintertime throughout this province, throughout most of this province. I am very glad to see that. However it seems to me that in terms of human dignity and so forth—I mean if some municipality chose to get gangs of men to come along and shovel the sidewalks that creates lots and lots of jobs, but just how does a man feel if he is being paid \$2.25 or \$2.80 an hour to dig with a shovel as he watches the front-end loaders and the other kind of equipment that normally do the work go by on the same street on which he is working? That isn't a really meaningful kind of task to carry out.

I would have liked to see, with advanced planning, more time and effort being put into using people in the social services, working with old people, in daycare centres and this sort of thing, projects which are carried out by the municipalities.

Now I am certain the minister will assure us this could be done, but it is the kind of thing which takes time to prepare for and to organize. It is not as simple as sending a few men out with a few axes and a pair of boots on and telling them to clear some brush which will just grow back in the next year or so.

We welcome the fact that some non-manual work can be done here and so on, but these just don't look like the kind of things municipalities are going to get into in any big way—half a dozen or a dozen jobs clearing the backlog in offices or counting inventory and this sort of thing. In other words, because of the delays for which the Premier and the minister are responsible, too much of the programme is going to be pure and simple make-work and nothing more.

I question as well whether many of the programmes will strike at all of the groups who are in fact unemployed. The minister may say he thinks it is desirable to have Ph.D.s clearing brush; I am not sure. Certainly I find very few jobs on this list which can be carried out by women who are unemployed. I find very few jobs here that can be carried out by university graduates and teachers and people like that who have skills to offer beyond the fact that they also may happen to be strong and could do manual work if nothing else was available. But I would have thought that more imagination

and innovation should have been coming out of the government than just to say to everybody, "Here is a saw, an axe; now go and cut down some brush."

I would like the minister to tell us in very specific terms, if he has the figures or if he can tell us if he has the information, just how many of the jobs will be made available in January, February and March. In fact, how many of the 30,000 or 35,000 people who are expected to be employed for about two months apiece in fact will spend the winter waiting for jobs that can be done and then do the work in April and May when they could very likely be looking for and getting other employment? In other words, how many of these 30,000 jobs will miss the major need and will go to sort of meet a peripheral need at the time when the economy will be picking up anyway, both because of general improvements and because of seasonal improvement.

I would also like the minister to tell us what has happened to the home improvement programme that was promised by the Premier on October 8, and which the Premier told the House the other day was in fact the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It was to be a new grant programme to provide positive incentives for home improvements and repairs through the peak unemployment period.

As we all know, the peak unemployment period is January through March. If a programme of home repairs is to be carried out, that means homeowners, who are the people who have got to make the decisions about this, need to know. There has not been a breath of information.

In my consultations with the department—I do consult the departments from time to time—I could find no evidence that there was even any preparation for this programme, which was intended to cost about \$10 million; there were no supplementary estimates.

The Premier spoke of positive incentives. There was no indication what those positive incentives may be. There is no indication what the tax treatment would be if property owners were to take advantage of this programme to improve their property. Will they have to pay additional taxes or will their assessments be frozen for a few years in order to provide another incentive to carry on with this?

There has been absolutely nothing about this programme, which was one of the major things that the Premier offered as a means of creating employment.

The third area in these supplementary estimates, Mr. Chairman, is the question of the regional municipalities. It was reassuring to hear the minister suggest that perhaps he wouldn't pull away these transitional grants and other things after one year. However, I think we need something more positive than simply a statement that he might not, that he would look at it and so on, because the money that came down bore all of the appearance of an election plum designed to calm the fears and the very genuine concerns of people in the regional municipalities about the way their tax rates have been behaving after regionalization.

The minister knows, and mentioned himself, that in the Ottawa area certain municipalities got benefits because the taxes had gone up very high. I understand that this has been the case in areas like the Niagara region as well.

Now, is the minister prepared to guarantee that these grants will not decrease by more than 20 per cent a year? I think this would be reassuring to those particular municipalities. Will the minister really guarantee that these won't decrease by more than that rate? Will he assure us that it wasn't just an election plum but that there are genuine problems there? And will he tell us whether he intends to keep on putting a freeze on municipalities as a condition of these grants, and if so, whether he will tell them at the beginning of the year and not, as in the case of these grants which we are now considering, at the end of the year when it became extraordinarily difficult for them to make the kind of cutbacks that were required as a condition to get a new grant.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has taken a very pessimistic view of the programme. I would just say to him that last year's programme came out at the beginning of March without any forewarning to the municipalities. Between then and the end of June, of an allocation of \$7.5 million, the municipalities were able to create programmes and provide work for more than 7,000 people, for 300,000 man-days of work, and used up some \$6.3 million out of a total allocation of \$7.5 million. There was a large number of letters and views from the municipalities as to their satisfaction with the programme last year, requesting certain changes, particularly with reference to additional moneys for equipment and other means, and we have provided for that in our programme this year. I think it is much more flexible than it was last year.

We have also covered works, other than purely labour or manual work, because we recognize that there are many people with a variety of skills who may be out of work and the municipalities can develop programmes for them or programmes that they wish to have carried out and the people are available to fulfil. That particularly applies in the planning field, for example, the research that they have not been able to do that they may want to plan ahead, which is not in their budget, and so on. But all of this will be developed. When we look at the number of applications that come in and, as I have said, we have 300 municipalities, I would say to the hon. member that those applications are coming in very quickly. In some areas, we have applications, and I mentioned this before, for more money than has been allocated to that municipality. In other words, they are asking for larger allocations than they were initially given.

Our reason for setting a deadline date for submission of December 31 is just for that reason, to see which municipalities do not wish to use the money, or perhaps haven't the unemployment in that particular area that there is in others. If they don't use it, then we can take that money and meet the requests of other municipalities which have a larger works programme. That will be done early in the new year, and we will probably do it later on again, because I will want to check and see what use is being made of the money toward the programmes that have been approved.

One of the points particularly made by the municipalities to us at the end of October was that they could develop the programmes, and they had developed them in many instances, but that they would much prefer to have additional moneys which they could use in a variety of ways, including work on private property. It is for that reason we have brought forward this particular bill. The bill will be flexible under that arrangement to see that the programmes as the municipalities may develop them, and with the consent of the private owner, can be carried out. Bear in mind, and I have said this before, the period of the programme is from December 1 to May 31, so that there is a substantial amount of the spring period that we are going to take into account.

The northern municipalities asked that the programme go on longer than May 31 and certainly that is a reasonable request. Subject to the moneys being available, I have told them I will give favourable and careful consideration to that. So come next May, we

may well extend the period in northern Ontario to a later date because of the weather situations.

Many of the home improvements, if there are home improvements made, provide assistance. The hon. member may not be aware of this, but we passed amendments to The Assessment Act last year. It provided for an exemption from taxation for home improvements or for improvements to property up to \$2,500 market value. So that is an additional assistance to them in that regard.

Turning to the other phase of the supplementary budgets, we put a control on their budgets last year and it had a good effect. In many instances the taxes were maintained at a fairly constant level. There were some decreases and some small increases but by and large it did have an effect of controlling those taxes. One of the conditions I imposed at that time was that there be pre-budgeting by the municipalities over a three-year period and that those pre-budgets be submitted to the department early in the year by a certain date so that we could assist them and our finance branch work with them if necessary.

We realize that last year the legislation wasn't passed until July. I saw them all at the beginning of August and it was difficult for them at that time. But with those requirements we will get their budgets well ahead of time and they will know where they stand. I said before that it is in the legislation. These moneys can be paid over a period of five years. It is my anticipation that that will be done but on a decreasing basis.

In dealing with Ottawa-Carleton, the member well knows that it was not in any time just prior to the election but last May, I believe—I am not sure of the exact day but it was in May—when I advised the Ottawa-Carleton region. They were very anxious to get that information then about the Watts Creek plant and our agreement to enter into and assist their financing.

The agreements have not been finalized, I might mention, with the federal government as yet but we are working on them. They have agreed to participate in that particular matter and the negotiations are going forward quite satisfactorily. I think we will have quite a good agreement with them in reference to that sewage treatment for the Ottawa-Carleton region. It is a detailed agreement and we didn't want the municipality to delay its work on the sewage treatment plant and so we made our commitment.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1407:

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask two or three questions of the minister. He seems to have missed two or three points that I was making in the speech, and let me just put them in very succinct terms again.

In the first place for next winter—not this winter now, but for next winter—will he work out plans, provisional plans, that are available for seasonal employment measures in the spring and early summer rather than waiting until October and November—that is question one—and learn from the lessons that we have had this year and last year?

Secondly, how many of these 30,000 jobs will be available at the time of peak unemployment in January, February and March? How many of them will, in fact, be in early and middle spring, in April and May?

A third point: What has happened to the commitment, I think they call it on that side of the House, that was made by the Premier to have a grant programme to provide positive incentives for home improvements and which the Premier told us the other day is the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs? What has happened? It seems to have vanished without a trace and the minister certainly didn't enlighten us during his comments.

If I could have answers to those questions, I would really appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Bales: In reference to the planning for last year, we started our planning last summer. I had consultations with some of the municipalities and we developed the programme and made it available and publicized it. We were concerned that the federal government did not come forward and did not respond to consultation on that so that the two programmes could have been dovetailed entirely. They are not the same—they are similar but they are not the same.

When we were at the federal-provincial meeting in mid-November we raised this with them as we had previously. There is now an understanding that next June or thereabouts we will meet with the federal people to review this year's programme and to plan it for the year after, if it is necessary, with the hope that the two programmes may, so far as the municipalities are concerned, be identical. It would be much easier for the municipalities to deal with it if they have a uniform programme from each. We are quite willing to make adjustments; we want to

gain from their experience and from our experience, and we will work it out in that way.

The member asked two other questions.

Regarding the home improvement programme, the \$10 million is included in the moneys that will be available between December 1 and June 1. The member referred to it earlier as \$35 million; that is included—the \$10 million as well as the \$25 million. The legislation we are bringing forward is part of that arrangement so that the municipalities can carry out a variety of works on private property.

Mr. Cassidy: Is that the programme, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is the programme at the present time, yes, because in reviewing the whole matter of engaging in a home improvement programme, the municipalities impressed on us that it is not a way they feel we can be of greatest assistance at this time. When we look at the rate of housing starts, for example, in Ontario this year, as compared with last year, we find that there is an increase of over 21 per cent. In many instances a high percentage of the people who would be involved in straight home improvement are already engaged. There is another group of people who are not so engaged. We will approve a variety of programmes for the municipalities to do work on homes, if they come forward. We have had some consultation with the municipalities about this matter, and I will be having further meetings on it as the work progresses.

The member's other question was in reference to the jobs that would be available early in the year. Many of these projects were ready, came forward and have been approved, and many of the people are now working. I know the municipalities have advised me that they anticipate much of it to be started early in the new year, so there will be a lot of jobs created at that point.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a few questions. Was the allocation made to each of the various areas of the province related to the unemployment rate and the welfare rolls in that area? I think we in our area received approximately \$1 per capita and the overall provincial total of \$25 million will work out to about something over \$3 per capita. Is this related to the number of people on welfare on each

area, or why were we only allowed \$1 per capita?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have allocated it on the basis of using the welfare arrangements to indicate the greatest need, but in no case has a municipality been allocated less than it had in 1971. And whether they used the programme last year or not, some basic money has been made available to every municipality for a programme this year.

Mr. Good: Well, another question: I have some townships in my area with no able-bodied people on welfare at all. I have been asked if they can employ people from the welfare rolls and from Manpower Centres of adjacent municipalities. Is this permissible under this schedule of 60 per cent from welfare and 40 per cent from Manpower?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Obviously they would be people from close at hand who would not have a long distance to go; I can see no reason why we should not permit it.

Mr. Good: It is permissible.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you.

I may have missed it in the minister's statements—he has made a number since he raised the matter. He said that he had some 40-odd applications that had gone through his department to Ottawa and he receives a weekly—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Fifty-one.

Mr. Deans: Fifty-one? And he stated there is a weekly report on activities in Ottawa.

Do you follow up on the applications after you make them; or do you just simply send them in and then if nothing happens they die on the vine?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is up to the federal government to approve or not approve, and they will advise us if they do not approve. They have not advised us one way or the other at the present time. We have been following it up with them, because we want to advise the municipalities which sent them to us. At the moment we simply have not received any answers.

Mr. Deans: Of the 51 projects at present before the federal government, for what period of time do they go back? I mean when

were they first submitted to the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I cannot give the member an exact date.

Mr. Deans: No; but a month ago?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Toward the end of November, the last quarter of November.

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: It is now 6 o'clock. Will there be further discussions? Does this vote carry?

There will be further discussions.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, December 16, 1971

Supplementary estimates, Lands and Forests	196
Supplementary estimates, Transportation and Communications	204
Supplementary estimates, Mines and Northern Affairs	230
Supplementary estimates, Municipal Affairs	234
Recess, 6 o'clock	244



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, December 16, 1971

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1971

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (concluded)

Mr. Chairman: Order please! When we rose at 6 o'clock, we were discussing vote 1407. The member for Wentworth.

On vote 1407:

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Just a couple of points. At 6 o'clock I was asking the minister about the communication between his department and the appropriate department in Ottawa and I am still just a little puzzled. Since obviously, in the eyes of the federal government, the Province of Ontario is acting on behalf of all the municipalities, it seems that it is the responsibility of the province to pursue the loans to it—or to pursue the grants and make sure that the programmes are being considered by Ottawa.

I am interested to know what kind of procedures the minister follows to make sure the 51 projects that are presently before the federal government are receiving any kind of consideration. Whether or not in his discussions with them yesterday, and I am sure he probably spoke with them yesterday, he heard they were going to okay them or give some kind of an indication before the end of this year.

It is fairly evident that unless the municipalities know prior to, let's assume the first week in January, not too much is going to occur before the beginning of February; which means we are rapidly cutting down that period when unemployment is at its highest.

I am curious to hear from the minister what kinds of things Ottawa is telling us since we have 51 what would appear to be reasonable projects. I take that from the minister's earlier statements. Are we likely to know anything about the outcome of this thing before the end of the year?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, during the interval

since we sat last, I made some further checks on the matter. We have been advised that three of them have been approved. We haven't been notified but we understand from regional offices that three municipalities have been notified.

The federal people notify the applicant municipalities direct. They will also advise us. We haven't received that as yet, but we have been told that three have received approval. Three projects have received approval. I can't tell you which ones. We will know within a few days.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Is this the result of the terrific pressure you have been putting on them?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman this is a new programme we are endeavouring to bring forward. We believe in co-operating with the federal people to help those who are unemployed. It isn't a case of being niggardly or nasty with them or anything else. They are trying to work out a programme and so are we. We are giving them every co-operation—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is not the way the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) talks.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —to assist those who are out of work; and I think that is the important thing.

Mr. MacDonald: What a display of indignation!

Mr. Deans: I am glad.

Can I ask the minister, assuming, and I hope it is not true, but assuming we are going to go into the same kind of a programme next winter, is it possible to negotiate with the federal government to allow direct communication in both directions between municipalities and the federal government, rather than have this sending it through the province and the province having nothing really to do or say about it? It would seem to me a much more direct route. There seems to me to be a feeling abroad in the province that perhaps it is time municipalities were

given some status in any event, and I would be hopeful maybe we could get that kind of thing under way.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is not exactly that way. We were concerned and we brought out our programme because we heard nothing from the federal people. We brought out our programme on October 8. A week later the federal programme was brought out. I think it would have been much better to have had prior consultation, to have had prior advice as to what the federal programme was to be and to correlate the two of them very closely.

Mr. Deans: Right!

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is for that reason that at the federal-provincial conference we asked—I have forgotten whether it was the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) or which person—but we asked that there be meetings on the matter at the end of this year's programme so that we could look at the results to see ways whereby we could have greater co-operation, whereby we could correlate the two programmes better.

May I go on to one further thing. Since last March when I assumed this portfolio, we have had discussions in reference to tri-level conferences, because I think there is much merit in them. At a conference in Winnipeg last April of ministers of municipal affairs I was made chairman of a committee composed of Mr. Andras and the president of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, to work toward tri-level conferences.

At the recent meeting of the federal and the provincial governments, or the first ministers, that concept was approved by the first ministers, and we are proceeding with it. I think there is much to be gained. It is in this field that we can do a good deal of constructive work.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): May I ask the minister at what stage of planning the minister and the government are in the implementation of the Hamilton-Wentworth regional government? I ask the question because I think it is highly important.

We are now dealing with some payments to regional governments. There are several established across the province that have had growing pains, or have been slack in the early formation days. But it is inevitable that they are going to continue to grow. Their

problems are going to be ironed out. They are going to gain the benefit of regional government with extra grants and attention from the provincial government. In the Hamilton-Wentworth situation there is a great deal of indecision and confusion about the whole growth of the Hamilton area.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I think that this is not a matter covered by the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1407.

Mr. Gisborn: Will the minister explain why—

Mr. Chairman: No, we are not discussing the—

Mr. Gisborn: I am trying to point out that this programme is highly unfair to the Hamilton area—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We are not really discussing the philosophy of regional government but the special grants which are being offered.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: These are extra grants for the existing regional governments, we are not on the formation of new regional governments.

Mr. Cassidy: Grants to regional municipalities are involved. It is perfectly in order.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The grants, if I can be of assistance, Mr. Chairman, the moneys that are before us today are in reference to those regional governments that are set forth in the Act passed last summer last July dealing with regional grants.

The hon. member for—it takes a little while to get to know the new members—Ottawa Centre asked for some very specific information in reference to man-days and when they would be available and so on. During the interval I obtained some additional information and if I could I would give it to you now:

There were 300—298 actually, I was using the figure 300—but there are 298 municipalities which have had projects approved. The estimated man-days according to their figures, and it is broken down by different types of municipalities, but the total comes to 272,919 man-days with a total expenditure of \$8,199,000.

We have had additional requests, Mr. Chairman, from 114 municipalities—this rep-

resents requests for expenditures of money over and above their original allotment—from 114 municipalities. The additional amount on requests come to \$2,800,000 odd, nearly \$2,900,000. I thought those figures might be helpful to you.

Many of these projects that have been approved are under way at the present time. In fact the bulk of them are. I am assured by the head of the branch that they will come to their peak early in the new year.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1407. The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I have to insist that I have some answer from the minister, because the procrastination about the establishment of the Hamilton-Wentworth regional government has established complete discrimination against that district.

We spent an enormous amount of money having the groundwork done, the Steele commission report and compiling the data that was necessary. We got the recommendations, the county spent enormous amounts of money, and this decision now hanging in limbo is putting Hamilton and Wentworth county region in an unfair position as far as growth and grants are concerned.

An hon. member: Get a lawyer.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

This is not the place to discuss this. Order please!

We are discussing the supplementary estimates under this particular vote for the existing regional governments, as I understand it. The question such as you are asking now could, I suggest—it is just a suggestion—could be entertained before the orders of the day, during the question period. I mean. But to go into the philosophy or the formation of new regional governments is not germane to this particular vote and I rule any further discussion out of order.

Mr. Gisborn: I only ask a simple question and all the minister has to do is say at this stage, we are considering it, we will have an answer in two months, three months or four months. If this is given Hamilton will be settled down to a fact of realization.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest the member ask a question in the morning and have it covered in the question period.

Any further discussion on vote 1407?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North); Mr. Chairman, I would like—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre was on his feet a moment ago.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the minister for seeking some information during the recess but I still regret that in fact there are two or three questions that he hasn't really answered satisfactorily, at least to the satisfaction on this side of the House. He might have at least tried.

The first is: The minister did say to us that many—let me see if I can find my quote here, I had it jotted down here—he said that many jobs to be created will be available in January and February; during the period of peak unemployment a lot of jobs will be available. Then I asked specifically: Okay, will the jobs be available in the period of peak unemployment?

Now he very kindly did go and seek some figures. There are 270,000 man-days of work approved right now, or about 7,000 men working for two months if you do the division. Of those 7,000 jobs he says that the peak will be early in the New Year.

But that, Mr. Chairman, is the peak of 7,000 jobs and not the peak of 30,000 jobs, and I want to know when will those 30,000 jobs come. Will they come when unemployment is at its worst, or will most of them come in April and May?

The second point is that the minister delivered a very unsatisfactory answer when he tried to explain the government's decision to scrap the home improvement plan which the Premier, who I see is here now, had announced on October 8. The Premier announced a scheme of grants in order to help with home improvements and repairs. The minister says that having checked with the municipalities it was decided to scrap the programme and do away with it completely, on the grounds mainly, apparently, that housing construction was fairly high and the number of tradesmen was limited.

Now the minister is surely aware that, regrettable as it may be, most of the manpower working in the housing industry and the building of houses is in fact non-unionized, not that highly skilled and certainly does not qualify as tradesmen; and secondly—

Mr. E. M. Harvot (Timiskaming): You don't know the difference.

Mr. Cassidy: He wouldn't know the difference!

Well, you say that to him not to me.

Mr. Havrot: You don't know.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He could tell you a thing or two probably.

Mr. Cassidy: Secondly, I think the minister should have looked very closely, and the cabinet should have looked very closely, at the home improvement programme.

It offered a number of good things. In the first place it offered an opportunity to do some work, a winter works programme with some lasting benefits; and if it had been applied in lower income areas, to substandard housing particularly, then to a group which doesn't normally benefit from the housing programme and from many other programmes that are carried out by this government and by the federal government.

There are many jobs which can be done, not by plumbers and electricians and skilled people like this, but on a handyman basis if you will. These are home repairs and home improvements that can be done by relatively unskilled labour, and such a programme would have had a lasting effect. Five years from now you could look at a house and you could say that house is still liveable because of the 1971-1972 winter employment programme.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): What is relatively unskilled?

Mr. Cassidy: The Premier had a word to say?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Shouldn't he have hired a skilled man in his life!

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is relatively unskilled?

Mr. Deans: Tory backbenchers!

Hon. Mr. Davis: NDP backbenchers obviously.

Mr. Cassidy: That would have meant that a house would not have had to be replaced by the Ontario Housing Corporation or by some other body. We could have acted in order to help to solve the housing problem by extending the life of existing housing; we could have provided much more meaningful work than cutting brush and this kind of thing.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

Mr. Cassidy: I will gladly yield to the minister if he has some explanations, yes.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have given it to you before, but you didn't hear.

I said before that we brought in legislation, which we will deal with, probably tomorrow, providing for the municipalities to do work on private properties—

Mr. Cassidy: If the minister approves.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —with the consent of the owner and subject to the approval of the department in reference to that type of winter works programme or employment centre programme. Since I introduced the legislation on Monday I have had inquiries from at least two fairly large municipalities asking about this kind of thing and doing work on homes and so on.

It is that kind of programme that we are encouraging, but we are not putting them into any straitjacket as to how they do it. We will give them every assistance; we want to approve all useful and practical programmes. The kind of thing you suggest is one that could well be approved if it comes forward from the municipalities.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the minister has had since October 8 and the Premier's statement to tell municipalities they would in fact be the designated agencies or vehicles to do this kind of work.

Mr. MacDonald: Which winter are you working for?

Mr. Cassidy: The minister has had 2½ months in which to do this, Mr. Chairman; and in fact until Monday of this week and this bill, it was not apparent at all as far as municipalities were concerned. In fact when I asked the department about it, the department said it is for elm trees and for demolishing buildings. Now we are suggesting that we keep some buildings rather than simply demolish them.

It is very good to hear the minister say it can be used this way by municipalities, but it surely isn't good enough to say a week before Christmas that the municipalities will be able to go into this and do it for January, February and March. Perhaps the minister should be aware of the fact that municipalities, because of their structure and their political culture and that kind of thing, take time to do these things. They take time because of their structure, the political culture of municipalities, the way they work. They have—

Mr. MacDonald: That is a different kind of culture from what the Prime Minister was talking about earlier today.

Mr. Cassidy: I don't mean party culture. The Premier knows that. I just simply mean they are relatively conservative with a small "c" in the way in which they do things. They don't act as quickly or as decisively as the Prime Minister likes to claim his government does.

Mr. Deans: It is evident in this action.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right, yes; I am not so sure about that either. It will take until January for municipal councils in most parts of the province to get around to approving the home improvement programme.

Mr. Chairman: Now we are becoming repetitious. I have heard this before several times.

Mr. Cassidy: All right, I am sorry.

I would just like to suggest that if the Premier and the minister really intended to do something about home improvements, they should have told the municipalities they would be the designated vehicles and told them two months ago.

Another point is that while having a home improvement programme very half-heartedly put into effect—I have the feeling it was put in there just a day or so ago when we began to talk about it; I understand the Ontario Housing Corporation budget has in fact been cut back for this year from the levels originally intended. In other words, in one of the areas—I know it is not the minister's—but in one of the areas which could have been used very fruitfully to create employment with sufficient advance planning in fact we find there is a cutback in the area.

Perhaps before I sit down, I could ask the minister for an assurance—you know let's forget about the mistakes and the sins and the problems that have been created now, it is December 16 and we can't do too much about the mistakes of October or September—would the minister at least assure us that come next June or July he won't just be planning for the following winter but he will be bringing the municipalities into his confidence and allowing them to start to plan in a very real way for meaningful projects for the following winter rather than pure make-work?

Mr. Chairman: We have heard this question before. The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: I would like to make a few comments relating to the \$3.5 million supplementary estimates which will, through The Regional Municipal Grants Act, go to established regional governments.

The minister has stated in an interview at the Federation of Agriculture meeting in Hamilton that of necessity regional government aid must be flexible. This is the problem that exists now across the province where regional governments have been established. As soon as they come into dire financial circumstances, the government rushes there with some money. Last July we sat here until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, passing legislation so the minister could rush down, as my leader has already indicated, with \$2 million to Niagara and North York and Muskoka.

In fact in the amendments to the Act the district of Muskoka had to be considered as a regional government so it would fit into the confines of The Regional Municipal Grants Act. Now has it ever occurred, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps there is something drastically wrong or basically wrong with our Regional Municipal Grants Act? It is not fulfilling the needs of regional government. This has been proved by the minister's own statements in the paper. As reported on November 25, he said: "I have visited regional governments and certain additional moneys were made available to meet their individual and different needs."

This is fine, but could the minister not see that places such as Waterloo county and Sudbury, which will probably be the next areas going into regional government, are very reluctant to go into this type of arrangement on a basis on which they know they will have to come to the provincial government for additional help? It may be forthcoming in the amounts required and it may not be forthcoming in the amounts required.

I think many of the problems in the regional governments that have been established, of course, have been administrative and financial problems. We have said for many years on this side that there must be studies made of the financial implications when municipalities go into regional government arrangements.

The minister, Mr. Chairman, has indicated that such a study would serve no useful purpose. The Treasurer of the province, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, has said that perhaps a study should be made of the finances. In effect they were saying the opposite thing, but I think that eventually

the minister is going to have to show us some kind of proof that he has indeed looked at the experiments of regional government across the province in enough detail to know what has been the cause of the financial nightmares that have existed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Financial nightmares?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have heard that phrase before.

Mr. Good: The minister knows what has happened in St. Catharines. We are now talking, Mr. Chairman, about \$5.5 million in additional funds.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, regarding the regional governments, when we went to them and checked their budgets and so on last summer, they were very satisfied with the situation; and certainly the people were satisfied—

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, could I have—

Hon. Mr. Bales: —with the situation in those regions.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I haven't yielded the floor.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why shouldn't they be satisfied? You had million-dollar bills hanging out of your pockets!

Mr. Good: This is exactly my point.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: This is exactly my point. Areas within the province have been changing their municipal structure. Up to now this government has had to pump in \$5.5 million in additional funds; this is on top of what they had to put into the Niagara area for the regional police force and into the Ottawa-Carleton area for certain sewer works.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And still their taxes went up.

Mr. Good: There must be something basically wrong with our grant structures in these areas. I don't think we are getting to the root problem, and that is the financial implications that occur when a municipality is taken into a regional government, by just throwing in additional sums of money at the whim and wish of the minister, as the bill permits. And this is the way the legislation was passed; it's all at the discretion of the minister. I don't think we are establishing our

regional governments on a sound financial basis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They won't be so generously treated next year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who won't?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The regions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes.

Mr. Good: And the more the province has to throw into these areas the more we are eroding their local autonomy. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the minister look seriously into what the root problem is so that year after year he doesn't have to come back with amendments in legislation and supplementary estimates to tide over these problems that have arisen in the newly formed regional governments.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1407 carry?

Vote 1407 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Vote 1802, The Department of Public Works, in the amount of \$13,050,000. The hon. minister.

On vote 1802:

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, I think it would be helpful to the committee to give a breakdown of these two items, and perhaps I could deal with the real estate one first.

The total is \$2 million; this includes an item of \$605,000, which has to do with the relocation of The Department of Revenue from the Treasury building to the corner of Yonge and Wellesley streets and to 71-77 Grenville Street. The regionalization of Ontario Hospital Insurance Commission offices in Ottawa, Kingston, London, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Toronto involves a total of \$578,000. The rental of the children's home in Toronto from the Sisters of the Good Shepherd for The Department of Correctional Services involves an amount of \$42,000.

In the case of the remainder, for the administration of justice there are rentals totalling \$570,000; interestingly enough, arrears to Windsor of \$298,000; a new courthouse in Toronto of \$180,000; a move out of municipal quarters in Milton for the provincial court, \$25,000; an expanded court facility in Hamilton of \$22,000; and a number of other small amounts for additional space for courthouses,

jails and registry offices at various locations around the province, of \$45,000.

There is a matter of \$60,000 in the acquisition of land portion of this item that has to do with the difference between the estimated costs of certain property purchases and actual costs to date.

The final amount of \$145,000 is made up of \$102,000 for arrears of rentals having to do with tax escalation clauses and maintenance escalation clauses for the OHSIP quarters at Overlea Boulevard. There are various other similar tax escalation and maintenance items at various rented places around the province, totalling \$43,000.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, this is hardly the place, or the minister with whom to debate the concept of regionalizing OHSC facilities. It seems to me when we are putting forward a bill which has already passed the Legislature, or at least a second reading, which would in fact put OHSIP and OHSC together with all of the problems that the Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) is going to experience in this connection, to have the additional problems of regionalization at the same time seems to be asking for additional trouble.

But for this minister: Are we leasing all of the facilities for the regionalized offices; are we leasing the new facilities for The Department of Revenue? If so, precisely how much of this almost \$2 million appearing at the top of page 17 will be going for the payment of leases, rather than new construction?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The entire amount of that \$2 million, with the exception of the \$60,000 which I mentioned for acquisition of land, goes for leasing and leasehold improvement. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, it is not in this department's judgement where space is located, but I think I can tell him without getting out of our own field that the OHIC operation will use these regionalized quarters.

Mr. MacDonald: You have been to a party.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We generally talk about OHIC after the Speaker's banquet, but it now has a new connotation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You are going to have a new PR firm if you are going to sell that OHIC stuff.

Mr. Chairman, as far as—

Hon. Mr. Davis: What PR firm?

Mr. Martel: The one from Detroit.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, can the minister assure us that his method of leasing structures and office facilities, particularly on the leaseback programme that he and his predecessor have been using so extensively, will have some safeguards built into it so that he can report to the Legislature that in fact there has been at least some sort of bidding or tendering for the facilities either in Toronto or the different centres across the province?

It seems that this minister, or the policy of the government, is abandoning any idea of building their own structures except for the major installations, and not even for those any more. I think the minister and his predecessor have been most justly criticized in the press and elsewhere for the concept of simply directing these many hundreds of thousands of dollars towards the payment of leases for which there has been no tendering. There has not even been a call for tenders or proposals on the facilities that might be used to co-ordinate or integrate the provincial offices in these various centres.

Probably we can get a fuller statement of policy when the full year's budget is before us, but to ask for an extra \$2 million now, when it is not really associated with an employment programme of any sort that I can see that is of any significance, means that the minister is continuing with the policy that has led to so many doubts in the minds of reasonable citizens, including the members of the opposition.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, as far as leaseback proposals are concerned, we do advertise in every case for proposals in an area. We advertise, in essence, by saying we need so many square feet and that the leaseback or the lease will be over a period of whatever the estimated time is. Generally it is always a minimum of five years, sometimes it is 10. If it is a leaseback where we own the building at the end of the period, it is generally 20 years. And we always advertise those in terms of—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You mean you always do now or you always did? Did you ever advertise for the agricultural department, or the ministry of Financial and Commercial Affairs for all those months?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We have done this since I have been the minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In other words, you have just started.

An hon. member: You have your answer. What do you want?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can only answer for when I have been in the department. I could look it up if you would like to find out about the past.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You don't have to look it up; it is a new policy.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As far as leasing property is concerned, in many communities where we need, say, 1,000 square feet for The Department of Labour, we find out from the client department, as we refer to them, the area they want to be in. For instance, if they have an operation where the public are going to be coming quite frequently, obviously you can't say we want to get the cheapest place and wind up out in the country where there is no public transportation. We advertise, if it is a large community; if it is a small community we approach all the agents in the community and see what is available and see what is the best price. Then the whole proposal goes to Treasury Board, and if Treasury Board says the rent is too high and the operating department can't have that kind of premises we look again.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth was on his feet a moment ago.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions. One is in regard to the \$570,000 that's allocated for the administration of justice buildings. Does that include the Hugh C. Arrow home in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am sorry—it does include which?

Mr. Deans: The Arrow detention home for children in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't think so, because my notes here indicate it is a courthouse, and as I recall it was an expansion of courtroom facilities. I think the hon. member is talking about a sort of halfway house or a detention—

Mr. Martel: Must be that new government building that was promised for Sudbury.

Mr. Deans: It is detention; Department of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I cannot answer that definitely, but I will give the answer to the hon. member in the morning.

Mr. Deans: I would like to know from the minister what kind of involvement does his department have in the acquisition of property by the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Auld: None, Mr. Chairman. We acquire for the departments of the government and certain Crown agencies. The Workmen's Compensation Board has its own funds and as they are not government funds it acquires its own property or makes its own leases for its regional offices and so on.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. I want to ask—the policy at the moment of the government appears to be a policy of leasing rather than building, as was said by the Leader of the Opposition. I have been watching with some interest. I notice in the case of the WCB—and I believe the same thing was true in the case of the building of the OISE building—the government purchased the land and they then became prime tenants. They leased from a private developer and he built the building. Now it seems from looking at the process that what is actually happening is the—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, if I could interrupt the hon. member. The government did not purchase land for the Workmen's Compensation Board nor did it purchase land for OISE.

Mr. Deans: The government did not purchase the land for OISE? The land was owned by the private developer? Is this the case?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid that I am not familiar with the exact details. I think—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, but the minister will look it up at the first opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —OISE was set up as an independent body, received funds from the government and then carried out its own programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just like the university.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government had nothing to do with it really.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Like the universities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Minister of Education (Mr. Welch) was surprised.

Mr. Deans: That is fine. I would like then to ask about the policy at the moment, the leasing policy.

There is a feeling, and I want the minister to answer one way or another whether it is

true or not, I have a sense the government is using public funds to acquire land, and that on this land private developers are developing buildings.

I thought that was the case in OISE although I may be mistaken. I would appreciate if the minister would check it. It concerns me because it appears that private developers with limited capital can take advantage of the rather large assets of the Province of Ontario using (a) the land owned by the province; and (b) the prime tenancy agreements signed as the collateral for the borrowing of funds for the building of buildings. That certainly is the case in the instance of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

The minister says he has no responsibility; I don't know why he has no responsibility. I think he should have some responsibility. I don't see why an agency of this government should be permitted to go out and purchase and, using trust funds, to operate independent of government sanction. Nevertheless they are in this instance.

Is it now the policy of the government to follow the practice that I have outlined? To purchase; to sign a prime tenancy agreement and to allow the private concern to use those things as collateral for the borrowing of funds in the marketplace?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, it is not the government's policy to lease back everything, as the estimates of the present time would show.

What is our capital programme this year? It is about \$64 million. We are building many government buildings. We have found it is more economical in many cases, particularly where our requirements may change over the year, to lease, or in some cases to lease back.

In the vast majority of cases, the person who gives us the best proposal is building on his own land. In some cases, in some communities around the province, we have land in the location where we want the building and we will, in part of the tender call, indicate that the proposal will be built on this land. We will then take this into consideration as far as the lease is concerned, lease the land to the builder for a nominal consideration over the period of time and at the end of the time we have the land and the building.

Mr. Deans: You pay for it by the lease?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We have found, and I haven't a great deal of detail here tonight

but I think I can establish it to the hon. member's satisfaction, that this is a more economical proposal in many cases, in the cases where we use it, than going in and building our own building.

Mr. Deans: Just to pursue it for a moment or two longer. How is it possible that a private corporation could borrow money, could lease to the government, and it would still be more economical for the government to enter into that kind of an arrangement, than for the government to borrow the money initially and to build the building?

Surely common sense dictates that the private concern is going to require to make money over and above the basic costs in order to make it a practical proposition for them to enter into the agreement in the first place. What they have to do is they have to recover, from the government, sufficient money by way of the lease to pay back all of the borrowing that they must do. Now how can it possibly be more economical?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The only thing I can say to the hon. member is that in some fields private enterprise is more efficient than government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: What you are saying then is that you are incapable of hiring construction people to build a building as economically as a private concern can do it—that you are incapable of doing that as a government.

Hon. Mr. Auld: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that this is a very large province. If we were to have the staff to do the kind of things that the hon. member suggests, our overhead would be just incredible.

Mr. Deans: Let me ask then, how is it that you cannot hire, as most other people do; even the private concern? And don't think for a moment the person who is putting up the money is necessarily the guy who is supervising the building. How is it that you can't enter into the same kind of working arrangements with construction companies in the Province of Ontario so that you can benefit from the same rates that are available to the private concerns?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that the record indicates that the way we are doing it is more economical than if we attempted to do it ourselves.

It may well be that the standards to which we would build are higher than the standards we actually require, or that will suit.

Mr. Deans: That just can't be so.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean your record indicates you have got to let somebody else do it.

Mr. Deans: It can't possibly be so. You tell me that the standards are higher? If the standards of government are higher in the first instance, you tell me you would then accept, after the lease runs out and the building becomes the property of the government, you accept a building built to lesser standards? Then why don't you bring your standards down to the initial standards if that is the case? What is the point of going through this exercise? It's futile. You are going to end up with the same standard of building anyway. So why don't you bring the standard down to one that is reasonable and benefit from the excess, the profit, whatever it may be? Let the people of the Province of Ontario benefit from the profit. Why don't we then cut the cost in that way?

An hon. member: He's got to go.

An hon. member: He can't do that.

An hon. member: Keep it up, keep it up.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I said if we were to attempt to do what the hon. member says, because of all the requirements of government, that we would have an extremely large staff and our overhead would go up, regardless of the standards. We can build, I suppose, to any standards, but we seem to be able to find people who can build adequate buildings, where they have all the responsibility of construction and supervision and we simply accept or reject, more economically than trying to build it ourselves.

Mr. Deans: That, of course, isn't true. You say that you have to have a staff so much larger and that this staff would be so costly, but when you hire someone you hire their total staff. You hire the total requirements for the construction of the building. You hire all the supervisors, all the designers, and all of the other people who are in a supervisory capacity. If you are already paying for those and if you have a sufficient number of buildings being built then it surely would justify having the staff.

Hon. Mr. Auld: When they have finished building we no longer pay that staff.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I might make a brief comment along the lines on which this argument is based. I would agree entirely with the government position if in fact what the minister is saying is that he does not approve of having platoons of architects and builders working for the government. If there is any way to increase cost and lower efficiency and open the door to hanky-panky, that has got to be it.

Mr. Deans: In this government!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right, maybe in this government, but in my view even in an NDP government.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the same thing applies in The Department of the Attorney General. I think it would be a bad thing if they had platoons of lawyers all lined up there waiting for some cases to come along, rather than simply using the firms that are already available. I can't help but agree with the Minister of Public Works in this connection. I think it is a good thing that the government has gotten out of those businesses and they should stay out.

Mr. Deans: Just to be clear I want to be sure what it is we all agree on or disagree on. What I am saying is that the government surely is capable of going to the private builder and hiring him to build the building. Surely he can go to the same construction companies and hire them to construct the buildings that they require. That is what I am saying. I am saying they put out tenders, they ask that the tenders be submitted, and they then take from among all of the tenders the company that can build the building to their satisfaction and they own it, instead of ending up paying rent for 99 years and paying not only for the building but paying for all of the additional costs too. Now does my friend agree with the government?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I disagree. I think the member's stuff is a little shaky, but he is right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why do they build any?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Deacon: In the case of the government designing and putting out tenders for a building, there is an open system whereby

anybody can examine and review and ascertain that the job has been awarded to the proper person either on price or on other qualifications. But the same problem exists with leasing as exists with the proposals for Ontario Housing; when you have a matter of a proposal, there is lots of room—actually there is a great requirement—for judgement. And one of the real problems I see is the fact that nothing is ever put out afterward as to the basis of the choice between one lease deal and another. There is a lot of variation in leases; there are a lot of variations in proposals in the housing question. I think it is very important that the department make available to the community an analysis of the basis of its judgement for having selected that. It should be something that should be public, a public document just as public as the accepted tenders.

There is a lot of suspicion about these lease deals because they are very quiet. There is nothing known about them. They are not out in the open; the basis of judgement is not out in the open. I suggest to the minister that is something that should be a common practice, the making available of the judgement on the proposals and the reasons for having selected the lease. I think it would remove a lot of the suspicion that now exists. Certainly leases give us much greater flexibility in meeting changing requirements than buying buildings.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us how long most of these leases are for that he has been using? The only justification I can see for his method of leasing is that the requirements of a department might change and it might want to move out of a building. That seems to me the strongest argument. Now how long are these leases usually arranged for? Five years, 10 years, how long?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, it will depend of course on the requirements and the projected requirements of the operating department. In the case of leasebacks I would say that where somebody was building a building for us it would be for 20 years. There have been some for 10 years, I think, in recent years. There haven't been any that short, I think, since I have been minister but I think under certain circumstances there have been some where the operating department figures that is its requirement.

Our leases would run, I suppose, in some

cases from six months to a year, two years, three years or four years. If I were to guess I would say the majority would be about five years, because when you are leasing anything these days, even with an escalation clause for municipal taxes and certain maintenance items, neither we, nor in many cases, the lessor, want to be tied up too much longer.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Perth.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): I would just like to ask a question regarding rental arrears for the Windsor courthouse. It seems rather strange to me that this would date back to 1968. I would imagine the department would be aware what there would be outstanding, or what the amount of rent would be for these facilities. I am wondering if, say, \$100,000 a year has been set aside for rental of these facilities, what has happened to that money in the past. Why do you need it now?

Hon. Mr. Auld: To answer the last question first, Mr. Chairman, of course we cannot set aside. At the end of the fiscal year unexpended funds go back into the Treasury, if you can put it that way. I am not surprised the hon. member asks this question because when I heard about it, that is the first question I asked. Apparently the city of Windsor, from the information I am given by my staff, did not get around to asking us for the rent. And as he can see—

Mr. Deans: Don't pay it if you are not asked.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —it is a pretty substantial amount of money. We owed it to them, and my information is that we had inquired from time to time. But they got around to asking us for it this year.

Mr. Edighoffer: When was the agreement made?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The rent is for 1968, 1969 and 1970.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury East on vote 1802.

Mr. Martel: Just a brief question, Mr. Chairman, I didn't get what the minister indicated was going to Sudbury, what the funds were going to the Sudbury area for. Is it that new complex of government offices which were promised during the provincial campaign?

Hon. Mr. Auld: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I don't recall promising any—who promised them?

Mr. Martel: Joe Raftis, the Liberal-Tory candidate.

An hon. member: The what?

Mr. Martel: The Liberal-Tory.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That is what J. W. Spooner was.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I must say I would be very interested to see that sometime. But the mention I made of Sudbury, and perhaps the hon. member—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It still doesn't come to \$2.5 billion.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —was not here, is for the Ontario Hospital Services Commission's regional office, which will become OHIC.

Mr. Martel: Then that means there is no new government building coming to bring all of the offices which are spread all over the city under one roof as was promised during the campaign?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not in these supplementary estimates.

Mr. Martel: Possibly in the 1972 estimates.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

An hon. member: Maybe Joe Raftis could—

Mr. Martel: He promised lots of things.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): In the justice rentals, Mr. Chairman, do any of these come under the city of Chatham. I see one in the provincial courts for \$13,000 a year that we now pay annually to the city of Chatham? I was wondering if you have any of those in your list there on the city of Chatham.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is not in the supplementary estimates, Mr. Chairman. As I recall, and I would not want to be firm on this without the full details here, that is in the regular estimates.

Mr. Ruston: I just see the list of buildings rented in Chatham comes to \$103,000 a year. I was wondering if any of them were included in that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Where did the hon. member find that?

Mr. Ruston: Oh, I had it available. That is my own estimate.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh, your own estimates.

Mr. Ruston: No, my own list.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1802.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the minister if there are any funds appropriated for living up to the commitment to build an in-and-out store in my home town, as was announced during the election campaign by my Conservative opponent.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I am correct in translating the hon. member's statement that would not be in my department. That would be in the department, at least in the Liquor Control Board. We do not build for them.

Mr. MacDonald: Stokes is in, Brydges is out!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Perth.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Chairman, we have had an explanation from the minister regarding the first \$2 million but I think we still have about \$11 million still to go here, something to that effect.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman: I was only speaking about the first item. If we have completed the first item, I would be glad to give an outline of the second.

Mr. Chairman: Is there a question on item two? Did the member for Perth place his question yet? Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, on the second item, which totals \$11,050,000, the first item making this up is \$4.6 million. This relates to the speedup of the calling of projects which we undertook in July when it was apparent that the employment situation was not going to be ideal this winter. This is the amount we estimate will be expended over and above the amounts that this House voted in the current budget, because of speeding up work and calling tenders earlier than they would otherwise have been called. The second item is an amount of \$2.6 million and that has to do with the portion of the work we announced on October 22—I repeat that, Mr. Chairman, on October 22—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They were all up and about announcing that day.

Hon. Mr. Auld: These are the winter works programmes, the items that were not planned to be called this year at all but were planned for next year. This is the amount we estimate will be expended between now and March 31.

Mr. Singer: On what?

Hon. Mr. Auld: On the projects—and I would be delighted to give the list of them if the hon. member would like them.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I would.

Mr. Ruston: Very much so.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I just happen to have my news release here.

Mr. Singer: Well, I thought he would. He is a most efficient minister.

Hon. Mr. Auld: A training school dormitory at Brampton, an industrial farm dormitory at Thunder Bay, new facilities for the staff training centre at Kempenfeldt Bay for the Civil Service Department, hatchery ponds at Chatsworth for The Department of Lands and Forests—

Mr. Singer: Good!

Hon. Mr. Auld:—construction of a regional centre for the hearing handicapped in London for The Department of Education, a district repair garage and service building at North Bay for The Department of Transportation and Communications, an addition to the records centre at Mississauga for The Department of Tourism and Information, an addition to the daycare centre at Thistleton for The Department of Health and a potting shed at Vineland for The Department of Agriculture and Food.

An hon. member: What's a potting shed?

Mr. Singer: Is there anything in there about the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member was not paying attention a few moments ago perhaps.

Mr. Singer: I wasn't here.

An hon. member: Oh, well, read it in then.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): Tell him what a potting shed is.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is not what you think.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's not that pot?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. Now where were we?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You were in the potting shed.

Mr. Stokes: You were at Thistleton.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well I tell you, it is not as bad as backward breeding.

Mr. Singer: You must explain that potting shed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: And finally there is the amount of an estimated \$3,850,000, which is about 8 per cent of our original capital construction budget. As we normally do, we call or estimate more jobs than we expect will be completed during the year because there are always weather conditions, sometimes strikes, slowdowns and one thing and another. The construction field has been very efficient this year and the weather has been good, and at this point in time it is apparent that we are going to expend more funds than we had anticipated when the estimates were prepared last spring. All that totals \$11,050,000.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Perth.

Mr. Edighoffer: I am somewhat concerned about that first list of accelerated tenders. I noticed there were two particular items, the Ontario School for the Deaf infirmary in Belleville and the alterations to the chief ranger's headquarters in Pembroke. I notice that the amount allowed in the earlier budget this year, plus what is budgeted in this supplementary estimate, certainly more than totalled the estimated amount of the contract. Has this increased because it is done in the winter time?

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I am in tune with the hon. member the accelerated tender dates—and I know he is reading from the same sheet I am—the total estimated cost of these is approximately \$34 million. The amount of work that we expect to be done in the current fiscal year between July 15 and March 31 is approximately \$4.6 million.

The hon. member will realize that in most capital things, where it is a large project the expenditure in the first year is probably somewhere—well, it can range from 15 per cent to perhaps 25 per cent of the total cost. Most of these big projects take about three years to complete. The biggest expenditure is in the second year and it tapers off in the third.

Mr. Edighoffer: I realize what the minister has said could be correct, but these happen to be fairly small jobs. I noticed in the capital works programme booklet from this spring that, for instance, for the chief ranger's headquarters the total estimated cost was \$170,000. The minister budgeted \$150,000 earlier this year and now he is asking for

another \$70,000 to complete. In other words he is asking for \$220,000 to do \$170,000 worth of work.

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, Mr. Chairman. We originally estimated \$150,000 at the time the project was given to us from Lands and Forests. They came to us and said this is what we want to build and we told them that this is what we thought it would cost. Subsequently—and I cannot tell the hon. member exactly why in this case—either the operating department decided they wanted some additional facility in it, or when we re-estimated prior to calling the tender, we found that costs had gone up in that particular area or for certain parts of the structure or materials and so on that would be required in the structure.

Mr. Edighoffer: Still \$170,000? Thank you. I am also wondering—under the major projects which were included, and I presume announced on October 22, I notice there were two new projects. One was the beef barn at Ridgetown and the other was the aircraft hangar at Sault Ste. Marie. I tried to look through the capital works programme and I didn't see that they were approved for working drawings or approved at any other time. Why were these two projects started at this time?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can tell you about the hangar. At the time the bluebook was put together the department, perhaps the hon. Minister of Lands and Forest (Mr. Brunelle)—he isn't here—

Mr. Singer: Yes, that makes it better.

Hon. Mr. Auld:—could tell you about their experimentation in their forest fire-fighting programme. It is a result of that that this hangar which was not envisaged as I understand it a year ago, was moved up in the department's priorities. Even though it was not in the bluebook which was prepared last January they wanted it. It was something that is fairly simple to design and as a matter of fact the contract for it was awarded today.

Now which was the other one that the hon. member asked about?

Mr. Edighoffer: The beef barn in Ridgetown.

Mr. Singer: Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) might say; he is here so the minister might ask him.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can only assume that his department, as often happens, changed their priorities for the good reasons that they had; dropped something else and put the beef barn in.

Mr. Singer: Why not ask him? He is right here.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Why doesn't the member ask him?

Mr. Singer: Well, the minister is explaining. The government has a responsibility to explain the expenditure.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not at all, I am explaining that this is what we are building.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister was referring to his colleague the minister of—

Mr. Singer: He is not commenting.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister how many man-hours his work programmes would create in the province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman I cannot give a definitive answer on that. If the hon. member is speaking about on-site jobs, I do not have a figure for the accelerated programme. The additional programme, the one announced on October 22, as regards on-site work, we would estimate at something around 300 by about the middle of February.

That does not include the supervisory people the architects and so on. Nor does it include the people who would be making the bricks and steel and that kind of thing.

It is very difficult to estimate; you can get varying figures—say that \$10,000 worth of construction creates one job for so many months—but I have avoided using any figures in the statements that I have made because I can't prove that they are right and I can't prove that they are wrong. There can be a great variation depending on the type of construction and the methods used by the contractors.

Mr. Edighoffer: I just have one more question, Mr. Chairman. I understand that the reason throughout most of these estimates is of course to create more jobs. Now looking over the—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is not the reason for all of these estimates; the winter works section is just the part that we have been talking about on the second part of the vote. The first part really has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Edighoffer: Right. Well in reference to the second part of the vote, I am rather curious to know about a job which has been approved only for working drawings which is expected to cost \$11,350,000. I see that \$250,000 is set aside for that job this year; how many jobs will that create in that particular community?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I can't answer the hon. member. He is talking about the regional centre for hearing handicapped in London?

Mr. Edighoffer: In London, yes. Sorry.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I couldn't tell him because it would depend first of all on how quickly the contractor gets at it, and on what portion of the work is done on the site and what might be done elsewhere. As I said a moment ago I have shied away from trying to make any statement of how many jobs there will be on any particular site at any particular time this winter.

I may say that some of these still have not been awarded. I think there are some tenders that closed today, and I think there are some that close next week and some early in January. So it will depend really on how long it takes us to analyze the tenders and how quickly the contractor gets on the site.

Vote 1802 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the study of the supplementary estimates for The Department of Public Works. The supplementary estimates, now, of The Department of Social and Family Services. We have two votes; does the hon. minister have an explanatory statement to start with.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are supplementary estimates shown here tonight for two of the votes in our original estimates. These supplementary estimates total \$37,279,000 gross and represent a sum of \$19,501,000 net.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the first group of amounts are shown on the right hand page of the supplementary estimates. In those amounts, 90 per cent is for what we are calling Project 500 and the other 10 per cent is necessitated because of the civil rights legislation which was passed by this House earlier this year.

Project 500 is part of the government's special winter works programme. It is a special programme that our department was

asked to administer, geared specifically to young people. The programme offers employment to unemployed young people in the social service field. These people are being hired by our department, paid by our department and put out to work in various social service agencies across this province. They will be working in daycare centres, homes for the aged, children's and youth institutions, family service agencies and social planning councils.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, we have had quite a phenomenal response to this programme. We have about 2,000 applications. The money that we are voting here tonight allows us to hire only about 500 of these young people at this point. We already have 100 undergoing their training and orientation programme and they will all be starting work immediately after the New Year. We believe the complete complement under this programme will be working by January 15.

There are several particular benefits to this programme, Mr. Chairman, one of course being that it will provide employment for young people in a very necessary area. It is a winter works employment programme that offers quite a different type of employment from that which is normally associated with winter works programmes. It also offers equal opportunity for women as it does for men. I think one of the big pluses will be that it will encourage these young people to seek full-time employment in this very worthwhile area and it may also encourage some of the institutions and areas where these people work to hire these people after they see the kind of work that they do.

The rest of this vote, Mr. Chairman, deals with our income maintenance programmes. The increase that is being asked in these supplementary estimates is purely—

Mr. Martel: Which item is that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Martel: Which item is that in the expenditures?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Which item is which?

Mr. Martel: Project 500.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Project 500 is represented by the first five amounts on the right-hand side—salary and wages, employee benefits, transportation and communication, services and supplies and equipment. Ninety per cent of that money is for Project 500. The other 10 per cent is necessitated because of the civil rights legislation which we passed, which

places certain special criteria and certain changes in routine on our family benefits staff.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What civil rights?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Civil rights is the large legislation that we passed last June, that the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) passed which, if you would read it, sets out new appeal procedures for family benefits recipients and so forth. They now must be given intent to discontinue their allowance, and so forth. There are new procedures which are going to necessitate more staff and certain other routines to be done that have caused us to increase these votes from the amounts voted on when these estimates were prepared a year ago.

Mr. Lewis: It is nice to bring some civil rights into your department.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Actually, we have always done this. Everything has always worked very amicably.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Why does it cost more if you have always done it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Because we are now doing it in the way prescribed under the new legislation.

Mr. Martel: Bigger and better.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): With enthusiasm!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, as I say, the rest of this first supplementary estimate vote deals with increases in the two income maintenance programmes that we administer, The Family Benefits Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act. The increases here are necessitated because of increased caseload. Our actual projections were under those which we now see as being projected. Our costs per case or recipient are in line with what has been happening, but the number of actual cases is greater than we projected.

In family benefits we estimate there will be about 11,259 more recipients of family benefits than we had taken into account when we prepared these estimates. At approximately \$160 per month per case, you can work it out and find almost the amount that we are asking for in these estimates.

In the case of general welfare assistance, of course, the same is the case, except, Mr. Chairman, these are based on projections of how we believe things will end up at the end of our fiscal year. There are certain signs now

that the number of recipients on general welfare assistance is levelling off and it may be that this amount of money may not be needed but as the members of this House are aware, we have no control over whether the money is spent or not. If a person qualifies for assistance, he receives it, of course, under the terms laid down by the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the second vote here deals with the children's services branch and this is the \$7,190,000 for the day nursery programme, the winter works programme, to build day nurseries across this province. I might tell the House that this programme has been received with great enthusiasm across this province. In reading the press clippings that I have seen over recent months, I do not think I have seen, certainly in the last few years, as much discussion generated at the municipal level about day nurseries as I've seen over the last month and a half. Many municipalities have been thinking about it and many have accepted our offers.

I might tell the House that under this programme we have received a total of 102 applications. We've approved nine to date; we are ready to tentatively approve 32. This means, Mr. Chairman, that within a very short time of these estimates and the legislation being approved we will be able to approve at least 41 which will account for 50 new day nurseries, with a capacity of 2,535, at an estimated cost of \$8,420,000. We are sure that the others will be approved in the very near future.

This is a winter works programme, Mr. Chairman, that will provide about 1,080,000 man-hours of work. It will provide this work across this province this winter and at the same time will provide many new, needed daycare facilities.

I think the House might also be interested in knowing that one of two of the first batch of applications approved were from Indian reserves and that they are going to build these daycare centres, under supervision, by themselves, using their own manpower. I think that this is very commendable. We have other applications from Indian reserves and I expect we will build at least five of these centres on Indian reservations.

On vote 2002:

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions in regard to the Project 500 that the minister outlined. I presume the name of the project indicates that this is going to be the number of people who will be employed under this project? For what

length of time will these people be employed? Can the minister give us some examples of what areas of the province they will be used in and what type of social work they will be involved in?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, they will be employed for four months. They will be paid approximately \$100 a week. This may change slightly from area to area and locality to locality. They will be employed in areas all across the province. We have about 600 applications from different social service agencies across the province who are willing to take people under this programme. These, as I indicated earlier, are daycare centres, homes for the aged, family service agencies, social planning councils and so forth.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is there an age limitation on applications for this type of employment or is it just general and falling into a younger age group?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member knows it is against the law to set any age limit on employment in this province. It is, however, being geared at younger people because we discern that there were quite a few younger people who were having problems finding jobs. Certainly the caseload of recipients in some of our municipalities is in this younger category. This programme is being geared specially to these people but there is no specific age limit on it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments I want to make with respect to the supplementary estimates. Three figures, of course, stick out rather noticeably. The \$8,577,000 for the FBA, \$19,107,000 for The General Welfare Assistance Act, and then the pittance for operation and maintenance of daycare centres of \$60,000. You know, Mr. Chairman, when you couple these two figures, the first two figures I gave, with what the government planned in the original estimates back last spring, it comes to a total of \$281 million for maintenance income or income maintenance whichever way you want to say it. It is an indication of the serious failure not only of this government but of the federal government to provide job opportunities.

You see, that's really what it is all about and what we are not doing. I can recall recently watching a television programme on the \$88 million, I believe, that the federal government poured into northern New

Brunswick to create jobs. With this amount of money they created 1,500 jobs, falling short some 7,000 or 8,000.

All of this welfare that the minister pays out is ridiculous and all of the retraining is ridiculous unless we have the job opportunities available. When is this government or the federal government—and I realize both of you are great free enterprisers—going to provide adequate job opportunities for those people who want to work? And it takes money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Blame the federal government!

Mr. Martel: Don't just blame the federal government! That's a lot of nonsense. The ministers have their own jurisdictions—do something about it!

I can recall during the mining estimates we talked about having adequate tax in order to create job opportunities. In Ontario the value of mineral production last year was \$1.6 billion and the total tax that the province accrued was \$30 million. Now with that type of money how can the government have adequate tax dollars to create job opportunities for people? You know, the minister can't continue to play games with people's lives. He can't continue to create meaningless jobs with no future. In most instances he talked about 500. I am glad to see that people are going to work, but what future is there? Absolutely none.

Four months? Four months of work? What about the future of these people? What about the future of the 54 per cent of the cases on general welfare who could hold jobs, providing some were available—and we just don't have them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martel: We just don't have it. It takes economic planning and this government has never been strong on economic planning, because it leaves that totally to the free enterprise system. The Treasurer says, "Hear, hear!"

Mr. P. O. Yakabuski: (Renfrew South): What about Attlee and Wilson?

Mr. Martel: What about the great numbers of unemployed? Do you think they should look after the unemployed which they create because there isn't sufficient profit this year and so they cut back? Or is there a government responsibility to create meaningful work?

We can do it through a variety of ways, you know. My colleague from Ottawa named

a few this afternoon. We could start to invest, if we taxed properly, in the private sector where the free enterprise system doesn't want to get involved. We could use the \$300 million—I don't know if the minister is aware or if the government is aware that according to Eric Kierans there is a \$300 million a year loss in taxes from the mining industry alone. That represents the total budget for The Department of Social and Family Services this year, which we lose in taxes from the mining industry through the concessions we make to them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What has this got to do with the estimates?

Mr. Martel: The Treasurer asked what this has got to do with these estimates. His colleague continues to insist when he makes representation that we lower the taxes in the mining field.

Mr. Ferrier: He takes his direction from the mining companies!

Mr. Martel: The point is, if we lose \$300 million a year in taxes, that's the total welfare bill. Who is the welfare recipient, through our largess, through our generosity? Why don't we use that money? Tax them adequately, get our fair share in Ontario and provide job opportunities for people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a great way of making jobs—raising taxes!

Mr. Lewis: How many jobs did the minister's tax rebate create? Ask the Treasurer about the rebate. He is too embarrassed to talk about it.

Mr. Martel: If you are going to create work for the minister whose housing programme has failed miserably in Sudbury and is inadequate—

Mr. Cassidy: You raise money by way of taxes.

Mr. Martel: —you take that tax money and you still have 3,000 cases on the waiting list. What is the minister talking about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A vacancy.

Mr. Martel: And you take that money that you could get back from the tax field and that you are not getting and you'd build houses and you'd solve two needs—a social need and the unemployment problem.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): If they are that smart over there they should all be millionaires.

Mr. Martel: Well they are. As I indicate, the two figures really disturb me, the \$8.5 million because we are not trying to get at the problem.

But I want to ask the minister, I understand that on FBA these jobs are usually for the aged, the disabled, mothers, widows, dependants, fathers unemployed for medical reasons. Why would there be an increase? Did the number in that category who became eligible increase that greatly in the past year—you know when you consider that it is about nine per cent of the original estimates for this year.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Are those the Treasurer's press clippings? Does he get that many?

Mr. Martel: No, he has nothing to do. But that is a substantial increase in that sector. I can see it going up in the general welfare—

Mr. Lewis: They are all from the Sarnia paper.

Mr. Martel: —because of the unemployment situation, but why the great increase in the FBA? Does the minister want me to ask all my questions, or would he like to answer them one at a time?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well Mr. Chairman, the increase I think perhaps results from several reasons at least. The first of which is that there has been a constantly increasing number of deserted mothers going onto family benefits assistance, and this has increased by 30 per cent over the last three years. It increased by 34 per cent in 1969 over 1968; 1970 over 1969, 34 per cent; and 1971 over 1970, 31.8 per cent. This trend seems to be continuing at the present time.

I think that also, as the hon. member has stated, because of the numbers who are coming on to general welfare assistance through the municipalities because of unemployment, there has been a more concerted effort to switch the municipal caseload over to FBA if at all possible. There may not have been this push before because there wasn't the increase in general welfare assistance rolls that we have seen in the last year or year and a half.

Now as I say, our estimate is that about 11,000 more cases are coming on than we originally estimated. It is just a plain simple question of not estimating enough. These seem to be some of the reasons that we ferreted out as to why this has occurred.

Our estimates on the budgeted cost per case have not changed. What we estimated it

would cost us per case on FBA is as we had stated. There are just more cases.

Mr. Martel: The minister's figures are interesting and they bring to mind a question.

Mr. R. S. Smith: On that point—just on that point.

Mr. Martel: On this point, the figures on the increase of desertion are rather interesting. Has any study been introduced within the department to try to determine why this is occurring? I am told by talking to a number of the minister's people that there is a possibility all of these desertions, or a great majority of them, are as a result of economic pressures—through young couples getting in over their heads, through the finance companies fleecing them, and so on. Is there a study being done, possibly, that could indicate why this is occurring and what we can do to assist in preventing it from occurring in future?

Mr. Havrot: Let's stick to the estimates.

Mr. Martel: We are talking about the estimates. Where did you get him from?

Mr. Havrot: All right, talk about it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, there isn't a study being done at the present time. We are as concerned as the hon. member and we are considering some type of investigation to get at this problem. We are, of course, putting emphasis in other areas and on preventive ways to try and grapple with this problem—credit counselling services, which we are attempting to open up in as many municipalities as possible, and encouraging family service agencies. But there is no question, I think, that what the hon. member says is correct, that a great number of these are caused by economic pressures, and those economic pressures are tied in with the increasing rate of unemployment. I think I mentioned this during the debate here about nine or 10 months ago, that the whole general economic turmoil that has caused unemployment also has had its effect on the families. That is one of the very distressing things about this whole period that we are in.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister can indicate to me what percentage of the total amount of money being spent under The Family Benefits Act goes particularly to that area of deserted wives and families. Can the minister give me any indication what that percentage is, because I believe as well, there has been

some change in the attitude of the department toward those people who have been applying for disability pensions under The Family Benefits Act. Has there been a loosening up of the criteria by which the department is providing benefits under that section as well?

Hon. Mr. Wells: To answer the last question first, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there has been any particular loosening up. Our definition of disability is still the same as it was, and it is still the same as I indicated before. It is a matter of concern to me, and I hope that we will do a fuller study of just what is a disabled person and the whole way that we treat disabled persons under our assistance programme.

I can't give the member a breakdown of the other figures; I don't have them with me at this time. I can get them for him, though. I haven't got the breakdown of the number on each of our particular programmes here with me.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister indicated earlier in the spring that would be done within the next few months with regard to the disability applications, and the problem that arises here is that many of the municipalities feel they are carrying on their general welfare assistance rolls many people who should actually be carried under family benefits. I would expect the increase in the amounts of money being put forward here reflects a cost to the municipalities that many of them can't afford, and because of the regulations that are now in force under The Family Benefits Act they are actually carrying a good number of people who should actually be on permanent types of assistance through family benefits.

It is also apparent that the costs of administration of general welfare assistance are much higher than the costs of administration of the same number of dollars under The Family Benefits Act, and I believe that the municipalities are being put in a position where many of them cannot afford the increased costs of general welfare assistance, much of which actually should be covered under family benefits.

I would like the minister to comment on that and state whether there is going to be extraordinary assistance given to those municipalities that are in difficulty because of the economic conditions that now exist and the extraordinary costs that many of them are facing under general welfare assistance.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, there is, of course, a provision to assist those municipalities that find themselves in really dire straits because of increased welfare assistance costs, but there are not too many in this province that have found themselves in that particular situation. I understand that we do make some special provisions for one of the municipalities up in the member's area because of a particular situation and a particular amendment to an Act recently.

But as to the general problem of switching the municipal caseload to family benefits, as I indicated I am sure many of the municipalities are presently doing this where the criteria can be established for those recipients. I know what the hon. member is getting at; it's this whole area of the disabled.

As I started to study it after my estimates last year, I found it became much more complicated than it first looked, because—and this is just my own thinking now—it seems to me that we may have to establish two categories of disabled. I have met with many groups of the disabled, the paraplegics, the wheelchair people, the people such as this who are in a particular disabled category and who, I think, make a very good case for some special treatment apart from that under our general programme.

There is another group of people who, I think, would like to come under the category of disabled and family benefits. I suppose the way they could be categorized is the unemployable unemployed. They are the people who for various reasons are not likely to be able to be employed; and these are people the municipalities would like us to take into our programmes as disabled.

Under our present definition of the disabled, it is not possible to do this with a great number of these people, but it seems to me that if we were to broaden our present definition of disabled, and lump all these people together, we might do a disservice to the first group of disabled that I talked about. Consequently, we are still looking at this to work out a reasonable way of handling it.

Mr. Martel: Well, Mr. Chairman, we discussed that very point at great length. In fact the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), I believe during the minister's estimates last spring, made a real plea along with many other members on this term of "unemployable but not disabled" and we tried to elicit from him at that time just how he distinguished between disabled and unemployable. It has reached the ridiculous, and I think the minis-

ter will agree with us that it has reached the ridiculous. Two people have a heart condition, and yet one will get a disability allowance under The Family Benefits Act and the other doesn't qualify; or you have one person with a back disability on FBA and the next person is on general welfare.

Now, how do you distinguish who is entitled to which? Is it drawn out of a hat? How do you determine which one is going to get the FBA; because there is more protection there—they are assured of their income—they are not always having someone call on them to see if they have got the appropriate number of things in the refrigerator and so on. How do you really tell one from the other?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well Mr. Chairman, at this particular time I think we draw most heavily upon our medical advisory committee and we ask them to interpret the reports that they get and to state whether the applicants qualify under the definition of disabled. That is the way we have been handling it at the present time.

Mr. Martel: The minister will admit though, or at least some of his people will admit, that it is a pretty haphazard system in that many people could probably be qualified for FBA. I am sure if we had three doctors examining the same person, we would have a discrepancy in opinion.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Then how would the member do it?

Mr. Martel: I would guarantee it, just as we do with the Compensation Board. I would guarantee it, because the line is so fine, Mr. Chairman, and I think the minister appreciates it. The line is so fine that it's ridiculous.

I would like to ask the minister, while we are talking about the general welfare: Can the minister indicate, of the people who are in receipt of general welfare this year, what percentage is there as a result of unemployment? Can the minister indicate? In 1970 it was 54 per cent, I believe. What is it for this year?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well Mr. Chairman, I haven't got that figure here. Maybe I can get it for the hon. member. I don't have the figure for those of our cases who are there because of unemployment.

Mr. Martel: Well it was over 50 per cent last year. I guess it is safe to assume that it is probably higher this year, and as I say I think this indicates rather drastically the failure of the government to get in-

volved in doing the job that the free enterprise system doesn't want to do. I realize the Treasurer doesn't agree the government should take up the slack. I, for one, do; the government should start to invest to provide job opportunities wherever available. I don't mean the job opportunities which are being presented now which have no future and have no real beginning.

Pow! They are there and they are gone.

It is a meaningless thing and we are always going to have this problem with us. How long can we go on with winter after winter of 200,000 people unemployed?

Mr. Havrot: Give us the answer then! You are the smart guy.

Mr. Martel: The answer is relatively simple. Only the free enterprisers would never exist! I might suggest that if the member for Timiskaming has something to say, would he get off his chair and I will yield the floor and he can say it.

Mr. Lewis: The government might have kept the Cobalt refinery open. That is one way of starting jobs. That is one way to start.

Mr. Ferrier: They watched that close down and did nothing about it.

Mr. Martel: They watched it close and I think the unemployment is something like 26 per cent now, in Cobalt.

Mr. Lewis: They might have kept the Upper Beaver Valley mine open. They might have kept the Upper Canada mine open.

Mr. Martel: It is interesting for the Minister of Agriculture and Food that—

Mr. Lewis: The member's entire constituency has been neglected.

Mr. Havrot: Look who was representing the riding during the last four years.

Mr. Lewis: That is right, because the government would do nothing about it.

Mr. Martel: I presume that the Minister of Agriculture and Food reads the Globe and Mail?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Most assuredly.

Mr. Martel: There was an editorial in there recently—and they are not known for

supporting this party—wherein they indicated the lowest unemployment rate last year in all of Canada was in Manitoba. As I say, the Globe and Mail has never been known to support this party. I wonder why they wrote that.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): All the people you made unemployed left there to come here.

Mr. Martel: To be unemployed here?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: They left Manitoba unemployed to come to Ontario to be unemployed?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Martel: Do we get a bigger welfare allowance here? Is that why they leave Manitoba to come here?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I hope you enjoy your short four years in Middlesex South, my friend.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, if I could get on without so many interjections! I wish you would control the House.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: I want to ask the minister about rentals in the Sudbury area. The minister and I have a file which is rather extensive. The rentals are in the neighbourhood of \$200. Many families—I have submitted letters to him as recently as three weeks ago—are paying in excess of what they are allowed on welfare or even under family benefits. I have asked the minister repeatedly to investigate to find out how many of the welfare recipients in the Sudbury area are being milked.

His deputy minister writes the odd nonsensical letter saying that it was investigated. My information is that it has never been investigated and I want to know what the minister is going to do when these families are paying \$60 or \$70 of their food and clothing allowance for rental?

Could the minister indicate whether he would give the go ahead to the district welfare and the Sudbury welfare and his own department in Sudbury to provide supplementary income to offset the great rents that are being paid by those people on welfare in Sudbury? I bring to mind one case

where the woman is paying \$200 a month rent. She gets \$340 or \$350 from welfare, with six children. The rent is \$200! Can't the minister's department insist that these types of people get supplementary assistance? He has a \$20 per month per person supplementary assistance. I realize all he will be doing is giving somebody who owns an apartment building an additional amount, but are the people on welfare the ones to suffer because of the housing shortage which this government allowed to develop in the Sudbury area after Inco and Falconbridge advised them—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Could I ask the minister responsible for housing what the vacancy rate is in Sudbury?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Why limit it to Sudbury? There are other places with high rents, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. It would be out of order.

An hon. member: He is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And so is his leader.

Mr. Lewis: All we want is an apology, then we will behave.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member for—

Mr. Lewis: Just a retraction.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the member should apologize for that!

Mr. Martel: Would the minister contact the three people at the head of the various agencies in Sudbury and advise them to loosen up on that supplementary income so that people who are on welfare are not being milked by the rentals that are being charged?

An hon. member: You can't milk bulls!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, as he stated, has written me about this. As I did in my estimates, I take great exception to his comments about the letters my deputy writes because he has written them in a very forthright manner. The hon. member—

Mr. Martel: That's not the way I hear it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The hon. member may disagree with it, but not withstanding his comments—

Mr. Martel: The minister didn't have it investigated.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want us to read the letter that he wrote?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Notwithstanding his comments, I got his letter of October 26. The tone of it offended me, so I wouldn't reply to it.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, oh. I see.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He ought to be nicer. Does he want us to read it? It would embarrass the Hansard reporter.

Mr. Lewis: Perish the thought!

Hon. Mr. Wells: The tone and language of it offended me, but—

Mr. Martel: So did the starving people offend me!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Shame!

Mr. Martel: Don't be so pious!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't be so crude!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me just assure the members of this House, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Martel: You are crude when you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: From a teacher yet!

Mr. Martel: What a constitution!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me just assure the House, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding the kind of language and letters their member writes, we take cognizance of their problems and handle them. The matter of high rents in Sudbury and supplemental allowances will be looked after by our department.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: May I ask the minister when is it going to start?

Now, as to the comment the Prime Minister made about being crude, what about when this goes on and \$60 or \$70 a month of the allowance goes toward rent over and above what is allowed? What does he call that, crude or cruel?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If that is what they are doing.

Mr. Martel: The Premier isn't the one. He's a pretty fat cat—he's not starving.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martel: So we're supposed to have parliamentary niceties as people starve. What kind of garbage is he handing me?

An hon. member: He talks about doing things for people. That's the kind of things he's doing for them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2002. The member for—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, just before the hon. member sat down I did not answer one of his other questions, and I don't think that the record can go unanswered because he has filled the record with—

An hon. member: Diatribe!

Hon. Mr. Wells: —a group of accusations and statements that are absolutely untrue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Crude verbiage

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think it has to be said that this government, probably more than any other government in this country, recognized that there would be a high incidence of unemployment this winter and took steps—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear!

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wells: —probably more steps than any other government in Canada, and if the hon. member would read those things, we are creating about 40,000 jobs.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense!

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): They have taken steps backward.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mind you, there are a few people who sat over there who haven't got jobs this winter, and we're weeping buckets about that.

Mr. Lewis: Some of them are still looking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's where I really lose my sleep.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I really worry about Makarchuk.

An hon. member: A real tear-jerker that!

Hon. Mr. Wells: I sit here, Mr. Chairman, and listen to the hon. member for Sudbury

East and the hon. member for Ottawa Centre and so forth talking about creating work in meaningful areas, but show me another province in Canada that has undertaken a programme like our daycare building programme, which is creating over one million man-hours of work this winter. Show me!

Mr. Martel: We are not now talking about one million man-hours of work. We'll talk about that when his bill comes up in a little while. Let's talk about the people, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Hurry up.

Mr. Martel: The deputy minister of this department indicated they had investigated what I had suggested in my first letter. Well, this just didn't happen!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Look around.

Mr. Martel: I don't have to look around. I know from discussion with the three agencies in Sudbury that it did not happen, that the deputy minister didn't even write to have it happen. He wrote to about three families. My request was that the department look into all the files of all of those people on welfare to see how many were being exploited because of the housing shortage and the inflated rentals in the Sudbury area. And the department didn't do it!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton—

Mr. Martel: Oh, no, I am not finished, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We are still on vote 2002.

Mr. Martel: The Prime Minister says it is crude, but I suggest that what they are doing is cruel.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: Pipe down! You are only prolonging it unnecessarily.

Mr. Martel: Oh, no. If a person is paying a \$200 rent on a \$325 income, that's not cruel, is it, Prime Minister! He is saying that is not cruel.

An hon. member: I will send the member a book on how to write letters.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am just saying the member's letter was crude.

Mr. Martel: It was deliberate. It was very deliberate.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It was couched in Shakespearean tones.

An hon. member: That was Shakespearean?

Mr. Renwick: These are

Mr. Lewis: These are really good letters.

Mr. Renwick: Classic letters.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, they are classic.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can assure the constituents of Sudbury East that we still handle their cases fairly and well, notwithstanding the kind of letters their member writes.

Mr. Renwick: It must be touching.

Mr. Lewis: But the minister doesn't answer their letters properly.

Mr. Martel: I have got the letter—

An hon. member: Read it!

Mr. Martel: —of August 6.

An hon. member: April or August?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Will the real leader please stand up?

Mr. Martel: August 6. The one you are talking about. I now have it here too. Shall I put it on the record?

An hon. member: Put it on the record.

Mr. Martel: I am writing to the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me this is outside the range of our supplementary estimates.

Mr. Lawlor: His letter-writing capabilities have been called into question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, that is not all that has been called into question.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2002. The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Martel: No, no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: I think they should be circulated to all members.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): It was a model letter.

Mr. Martel: I am not about to relinquish the floor yet. There are a couple of other matters I want to raise with the minister. Then the leader of this party will read the letters on the record.

Mr. Lewis: What letter are you talking about?

Mr. Martel: I asked the minister if his department, in collaboration with the Attorney General's department, is responsible for the fact that women whose husbands might have deserted them are not able to get legal assistance when they attempt to bring their husbands before the court in order to try to get an adequate income from their husbands who have deserted them. I have had several cases of late and the women have been advised they are not entitled to legal aid.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Will you tell me what that has got to do with daycare centres?

Mr. Martel: Where were you? Where did you come from? Did somebody just wake him up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why are you standing on the bias?

Mr. Renwick: That is the minister without.

An hon. member: Ask him what he does. We haven't found that out yet.

An hon. member: I don't even know who he is.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister be so kind as to tell us why legal aid is not available to women who have been deserted?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any jurisdiction in the area of who gets legal aid. All we do is prepare the records in our department as to whether they are entitled to assistance or not and the degree of assistance. We don't have anything to do with who is given legal aid.

Mr. Bullbrook: You know that is wrong. You make recommendations that the director follows.

Mr. Martel: Wouldn't the minister think that because these people are welfare recipients and because they are trying to get assistance through the courts in order to not be on welfare, why should they be denied the right to legal aid? We are providing it for some of the world's worst shysters and yet we won't give it to a woman who is deserted. Why?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am not a lawyer, but as I understand it, the certificate that we give in regard to legal aid has to do with the amount you pay for. We don't decide whether the actual legal service is to be performed—

Mr. Martel: It is not being performed.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, but I am saying we don't decide whether that is the one to be performed. My colleague the Attorney General lays down the ground rules for what kind of services legal aid will be supplied for.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Bring it up in his estimates.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I agree with you. I would be quite happy to have wives who have been deserted availed of these services. My personal opinion is that legal aid should be much more readily available for people who need it in this circumstance even than in the criminal circumstances.

Mr. Martel: Would you talk to your colleague?

Mr. Havrot: Why don't you talk to him?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why doesn't his leader tell him?

Mr. Lewis: No, I know my place.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the supplementary grants—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: —through the general welfare assistance—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member for Hamilton East has the floor and we would like to hear him.

Mr. Gisborn: The increase in the general welfare assistance grants in these supplements is \$1,109,000. I have found that is about a 19 per cent increase over the total amount that was voted last year. As we know this points up the serious unemployment problem—

Mr. Martel: Oh, 40,000 jobs.

Mr. Gisborn: —the greater number of people going on welfare. The thing that bothers the people on this side of the House is that we agree, first, that these supplements were necessary to create employment on a crash basis, but what bothers me is the way that each minister, as he has introduced them, has patted himself on the back so much about it that I was afraid some of them were going to fall over.

It is not a laughing matter because—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will recover from that.

Mr. Gisborn: —this contingency should have been looked at before we finished the 28th session of the Legislature. The government had all kinds of warnings that we were going to have high unemployment during the summer and that it would increase through the fall of this year and the long-term planning should have been done at that time.

Mr. Lewis: I found the letter!

Hon. Mr. Wells: It really wasn't worth all that.

Mr. Gisborn: I want to point to the conditions of capital grants to the nursery schools. As the minister pointed out, they would get 100 per cent subsidies for the payment if they had their applications in and had the jobs completed by May 31.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That really must have been a pornographic letter.

Mr. Gisborn: But doesn't the minister feel in his own mind that this kind of an imposition, this kind of a programme, will create a lot of hasty planning? Can you imagine what the municipalities are going to have to do in that short few months? They have to set out their plans, get the architectural work done, get the properties and build the buildings by May 31. And these buildings are going to have to be buildings that maybe will have to be used for half a generation.

What does the minister think about this? Does he think we can bring about an effective programme in such a short time? Doesn't he think there should be a more precise long-term planning in this area, with a longer-range look, a more specific, basic assistance to the municipalities?

I am just afraid that this programme is going to fall completely apart before three months of next year, because the municipalities won't be able to get off the ground to do the proper job. I just wonder what kind of planning can be done in three months of the new year so that they can receive the 100 per cent subsidy in regard to the capital grants on nursing homes. Aren't we going to end up with a hasty programme of faulty, deficient, poor buildings? What kind of control is the minister going to have over this situation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is talking about the day nursery programme, is he? As I already indicated to the hon. member, I think the programme is moving ahead. This programme has been in motion, certainly since mid-September. It is now moving ahead and there are nine areas that are all ready to go. As a matter of fact the good city of Sault Ste. Marie expect to be tendering their day nursery next week.

We have approved them in Hawkesbury, Amherstburg, Sarnia, Welland, Chinguacousy, and the York region and the Wampole Island Indian reserve, and the Kettle Point Indian reserve. There are 32 others that are ready to go.

I can assure the hon. member that these will be built and they will be built according to the standards that are laid down in the regulations under the Act that we will be considering soon, and they will be a credit to these municipalities. We are supplying the money; the municipalities are building them, and I have not had any backlash from the municipalities saying that they can't fulfil our requirements and have these built over this winter and that they will not provide jobs in their communities.

Mr. Gisborn: Then the minister has looked into all of these—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. We are now discussing vote 2003. Are we finished with 2002?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Chairman: I did not realize the member was on it until it was too late to stop him.

The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I want to get back to the original question, Mr. Chairman, that I think the member for Sudbury East was trying to ask the minister, and that was in regard to supplementary and special assistance. I think they got sidetracked and there was no answer to the question.

Mr. Martel: We can't get it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I would like to know if the minister is prepared yet to make the provisions of supplementary and special assistance mandatory for the municipalities. This has been discussed for the past two years in the committee considering these estimates—earlier this year and last year—and there was supposed to be an undertaking from the minister, I think at that time, that this was

under review and would likely be forthcoming.

This, I think, is what the member for Sudbury East really wants to find out: whether the minister is going to make it mandatory for the municipalities to implement supplementary assistance; and is the minister going to take part in the cost of special assistance? When the federal government and the municipalities share the cost then this department doesn't contribute anything.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the answer at this point in time is no, we are not going to make it mandatory. We are working with such areas as Sudbury to work out procedures to encourage them to grant this assistance where there are rent problems, and I can tell the hon. member that we realize the problem created in some areas because of high rents and we are trying to work out systems to help the people without helping the landlords and this is not always easy. We are trying to do it, but we are not intending to make those services mandatory at this time.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the minister that there is more than the rental problem involved in both supplementary and special assistance and I am sure he is aware of the fact that the programme is not applied the same way in any two municipalities across the province.

What you have developed is a programme wherein if you are on the general welfare assistance or family benefits, and happen to live in an area that is rather affluent, then an extra \$20 a month is made available to you. But if you happen to live in a poorer municipality that can't afford it—or won't afford it because of the acceptance of the people in the area in regard to the programmes—you live for \$20 a month less in that area.

I happen to represent a constituency where part of my area doesn't provide any assistance under either programme because of the legislation that was established to bring in the district welfare units; and the municipality in which I reside has yet to accept the principle of either programme very seriously. As a result, many of the people in my area are living below the poverty line because they cannot obtain the extra \$20 assistance, 80 per cent of which is provided by the province and of which they obtain 50 per cent back from the federal government. So it is an unequal programme that is being administered unequally across the province. Some people are being discriminated against because of

where they live, and I think it was pointed out to the minister last spring and last year that this is a serious problem for a good number of people and all that is required is for the minister to make the programmes mandatory upon the municipalities; because the cost to them would not be excessive.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to discuss with the hon. member the particular problem, but the indication is that Nipissing is the only county or district board in this province that doesn't pay special or supplementary assistance. The member is asking me to make the thing mandatory because his is the only area that does not pay. So—

Mr. Martel: Oh no.

Mr. Lewis: It is in Cochrane, it is in Ottawa, it is in Nipissing, it is in Sudbury. That is what these letters are about.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I said the only county or district board that did not pay. I think we could look at that but hon. members are always telling us that there is a great desire for local autonomy for the municipalities, and apparently that is not so.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I don't feel the administration of general welfare assistance is an area for local autonomy—

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member wants the province to take over all of it?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, right. Welfare assistance, under The General Welfare Assistance Act, is the responsibility, and should be the responsibility, of the province, and it would do away with an awful lot of administrative costs if you put The Family Benefits Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act both directly together under the administration of this department rather than the municipalities.

Mr. Renwick: And pick up the other 20 per cent of the tax.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow on the lines of the hon. member for Nipissing. He didn't get too far with the minister.

Has the minister given any consideration to upgrading the benefits for those receiving family assistance, particularly for those classed as single persons—a widow, say, perhaps in the age group from 45 or 50 on up to about 64? Many of them cannot be gainfully employed and I find out, particularly in the Niagara regional municipality, that it is quite a problem with them.

Some of them are only given a bare subsistence to live on, somewhere around \$80 a month. Has the minister given any consideration to bringing it in line with the federal old age security plan of \$135 per month—upgrading it to that level?

I know the local administrator takes a dim view; they say because they happen to own their homes that is all that they are entitled to. And they work it out on a programme that your taxes may be around \$150 a year, so you pay an average of about \$12 a month; they allow for rent on that basis, which is wrong.

I think someplace along the line, as the hon. member for Nipissing says, the municipality must come in with a supplement. I find the regional directors, particularly in the Niagara Peninsula, use such a wide variance in deciding just who should get this supplement.

I think the minister should now take into consideration the cost of living for those receiving family benefits assistance. I find it is rather hard for those persons in that category to actually try to live on that subsistence of some \$80 or \$75 a month. There is no way that they can do it. Not in the present living conditions in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I just want to say a word to the Minister of Social and Family Services, and this to suggest to him that I have now looked at a number of representative, various letters from my colleague from Sudbury East. The minister need not be so sanctimonious about the language, because every single letter which is written is clearly—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Only as sanctimonious as the reply.

Mr. Lewis: —is clearly written from the heart. He feels strongly about the dilemma in the Sudbury basin. Everybody in this House knows that the vacancy rate in the Sudbury basin is 0.03 per cent, and that there have been 3,000 families on the waiting list for God knows how long, and that because supplementary assistance isn't given it is virtually impossible to find rental accommodation at any rates which indigent families can afford. And the minister sits there and pronounces in pious ways about an occasional four-letter word which offends his dignity.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think the member is getting a little pious.

Mr. Lewis: The minister and I served on the select committee on youth together.

Mr. Martel: Fat Billy.

Mr. Lewis: Remember that? The minister used to read Playboy out in California. I didn't see him worried about four-letter words. He shouldn't pretend that when members write to him with feeling about individual cases that he doesn't respond to them or that he sloughs them off.

Hon. Mr. Wells: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say I sloughed it off. I said that the—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister said he wouldn't reply to the letter.

Hon. Mr. Wells:—cases were being handled in our department, and they will always be handled.

Mr. Lewis: They are not being handled.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But I merely indicated to the hon. member that a few of the secretaries in our department who read those letters remarked on his rather bad choice of words in his letter. That is what I think is bad about it.

Mr. Lewis: Bad choice of words! The Bible has occasionally used words rougher than these. Shakespeare is more florid than this. I venture to say even Edmund Burke had his aberrations now and again. Don't tell us—

Mr. MacDonald: In his quieter moments even the Premier may be more florid than that.

Mr. Ferrier: Maybe if he read the Bible there may be a few things in there that might not satisfy the minister too.

Mr. Lewis: I have seen the kind of letter he writes to the minister's deputy, and when the deputy has replied genuinely to a letter in which he has raised a number of serious problems, he says:

Dear Mr. Borczak:

Thank you for your letter of March 23 regarding the problem I expressed in my letter to the Hon. Thomas Wells on March 1, 1971 . . .

He opens with "Thank you." What more respectful beginning can a member in the House have? How can the minister call calumny down on his head? He is one of the most deferential members in the House!

Hon. Mr. Davis: That he is!

Mr. Lewis: Even to the minister's deputy he bows!

Mr. Ruston: Where is the halo?

Mr. Gilbertson: The member is just trying to recover Sudbury. He knows he sank it.

Mr. Lewis: Look, we came second in your riding, my friend. Be careful next time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: One has to salvage something. To continue with the letter:

I must state that on reading your letter and, in particular paragraph 2, I was simply horrified at its content and at your assessment of the situation.

Your assessment is completely wrong. There are literally scores of cases wherein a welfare recipient is using large portions of his living allowance to make up the rent.

In other words, the amount allowed for rent by the various agencies of The Department of Social and Family Services, be they provincial or municipal, does not cover the majority of the rents being charged in the Sudbury area. Welfare recipients must use that portion of the allowance allowed for food, clothing, et cetera, to make up the difference. In many cases it is as high as \$50 or \$60.

The two cases I put forth, and which you have asked Mr. Belanger to look into, as I understand from the content of your letter, are merely examples of what is happening to family after family after family. I would suggest that you contact by telephone Mr. Belanger, Mr. Schaak or Mrs. Patterson and you will find out that I am correct. Your letter seems to have the appearance of simply brushing aside one of the most serious problems confronting those on welfare in the Sudbury area.

I do not like to write this type of letter but, for God's sake, don't tell me the problem doesn't exist when I have person after person phone me in my office to see what they can do, because they are using such large portions of their assistance to meet the cost of rent.

I would urge your assistance in this matter and I am looking forward to a favourable reply to my earlier request that the matter be given a thorough investigation.

If necessary, I believe the department should pay the full rent or at least make it mandatory that the special assistance of \$20 a month per person per family be made readily available for rentals and the authority for dispensing this extra amount not be left simply to local authority [That is what the member for Nipissing was saying.] but rather than in the Act it be stipulated that in such cases this be made available [And he ends.]

Sincerely yours,
Elie Martel.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are waiting for you to drop the other shoe. Where is the four-letter word?

Mr. Lewis: Right, okay? Now that's the tone. That is the tone of every single letter which the member wrote you. That is the tone of every letter he wrote.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where is the other one?

Mr. Lewis: You have no right to dismiss—

Mr. Deans: What did you lay the other one down for?

Mr. Lewis: —the member's letters in that fashion, however vigorous the language might be on occasion.

Not wishing to offend your sensibilities, I won't read the October 26 letter, lest you not reply to me. You may feel you are unable to respond. So not wishing to render you speechless, I won't read it, but I think it is fair to say that the tone of the letter is absolutely identical to that which I just put on the record. If you force me to the wall, I'll certainly read the other, if I am forced. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have conveyed—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Read it.

Mr. Lewis: —and I would feel very strongly —no, only a request from the Premier himself will win it from me.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that to move from the letter in particular question, the minister knows that in the Sudbury basin, perhaps more than any other part of the province, this particular problem is acute and your department is forever investigating and never responding.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Lewis: That is what frustrates the members from Sudbury in this caucus.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2002.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, it is, I think in this debate, a pleasure to hear from the absentee member for Scarborough West.

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean "absentee"?

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean "absentee"?

Mr. Deans: What kind of nonsense is that?

Mr. Lewis: Either an apology or a retraction from the minister. An apology or a retraction. On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I would like a ruling from the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is a little in-joke that we have out in Scarborough, and I think the member knows it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I might say, Mr. Chairman, it is probably just as well he absented himself as often as he did because if he had been present, he probably wouldn't be here now!

Mr. Renwick: You may offend my leader's sensibilities here. He may not like the tone of what you are saying.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Anyway, as I indicated a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, to the member about Sudbury, his general complaint did not go unheeded and we have been making efforts with the local municipalities to provide this assistance to people who need it, but we are not at this point in time making these programmes mandatory for the municipalities.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Martel: On this point, Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: The minister knows full well that the only way we can get any type of supplementary assistance in the Sudbury area is to go through the regional administrator of The Department of Social and Family Services, who is a superb fellow. He is the only man who tries to go to the other two, the district welfare officer or the Sudbury welfare administrator, to try to get supplementary assistance. If they don't go through him they just don't get it. What I asked the minister to do was find out. It is not a very difficult job to find out just how many welfare recipients—

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are finding out.

Mr. Martel: I wrote that six months ago! How long does it take to find out? How long does it take to find out, with that number of people on welfare, what their rents are? That is what I asked the minister to do in the original letter. That is what the deputy minister said he did; he did not do it and I know he didn't do it. He looked into two cases and that is why in my last letter in October I said I was tired of—what is the word I used?

Mr. Haggerty: Read the letter.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is chicken!

Mr. Martel: Anyway that is what I said I was tired of.

Mr. MacDonald: Evasive replies.

Mr. Martel: Yes, and I did not use the word evasive.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have two or three things I would like to speak about.

I do not think the high rents and the housing shortages are confined to Sudbury. There are other parts of the province where welfare recipients find themselves in the same position and should be getting the same kind of consideration—namely my own area.

I would like to follow up on what the member for Nipissing said in regard to special assistance, I believe it is called, whereby a welfare administrator has the option of providing, if so granted, dentures and assistance for prescription drugs. In the case of a number of the northern districts, it involves paying transportation for a recipient to visit a doctor down here in the south for some kind of specialized treatment that is not available in northern Ontario.

We argued with the minister in the estimates last summer as he likely recalls, about the province picking up at least a portion of that. I believe now it is federal 50 per cent and municipal 50 per cent. Because the municipalities have to carry such a heavy load, they have been holding back. I have tried on a number of occasions to get false teeth or a pair of glasses for a welfare recipient or a member of their family or an old age pensioner.

The welfare administrators are extremely sympathetic but because of the cost of the thing they are not able to provide it. You

come to the end of the year and the demand has been so great that there is a backlog as long as your arm.

I really feel, to the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the minister has got to loosen the reins here and provide some kind of assistance. Or take over at least 30 per cent of this special assistance and enable the people in a number of these areas to get certain basic necessities and not keep them waiting, or put the boards in such a strapped position.

I might also say, in terms of the district welfare board, that as it stands now a number of major municipalities which contribute to it do not have a representative on that board and have no say consequently as to the kind of programme or the kind of budget that is laid down by this welfare board. If the minister wants to get some confirmation of this, he can ask the Minister of Lands and Forests, the member for Cochrane North who is sitting on his left hand now. The town of Kapuskasing has no member on that board—I can think of Iroquois Falls as well without representation on the Cochrane district welfare board. I think you have got taxation without representation and I think that is a bad principle.

The third thing I want to say is something along the line of the member for Sudbury East, who got a rebuke from the minister's department. Evidently one is not allowed to question in any way some of the people in this department because one gets the same kind of a rebuke from them. It seems to be a change in the way things have been run there in the last while, but I can tell the minister that from my point of view it doesn't sit very well and if that kind of thing continues, then there can be some kind of nasty exchanges. I just hope the members are not going to be subjected to the kind of lectures and nasty letters that sometimes come from this department.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of points about Project 500—it will be partly a statement and partly a question addressed to the minister.

He stated there would be 500 people employed for four months; I suppose they will come from various disciplines, mostly from social sciences, and he suggested they will be employed in daycare centres, in

social agencies, possibly in hospitals and so on. This is supposed to be for four months. He has also expressed an opinion that hopefully this would lead to the employment of those people afterward by the agencies.

Before I get to the question, does the minister realize that before the agencies can in fact employ people like this, which means paying extra at the moment, some changes will have to be made in their staff complement? Where it is a civil service institution some changes will definitely have to be made in the complement; if it is a social agency, they will not be able to do it unless they have extra money. In fact, he expressed the hope that this would be continued to provide permanent employment for all sorts of people who come out of community colleges, as I suspect most of them would be. But this is not feasible unless the minister can also make a promise at the same time that he will pay some of the costs after the four months. Can the minister answer that question for me?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, there may be a bit of a misunderstanding about how the programme works. The salary for these people will be paid by us, not by the agencies where they work. In other words, they come under this particular vote; we are voting the money here to pay the salaries for these people. They will be hired by us, they will be paid approximately \$100 a week, with certain fringe benefits, and then they will be put out to work in the various social agencies. They won't have to invest any of their money in paying these people.

I don't think we are employing any of them in the government, are we? No, we are not employing any of them in any of our government departments; they are all going out into other social service agencies. But they will go out and work in those agencies under the direction of those agencies but their paycheque will come from the government.

Mr. Duksza: There is no misunderstanding, Mr. Chairman; that is exactly what we are talking about. The government is going to pay for four months; it is like a drop in the bucket. What happens to the 500 people afterward? The minister has suggested in his statement that possibly the agencies that have employed them and have been paid by the government would then pick up the load and then employ them from then on. I am asking if the minister has thought about what happens to the 500 people afterward? Is he expecting the agencies to change the com-

plement and in some way to employ them and to pay them from their own resources, or is the government going to continue paying them? That was my question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I understand, Mr. Chairman. We are not going to continue paying. It's a winter works programme; we are hopeful that, as the people work in there, perhaps the agencies—we know all the agencies won't be able to keep the people on after; some of the people won't want to stay on. This is a winter works programme for a specific group of people, but it may be that some agencies will develop methods—they'll find extra money, they'll do extra things—to keep these people on, if they find (a) that they serve a purpose; and (b) that they are eminently suited to the kind of job or the service they are giving in that agency.

We are always asked to develop programmes in this area that provide meaningful employment and do something other than just cut down trees and so forth. This is an attempt to do this, to provide employment over a high unemployment period.

It is an experiment. We have not done this before; it will be interesting to see how it works. I think we have to let it go, find out what happens after the four months and evaluate what happens to all the people who were on it.

Mr. Duksza: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary to this: Do I understand from the minister's statement that possibly this pilot project, as he calls it, will work because he will be able to find the places and support the agencies if they decide to keep and extend their social services in these terms?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, we can't give any commitment on that at this time. It is impossible. All we are asking for now is the money to provide these people with temporary employment for the four months over the wintertime and I can't give any commitment after that.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the minister, in what manner was Project 500 advertised? We knew nothing about it in the north until there was a press release issued from Toronto which appeared in one of the northern papers. It said how disappointed the minister was in the response to the programme. He said there was a fairly good response in the Toronto area but literally no response, or a very poor response, from other areas in the province.

I want to assure the minister that it was not very well advertised. I got only one

request from a constituent to look into the possibilities of his enrolling in this programme.

I am just wondering, was this the case in many areas across the province that it was not advertised properly or sufficiently to allow a large number of people in centres other than Toronto to make themselves aware of it and to qualify for employment under this winter works programme?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, I think that it could be fairly said that in its initial stages it perhaps was not advertised well enough. We tended to believe that the programme could be advertised through the news stories in the paper. They were carried fairly extensively around the Metro area, but on checking we found they weren't carried too extensively out around the province.

I think letters were sent to all the municipal social service departments because, firstly, we wanted them to look at people who were on the recipient rolls—young people who just had not been able to find a job. Certainly these were the people we wanted to get interested in this programme, and they were urged to do this.

I think it is fair to say, in its initial stages, we were not happy with the kind of response, or the way it had been advertised. But that has been overcome in the last three or four weeks, and as I indicated, there have been many more applications from all across the province than we had initially.

Mr. Stokes: Well, is it implicit in the minister's remarks, then, that the only areas that might qualify for this kind of personnel are those that already had social assistance agencies? He must appreciate that in many areas of the north, where they don't have that kind of organization, could very likely be the areas where there is the greatest need.

I am wondering if there is any way in which the minister could get a portion of these 500 people out into remote areas, say in little unorganized communities like Armstrong? Surely the minister's predecessor knows what I am talking about?—where there is a dire need for these kind of people to go in and assist local people without municipal organization, without any legal entity at all, to come to grips with some of the social problems that we have in remote communities in unorganized areas.

I am wondering if there is any provision in the programme for directing these people

the minister is enlisting out into those communities to fill that very important and much-needed role?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, we will try to do that.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2002 carried?

Vote 2002 agreed to.

On vote 2003:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury—well, it is 10:30 o'clock p.m., and we have no authority to sit beyond the hours as set.

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 supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the House have permission to sit beyond the normal sitting hour of 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, before we agree to that, which I gather will likely happen, can the House leader give us an idea of the other end?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in reply, I would like to say that the order of business that we would like to conclude is as I called it this morning—bills standing in the name of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells), and three standing in my own name.

Mr. Lewis: Is the House leader suggesting, Mr. Speaker, the three tax bills will be done tonight?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): No they won't. He had better send out for his breakfast.

Mr. Lewis: I just can't imagine why he then wants us to sit beyond 10:30. We will be here to breakfast. I gather by various gestures across the way that midnight might be the point at which we stop. That seems reasonable under the circumstances. But if

the minister is serious about doing the tax bills and the day-nursery bill, it will go on very, very late. It makes very little sense.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): May we consider perhaps—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Oh, ho, ho; there is the new leader.

Mr. Bullbrook: May we consider the possibility of the whips coming together and looking at the less contentious legislation, because the tax bills—we have had private discussions—are going to be somewhat contentious and lengthy, but there should be some statutes there that we can get through with some despatch. I think the leader of the New Democrats would be amenable to that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, having said that I did state this morning what the business would be, and inasmuch as the tax bills are fairly necessary ones—they may be contentious from the members' point of view across the way—I will ameliorate my position to this degree that we will just wait and see.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I see in that a total capitulation on the House leader's side. That is how I read it.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Mr. Chairman. Supplementary estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services. The hon. member for Sudbury.

On vote 2003:

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, in the minister's opening statement, was I correct in understanding that the budget for this item was already overexpended in that you had already approved nine applications and you would have approval of 41?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Chairman, it is not overexpended. I am indicating that we have now nine that are definitely ready for approval and 32 that we tentatively can approve within the next couple of weeks.

Don't forget that if we are going to live with them, the kind of time restrictions that we have to apply, and such as your hon. colleague was talking about to get this thing going this winter, we have got to move fast.

There is still some other money available, but I think I must tell the hon. members of the House that for the total number of applications we have in, if we were to approve all of them, we would need \$14 million. There isn't that much in the programme, so we have to be selective. We are being selective in that we are looking at the existing facilities in the community, existing daycare facilities, the need for daycare facilities in the community, the degree of unemployment and the number on the recipient rolls.

Using all these three criteria, we will have to make some judgement decisions on some of the projects. Further, we have tried to allot the projects among the three different groups. We have tried to approve so many municipal daycare projects, a certain number of projects on Indian reservations and a certain number of projects submitted by local associations for the mentally retarded; so that has further split the thing up. In other words, we are not taking them, say, first come, first served since it might be all municipal ones that came in. We are reserving certain parts of the money for the retarded and for Indian reservations.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I take it by that answer, that even though an application will be late coming in—I know there will be an application from my constituency, albeit it is going to be late—from that answer I would gather that it will be considered, but I think the—

Hon. Mr. Wells: May I say to the hon. member we have indicated that all applications had to be in by December 31, so that any that get in by then will be considered.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, just in case my constituency does not get in by that time—as a controller of the city of Sudbury, when the announcement of this programme came on September 1, we were naturally quite elated because at that particular moment we had negotiated an agreement to rent an old shack in downtown Sudbury for \$500 a month and we were going to renovate this place and turn it into a daycare centre.

While we had negotiated the lease of this place we still had not signed the formal document so through some wriggling around we did get out of the lease and in the original

letter that we got the minister indicated that he would also supply plans, ready-made plans for this daycare centre.

So we immediately wrote and asked for a set of drawings, because we were in the process of starting a daycare centre and we wanted to be smart off the spot. We did write and ask the minister to send us a set of drawings but lo and behold we received an answer that the drawings were as yet not available but they would be ready shortly. So we did delay a couple of weeks.

Finally a set of drawings did come and in the interval while we were waiting for these drawings we acquired a piece of land. Now due to Sudbury's topography, with its creeks and its railway tracks and everything else, most of our land comes in long narrow strips and this is the type of land we acquired and on which we were going to place this daycare centre once we got the drawings from your department.

When the drawings came in they would not fit on our piece of land because the drawings for a daycare centre to house 50 children comprised something of a square design and here we were on the edge of a creek, jammed between a mountain and the creek. We needed a building something like a bowling alley and there was only the one set of drawings available.

So you see, Mr. Minister, we were frustrated again, and at the last meeting of city council—you know it has taken about five weeks since September going through this routine—we commissioned an architect to make us up a set of drawings that will fit this piece of land and yet meet the requirements of your department.

The haste with which the programme was conceived, Mr. Minister, has caused us probably not to meet the deadline of May 31, and in fact we may not even meet the deadline of application by December 31. So I would ask the minister to take this problem into consideration when in fact he does receive this application from the constituency of Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of discussion about Sudbury tonight and I would not like it to be said that we never do anything for Sudbury. Actually I had in mind approving the plans for the site of that daycare centre next week in Sudbury. We have already had the official application and our people are working with you to get that going. Actually it is in the list of 32 that we are ready to approve, so I think it is further advanced than perhaps you think.

One other interesting observation should be made here, Mr. Chairman, and it is interesting because we hear many times in this House that we should have standard plans for schools and for various other facilities.

Because of the speed with which we wanted to get this programme going we do, as the hon. member has said, have a standard plan for a daycare centre which can be picked up from our consulting architects and used intact so you do not have to employ an architect. But I think the hon. member has given a very good example of why this doesn't work all the time; because land sites and all kinds of situations often mitigate against using a standard plan that is available. This is one of the problems that we face many times, but the Sudbury Centre is going to be approved, likely, and I do not think there will be any problem there, provided your architect and your people keep moving along.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Chairman, the minister said there was a list of some 32 projects that has been approved. I notice in his statement on December 13, that there is \$10 million for construction of day nurseries and in the estimates here I see there is a total of \$7,190,000—

Hon. Mr. Wells: That would be in next year's estimates.

Mr. Haggerty: Next year's estimates? I know there was a delegation in today from the regional municipality of Niagara. I think they were in to see the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) concerning a daycare centre in the regional municipality of Niagara, particularly in the Welland area.

I had made representation along with this group here last spring and last summer, and we met with the director of homes, Mr. Crawford. At that time approval was given to go ahead and build this project at a cost of some \$300,000. This was called the Welland area retarded association.

They have told me that the subsidy allowed today would be \$150,000, that is, 50 per cent of the cost. The catch is, once again they have to go back to the regional municipal council for approval. I also understand that they have to raise 15 per cent of the original cost of \$300,000. I was just wondering what happens to the 100 per cent in this particular case?

They started this project last spring. They met with the department on different occasions and I think they were under the wire. I am sure they were in under the wire. Why hasn't the project been given the 100 per cent approval? That is, toward the cost?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the project that the hon. member is referring to, basically, in the first instance was a community home for the retarded to be built by the Welland district association for the retarded. As he has indicated, the planning of this has gone on for the last eight or nine months or maybe even a year. This is as a community home for the retarded under The Homes for Retarded Persons Act, for which subsidy is 50 per cent, I guess, or 5,000 beds.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, 5,000 beds.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, 5,000 beds. In this project, I think they wish to include some type of daycare centre, some type of daycare facility. When this programme came along they wanted to bring the daycare facility part in under the 100 per cent grant and build it as part of the community residence for the retarded.

There are some differing opinions among the experts in The Department of Health, our department, their association, and the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded on whether it is a good or bad thing to have a daycare centre for the retarded in with the home for the retarded and so forth.

We had them all in today. They had a meeting, I am not sure whether all sides are happy but I understand that they are working out some kind of a compromise. I would also tell the hon. member that the regional municipality of Niagara is building a municipal daycare centre and has already been told it can go ahead in the city of Welland.

Mr. Haggerty: That's in the city of Welland?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The city of Welland, yes.

Mr. Haggerty: This is a project between three municipalities, the township of Wainfleet, the town of Pelham and the city of Welland, I think this takes in the area. It covers rather a large area and I thought with the inclusion of the daycare centre that—well I still think that the 100 per cent subsidy should apply in this particular case.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2003.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): May I ask the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, what has happened to the campus daycare centre at the University of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the campus daycare centre at present has an appeal lodged before the day nurseries appeal board. Their licence was refused; I think there were certain conditions. The case is being argued and the decision has not been rendered yet by the appeal board.

Vote 2003 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes study of the supplementary estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services and also completes study of the supplementary expenditure estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee of supply rise and report a certain resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Rowe from the committee of supply reports the following resolution:

(Reading dispensed with.)

Resolution concurred in.

DAY NURSERIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moves second reading of Bill 11, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I want to speak to the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The motion for second reading was carried.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Oh, come on!

Mr. Speaker: Well, I thought I had clearly called for—

Mr. Martel: Get serious!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He was on his feet; he was smiling at you.

Mr. Martel: The shock of the insults from the Prime Minister tonight have just devastated me.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): I have not said a word.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I did put the motion and I gave the hon. members an opportunity to rise to debate. No member had risen, and the motion was declared carried.

Mr. Lewis: I will urge Mr. Speaker to reconsider because of the extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Martel: The lateness of the hour saw me getting to my feet in a slow manner.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the motion is carried. Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Some hon. members: No, we'll take it to committee.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Lewis: No. We would like the bill to go to committee under the circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the House resolve itself into committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lewis: The government is using its majority to bludgeon through legislation!

Clerk of the House: The first order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

Hon. Davis: Well, if the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) cannot stay awake—

Mr. Lawlor: He had momentary paralysis.

DAY NURSERIES ACT

House in committee on Bill 11, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 11, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act. Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill and if so, which section?

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, on section 1—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Where was he on second reading?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, the definition section is amended and enlarged in contemplation of the establishment of day nurseries for retarded children, but the Act in section 1 indicates that the Ontario Association for Retarded Children will be the only private agency that will be allowed to make application. I would think this is a move away from what has been the practice in the past, in that as a rule the decision as to the private associations that will be recognized for capital or operating grants is usually left in the hands of the minister, but this bill specifically regulates that no agency will be allowed to make application other than those that are affiliated with the Ontario Association for Retarded Children. I would like to ask the minister if he can outline to us why this particular method has been used within this bill.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my opening remarks on first reading, we are moving into a whole new area here for the first time. We are providing capital grants and operating subsidies to other than municipally operated daycare centres directly.

It was our desire to do this now because of the money that is available in this winter works programme. In other words, we wanted to make some of the \$10 million available to create jobs and to build daycare centres for the retarded where they can prove a very important part of this total programme for the retarded, with its full emphasis on the community.

We felt that in the time span that is available to us we had to have assistance. We have not got the time, if we are going to get these projects going, to let every group start its own project.

Further, the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded and its local associations are playing a very integral and vital part in the total work that The Department of Health and some of our other departments had going on in regard to task forces for planning total services, and so forth.

So it seemed very logical, at this particular point in time, to say that any group that is affiliated with the Ontario association,

would be a good group to recognize for building under this programme.

It meant that they had some already established status. A number of them are already incorporated as corporations without share capital, so they didn't have to go through that procedure. It meant that we could move very quickly with a group to get these nurseries built and that is what has happened. We have had a good response and I think that it is worthwhile.

We were worried at this instance that a lot of groups might just want to start up their own corporation and come in and that we would have to try to find out if they had the expertise to run programmes and so forth. I think that to get it done and to start this programme for the retarded, this was the best way.

There is one exception in this bill and the members will find it when they come to, I think section 2. There is a clause that protects any nursery for the retarded that happens to be operating when this bill comes in and is not affiliated; it will be recognized. Now, there is one nursery in the city of Toronto that fits into this category. They are doing a good job. They are not affiliated. We think they should be recognized for operating subsidies. They are not applying for one of the capital grants under the programme.

Mr. R. S. Smith: From the minister's remarks am I right to assume that eventually the areas which would be covered under this Act would be broadened so that other agencies might make application for daycare centres for afflicted persons other than those who fall into the category of the mentally retarded?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think I could answer that in the affirmative, Mr. Chairman, because all I can do is state what we have decided and present as our policy at this time. That is all I can guarantee the member that we can do at this time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East, on which section?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): First section, Mr. Chairman. You know, after the initial euphoria died down the other day on listening to this new bill and we started to look at it, the discrepancies come forward. I can't understand how the minister can exclude in this the co-ops or the church-related groups which might want to establish,

and which probably have long worked toward the establishment of daycare centres. I am sure that some of them are as prepared to move, and are maybe further ahead in their preparations, than many municipalities.

I think it is a tremendous oversight on the department's part to exclude so many people who work on a voluntary basis from obtaining a 100 per cent grant at the present time. It would seem to me, as I stated already, that in many instances, Mr. Minister, they are much further ahead than municipalities, much further.

The minister indicated in a letter some months ago that the co-ops did get help, but not capital help for capital expenditure. I intend to move later on in this bill, an amendment with respect to that portion—the appropriate place to try to get the minister to include co-ops, church-related groups and so on, because I think too many are excluded.

I also want to question two things with respect to section 1. Under the old Act, on page 2 of the bill, you had the term, "not of common parentage" and it is dropped from this bill. Why has this been done? At the same time, why has the term, "private schools registered under The Department of Education Act," been dropped? Perhaps the minister could indicate the reasons for those two deletions from this bill, as opposed to what was in the previous bill.

I have only the copy of the initial draft, Mr. Chairman, but on the top of page 2—if the minister has the lengthy one—there used to be "under 10 years of age and not of common parentage". That has been deleted, and it has been followed up in all other cases. I would like to know why that is dropped and I would like to know why the "private schools registered under The Department of Education Act" has been dropped.

It is subsection 2 of section 1, and part 2 of (ab), and part 5 I believe it is of—you have moved one in and moved one out.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I wonder if I could ask the hon. member if he could perhaps get the printed copy of the bill, in order to facilitate the discussion of this bill because there were a couple of changes, a couple of errors in typing in the original copy, which we supplied to him just before the House opened. I think the error that he is talking about is a typographical error which was corrected when we got the final draft. What was the other?

Mr. Martel: It is all in.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is all in, okay. Yes, there are a couple of errors.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister care to comment on the inclusion of co-ops and other groups? Would he change his mind—let us put it that way—and include them by a very simple amendment?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, this of course was considered in the development of this bill but we felt, as many members I think urged me during my estimates last year, we should encourage municipalities to enter the daycare programme. Building daycare centres is part of their total social service programme. We really felt that the emphasis had to be on municipalities here and there. Sure there are all kinds of groups that could be included and they are all worthy. But at this particular point in time we felt that we would just include municipalities and Indian bands which are treated as municipalities and broaden the Act slightly to try to work in the retarded where there is a desperate need for daycare facilities in a different sense, because daycare, really, for the retarded becomes part of the total programme and perhaps keeps the retarded out of an institution if proper daycare can be available in the community. So that is why there was a thrust to put this in. It will be coupled with programmes The Department of Health brings about to break down its large institutions.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on the point which my colleague has raised with regard to the broadening of the groups which might be able to avail themselves of these funds for the development of daycare centres, may I come at this in another way? May I ask the minister, since we are now very close to the end of the year when applications will be in, and his announcement when he introduced the bill was that 102 applications had been made—63 as I recall from municipalities and 26 from—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Retarded associations.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, retarded children's associations and 13 from Indian bands. What do you estimate is the total expenditure involved in those 102 applications?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think these are the figures which I quoted when we were discussing

the supplementary estimates a few minutes ago. We estimate that the money involved in the 102 inquiries and applications that we have in could amount to \$14,720,000. That is obviously more than is set aside for the programme, so as I indicated we are going to have to make some decisions as to what ones could go ahead. We are not going to be able to go ahead with the total programme at this time.

We have indicated that we can move ahead. I have indicated some of the ones that we can move ahead with already. I've indicated others which are tentatively ready to move ahead and there are others that are still in the discussion group. Anybody who puts an application in before December 31 will be considered.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this is a very difficult area to debate because there is an intrinsic motherhood quality to the creation of daycare centres, day-nursery centres, anywhere in the province. All of us on this side of the House have been agitating for it. I choose the arguments carefully then, but I think this bill runs counter in two important ways to everything we know about good child-care facilities in Ontario.

The first way in which it runs counter is its preoccupation with buildings. With great respect, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is spending far too much money on plant. This capital plant obsession runs through the major social departments.

The Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) seems to be getting away from it. He made a number of statements yesterday which were really telling about his reorganization of mental health services and his move away from capital plant to the community.

This business of having to build something, of having to build a structure almost in every instance—and the majority of the money will undoubtedly go in that direction by the very nature of the grant and by the nature of the demand—seems to me to be taking from the municipalities, or asking of the municipalities the wrong emphasis. That is number one.

Number two worries me much more greatly than that. Number two is the minister's refusal, for reasons I just cannot understand—we in this party cannot understand—to give the money to duly qualified and eligible-for-licence groups in the community who have an investment in daycare and provide a service, and are other than formal municipalities or Indian bands organized for the purpose of a municipality. I just don't comprehend.

I don't know whether the day nursery branch is threatened by a little unorthodoxy in the development of daycare services. I don't know whether the department feels that only municipalities can respond to the need. Surely the greatest single potential in Ontario is those groups of parents, almost exclusively, who have got together to try to find daycare facilities for the young kids. Those groups are largely eliminated from funding under this Act.

That, of course, runs counter to the entire department. The minister gives money to children's institutions which are charitably incorporated for the purpose of having kids in a boarding home or having kids in a treatment centre. He gives money to Children's Aid Societies to run group homes, various residences, holding centres; and to privately incorporated charitable institutions entitled to grants from the department. But in the one area of daycare he refuses to give funding to privately incorporated, charitably organized groups of parents or co-ops or whatever for the purpose of daycare nurseries.

I don't understand it, because that is the greatest single potential throughout Ontario. That is where the day nurseries now exist. That's where the expansion can be most immediate. That's where the potential lies.

I find it difficult to comprehend why the minister has put on this bill the limitations which he has, when I think he would win such an immense response and fulfil such a great need if he allowed these groups, who could easily incorporate, and meet his standards to participate. No one objects to setting down rigorous standards and having charitable causes as the purpose of the funds employed, but do not put the strictures on it which this bill puts; these extreme limitations and prohibitions.

I would think that this runs counter to the entire trend in the provision of daycare and day-nursery facilities throughout the province. Admittedly some of them are in church basements; my four-year-old son goes to a little nursery school called the Butternut School in the riding of the minister's colleague from Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch)—one of the loveliest little schools of its kind I have ever seen anywhere.

There are similar day-nursery daycare centres all over the province, struggling for survival, very appropriate, with excellent techniques of child care, tending to involve the mothers in the programme and the fathers in the programme; investing a parental knowledge which frequently does not

exist in the organized day nurseries set up by municipalities, where parental values are largely not viewed with the same worth—you have to have a motherhood craft certificate in order to know how to handle kids in many of these areas—and that is why the Toronto co-op was resisted by your department because it did not conform to your fatuous regulations; regulations which suggested that parents weren't as capable of relating to kids as were trained staff.

That is why it was challenged at the time and that's the kind of thing which this bill prohibits again. The minister is depressing that whole sector of potential which Ontario has in this field and in its place he is allowing the building of new structures, of municipal day nurseries, all of which is, I suppose, desirable but does not begin to touch the potential around Ontario.

Can the minister not consider it? He did it for the mentally retarded, didn't he? As I recall, Mr. Chairman, section 3 of the bill says that a corporation—I am working from memory—that a corporation which is related to, or a part of the mentally retarded association, can get a licence. And he does it in The Children's Institutions Act, he does it in The Children's Mental Health Act, in The Children's Boarding Homes Act, in The Child Welfare Act. But in the minister's Day Nurseries Act he won't do it—and this the area in Ontario where the need is of greatest import.

I would appreciate the minister indicating why he has excluded this from the bill. Does he not see the possibility of including this whole vast array of services?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Do you want me to reply now, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Lewis: I won't prolong this.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, if other members wish to talk on the point I thought I would wait.

Mr. MacDonald: I don't want to talk on this.

Mr. Lewis: I would appreciate the answer.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think, Mr. Chairman, the points the hon. member brings forward are quite valid. There are many, many other day nurseries operating in this province in many different forms and in many different ways. Some are operating as co-ops, some are operating as private corporations.

I am sure that the day nursery he takes his four-year-old to, and the one I take my three-year-old to, are good day nurseries, but I don't think that they qualify under the terms of reference we are thinking of in this bill because they are private day nurseries. They are in the business, so to speak, of providing that service and they charge for it. They charge the going rate that covers their costs and so forth. This bill is aimed at providing day nurseries for people with a special need, and most of the day nurseries that are operated by the municipalities are built in areas where there is need.

If the hon. member will look around at the ones that Metro social service operates, such as the one in Warden Woods and places like this, they are a different kind of day nursery. As I say, in discussing this I am not in any way saying anything against the other day nurseries, but we basically passed a bill in this House at the end of the last session which for the first time provided capital grants to municipal day nurseries, and this was passed I think unanimously by the House.

We have always paid 80 per cent of the cost of renovating municipal day nurseries, because here again under the Canada Assistance Plan most of the people who were served by these day nurseries were people deemed to be in need.

This programme that was brought in—and I agree it does have an emphasis on plant, on buildings, because it is both a day nursery programme and a winter works programme—is an updating of that original legislation which we already passed. This said we would pay a 50 per cent grant to municipalities in order to provide the incentive and carrot for them to really move into day nurseries.

As I say, during our estimates last year people told me time and time again that we were not doing enough to encourage the development of day nurseries across this province. We decided that in order to encourage municipalities we would give the 100 per cent grant, and some municipalities indeed had already begun to tool up, so to speak, to provide day nurseries under the existing legislation which had just been passed with the 50 per cent grant and they got this—

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean by need? What is his definition of need?

Hon. Mr. Wells: A person in need?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Metro social service department I know has a form that certain people fill out and sign when they attend a day nursery. That entitles them then to go to that day nursery and either pay nothing or a very small sum, and then that complete money is shared under the Canada Assistance Plan by us. We pay 80 per cent of the operating costs—

Mr. Lewis: Then the form indicates their income level—whether they are on social assistance?

Hon. Mr. Wells: There are various criteria. I am not just sure of the exact criteria, but the people who attend these establish some type of criteria.

Mr. Lewis: But what are the criteria? I mean it sounds as though the criteria are people who are in receipt of family benefits or general welfare or similar—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Family benefits, general welfare or low income.

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean by low income?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't tell the member the exact levels of low income. I suppose there is a sliding scale.

Perhaps if your income is at a certain level then they may charge you \$3 a day or something. But the emphasis is there for the working mother who is earning a salary, but not a great salary, that a day nursery would be provided at a very nominal cost.

This is the emphasis of the municipal day nursery programme. It is not a universal programme to provide daycare at no cost to all the population, regardless of some type of need-means test. There is this built into it. That is why we have put the emphasis on municipal day nurseries here, as I say, without in any way saying there is anything wrong with the other groups.

As the hon. member knows there is provision for the other day nurseries to share in government funding of their operating costs through the municipal day nursery system. In other words the municipal day nurseries—social service department, if you will, in Metro Toronto—can purchase service from any of these other nurseries for, again, people deemed to be in need and then they pay to the nurseries that part of the fee. So there are a lot of day nurseries which are not municipally operated day nurseries where we are sharing in their operating costs.

This is going on at the present time and now will also be extended to private daycare. Private daycare will now come in and we will share in its cost, again worked through the municipality.

I guess what we are really talking about is a philosophy of whether you try to have the municipal social services department tie together daycare and co-ordinate it, or whether you have it all sort of fragmented.

I do not know the answer at this point in time, except that I think it looks like we should move with just what we are doing now, letting municipalities build; except for the retarded, where I felt that there was a good case to be made for moving the retarded day nurseries out of the municipal field.

In other words, most now either had to build themselves, or they had to get a municipality to build a nursery for the retarded, which was not done very often, I just cannot recall whether any had done this.

I think, as I say, as part of a different type of programme tied in with the Minister of Health's programme to break down the large institutions, we have got to have community residences for the retarded and adequate daycare facilities. This hopefully ties in with this. We are greatly involving the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded in the planning of where these daycare facilities for the retarded will be built.

As I say, we have got the requests in from the municipalities to take up this programme at this time. I am sorry, but we just can't move in this bill to anything beyond that.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I won't prolong it. I find it just a little depressing to hear the minister speak the way he does. We won't resist what he is saying about the retarded, because, of course, the point is well made. It is precisely the point we are trying to make here—that at some stage he takes it out of the hands of the municipalities.

I don't think the minister really means it when he says they don't know what to do as a department. They have had the experience in all these other areas—from sophisticated treatment centres to children's boarding homes. The department has learned that when it is left to the department itself or to a series of municipalities the service isn't adequate.

I, as a socialist, am saying to you that the public sector alone, the state alone, will never have the facilities adequate to run this kind of service. Where you charitably incorporate

in various areas, all kinds of parental and other groups can do an adequate job.

Certainly this is true in daycare. They do it through government. They receive subsidies through government. They are licensed by government. They are approved by government. They work with government. But government alone in this instance simply won't fill this void now, particularly when we have got so many other groups that are capable of handling the job.

It is a sort of Elizabethan poor law view the way this government handles kids. Those who are in need, or whose parents are in need, the department segregates and isolates in a municipal daycare centre—a very perverse way of handling human relationships at the level of the child. It is not very useful in social terms and it doesn't fill the gap. There are so many viable groups of daycare and day nurseries, not just serving the middle class for a fee but all kinds of them which would be delighted to provide a service with some assistance from government, that was approved by government and that could answer the needs of low income groups.

The minister is very quick to be able to say to this House, "Yes, family benefit recipients are covered. Yes, general welfare recipients are covered." But he is not sure about the low income levels and the way in which it works there.

Everyone can sense immediately where the emphasis is. The emphasis is in the social isolation of the children of those who are in receipt of social benefits.

That is absurd. That is not why the minister developed daycare facilities. It is essentially destructive of the object he has in mind. I think he has an opportunity to make a very great contribution in this area—to create many more places than he is now going to create without all the emphasis on structure if he just recognizes all those groups out there that are ready to form or would like to expand and that will meet his requirements. No one pretends that it will be done in a unilateral way. What the department says can be adhered to. The programmes won't be diluted.

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

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the point that I started to make a few moments ago. There is an essential conflict in what the minister is

attempting to do here—namely to meet an expansion of daycare needs, a long-felt vital, social need, but doing it as part of a winter works programme.

Most people were sort of startled; there was novelty in the proposition. I give the minister credit for this. He got headlines on the novelty of providing this kind of social capital in the community through a winter works programme. But the more one thinks about it, the more he is going to create difficulties. Quite frankly, he may be going to end up with serious flaws in the institutions he is establishing.

The rush of a few weeks to plan them; the rush of a few months to build them—and if they don't get them built by June 1, the capital grant drops from 100 per cent to 80 per cent. That is no way to build a long-term facility in a community that has waited this long to get it, in a sort of a slum housing style. Inevitably there will be errors. Some of the errors will be in the planning and some of them will be just inescapable human errors because of such a rush.

However, I don't want to spend any more time on that. I want to get back to the point I rose to make, that is I was intrigued in discovering from the minister—I am sorry I was out of the House when he first mentioned it during the supplementary estimates—that the 102 requests add up to \$14 million. Let's deal with it for the moment as strictly a winter works programme. We are looking for meaningful ways to spend money, meaningful ways to provide jobs, and we are trying to escape from the proposition of make-work, of doing something just to go through the motions and give somebody an income, because otherwise he is going to be on welfare.

Mr. Martel: For four months.

Mr. MacDonald: It seems to me that suddenly you have tapped—and you shouldn't be surprised that you have tapped this, even on a few weeks notice—suddenly you have tapped \$14 million of need. What you should be doing is coming into this House with an expansion of your supplementary estimate—

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: —because there are going to be some other estimates in these magnificently varied winter works programmes that you and the Trudeau government at Ottawa are trying to dazzle the public with

which aren't going to be filled. They are not going to be taken up. Here is one where it is already more than taken up.

Indeed now I come back to the point the hon. member for Sudbury East made to tie it in.

I was momentarily taken aback and rethought my arguments when you said you have \$14 million of requests because I expected it was going to be the same here as in all your other programmes. You would not yet have met the total appropriation that you were making available. But you have \$14 million. It is a meaningful series of projects. This is what the public is wanting. It is not make-work.

Okay! Get your \$14 million from elsewhere or else expand your supplementary estimate and make more available so that you can do more. Broaden into the co-op and broaden into your church groups so you may come up with \$20 million or \$25 million or \$30 million. I would feel far happier with you coming in to double or treble this estimate than I am with some of the other makeshift, make-work kind of winter works programmes that inevitably you get in on the short-term basis that we have moved into again this year, albeit a bit more longer-term than it was in previous years.

Is there, at this stage, any possibility the government will consider not cutting back on what you have got, and indeed even consider the proposition of the hon. member for Sudbury East that you include other worthy groups like co-op groups—which aren't private in the normal sense; they are community groups on a co-op basis—or a church group so that they too can be included and conceivably build your figure up to \$20 million or \$25 million.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, then all of them will be worthwhile in your terms and our terms.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat puzzled by the minister's statements in his speech on December 13 and the answers which we are discussing right now, and some of his remarks that he has just made. In his speech he makes a claim which is nowhere near what I see in the Act, and especially the section we are discussing, that he is concerned with creating, in fact claiming that he is creating a new way of dealing, in the community, with the mentally retarded.

From what I gather there have been 23 or 26 applications for this type of daycare facilities for mentally retarded. I think it has to be related somewhat to the amount of retarded people.

I shall try only to speak specifically about the mentally retarded. We must relate somewhat to the number of people who are considered mentally retarded, the type of people who arrive in our institutions, the type of people who can be treated in daycare centres. I think there are something like nine provincial institutions which have 5,500 people as inpatients. There are something like 900 others who are in special care homes and residential homes. It is estimated altogether that there are probably 150,000 retarded or minimally retarded individuals in Ontario. What you are proposing to do as a beginning, is to build 23 small daycare units.

Many of those mentally retarded people of whom we speak naturally have to be in hospital, but not the majority of them. Two per cent of the population if you look at it, are born mentally retarded. They have nowhere else to be taken care of in our system. These are the people who become, in fact, unemployed and unemployable and will provide a persistent problem, in a sense forever, for all governments to solve. This particular group can be helped not by building a few small centres but by a concentrated effort by this department to build a series of centres. We can't really rely entirely on municipalities to provide them; there has to be a much more concentrated effort.

My own estimate of those 150,000 people, many of them now abandoned—and I am talking about both children and others—is that we concentrate only on the children, let's say about 50 per cent of them, then nowhere near the care needed is given or has been extended by this department. I consider the department's building of those 23 centres under the guise—very laudable in itself—of providing work for a number of people a winter works programme, a lilliputian effort. An incredibly grandiloquent attempt to produce some specific effect, directed I think largely at the press, that the department has moved toward, actually looking seriously at what is probably one of the major problems in our society, which is what happens to people who are retarded or minimally retarded.

The whole effort and the minister's statement in the speech, which I have said is not connected at all with that, remind me somewhat of the advertising for soap flakes: It starts at large, then it goes to extra large and

ends up with gigantic, but actually the input is totally minimal and lilliputian.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I just add one footnote to my earlier comments for the minister's consideration before he replies. I recall the provincial Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) comments that at this stage it is unlikely the municipalities of the Province of Ontario are going to take up the \$28 million available for Ontario from the federal government, and therefore this government would take it up to be able to exercise the forgiveness factor in it. Is there not some money there that could be used to meet the excess beyond the \$10 million that the minister has got in his supplementary estimates?

In other words, I am giving the minister two options: Either he comes back with a supplementary estimate that is large enough to meet a need that he has now tapped, or alternatively he uses some of that \$28 million the province is going to pick up from Ottawa because the municipalities don't see their way clear to use and direct it in this instance, because clearly he has tapped a very great need.

Mr. Martel: Perhaps I could raise one point with the minister. We seem to have covered the waterfront pretty well, but this concerns the time factor, Mr. Chairman, and particularly with respect to northern Ontario. The deadline, of course, is December 31. Many smaller municipalities, with elections and so on, have not had an opportunity to get their plans in, and should they even get their plans in, actual commencement of work in northern Ontario is slowed down considerably as opposed to the south because the ground is frozen and so on. Could the period of time for application not be extended to, let's say, January 31, and the period for full grant beyond, because we lose at least two months in the construction stage in northern Ontario as opposed to the south because of the intensity of the frost and the cold and so on. It seems to limit the ability in northern Ontario to get the maximum benefits of the plan.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that particular point it doesn't seem to have limited anybody at this juncture, since as the member's colleague has pointed out, one might say we are oversubscribed to the programme at the moment.

Mr. MacDonald: They grab for it, but how can they plan effectively in such a short time?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am guaranteed that they are prepared to start work on the programme.

Before I came in here I was chatting about some of these, and I think even in Red Lake they are organized and ready, when they get approval, to build during this winter. If we are going to meet the criteria of a winter works programme—and I noticed there seemed to be a little difference of opinion between the former leader of the party and the present leader of the party about the programme—

Mr. MacDonald: Deal with some of the points we have raised!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well all right, but the member said it was a great programme and we should spend more money on it and his leader said that it was too institutionalized and we should perhaps not be building so many plants.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Exactly what he said.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What we are going to have to do really—and I must say that I won't be able to get any more money at this point unless we can get some of that Ottawa money; we have passed our supplementary estimates now—this is the money that I have got for the programme for this year, and—

Mr. MacDonald: Go back to the Treasury Board.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What about that \$7.5 million the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. MacNaughton) has? That is rolling stock.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, we will make every effort to see if there is a way to use the \$28 million in this programme. It is not as generous as our grant and the municipalities apparently have some, but are not too interested in using it for a lot of the projects that are there, it isn't attractive enough; which of course, in my thinking, makes it not a very good winter works programme.

Hon. W. J. McKeough (Treasurer): Not a very good programme; but I won't say that because it upsets the Leader of the Opposition. (Mr. R. F. Nixon).

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Let's hear from the Treasurer, he is very quiet tonight.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The comments of the hon. member for Parkdale I think are very valid, and of course in this Act there can be none of the other things that are implied in my

statement because this Act deals only with providing daycare facilities for the retarded. But I think that he will find, if he talks to me or my department and my colleague, the Minister of Health, that our new total approach for the treatment of the retarded involves the kind of concepts we talked about in that statement and that this concept is moved forward by doing the things legislatively we are doing in this Act. It is all part of a total co-operative what will probably develop into a task force arrangement between the association for the retarded and our various government departments to implement the facilities in each region and to plan the different facilities that are needed.

I must tell the hon. member though—he talked about 23—we are not going to be able to build 23 of these facilities.

Mr. Lewis: It is even more lilliputian than he said.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We will have to make certain decisions in co-operation with the associations for the mentally retarded as to those that will be built. We won't be able to build all the 23; we will probably build seven to nine.

Mr. Lewis: Seven to nine, that is quite a programme.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Now 23 are applications or indications of interest. Some of those are way off in the future because they are not ready to move forward, but we have very carefully assessed the need with the association and I think that we can pin down and build those in areas where the kind of concept that we have talked about in that statement can start to be brought into effect, and this is what we want to do. We want to do in the field of treatment for the retarded exactly what the leader of the Opposition—the leader of the New Democratic Party—talked about—

Mr. Lewis: I will accept the former, under pressure.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member won't be offended, eh?

Hon. Mr. Wells: For instance, we want to build them in areas where there is a very active real involvement of the community through their association with the mentally retarded.

I might also indicate that the new regulations that come in will keep the 50 per cent

capital grant on an ongoing basis and extend it to the retarded. That will be an ongoing grant after the winter works programme.

Section 1 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if, with the indulgence of the House—I guess according to the rules I would need unanimous consent—I could have the permission of the House to add a section 6 to this bill. This has nothing to do with the subject matter of any of the sections here, but has to do with the Revised Statutes of Ontario which have just been distributed. Section 15, subsection 3, has a typographical error and the section makes absolutely no sense. In order to facilitate things for the members of this House and the lawyers and the public who use this it would be very helpful if we could correct it by an amendment which—

Mr. M. Shulman: (High Park): If you leave in a section with no sense the lawyers will enjoy it.

Mr. MacDonald: They make their living out of it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the section as it now reads says:

No person shall hinder or obstruct a provincial supervisor in the performance of his duties or refuse to permit him to carry out other records therein and supply extracts therefrom.

Mr. Lewis: I don't know, it is a lot sounder than most of their legislation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member reflecting on legislative counsel? He shouldn't do that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be amended by renumbering sections 6, 7 and 8, as subsections 7, 8 and 9, and by adding thereto the following:

Section 6, subsection 3, of section 15 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor: (3) No person shall hinder or obstruct a provincial supervisor in the performance of his duties or refuse to permit him to carry out his duties, or refuse to furnish him with information or furnish him with false information

Mr. Lewis: Refuse to furnish him with what?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Refuse to furnish him with information or furnish him with false information

Mr. Lewis: That is actually rather poorly worded.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am not a lawyer.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Martel: I am not quite sure yet, Mr. Chairman. You know, as a crude person I just might hold things up here, unless the Prime Minister apologizes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Point of order. No one said the member was crude—just that what he wrote was crude.

Mr. Martel: Oh, he clarified it. I give consent then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wouldn't want the member in difficulties over the Christmas season.

M. Martel: Well, I am delighted to hear that.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comment, question or amendment to any other section of the bill?

Mr. M. Cassidy: (Ottawa Centre): Section 5, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Section 5, yes.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the minister stated on Monday that the capital grants arrangements would apply to the cost of land, construction of new buildings, renovations and additions and that sort of thing. I searched section 5 in vain in order to see where the cost of land is covered. I think it is a problem, particularly because of the haste with which this programme has been brought in.

It has the effect that in many cases day nurseries will not be able to be built in the areas of greatest need. I am speaking of the inner city areas of cities like Windsor, Toronto, Ottawa—areas where land is rather more difficult to find, where the rather expansive suburban designs distributed by the minister really are not applicable. There problems arise if the municipality tries to move in and buy land; it may find, in fact, that it is having to pay almost as much as the cost of the building.

How does the minister intend to cover land? Perhaps he could explain the legislation to another non-lawyer like myself? I don't find it here and it looks as though

there may have been an error in the drafting.

Mr. Lewis: Or an error in the statement.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, the statement says that it may direct to the municipality, band or approved corporation as may be the case, out of moneys appropriated therefore, an amount to be computed in accordance with the regulations.

Now Mr. Chairman, the regulations—if I can just find the section—we have the regulations all ready and as I indicated to the leader of the NDP yesterday, they will be going to the cabinet immediately upon the passage of this bill. The regulations indicate that land is included in the computing of the cost. I can't find the section right at the minute, but it is in here and the regulations state the various things that will be counted in computing costs.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this bill as amended be reported?

Bill 11, as amended, reported.

Mr. Lewis: Now we will have a debate on the principle on third reading.

Mr. Chairman: That was really on section 1.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report one bill with a certain amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: The committee of the whole house reports one bill with one amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): I would like, Mr. Speaker, to call No. 3 on the order paper, Bill 2.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves second reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): This bill is a minor amendment indeed. It was explained by the Treasurer (Mr. Mc-

Keough) in his statement before the orders of the day on opening day.

The thing that I might put before you, sir, is something that does concern me. It really follows from an exchange between the Minister of Finance and the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons. There is some expression of opinion there that perhaps in the long run, after some other amendments to The Corporations Tax Act of this province, we'll find that the federal statute and the provincial statute no longer tax on the same base and the computation of corporate profits would therefore be established in a different way.

While I admit, sir, that this does not deal directly with the principle of the amendment before us, this might be an occasion when either the Minister of Revenue or the Treasurer might, in talking about the corporation tax amendments that are before us, indicate something about the future of this particular tax and whether there are further amendments planned that we might deal with at the next session of the Legislature. Certainly we approve of the principle that is put forward in the minor amendment that is before us.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, we in this party do not consider this a minor amendment. The Liberals may do so, quite in contradistinction with the position taken at the federal level; which this bill was designed, as a purely gratuitous measure, to offset. If the benefit was conferred under federal legislation and it was designed to maintain an increase, or at least to maintain existing employment in industry because of the American surtax situation, then that cause has been effected by the federal legislation.

For the provincial government to come along subsequently—it is not a case, even, of adding icing to the cake but adding icing to the icing. You know, one can gild a lily too often and in this particular instance it is precisely what the government has done.

If the purpose of the legislation at the federal level was precisely to make up for any difference in the profit measure or the losses that may be suffered, and therefore has a redounding effect to the laying off of people in that particular plant; if this makes up the measure of difference, it is done on a most indiscriminate, inchoate basis as the federal government often does things, with no real assurance in advance that the cause would be effected.

Very often the benefits will accrue to corporations which would in any event not have laid off their forces. The criteria up there on the hill does not really make an obligation with respect to the work force.

There is this government coming along seeking to outdistance the federal government. It is the most peculiar gyration that this government is prone to perform—it is going to be even more liberal and open-handed.

Of course, we find the liberality is extended to the corporations to which the government has already granted the five per cent machine and machinery tax rebate earlier this year to give that magnificent leap to the economy, the surge forward which never came to pass. Here the government sees another opportunity to vouchsafe to its friends a completely gratuitous subsidy from which no particular return can be anticipated, it already having been performed.

On that particular basis, we don't see why the benefit should be given. The federal government was just as cognizant as this one of the need involved here. It felt nevertheless, that if the profit margins were maintained or even increased under the giving of the subsidy, then there was no reason, having the same profit, that they should not pay the same tax on that profit. The government's position appears, on a superficial glance, to be extremely logical.

The bland way in which the Treasurer put it forward in his statement here would mislead even the enlightened. But it does not mislead us, unlike the Liberals, on this side of the opposition in this House. The matter is a piece of persiflage, it is a giving away of public funds gratuitously without any particular motion of a return and I don't think it can be justified in the least.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Hear, hear! It is another gift to the corporations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Just persiflage!

Mr. Renwick: —I share the concern the member for Lakeshore expresses about the Act and the proposal that the Treasurer makes. As I understand it, if the federal bill for employment support is a maximum of \$80 million; and if we assume, as I do, that we will probably get somewhere in the

neighbourhood of \$25 million of that particular support in the province—at least and perhaps more—we are talking about a gift to the corporations of about \$3 million of provincial Treasury money.

Mr. Lewis: Another gift!

Mr. Renwick: It really struck me, as I listened to the Treasurer the other day, that he felt he just could not possibly bring in a bill which dealt with legitimate tax reductions without somehow or other getting something in there for his friends in the corporate world. He did it without any requirement on their behalf.

At least there was some vestige of obligation with respect to the five per cent investment tax allowance because there the corporations had in fact to do something to get the benefit of that credit. Similarly, on the federal Employment Support Act, they had to do something. The grant is not made, except in exceptional circumstances, until after the manufacturer has satisfied the employment support board that, during the period of assistance, the usual 90-day period, the manufacturer has in fact maintained employment at the level which was in effect at that time.

I am simply saying that if the federal government clearly and logically explained that if one is substituting a grant for what would otherwise be revenue then it is very logical and consistent to ensure that that money is taxed. The grant which is being made is a direct substitution for lost revenue. On the logic of The Income Tax Act, the federal government felt that it had to put into its Employment Support Act the provision that:

for greater certainty any amount paid to a manufacturer as a grant shall for the purposes of The Income Tax Act be included in computing the income of the manufacturer from carrying on his business for his taxation year in which the amount was received by him.

I think that it is incumbent upon the minister, and if he needs an assist upon the Treasurer to explain to the House what the government of the Province of Ontario or the people of the Province of Ontario are going to receive in exchange for a gift to certain selected industries in the Province of Ontario of amounts, which on my calculation will leave the provincial Treasury short at least about \$3 million to \$4 million.

It is just not sufficient for the Treasurer in his statement to say in this way the province will reinforce, at least in a modest way, the positive assistance provided to Ontario manufacturers under the federal programme. Is the government going to ask that in return for a dollar anything be done by the corporations? Is it going to ask in return for the \$3 million that any additional employment be provided in the Province of Ontario?

Certainly not by reliance on the federal Act, because that is the condition under which the grant is made by the federal government. But here, for some reason or other, this government feels that whenever they alter the tax structure of this province in any way it has got to make a gift to the corporate world about it.

I ask the minister to reply directly to the question: What does the government of the Province of Ontario obtain? What does the society in the Province of Ontario obtain by this gift to certain selected industries in this province of the moneys which are going to be given to them by providing that the grants received under the federal Employment Support Act are not to be included in computing the income of those companies in the Province of Ontario.

That is the point and that is why we are opposed to the bill. We want the government to know that this group in the House thinks it is an entirely unwarranted contribution, be it ever so small, to the corporate world in the Province of Ontario. On our calculation a minimum of \$3 million is simply going to disappear out of the revenues of this province at a time when we can't afford it.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The member's front-bench people are not with him.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate in the debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the Leader of the Opposition in his view, and, in answering him—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister would.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The government's opposition is over here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In answering him in regard to further legislation, I think that we would be in error if we were to endeavour to guess, as it were, what the outcome of the tax changes in Ottawa are. Immediately we

have determined what they are and their impact on the economy of Ontario, we will have further legislation to present to the House. I think it is commonly known that we have a group of people studying it day by day and, soon after it has passed in Ottawa, we will be in a position to report to the House. That will be done, of course, early in the new session.

In reply to the member for Riverdale, obviously the taxing philosophy of the member and his colleague is substantially different than our view of the situation now.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is an irrelevant comment. We are just objecting to the government's handouts.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Okay, I will have a word to say about that.

We don't think under the present circumstances that one would term this a handout. First of all, if the support is required—and we believe it is—as a result of the American 10 per cent surcharge, the gift that we receive in return is jobs. It is our concern in society—

Mr. Renwick: We won't receive a single one. There is no assurance.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now it is a very easy thing for the member to say they wouldn't have laid anybody else off anyway. I believe that the situation is that critical that this particular move was necessary.

Mr. Renwick: But the government has no commitment for it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, we know this much: That it is the offsetting factor in regard to the American 10 per cent surcharge that we are endeavouring to achieve for the people in the Province of Ontario. That is our philosophy and, in doing it, when we make this consideration we believe that it should not be taxable because if we do it, and we do it in good faith, why give to a company a tax advantage in money in this way and then recover it again in taxing the company. We believe that we move—

Mr. Renwick: This government is not giving them a tax advantage.

Mr. MacDonald: The federal government is doing it.

Mr. Lawlor: They made a better calculation of it than this government.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We believe we move correctly in this area, Mr. Speaker, and we believe that the federal government didn't.

Mr. Lawlor: That's what this government did with the gold mine assistance.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We endeavoured to cooperate with them to the best of our ability and we made this move, believing that it was the best thing for industry in the Province of Ontario, and we put it forth with that thought in mind.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like it to go to committee.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole.

Mr. Henderson: No!

Mr. Lawlor: We have a few questions to ask.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The committee is going to meet on December 25.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): We can wish the minister a happy birthday then.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you now to call item 2, Bill 1.

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

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

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have read carefully, the Treasurer's remarks, as well as this bill in an effort to comprehend the mechanics of the tax reduction that this bill is supposed to achieve. To me it is indeed a pity that in the writing of the Act and in the writing of the federal tax reform bill, the explanatory notes are not sufficiently complete to fully explain what the Minister of Revenue is endeavouring to achieve.

For example, on page 1 the explanatory note states, "The amendment provides that the tax payable by individuals for the 1971

taxation year will be 27.5 per cent of the basic federal tax." For years the Ontario tax payable has been 28 per cent. How does a 3 per cent reduction of 28 per cent come to 27.5 per cent? By my calculation this would bring us down to 27.16 per cent.

Actually if we read the Treasurer's statement we get the explanation, because he indicates the tax cut is actually a 3.6 per cent tax cut for a six-month period and this is equivalent to 1.8 per cent for the full year. The reduction of 1.8 per cent for the full year of the 28 per cent we used to have does work out to the 27.5 per cent. Why doesn't that come out in this explanatory note?

I think it is a shame that in bringing in this bill the minister hasn't made this clear, because we should have it clear in the Act itself.

There is also no explanation of the 30.5 per cent figure referred to in the same note on page 1. A reduction of three per cent will reduce 30.5 per cent to 29.6 per cent but why does the figure move up to 30.5 per cent in the first place? There is no explanation in the Treasurer's speech.

I know that many will recall that the federal Minister of Finance had indicated that implementation of his tax reform bill would actually mean a substantial reduction in the amount of revenue that the provinces would receive. Members may recall, also, that this province particularly was loud and voluble, and very forcibly stated that the new tax reform bill would actually increase substantially the amount of tax collected. Maybe the Minister of Revenue doesn't remember that. I certainly recall there was a lot said about that by the Treasurer of the day.

Now in this Act, apparently the government recognizes the statement made by the federal minister that a figure of 30.5 per cent is needed in order to get the same total amount of revenue from the new tax reform bill that they are now getting from the 28 per cent under the existing bill, under which we are operating.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased in this party to support the bill which provides for an estimated tax cut of \$22 million in this calendar year and \$36 million next year. We regret that this government, as well as the federal government, have not included as a preamble to the bills a clear explanation of what the bills are intended to achieve.

In the past our tax legislation has endeavoured to describe the intent. It has left the detailed mechanics to the regulations. The

detailed mechanics in the new tax reform bill are in the legislation, but there are no explanatory notes that really set out the intent at the beginning in the preamble, and they are almost impossible to understand. This bill is just the same.

It is important in my view, and in the view of our party, that a full explanation of the intent be included as a preamble to a bill of this type. Those are the comments I would like to make on this Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Just to show the degree of accuracy on those points just made by the hon. member, the footnote in the original—the overleaf note on the original bill as submitted to me—makes reference to section 5 where it talks about the decrease in the tax, the deduction of three per cent for the taxation year 1972. Obviously that note is completely wrong. It has a reference to some other section. I will let the Minister of Revenue figure it out for himself.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the business of addressing oneself in this House to this somewhat twisted hermaphrodite of a minister, who at the regular times in the estimates—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary.

Mr. Lawlor: —will not answer questions of policy or deal with matters of this kind at all and suddenly pops out of the woodwork on this particular occasion, when the Treasurer was the one who introduced the matter and made the statements with respect thereto and would be the one who seems to me fundamentally responsible.

If the answer given to the last bill is the kind of thing we are going to have to contend with tonight—the amorphous reply of something about having to look at the effects of federal legislation, the minister is going to say that about every bill that comes before us tonight under that. He is going to say it about the gift tax that he hasn't brought forward. He says that the business is that he is in attendance on, is as a servitor to the repercussions that come out of the federal legislation. That is no reply.

We have to send things to committee if that is the best he is going to do for us before 3 o'clock tomorrow morning. That is a threat.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Not wrong.

Mr. Lawlor: I would have it on the record that the multiple references in the bill to federal legislation are to the present federal legislation that is, I believe, in the Senate at the present time. That is Bill C-259, that voluminous and magnificent document hidden away somewhere here—

Mr. Cassidy: Here you go. It takes two of us to lift it.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right. And members can see that since I intend to go through pretty well every page of it, point by point, we might have a visitation for some time.

The bill refers back and forward to this legislation. I wonder just how can it be that the government can bring forward legislation here in this House dovetailing supposedly with federal legislation which is not presently legislated. In other words, there have been, as the minister well knows—and I wonder how his department can possibly keep track of them from day to day, because I find it is quite impossible for me to do so, and I work quite hard—there have been amendments, changes and what not pouring through the House of Commons for the last few weeks. Even in the past few days there have been multiple amendments. Just how can the minister pretend to be referring to a particular section in this piece of legislation which might have been altered so far as he knows the day before yesterday.

It is one of the weirdest instances of legislation brought before this House, at least in my experience. Therefore the minister very well might be back here at a very early date, because his legislation may be invalid to some extent because of the wrong cross references and the misapplications involved in that particular bit. I wonder if he has thought about it and about what moves to amend that possibility he possibly can make during the period of recess if he wants his legislation to go into effect at the first of the year.

There are two points to be raised about the amendment to the Income Tax Act. One of them is, as everyone must agree, we would have to accede to this legislation, as it would be somewhat politically unwise not to do so, since there is a tax cut involved of three per cent, and that is great stuff.

Two problems, as I say, are connected with it. One is timing. The minister will recognize that because, insofar as the 1971 taxation year and the immediate impact of alleviating the economy are concerned, he is not going to get any benefit of this until the filings take place,

until the computations are made and until the money is returned, which might be six months hence. Such is the difficulty with this kind of legislation.

The second point which goes somewhat against the grain about the legislation is that the tax credit concept the government has utilized would have been better in this context or to cut the sales tax, over which the government has complete and total jurisdiction, by say a half or one percentage point, would have an immediate, vital impact on the pockets of the consumers giving vigour to the economy, turning the wheels over, and doing precisely what the government wants. But here it has this delayed action fuse that it has written into its legislation with respect to the personal income tax.

By the time that tax really begins to take effect, and particularly that for 1972, what reasons have the government to believe over there, in Treasury or otherwise, that far from being in the trough of the economy it may be at a crest and the tax cut would only add to the whole inflationary gestus that is involved. So the government is taking a marvellous risk tonight putting through legislation which may act contrary to the cycle in the economy and to the Keynesian thrust which no doubt the poor devils are seeking to achieve, but I think rather floundering in the process, because they are projecting much too far.

The Treasurer of Ontario comes before us. In the newspaper and elsewhere I see yesterday he is catcalling about the possibilities of a great rejuvenation in the economy. A few years ago we had nine per cent growth rates. He seems to think that 5.5 is some kind of achievement. When you consider the Japanese have been hitting 11 per cent all the way along the line, and even against the American surtax are quite likely to continue to do so, what all the thumping of his chest is about quite bemuses me.

But in any event, the business of giving that projected tax cut into these future years, over against what might have been done by way of direct grants—to the stimulation of a whole host of local enterprises on a far greater scale than has been projected in these estimates that we have just finished—works against the grain and against the purposes which I am sure in good heart the minister is seeking to achieve to stimulate this economy. Otherwise, his tenure of course comes into question and the reason for contemporary government will no longer exist.

And so, what happens? He gives a three per cent across the board, ignoring his own

nostrums about tax credits that I have heard so many times, so that the total benefits fall infinitely more beneficial to the higher income brackets than they do to the low.

Just to demonstrate. With the government's three per cent federal and provincial tax cuts for the 1972 taxation year, anyone having a gross income of \$3,000 would get from the federal government \$7.02 and from this government \$2.14—

Mr. Lewis: How do you like that?

Mr. Lawlor: —but anybody in the \$100,000 bracket will get from the federal government \$1,193.17—

Mr. Henderson: Who is the member supporting?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, it is nice to see the member for Lambton looking across. He has been looking sideways since this session began. We thought he would have a crick in his neck!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: —and from the provincial government—

Mr. Henderson: I have hardly listened to the leader of the NDP!

An hon. member: We can hardly blame him!

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I don't blame you, Lorne.

Mr. Lewis: He should turn around in his seat and face the front!

An hon. member: The member for Lambton should watch that water on his knee now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, how is that water on his knee? We heard about that last session.

An hon. member: Watering again!

Mr. Lawlor: It is too late at night.

An hon. member: I'd turn in my seat if I were him too. It's much more attractive.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Anyhow, the provincial government will be giving the \$100,000 class \$363.91. In other words, a total sum of \$9.26 for somebody who is making \$3,000 and \$1,557.08 for somebody making \$100,000. I am telling the minister that

there are better ways of doing it than the way he is presently doing it.

Mr. Henderson: The member doesn't have any better ways.

Mr. Lawlor: We find this government's inastuteness and its inability to manipulate the economy, its fourflushing schemes and its inability to move in with adroitness overwhelming. Where on earth do they learn their lessons over there as to how to handle a contemporary economic situation when I think, as I said, that they are working against themselves in this particular head.

Well, that is their legislation and it is too good not to give that much credence to. As I say, it is simply a question of indiscretion in not accepting it; and as far as we are concerned, we find the usual ineptness prevalent over there. Nothing has improved except that the arrogance has grown ever so much more hard to cut.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of comments, one by way of clarification.

The question I want to ask the minister—I hope he will reply to it—is that the amendments which he proposes in this bill relate only to the existing Income Tax Act of Canada and don't relate in any way whatsoever to the bill which is presently wending its way through the Parliament of Canada. There is no endeavour in this bill to bring The Income Tax Act of the Province of Ontario into line with the so-called reform bill being passed by the Liberal government in Ottawa.

The second aspect of it—and I am rather glad there are two ministers, really, because it would appear to me that we might possibly get a clear statement from this minister as to whether or not, regardless of the shadow-boxing the Treasurer does with Ottawa about the question, we are really going to be satisfied that this province is not embarking upon such a distinction in the taxing statutes, both income and corporate tax in the province, that there is going to be confusion with respect to the tax base which is in effect in Ontario as distinct from the tax base which is in effect across Canada?

I really don't know what the game is that the Treasurer is playing. All of the things the Treasurer wants to accomplish which are good, that is in terms of tax credits and

assistance to persons with low income, can be accomplished without having an entirely different tax base.

Yet from the statements the Treasurer made in his remarks to the House on the opening of this session, it would appear to me that he is going to continue for some considerable time shadow-boxing with the federal government before we get conforming legislation brought through this Legislature both in The Income Tax Act and The Corporations Tax Act.

I would draw the minister's attention to the statement which is made by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants in the booklet 'Tomorrow's Taxes' which was published in an endeavour to explain the various changes in the taxing system. They point out the problem which would be involved and they use this language:

Failure of the provinces to agree to the new system could result in the development of a tax jungle with each taxing jurisdiction determining its own tax base as well as the tax rates. It is unthinkable that such a situation would be permitted to arise.

I would ask the minister to give us here some assurance that the basic ingredients of the proposals presently before the Parliament of Canada will in fact, both in the corporate field and in the personal income tax field, be adopted in this province and that we will not go through a period during which the people in the Province of Ontario will be paying taxes, either for business or for their personal income tax, on bases different from that of the federal government.

Are there sufficient pressures within the new tax collection agreement itself to indicate that really there is no way that this province can embark upon a separate road so far as the taxing bases are concerned? Is it, for example, true that there is going to be no capital gains tax conformity between The Income Tax Act of the Province of Ontario and The Income Tax Act of Canada, both for corporations and individuals?

Are there going to be any agreed rules with respect to the allocation of capital gains for the purpose of imposing taxes in the Province of Ontario, as distinct from taxes imposed by other jurisdictions across the country?

Are some of these questions going to be questions which we are going to be worried

about continuously? Or is the province going to pursue the road which made very good sense to us? That is, to agree on the common taxing base of the major taxing statutes that are common to both the federal and the provincial level, and provide for the amelioration which is required in the strictures of the taxing structure by a system of tax credits against taxes payable for those who are entitled to them.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is straying somewhat from the principle of this bill.

Mr. Renwick: The essence, Mr. Speaker, of what we are trying to say—I didn't intend to stray because what I was saying was very much what my colleague from Lakeshore had tried to say. That is, when the opportunity came for them to pursue their principle, their principle being one of tax credits rather than across-the-board reductions in taxes, they departed from it and they conformed to the federal government.

So when it is a matter of their principle, they give it up and conform to the federal government. But when it is the other side of that particular coin, when they should be conforming to the federal government, the Treasurer in his own stubborn and difficult way insists on pursuing a separate road for which there is no principle to justify it at all.

This is why we are asking of this particular minister some assurance that the basic proposals put forward by the former Treasurer as a method of bringing equity into the tax structure so far as people in Ontario are concerned will be pursued, and not the road being pursued by the present Treasurer. The budget that was introduced in 1969 under the former Treasurer within the terms of budgets in this Legislature, was a great budget. We want to see some effort made to introduce equity into the Province of Ontario without us being faced, for another year or two or three, with the fight that the Treasurer has with the federal government.

We'd like to know if in this bill, carrying through these changes as the minister has introduced them, we can have some assurance about the future, because everybody in the country is very much fed up with the lack of certainty that now exists. This was necessary, of course, as changes were being carried out, but those who perpetuate that sense of uncertainty in the taxing structure of the country now will begin to pay an electoral price.

Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, why does it take that party so long to find out what our Treasurer told them Monday afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Touché.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does it take the member so long to find out what we are talking about?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, briefly, two points: The fact that the three per cent reduction conforms with the federal reduction, I think, is attributable to, let us say the political pressure at the time the Premier made his decision.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What nonsense!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I just have this feeling that instead of going through some perhaps more thoughtful, more convoluted approach to the reform of the tax base, the decision was made much in the same way that the decision was made to give so-called free Medicare to the pensioners: "It sounds like a good idea, boys, and the minister will agree, I know, when I get a chance to talk to him about it."

The point is that we have here a proposal for tax reduction, and it conforms with the three per cent reduction that was undertaken at the federal level. I don't necessarily disagree with what the member for Riverdale has just said. We're not talking about tax credits or anything like that; I am talking about whether or not we should conform with the federal lead or not. Obviously we should not always do so. Frankly—and I suppose it is soon enough after an election to say this—I liked the proposal, innocuous though it was, that came from the Premier at the Ottawa conference, that we do have some kind of a fairly strong committee, which in fact would involve the Treasurer and the Minister of Finance so they could thrash these things out. It wouldn't be a matter of somebody going first and you either follow or else you do something different.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, if the member likes it, how could it be innocuous?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't speak for Benson or anybody like that; I am just saying that surely it was an innocuous proposal, and I was surprised it wasn't taken up by the federal people, saying, "Yes. Great! Let's have a committee in which we can sit down and get these things together."

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Why does the member like it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a matter of fact, I am not sure what the final disposition was, because it appeared to me that either Benson or Trudeau said, "No, we can't do that. We've got to reserve all the autonomy for ourselves to do what we see fit." Then it seems to me there was something in *The Globe and Mail* a couple of days later—well, they are all secret meetings and it was very difficult to tell just what was said—that perhaps this would be reconsidered.

There has always been a continuing attempt to have close association with tax bases in the province and the Government of Canada, and we have never been able to achieve that. But we may be getting back to the days when at federal-provincial conferences they end up throwing buns and champagne bottles at each other. As a matter of fact I think that the present Treasurer would look forward to occasions like that, but it hardly fits the personality of the present leader of the provincial government. For all of our history—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't like champagne.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, I don't think the Premier likes throwing the bottles.

But, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if we will ever achieve that political Valhalla or Nirvana when there is this great exchange of views and the experts and technical people finally all decide that there is one perfect way to do it.

It just can't be done, because obviously the provinces are going to want the federal government to collect money for them and send it back, and the federal government is going to continue saying, we like to do all we can as far as equalization is concerned but you boys will have to tax for your own money.

So it seems to me there is no way, even by establishing committees, that we are going to achieve the uniformity that everybody thinks would be so great. We might as well forget about that. So it was political pressure that caused the leader of the Conservative Party to say, well we are going to reduce the taxes by three per cent too and it sounded like a good idea. As a matter of fact it still does.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As a matter of fact, we suggested it first.

Mr. Singer: Yes, yes; they also discovered America.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No we didn't.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You remember our discussions on tax reduction at the session earlier in 1971 when we pointed out to the Treasurer, and I think the Premier was sitting there too with his pleasant look on his face, that if they thought tax reduction was such a good idea, then was the time to do it, so that under the federal-provincial agreement we could inform the federal authorities that they would not have to collect so much money from the citizens of Ontario. I don't remember your thinking it was such a good idea then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We did not say it was bad.

Mr. Renwick: The timing was bad.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is just one other aspect of this, and it is probably as a result of my red-necked, rural extraction that I want to recall to your mind, Mr. Speaker, that this tax reduction and other programmes we have been discussing in the last few days has led the province to accept a deficit of \$553 million this year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you think your blueprint for government would have done?

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Why did you call it a blueprint?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is no such thing as a redprint.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It would have been if you had had the chance, but you are so far in the red—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You know, Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting thing that even with the convoluted approach by the Premier in marshalling all of the staff of the Treasury Board and the minions that he keeps over in the Frost Block, which were able to take the programmes of the NDP and the Liberal Party and price them out at \$3 billion plus, that since the election of 1967 the increase in the budget over there, largely attributable to education, a responsibility which was formerly the Premier's, was even greater than the inflated amount the Premier was able to extract from the puppets over in the Treasury block that jump when he pushes those buttons.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not nice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well it's the truth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's the truth. It is a wonder they even stuck with their jobs when you use them for such crass, low, political purposes

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear! Right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to recall to the smiling Premier, although I do believe the Treasurer is even more concerned with this, that we do have in this mini-budget a deficit of \$553 million. It is so easy to relate this as a percentage to the provincial product and to say that if we were to apply our tax take for only so many months we could pay it off immediately.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I didn't say that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You didn't say what? Your budget relates it every year as a percentage of the provincial product. You learned that from the former Treasurer, the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan). He was the one who started doing that. Do you remember when he used to have shortfalls? He is the fellow who forgot about deficits—it became shortfalls. Well he was the fellow who led the way and I think he is still calling the shots from the back row. As a matter of fact that is the only reason I have some confidence in the administration.

So Mr. Speaker, it seems to be very unfashionable even for those Tories over there to concern themselves with deficits. Anybody who worries about going into debt is old fashioned, indeed. But you know, even in the days not so long ago when we used to have the shortfalls and the man from Dunville in a most amiable and able way was justifying to a critical House the fact that we were not going to have a balanced budget, still even he must surely be concerned with the fact that over half a billion dollars is added to the debt this year. We have got a three per cent reduction and we are postulating how much this is going to cost in the coming year—\$36 million for the coming year.

We are going to have another budget, I presume, in about March, probably very early when we come back. I would trust that that would be so. There is no doubt in my mind that the government is going to be raising revenues and that it will be looking at all the possibilities. It will be examining the eight per cent sales tax in Quebec and trying to say "Could we risk that? Maybe we could go up one per cent or 1½ per cent. Surely the government is going to reject that? I

would predict, Mr. Speaker, that this three per cent tax reduction is not going to live very long. It has served its purpose, and it is not a purpose—

Hon. Mr. Davis: So far all the predictions of the Leader of the Opposition have been wrong.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —to put money in the hands of the people of the province. It was simply so that the government could say if the federal people can reduce taxes so can we. Although just five months previously it was not prepared to do it when the proposal was put before members in this very chamber.

Certainly we believe that taxes should be reduced; we are supporting this bill. It has already been pointed out that it is a convoluted and misleading thing, but I don't think the reduction is going to last very long. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in this very chamber within the next few months this three per cent is going to be tacked back on, with a few more per cents indeed added to it. The great blue machine that everybody talks about is a spending machine par excellence.

You know, Mr. Speaker, these Tory people in the back row are not going to let the fresh, young Keynesians in the front row go on spending like this. No, they are not! After all they know what happened when Diefenbaker got spending. He did not even have a budget for 28 months! They did not figure they needed it down there. He was the friend of everybody; all the money went out the window and it has taken many years of careful Liberal administration to get Canada back on the track again.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot take this tax reduction very seriously—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: When do you go to the Senate?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am not preaching flower power.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that we expect this gratuitous political handout to be taken back by the somewhat less generous powers in the Tory party in the next three months. We vote in favour of it; we will vote against the tax increases which the ministers are already forming in the frontals of their tiny little minds.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate before the minister replies? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks that have been made.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Inaccurate as they may be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Inaccurate?

An hon. member: You weren't listening.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I was. I will approach first of all the remarks made by the member for York Centre. I think that in actual fact—I do not know how he came to his calculations but—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister doesn't know how he came to them himself!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —in actual fact the return in the current year is 3.6 per cent. That is exactly what happens and that is dealt—

Mr. Deacon: That is not right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is. It is correct. It is dealt with in the Act in section 3 for the current year. It is reflected in the rate that we pay to Ottawa, or that Ottawa takes from us and has agreed to.

I must say in regard to some of the other remarks that have been made, members must remember this. This is a tax agreement with Ottawa and members know very well we do not do any of it ourselves, so that agreement is—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is right; they do all the work for us.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —is agreed upon and is signed. And one will find the percentage that is taken for the province will be reduced by 3.6 per cent in round figures for this year. The year 1972 is dealt with further on in the Act; it is a little more specific and it works out to exactly three per cent.

Again I think the hon. member for York Centre raised the particular point about the difference in rates in effect. He will find that the base for 1972 was changed not by us but by Ottawa, and we have now agreed to it. It is 30.5 per cent, but the yield of the 30.5 per cent is approximately the same as the current 28 per cent in the new statute.

Mr. Deacon: That is what we were saying.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Because the changes reduced the revenue.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is what it is; that is the reason.

Mr. Deacon: That is a change in tune from the government side.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, that was agreed to in Ottawa. I attended that meeting; there was no question. The yield is approximately the same and therefore that shouldn't confuse the member, because the amount of money coming back next year will be the same—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): We aren't confused. The government is.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and the reduction will be an even three per cent.

Mr. Deacon: Maybe we are confused by the fact that for two years we heard nothing but complaints from you about Ottawa's bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member will find that in the Act too. There is no confusion in my mind. I know what's going on here.

I must say another word—I am not too sure whether it was the hon. member for Riverdale or for Humber or what the riding is—

An hon. member: Lakeshore.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The minister confused his leader too.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is quite true that most of the Act applies provided that the Act that is currently before the Parliament of Canada passes and that these are relevant within that Act. And the cross-references and all the other parts of this bill—actually the parts of this bill we are discussing here tonight for the purpose of income tax reduction are very few.

Mr. Lawlor: A dozen of them.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is, as I said, section 3 and subclauses (f), (g) and (h), and I think it is clause 7; I am not certain—

Mr. Singer: There's nothing like a well-prepared minister!

Mr. Ruston: He really knows what he is talking about!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, it is clause 7, sub-clause 6(a). Those are the two matters we are immediately concerning ourselves with tonight. The rest of this particular bill ties in, provided that the Act in Ottawa is passed approximately or as is. The cross-references and all the rest of the sections of the bill will be held and the income tax reductions will be effected immediately the bill is

passed. The rest will be done on proclamation at a later date and provided that these changes do fit the federal bill as we anticipate.

An hon. member: Would the minister repeat that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now of course this might take some time, and indeed the hon. member for Humber might be correct—

Mr. Lewis: Lakeshore. When the minister hears the member for Humber he will know it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There may be some changes at a future date, but we don't think so.

Mr. Lewis: He will remember him for a long time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But they will be held; I can assure him of that, and brought into force as the situation warrants. I don't think the Leader of the Opposition brought up any points that need comment from me, not that I recall anyway.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister wasn't here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh yes I was; I was in the chamber all the time. That's why I said I appreciated the remarks that were made, mainly because of the member's speech.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I hope so.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In regard to the matter of policy referred to by the hon. member for Riverdale, I think it would be—now, he will say I'm backing away from my responsibilities—but it would be inappropriate—

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister going to cross the floor? Is he going to come over?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I thought in case the argument became heated, if he wanted to come out, we might settle it some other way.

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister like a blackboard?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But I think it would be inappropriate for me to make reference to the broad policy questions that he posed to me, other than what I have discussed with the members that is immediately relevant to this bill, the Treasurer's remarks and his statement stand.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister has been a big help!

Mr. Singer: Yes sir!

Mr. Lewis: There is a prefrontal lobotomy!

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of bill one.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The 4th order, second reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves second reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Before I begin I want to be assured that if I join in this debate, Mr. Speaker, you are going to protect us from the Minister of Revenue when he starts encroaching on the centre here. I want the minister to know that the hon. member for Lambton does all my small fighting for me, and I will get the member to take care of him.

In relation to the last statute my leader was—

Hon. Mr. Davis: What leader was that?

Mr. Bullbrook: My leader, the true leader. The true leader; the true red leader.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: The true red leader, Mr. Speaker, was referring, in relation to the last statute—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): We are all for the member for Sarnia!

Mr. Bullbrook: —about the meeting of the minister of finance and the first ministers being really, in effect—and they must be—champagne and bun-throwing parties.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No champagne!

Mr. Bullbrook: One has to wonder what type of liaison the Treasurer has with Ottawa—absolutely none. We go back into 1969, the member for Riverdale referred to it.

The Treasurer says the responsible options left open to Ontario in respect of succession duties therefore narrow down to two: retain the provincial tax and bring it into conformity with the new federal tax; or relinquish this tax field to the federal government in exchange for equivalent revenue. Ontario proposes to relinquish its succession duties in **exchange for 75 per cent**, as do seven other jurisdictions, I believe.

Now in point of fact, the Treasurer let the feds do something to him that they shouldn't have been allowed to do. And I wonder does the Treasurer, through you Mr. Speaker, ever discuss these things with the Minister of Finance at Ottawa.

They had absolutely no right to relinquish this responsibility to the province. I hate to agree with the Treasurer, but he should be out of the field. It should be a federal responsibility. It borders on irresponsibility on their part that they would abdicate that field to the province. In point of fact, one would have hoped—and I think I am correct really there are seven jurisdictions as of December 31 that will be in a position of not taxing wealth and capital accretion, up to January 1, 1972, I believe.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Would the hon. member mind just one correction? Our latest information is that at least six of those seven provinces will agree to the model Act. They will probably pass at their spring sessions, whenever they may be, the model Act which is being drafted by Ottawa retroactive to January 1. I do not think this is a very good principle, but that is probably what will happen.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is fine. At least we have—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I may say that that procedure was suggested by the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Treasurer does not have to take credit for everything. That is not absolutely necessary. He has a difficult enough time running Ontario; he shouldn't take credit for running, for example, Prince Edward Island too!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, we are going to do it for another four years.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to say to the Treasurer the more that I deal with him, the more I think he has great talent to run Prince Edward Island and he should be down there doing it. I think there are about 110,000 people. I hope he has a greater political impact there than he does in the city of Chatham though. I must say I was worrying about him getting back in. I hear he squeezed through.

Mr. Ruston: That is enough for him!

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could get back to the bill.

Mr. Bullbrook: We will. We will get to the bill. But in essence really then we do premise our remarks in this respect that the federal people should be in the field.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: It was to a great extent an irresponsibility on their part to not continue in the field, at least until their capital gains tax matured sufficiently.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We agree.

Mr. Bullbrook: At right, we agree. There is nothing wrong with us agreeing once in a while. It is mightily distasteful to me, but I have to do it once in a while.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member must go out and work against Ottawa.

Mr. Bullbrook: Now there is a remark. The Treasurer has now recorded—spare us—at 20 minutes to one in the morning. We did have, I thought, an arrangement that said in effect they wouldn't bring on these provocative statutes at night—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: But they do!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: We don't want to talk about these things tonight. We want to do it in the coolness of the afternoon sun, that's when we want to do it. Without any—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It makes great reading in Chatham.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, why do you permit him to be so abrasive to me all the time? Really. I want to get through this as quickly as possible.

May I say, really, through you to the Minister of Revenue, that I express some

individual and personal concern here. I mentioned to the former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), one time, two years ago, that I believe, as a matter of conscience, that this type of taxation is equitable and appropriate—substituted now to some extent with the new philosophy in connection with capital gains at Ottawa that we had hoped would bring about equity in a tax base throughout the whole Dominion of Canada.

Therefore, in effect it is difficult for us to speak against the principle of this type of taxation in the context of its present need. But I want to make some personal remarks about the statute.

I want to say that I, as one individual member, notwithstanding the validity of some of the platitudes in Monday's pronouncement by the Treasurer in connection with family businesses and in connection with family farms, and in connection with the worry about the encroachment of American capital into these small businesses, I want to say that I personally find it reprehensible and unacceptable that a spouse has to have \$500,000.

I just don't think that that is equitable when I have constituents with six children who have to drive up to buy a gallon of gas and pay 18 cents tax on it. I think there is something wrong there and I don't think that does bring forward the equity. I don't think for a moment that you really have the right to say to the stranger class that there will be no tax on \$100,000. I think you are stupid in removing the notch provision in connection with collateral and strangers. I can see equity in connection with the preferred class, but why you do a thing like that I can't accept.

In principle I can't speak against this type of taxing legislation, but I wonder really and I really would like to have an answer from the Treasurer as to exactly what he does when he goes to Ottawa to speak to the Minister of Finance. He has Ian Macdonald write these things for him; and I must say, frankly, the Treasurer comes over very well on television—he briefs him very well, really.

I am not always certain that the Treasurer really understands the substance of what he is talking about. But he does come over fairly well on television.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He does.

Mr. Bullbrook: But I wonder, when he permits this type of thing that really could in essence lead again to fracturing of Confederation. There is no reason why there

should be 10 separate jurisdictions in the inheritance tax field, eventually perhaps vying with each other for the accumulation of capital and wealth through, in effect, I suppose one could call it chicanery. Here the government is involved in section 2 in this esoteric rate schedule because of its constitutional restrictions in the direct taxation field. The federal government is not in that position, and therefore they should be the people who should be passing statutes of this nature.

What can this government do? I have a friend who is a lawyer and who is a director of 17 corporations in the Bahamas that administer over \$180 million of capital funds transported from the Dominion of Canada down there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Some of the Treasurer's best friends—

Mr. Bullbrook: The Province of Ontario can't do a thing about it. The federal government has a difficult time plugging the loopholes. I can tell the House, no province can plug the loopholes, and that is another great inequity and another great abandonment of the government's responsibility to the people of Ontario who pay that 18 cents.

We have been listening to the Treasurer and his predecessor for at least four years, year in and year out, during the course of budget addresses, complain about the lack of progressive tax fields available to him. He finally has got one here and he thinks it is equitable. He seems to think it is equitable on balance, notwithstanding the burden in connection with family farms and businesses. He still seems to think that \$500,000 is a realistic exemption. I personally, and let me underline the word personally, don't agree at all.

I will support the bill as a matter of principle. I want the minister to tell me, the Minister of Revenue to tell me several things about it. Tell me about the administrative aspects of the 15-year exemption in connection with gifts. Tell me about that, right; and the burden of paperwork that he puts upon individuals and upon his own department; tell me about that. Tell me about the application of the notch provision, the collateral and strangers, and tell me the reason for that one.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He will have to send for more staff to answer those.

Mr. Bullbrook: Tell me, if the minister would, how he proposes to administer the

15-year exemption period, which in effect, as I read it, will become applicable in 1987.

I take the position that the government is going to have to accept affidavits, in effect. It is going to put an onus on the individual taxpayers in this province that they can't fulfil. Basically that's the attitude that I have in connection with this statute. We will, I take it Mr. Speaker, support the bill in principle because of the fact that it does have some equity of purpose, but I wanted to lodge my own personal complaint as to the exemptions.

Mr. Lawlor: We won't!

Mr. Lewis: We just won't.

Mr. Lawlor: This piece of legislation is a blockbuster. It is the first opportunity we've had in a number of years really to go to work on succession duties and we intend to do so. We think that this piece of legislation is a blasphemy against any principles of equity or any concept of a just tax mix.

Mr. Speaker, we take particular umbrage in this party with having to contend with these measures one by one in isolation. What has been introduced by way of a novelty in the House is a mini-budget. Strictly speaking, we should have a budget debate because with this kind of legislation mixed in with personal income tax and with corporation measures, it does change the whole orientation of the tax system. The minister warps it. He places the incidence of tax on the wrong shoulders and it is only when we get the whole picture, Mr. Speaker, that the impact all the way along the line can be felt.

Bringing in a truncated and a severed debate to bear on matters of this urgency with the vastness of importance that is implied in these measures, seems to us a complete dereliction of duty. But of course the government is riding high these days, so I don't suppose it much matters. But I would like it to percolate through the crevices to the people of Ontario that this is a really high-handed way to handle measures. In cutting off what is effectively a debate on a wide-ranging issue, and the government will cut me off in a moment if I should seek to inter-relate the measures, so I will dwell at some length on this Succession Duty Act, so called, presently before us.

First of all I, too, concede the obvious. There is no difficulty if the thumb sticks out sorely to see that that's the case. When the Treasurer says on page 20 of his statement that the immediate elimination of the estate

tax was an incredible about-face, that's perfectly true.

It put the onus on the provinces to prevent the obvious inequities inherent in a tax system which eliminated death and gift taxes when the tax on capital gains had barely started.

Those are fair words.

When he talks about exactly what I'm talking about—the tax mix—when one eliminates a particular tax position from which revenues have been indispensable and relied upon for considerable periods of time on this kind of short notice and without proper consultation, it sends awry the total tax picture, and inevitably in an inequitable way.

All the prating, posturing and platitudinizing about taxes that we have heard from both levels of the government, and the complete abandonment and betrayal on Benson's part of anything ever resembling equity so far as Carter or even his own propositions were concerned, a year or so ago; and the almost equal obnoxiousness and posturing of this present government in the preservation of established positions and the status quo in the economy—it is this kind of tax measure.

Whether or not you maintain degrees of an inequitable wealth currently, while people are alive, surely when wealth passes over from one generation to the next generation by no desert whatsoever, by no simulacrum of a reason—why they should inherit that money. What have they done to earn it?

I have spoken on this measure before in this House. You, as free enterprisers, you may have to say you have to make it the hard way all over the faces of everybody else in the process of doing so—this is the inherent jungle philosophy which you espouse. Why don't you stick to it and say that the younger generation must make their own way? Why should they have visitations from the "Gods from on High"—largess poured in upon them, so that young men start off in life with half a million dollars or \$2 million in the kitty.

What kind of egalitarianism is that? What kind of free enterprise philosophy? Where is achievement, initiative and the overbearing competitive urge under those particular contexts?

I repudiate your whole wretched philosophy, but at least you should be consistent with what you hold yourselves.

Oh no, oh no! You happen to be aligned with those groups to whom it is beneficial and somehow sentimental that the largest

possible amount should be handed down to the next generation in perpetuity and should be protected at all costs within the terms of your legislation. And that is precisely what you are doing in this particular legislation, against the seconding and the establishment of commissions, of select committees, of committees who operate within the government structure itself and the whole position.

Just let me refer you to what Smith had to say about the situation on tax and some wealth taxes. At page 132 of his resume in an analysis of the whole tax picture, volume 3, he says:

Wealth taxes cannot be justified in any form at the provincial level by any strict interpretation of the principle of benefits received, and yet there is considerable merit for the point of view that holds that the private accumulation and maintenance of wealth are made possible in good part by the actions of government in creating and protecting the economic and social structure within which such assets are amassed.

This contribution by government is surely of greater value than the cost of providing the services paid for through taxes. It can be argued that the state, as a silent partner in the accumulation of private fortunes, properly should share on behalf of all citizens in the prosperity of its more affluent members.

And it goes on. Smith as I read him throughout that lengthy chapter—and I won't go through it with you—says:

The basic element that must be preserved is where widows and other relatives, dependents particularly, must be kept in a condition to which they have grown accustomed and to which human decency is accorded. But beyond that, it is all free play.

Not only that, but within the terms he sets up for you a complete revamping—where you set up a single schedule, not three schedules as you presently have. Not the messy business of having three distinct classes—preferred, collateral and stranger class—and then taxing them up until recently, in three different ways—taxing them with respect to a basic tax which is different in each instance as you perpetuate it within the terms of your present legislation.

Then, at the end of this long, long section, placing an additional tax computed on a completely different basis; three separate and distinct bases upon which the tax is

levied. There is not a lawyer in the province whose head doesn't spin in the face of The Succession Duty Act. It is a magnificent juggernaut. It's a labyrinth of nonsense, and you have been told to change it for almost six years now.

The previous Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) and the previous Treasurer of Ontario all said they had it under immediate, urgent and almost instantaneous advisement; and as members of his House, we sat over here panting to see the thing emerge from the womb. But this is stillborn, as most things that are highly beneficial are.

So you've got these three things with the additional tax and the surtax superimposed at the end. Last year you took the surtax off preferred beneficiaries, now the government is purporting to take that surtax off the collateral and stranger class.

Now why? Why, I would like to know, does the government set its basic rate at \$100,000 now? As my friend says without the notch provisions too rising above that, which makes for the greatest type of inequity. Eliminating notching provisions imposes an extra weight, so that the man in the next bracket up possibly will have to end up with less of an estate after he pays the tax than the man that is in the bracket below him, or even two or three brackets below him. That is the effect of that particular elimination. But the main point in here is, having set the \$100,000 floor under this particular tax, by what reason does this government in its openhandedness confer upon some remote relative, or some total stranger, living in Transylvania—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where?

Mr. Lawlor: Ubangi—in Ubangi. He never has seen the old man, does not even know he exists, and along comes the bonanza from Billy Davis—a \$99,999 cheque and Ontario doesn't want a dime.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't have any relatives in Ubangi.

Mr. Lawlor: And Ontario says: "Oh, you distant relatives in Ubangi, whom we never heard about, need that plenitude of the Province of Ontario more than our own people, we who have toiled and worked here. This man has made his fortune under our benign and plenary auspices, because we have been in power so long and the economic conditions we have stimulated have been so gratuitous and beneficial that you fellows have made a pile of money. So we

want to disperse our largess over the face of the earth and don't want, in our unanimity, a dime in return.

And that is what the government's legislation does.

Isn't it ridiculous? Think about it. The stranger class up until recently began to be taxed at \$10,000 and it was taxed at a very heavy rate. The surtax was 25 per cent on top of every other tax and it brought in a considerable amount of money.

I would have the Minister of Revenue peruse the background reports that were issued along with the Smith committee. These had to do with the earliest estates they had in their hands at the time, 1963 and 1964, and were done for the committee by Kenneth Shane, John A. Grant and Henry Prager. They are fairly lengthy, with numerous tables which show conclusively, without my going over it in any depth, precisely the munificent revenues that are derivable from this tax without undue weight on anybody's shoulders, particularly the man who happens to be dead, and it lies at the minister's fingers.

El Dorado lies at his feet; the way by which to stimulate people into activity by taking their money away from them, or at least not conveying to n'er-do-well heirs a pile of money of that particular kind; to stimulate them in activity so that they will all become entrepreneurs out to make a fortune in their particular lifetime, to prove what magnificent human beings they really are and how much more vitality they have than the rest of us poor slobs who don't dedicate our lives to quite those purposes.

In any event, this is what the minister is doing at the present time by raising these levels.

And what does he say? He is probably going to stand on his hind legs and say, "Well, we are going to cut down the estates of \$40,000 or \$45,000—maybe the \$50,000 estates—this coming year to about 5,000 estates that are actually taxable.

I don't think the minister is going to get any reduction of staff at all. The consents have to be applied for in any event. The \$50,000 estates will have to come through the minister's hands and be perused, whether they are taxed or not, and the people have to do the job. So from the point of view of saving administrative costs there is certainly no benefit, as far as I can see, in that particular area.

I would have the minister reconsider, as he peruses over the Christmas season, the

possibility of reversing himself in the spring, particularly with respect to the stranger class in this particular context.

You know, he should even go further and take a look at the preferred class. The people to whom the \$100,000 benefit is given at this initial rate are as follows: Any estate given for the benefit of the father, mother, spouse—well you know there may be justification there—the grandfather and the grandmother.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): That is the member for Lakeshore!

Mr. Martel: He forgot more than the hon. member will ever know.

Mr. W. Newman: The great philosopher.

Mr. Lawlor: I don't know if you resemble Grandma Moses. Keep quiet!

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are discriminating again.

Mr. Lawlor: Why should a son-in-law—a daughter-in-law, I can imagine possibilities there—but why should the son-in-law be supported by such a grant?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't you like mothers-in-law?

Mr. Lawlor: Mothers-in-law aren't protected within the wording of the statute. You don't give the poor old mothers-in-law a break.

That is the kind of government you are. You discriminate, you include the wrong kind of people and exclude the right. If you take them out, why should brothers and sisters—they may be just as well off or better off than the one who is leaving the money—why should they be given a collateral and preferred status under your legislation? I think it is a dead giveaway. What you do is you pretend to double the rates. Having hit the \$100,000 figure—

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean dead giveaway? That is a Freudian slip.

Mr. Lawlor: —you proceed to double, I think in one case, the rates for preferred beneficiaries. It is up to 10 per cent plus.

They are notched up as you go from \$100,000 to \$150,000, whereas your previous rate was five per cent. But that doesn't mean that you are doubling by any means the taxation on the estate, because the federal government—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): What is the previous rate recorded?

Mr. Lawlor: —in abandoning the field completely, has created that particular room for you to move into.

Listen, you cannot do me any good. It is just conceivably possible that your particular—

Mr. Kennedy: You mentioned a previous rate. What is the previous rate you mentioned?

Mr. Lawlor: The previous rate was five for preferred at that particular level.

Mr. Kennedy: Five per cent?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. Now it has gone to 10.

Mr. Kennedy: And what section of Smith were you quoting about 10 minutes ago?

Mr. Ferrier: If you had your ears open you could have heard.

Mr. Lawlor: If you want to look it up, page 132. I will be quoting it again in a moment.

Mr. Kennedy: Section 132?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Page 132.

Mr. Lawlor: I was pointing out to them what a mess this legislation is.

Mr. Kennedy: Oh, I know what you were trying to do.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lawlor: You happened to be clued in on this because you were one of us, that little band.

Mr. Kennedy: Oh, I know. That is why I wanted to check your accuracy.

Mr. Lawlor: It didn't apparently stick to your ribs because you haven't been talking to the right people.

Mr. Kennedy: No, it stuck to my head.

Mr. Lawlor: After all, you are inside the caravan. Can't you speak to the camel driver over there and have him alter a bit the dromedary?

Mr. Kennedy: No need, it is spelled right out.

Mr. Lawlor: He never was on the committee; you kind of excuse the poor devil.

Mr. Kennedy: No, but it is spelled right out. You are misquoting the principle in the sections.

Mr. Lawlor: All right, here is what Smith says about this wretched legislation.

Mr. Stokes: Can't the member for Peel South do his own research?

Mr. Lawlor: At page 146 he says:

This brief summary should give the reader a notion of the bewildering complexity of the tax as it is now applied in Ontario.

This is quite a few years ago, gentlemen.

Mr. Kennedy: Yes, but we weren't bewildered.

Mr. Lawlor: Permit me to read from the report. Smith is one of those ripe Conservatives who has, nevertheless, a fairly just view of things and, if it could only be inoculated—to continue:

The actual statute that dictates these intricacies is frequently so abstruse that it has gained almost universal notoriety among practitioners as being the worst piece of tax legislation in the books of the province. One writer has called it unparadonable; certainly a thorough rewriting of the Act is long overdue.

In succeeding sections he will show you how to do it. You have had it before and you have had it since.

Another matter I want to talk about precisely is this 15-year rule. This is a very interesting new departure on the part of the government. How do you propose to go back and obtain affidavit evidence or other forms of it as to gifts that were given within a 15-year period? Is this—

Mr. Singer: It is a long time since you practised law. It is the simplest thing in the world proving a gift 15 years ago.

Mr. Lawlor: —particular piece of mental gymnastics solved in the memory? Is that to be a substitute by this government for the gift tax? It seems to me there is something operating in the minister's mind.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Surely the hon. member would realize that is brought in at this point to protect our position until such time, presumably at the spring session, as we pass a gift tax Act as proposed by the federal government, the model act of which the

Toronto Sun mentioned the other day. This simply does not allow the—

Mr. Lawlor: Why 15 years? Why not five?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because, I think, many of us would contemplate living for five years and could very well give a great deal away on January 1.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is one part of the bill the member should be supporting.

Mr. Renwick: It is 15 years from January 1, 1972.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right, yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why do you need it for 15 years?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Even the hon. member for Riverdale will live that long.

Mr. Renwick: Why do you need it that long?

Mr. Lawlor: Another myth that is perpetuated by the Tory party and joined by that arch-Tory Benson at the present time—and I have heard it ad nauseam in this House—is the business of the Treasurer saying repeatedly, and apparently completely oblivious to any counter argument or open to the numerous times which members have pointed this out to him—his basic argument is that as capital gains taxation goes into effect in Canada inheritance taxes of all kinds will be eliminated.

I say to him that should not necessarily be true. There are instances where on death a capital gain would be realized. If a man invests his money in the stock exchange, holds it for a number of years, does not turn it over and dies, this stock may very well have gone up a considerable percentage.

Mr. W. Newman: It sure will have by the time the member gets finished.

Mr. Lawlor: But suppose he dies with half a million dollars saved in this particular way? Are there not dozens of other ways in which a man would not make a capital gain and would simply accumulate money by investments, say in mortgages, over a period of years? Or investment in various forms of paintings or art works or other things where no capital gain would necessarily be involved? Nevertheless the accumulation has taken place and no capital gains tax would be attracted at death. The minister may argue back and say this person is paying

on income, he is paying on interest in the case of mortgages or rental in the holding of houses in this particular regard; but that is not the complete answer by any means.

It comes to this, that he has half a million bucks when he dies. A buck is a buck, as somebody said, and when it passes on one man gets hit with a tax on a capital gains situation on half a million and the other man pays absolutely nothing and it goes off to his remote relative in Ubangi. The ministers bow their heads in the face of this situation.

If a man is paying ongoing income tax with respect to benefits derived from investments during his life, that can be calculated back and credit given with respect to the capital gains situation on death, but there is no reason for him to escape completely from paying inheritance tax. The government has to preserve against it although I have not seen a single instant where the minister has argued that way.

On the contrary, everything he has said in the past two or three years has all been precisely the opposite. He bears it out in this most recent statement of the other day. That myth, I say, must be punctured. I would trust tonight, since it is so late and the impress of my word must be almost indelible, in order to get rid of me, unless the minister surrenders and says that he will give this goodly consideration when he brings out his revised legislation; that he will not any more, as long as he lives, lift his head from where he is and say that ridiculous piece of chicanery and myth-making that you have been given to over the past few years—if he promises that, I will sit down almost immediately. If he doesn't—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: If he doesn't, I will use coercive measures.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What does the member want me to promise? Because I am really tempted!

Mr. Deans: Make the promise again. He wants to hear it again.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): He says if we almost promise it, he will sit down.

Mr. MacDonald: Remember, the stubborn Treasurer!

Mr. Lawlor: Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I want to advert for a moment to

gift tax. There is no provision at present in the province; we are left dangling, bereft with respect to gift taxation. It is an extremely serious matter because everyone agrees unless we have a proper gift tax the whole base of any kind of succession duties we might have can be and will be eroded. They will give everything away before they die and therefore we will get no tax on the accumulated savings of a lifetime; that would certainly undermine the whole purport and intent of the legislation.

But what I would like to know under this head is since there are no proposals for a gift tax before us, nothing whatsoever in this legislation, does the minister propose to introduce retroactive tax legislation under this head? And doesn't the minister agree that he is somewhat derelict in his responsibility in being forced into that position?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I am not derelict.

Mr. Lawlor: It seems to me the last kind of retroactive legislation the government should contemplate would be tax legislation—it is practically unheard of—but here they are, as usual, blandly thinking that sometime in the spring they are going to retroact their legislation back to January 1; otherwise they could be in serious trouble with respect to their tax base. If that is their intention I would like to know tonight precisely what they want to do under that particular head.

I think we will send this legislation into committee of the whole House too, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I would like a more adequate explanation than has been given thus far as to how these rates are set and with respect to the notch provisions—why have they been eliminated, what is the purpose behind that? These various nice matters, which attract lawyers more than anybody else, nevertheless need some explanation for the purposes of whoever would be brought so low as to have to read the Hansard.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, one or two comments. When the hon. member for Lakeshore began his speech I was interested in hearing that he quoted something from the Smith report that sounded as if the recommendation from Smith was that the provinces should get out of the field and leave it entirely to the federal authority. At least that is the way I understood him. I would just like to read the recommendation from page 208.

Mr. Martel: The member is a little sleepy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It reads: "That Ontario make representations to the government of withdrawal to from the death tax field." I must say I personally don't agree with the basis of that recommendation, but there it is in the royal commission that really has postponed tax reform here now for a full decade.

I know the Treasurer would disagree; he is careful in all his budgets to list the areas of tax reform, like payments to pensioners and payments to farmers and that sort of thing, that he construes as tax reform. We have argued that before and I have a feeling we may again.

But the statute imposes a tax on wealth from this province that will accrue to public treasuries in general the same amount of money that was extracted from the province in the past. I find it almost incredible that his exclusions have narrowed the number of taxable estates down to 2,000 but he claims—at least his experts claim that is the case, that the taxation of wealth has always been something of great concern here.

I was also interested to read in the Smith report that back in the Thirties, succession duties were our major source of income. It seems incredible, because there is a tendency to think of it as something that is not so important—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What is \$100 million?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right—as some people that I know might say.

The other thing is that the hon. member for Downsview, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce and I were just trying to figure out why the government needs that 15-year provision, when if in fact it is going to pass a bill within three months imposing a gift tax that may be retroactive to January 1, that is going to look after the possibility of some of the government's millionaire friends and relatives giving large amounts of money that would be tax free. I don't see any loophole whereby those transferences of wealth could take place without being taxable.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think it simply serves notice. None of us, presumably none of us in this House subscribe to the principle that retroactive tax legislation is a good thing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So you are going to make it retroactive and protect yourself.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But by legislating the 15 years now, we at least serve our

intent that we will be bringing in, in effect, a gift tax of some sort or another.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It appears then that it is not important whether it is three months or 15 years or 70 years.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well what is the importance?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Perhaps when the minister is talking about it, he can refer to it because I don't—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The thing is you shouldn't die retroactively.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, well it doesn't look like there is any good time to die if what you want to do is pass on your estate without it being taxed, unless of course it is within those limits.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No good time to die, period.

Mr. Speaker The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Martel: Give it to them, Jim, one hour!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, it is only on rare occasions that we have an opportunity to debate a bill which reflects the fundamental divergence in philosophy that exists between the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party with respect to the taxation of wealth. That's what we are talking about. We are talking about the kind of taxation which should be levied on transfers during the lifetime of persons, or as a result of their deaths, to avoid the undue accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few people in the Province of Ontario; and I would hope at some point in and throughout Canada.

You only have to look at the very close connection between democracy, as we think we know it, and the plutocracy, which can easily arise if you insist upon minimum taxation of the transmission of wealth. In the United States it is very clear now that it is just about impossible for anyone to achieve elected office at the federal government level in the United States of America unless in fact he is a millionaire and in most cases a millionaire many times over.

Let's make it perfectly clear that if we are talking about the maintenance of the democratic system of government, or if we are talking about something deeper than that, and that is a sense of the democracy of the society in which we live, then we have

got to recognize that power follows wealth. Power is parallel to wealth. Power is commensurate with wealth. To the extent that we have a framework of taxation which in its full complexity permits an undue accumulation of wealth in the hands of a minority in the country, then to that extent you are going to have an undue accumulation of political power.

It is just as simple as that, and if I may quote very briefly, Mr. Speaker, from "The Real Report on Poverty" which was published recently by those men who resigned from the staff of the federal committee on poverty headed by Senator Croll, let me just quote this to you:

Taxes are collected to finance government programmes and manipulated to help stabilize the economy. They can also be used to redistribute income and wealth from the rich to the poor and so inject an element of equality into the life of the nation.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): You are right, Robin Hood.

Mr. Renwick: To continue:

But wealth in this country is largely and securely concentrated in the hands of a minority. Canada's system of taxation does very little to dislodge it. There has been no narrowing of the gap for 20 years and if the new legislation is anything to go by, there will be no such narrowing over the next 20 years.

Mr. Havrot: Narrow minded!

Mr. Renwick: The point, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. Succession duties, inheritance taxes, death taxes, estate taxes, inter vivos gift taxes of one kind or another, are the democratic method by which a government, which is sensitive to the maintenance of democracy, ensures that there are not concentrations and accumulations of wealth in the hands of a minority in the country. What we are saying about this bill is that we object to the emasculation in the present bill of the present legislation, inadequate as it was in any real sense of wealth taxation.

Mr. Havrot: Get to the point!

Mr. Renwick: We sensed the emasculation in three or four ways.

First of all, the minister has said—and we have opposed this right from the beginning—that they were prepared to vacate the field in favour of the federal government estate tax.

We disagreed with that proposition because we think there are other methods than a simple flat rate estate tax for the purpose of taxing wealth.

We felt in addition—and we realized—that the elimination from the federal field of the estate tax and the gift tax would force this government into maintaining at least the existing succession duty statute as we knew it.

But no, the government has to then start to whittle away at even the remnants that we have of an effective inheritance and estate succession duty tax in the province. We find the Treasurer saying, Mr. Speaker, that because of the capital gains tax we have got to look at this matter of our Succession Duty Act and phase it out gradually as the capital gains tax comes into force.

Mr. Speaker, as the Carter commission tried to point out very clearly when it tried to bring capital gains, or so-called capital gains into income to be taxed as income, there is a very real distinction between the taxation of income, the taxation of capital gains and the taxation of wealth. We in this party are committed to the proposition that we tax income, we tax capital gains and we tax transmissions and transfers of wealth in addition.

The problem, Mr. Speaker of course, has been that what was at one time thought to be an essential ingredient of the democratic system has ceased to be that. Under the Conservative government the shrinkage of the taxing net of the tax on wealth is similar to the decline in the share of the revenues of the province which are produced by the corporate sector. The lines on the graphs go just like that over the period of Tory rule in the Province of Ontario, in both instances.

What we are saying is that this government insists on permitting accumulations of wealth in the hands of the corporate institutions of the province. It persists in permitting the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the large financial institutions in the province. It insists in permitting the large accumulation of wealth in private hands and in private trusts at the expense of the very fabric of the life of the democracy that we are supposed to be engaged in preserving.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renwick: It is no point to say that democracy means only something called the election of representatives in the system of

government as we know it to come and sit in this chamber.

When we talk about the reorganization of government, part of the problem that we're faced with is the whole sense of the participation of people in their government. The report of the committee on productivity points out in some of the matters which they've said are part of an on-going study, how do people who haven't got any wealth, who haven't got any leverage on the system, how do they get a sense of participation in government? How do they get any sense of participation in the policies which affect their very lives?

One of the reasons why they don't have any leverage on the system is because they have to knock on the doors of people who look at things from an entirely different bias and from an entirely different attitude. That attitude runs through the whole of the media; it runs through the whole of the advertising system of the country; it runs through the whole of the affluent society.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Come on, come on!

Mr. Renwick: And that is that there is a constant day-in and day-out selective influence—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All it needs is a good member like "Grossman."

Mr. Havrot: Let's get to the point.

Mr. Renwick: —day-in and day-out selective influence on the whole of the society for consumption for affluent purposes.

Thorstein Veblen spoke about it many years ago—the theory of conspicuous consumption.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renwick: And every one of our institutions today is designed to trap people into the theory of conspicuous consumption.

Now let us get back, Mr. Speaker, to the guts of what we have in the Province of Ontario. A real society—

Mr. Havrot: Yes, let's have a vote.

Mr. Renwick: —a society with long traditions. A society which is not prepared to succumb to all of the modern aggressive instincts of the United States of America or of the other highly industrialized empires. We do not happen to believe in this party that the only way in which a civilization can

be organized is on the basis of a constant insistence upon the need for consumption—

Mr. Havrot: Who does?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Even the member for Lakeshore is smiling.

Mr. Renwick: —a constant insistence that the only way that men and women can be gainfully employed is in a society producing material goods for consumption.

Mr. Havrot: Fairy tales!

Hon. Mr. Davis: He doesn't believe that and you know it.

Mr. Renwick: Now let's get it perfectly clear and let's make no mistake about it. This party stands fundamentally opposed to that party on the question of the democracy of the system as reflected in the tax structure. The tax structure, as we understand it, is one of the methods by which you reorder the priorities of an economic life in the society—

An. hon. member: The member doesn't want democracy, eh?

Mr. Renwick: —which has gone haywire.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): What would the member do about it? He doesn't have an alternative.

An hon. member: A hibernating bear woke up!

Mr. Renwick: It's gone to the point, as we debated tonight—we debated it and we saw the result of it—day nurseries, not for people, day nurseries because the government can't in any other way create the kind of jobs which are required.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for York South wants us to have more of them and the member for Riverdale wants fewer.

Mr. MacDonald: The Prime Minister's confusing the whole argument.

Mr. Renwick: We have asked for an increase—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I said within the framework of how the government was presenting it as winter works.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Let's make it perfectly clear. What the leader of this party said and what

the member for York South said on that bill is on the record.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Mr. Renwick: They wanted an increased appropriation for the purpose of providing day nurseries for people, not just for the purpose of creating the jobs that, for some reason or other, the government feels is the be-all and end-all of the kind of society that it wants.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Three times the amount, he said. I am talking about what the former leader said.

Mr. Lewis: The all-productivity principle.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Jobs are for people!

Mr. Lewis: You're slaves to growth, endless growth.

Mr. Renwick: Well that is another debate I say—the Minister of Trade and Development, we will debate that again. Project 500 didn't provide a single job and will not provide a single job for one of the persons in receipt of assistance under the general welfare assistance or the family benefits plan. It will provide jobs for highly skilled people at the expense of money being used for those who have not had that amount of capital invested in their education.

With that diversion, Mr. Speaker. I will simply come back and say that what we are trying to say brings into play all of the opposite terms—affluence and poverty, power and powerlessness, and all of those matters. Why is it that after a quarter of a century or more of Tory government there are still in the province of Ontario one million people living at a level that is less than adequate at the present time? Why is it that there are 400,000 units of individuals or of families who are living at a subsistence level? And this government only provides support for about one-third of them. The rest of them aren't going to—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Let's debate this bill that is before us.

Mr. Renwick: What I was coming to say is that those people will not be transmitting \$100,000 tax-free to the next generation; those people will not be making \$5,000 gifts to their children this Christmas; those people will not be transferring half their net income after tax for the preceding year without any gift tax.

Let us make absolutely certain that when this model bill for gift tax comes into this Legislature there will come in a bill with some adequate teeth to tax the transfer of wealth *inter vivos* and that the ministry will be able to bring in an up-to-date, modern and effective succession duty bill to tax wealth when it is inherited as a result of death. When that is done then the philosophy of this party will have matched that of the Conservative Party, and we challenge them to bring it in—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do not want to match the NDP philosophy.

Mr. Renwick: —because it is part and parcel of the continuance of the vitality of the democracy under which we live. If the government persists in the method it is following, it will ultimately destroy the democracy that we know. And no managerial techniques, no reorganization of government, no manipulated conveyance of information to the community will ever restore or maintain the basic sense of equality which is determined in a society by a relative degree of equality of wealth.

When we have a relative degree of equality of wealth, we have a relative degree of the distribution of political power; and when we have a disparate degree of the distribution of wealth, we have a disparate degree of the distribution of power. That's why, Mr. Speaker, we in this party are going to oppose The Succession Duty Act amendments brought in by the government.

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

Mr. Deacon: I wish to make a couple of comments in connection with this bill. First of all, I certainly go along with the principle of increasing the limit for widows who have shared in the accumulation of the wealth to some degree. I think the degree cited in this bill is far higher than is necessary to provide for the future requirements of a widow.

I also believe in the principle of raising limits to the preferred to protect family businesses and farms of a small nature.

Mr. Lawlor: Did the member say half a million was too high?

Mr. Deacon: Yes, and I think it is a very important part of the social fabric of our society that it is possible for small businesses and family farms to be passed along without being destroyed by succession duties.

But basically in my view Mr. Speaker succession duties are an equitable form of tax; they also do a great deal to improve the fabric of the country. How often we see tragic circumstances where a father who is successful in accumulating wealth fails his family miserably because he thinks he is doing right by them when he provides them with a large bequest and sees that they are set up in such a way they don't have to work any more.

What we are doing in succession duties and I hope anything we do in regard to gift taxes is to make it difficult for large amounts of wealth to be passed along from one generation to another.

Only too often we have seen businesses destroyed because of the fact there was never any other benefit passed along by the parent who has been successful in accumulating wealth. He has failed to give to his family other benefits which are not of a material nature but are an ability to cope with life and live a life that's constructive and adds to the society in which they live.

So I am very sorry that in this bill we have set limits which I think are excessive, although I support the position of the bill that there is a necessity for increasing the limit to widows and to preferred beneficiaries.

There is absolutely no reason to have this increased limit now for non-preferred beneficiaries. I cannot go along with that; there is no reason that wealth of an estate in excess of the present limits should not be subject to tax.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, as a newcomer I am somewhat surprised at the amount of furor that has been aroused over legislation that so accurately reflects the philosophy of a party like the Conservatives. Indeed, whether we are talking about day nurseries or whether we are talking about corporation tax or succession duties or income tax, it matters not.

In the past two years, Mr. Speaker, corporation taxes in the Province of Ontario have gone down 39 per cent while personal income taxes have gone up 37 per cent. That is exactly the way that this government does things. That's how they do things for people.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to enter the debate? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, of course the debate has wandered on a very broad

base and I am just not too sure who said what, but I will try to answer the hon. members—particularly the member for Sarnia. He wanted an answer.

Mr. Bullbrook: I was inclined to think I was a write-off.

An hon. member: I didn't wander at all.

Interjections by hon. members!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I want to assure my hon. friend from Riverdale that I don't want to stand here and appear to him to be a Santa Claus dressed in a blue uniform, nor do I want, in the words of Gordon Sinclair probably, to appear to be Scrooge either. But then one doesn't know what position to take and I wouldn't want him to think that I would be one of those people who would believe that a bill such as this would create some type of plutocracy. I am not that kind of a person. I think he would know that and—

Mr. Lewis: You are a member of the plutocracy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is such exaggeration.

Mr. Lewis: You are one of the leading bloated capitalists.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, you are not planning to be—I must say that to the member of the NDP.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well it's not an original phrase but I think that Scarborough West's branch plant from Ottawa is trying to create a family compact to take the whole show. Would you not call that plutocracy?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: To being with; for my hon. friend from Sarnia, the announced provisions are not removed. The announced provisions remain in but the repeal takes place to take care of all of the new categories, so the announced provision does in fact apply to all categories.

Mr. Bullbrook: The provision wasn't applicable to strangers before.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well it is now.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is what I am asking you—why?

Mr. Speaker: This sort of debate is out of order. The hon. minister will reply to those points raised previously.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is forgetting what was asked of him.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I must admit that I misinterpreted that part of it. They are all put on the same base.

Mr. Bullbrook: But why strangers?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well now, that is the way it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You can be against it if you want.

Interjections by hon members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I want to say to the hon. member for Lakeshore, we agree that the bill is not by any means the best kind of bill. We will say that to you, and we will say that it is of a rather temporary nature.

Interjections by hon members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well all right. I am telling you now and that part of it is my responsibility and I will agree with you on that base.

I will say to the hon. member that nobody knows—and he can't tell me either—what the effect of capital gains is going to be. We don't know what it is going to mean to the Province of Ontario; consequently that's the purpose of the 15-year drawback at this time. I can assure the member as the Treasurer can assure him that as we get a clearer picture of what will happen to the Province of Ontario in regard to cash flow from the federal government, we will certainly amend that particular part of the Act. As time goes by we can fully implement the sections of the federal Act as they apply to us.

As far as The Gift Tax Act is concerned—I think that was explained to the member as well—we will consider the model Act when it comes forward and he will then have the opportunity to consider to what degree he wants to tax people. The opportunity will occur then.

I say to him that the entire bill in front of us now is to take care of the present situation on a temporary basis, so that on January 1 in fact we will have no less revenue in this

regard than we have now. And, as I understand it, we will receive from the estates that will be taxable under this Act approximately the same dollars as we received before.

Mr. Cassidy: They are giving away \$30 million to the very rich!

Mr. Johnston: People died poor!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member can be sure we have made provision that the cash flowback will be retained after January 1, and the 15-year provision is part of that.

Mr. Cassidy: It is in the Treasurer's speech. They are taking \$30 million less.

Mr. Johnson: You never had it so good!

Mr. Cassidy: That is as much as their three per cent tax Act is worth!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We will also watch very carefully what the maturity of capital gains tax will mean to the Province of Ontario; we are vitally interested in the future of this province.

As I listened to the member for Riverdale and somebody else talking about the great decline in corporation tax and other taxes, I thought it is a funny thing that Ontario enjoys the position in the economy of Canada that it does.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In consideration of what was said it seems peculiar that they don't understand that. One of the other things that is diminishing is the size of that party; it may well go down beyond what it is.

Mr. Lawlor: Not seriously!

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): Wait until 1975!

Mr. Lawlor: We will become more vocal.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now that might not be adequate for them, but that is my reply to remarks that have been made.

Mr. Lewis: It is not adequate.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister permit a question before he sits?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are on second readings—assist me, because I am obviously very obtuse—but, as a matter of principle, what is the directing philosophy that there should

be an application of the notch provisions to strangers in the same equity as to spouses? Please explain that to me.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The explanation of it is that the stranger now comes into that particular category; we're just going to make the same provision of this law apply to him.

Mr. Bullbrook: At least we've got it on the record.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on! What does that mean?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It means he doesn't know.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I do. The member doesn't know.

Mr. Lewis: What is the notch?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Does the member know what the notch is?

Mr. Lewis: I am asking the minister to enlighten us on it.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 3. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

The House divided on the motion, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Bounsall
Apps	Burr
Auld	Cassidy
Beckett	Deans
Bennett	Dukszta
Birch (Mrs.)	Ferrier
Brunelle	Foulds
Bullbrook	Germa
Carruthers	Laughren
Carton	Lawlor
Clement	Lewis
Davis	MacDonald
Deacon	Martel
Downer	Renwick
Eaton	Stokes—15.
Edighoffer	
Evans	
Ewen	
Gaunt	
Givens	
Grossman	
Hamilton	
Handleman	
Havrot	
Henderson	

AYES

Hodgson
 (Victoria-Haliburton)
 Hodgson
 (York North)
 Irvine
 Jessiman
 Johnston
 Kennedy
 Kerr
 Lane
 Lawrence
 (St. George)
 Leluk
 MacBeth
 Maeck
 McIlveen
 McKeough
 McNeil
 McNie
 Miller
 Morningstar
 Morrow
 Newman
 (Ontario South)
 Nixon
 (Dovercourt)
 Nixon
 (Brant)
 Parrott
 Potter
 Rhodes
 Root
 Rowe
 Ruston
 Scrivener (Mrs.)
 Singer
 Smith
 (Simcoe East)
 Smith
 (Hamilton Mountain)
 Smith
 (Nipissing)
 Snow
 Spence
 Stewart
 Timbrell
 Villeneuve
 Walker
 Wardle
 Welch
 Wells
 White
 Winkler
 Wiseman
 Yaremko—71.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion for second reading now carried.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Some hon members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House.

CORPORATIONS SECURITIES REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Carton moves second reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend The Corporations Securities Registration Act.

Motion agreed to, second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Welch moves second reading of Bill 9, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, there are a few points that I want to put before you and to the Minister of Education. The provision here means that the Treasury of the province is not going to be involved in paying the normal share for the contributions of those covered under this Act. It will be left to the local boards, no doubt receiving some grants for this purpose, but raising substantially a large sum of money from the local assessment for education purposes to contribute the share that is normally and has in the past been paid from the provincial Treasury.

We believe, on this side, that already local assessment carries far too great a share of education costs. It seems unreasonable to add to this share by the provisions of Bill 9.

The second thing I want to raise briefly is that one of the things wrong with superannuation statutes in the past, although they may have served the purpose for the time they were enacted, changes in the cost of living soon put them out of date. We find

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 71, the "nays" 15.

that the provisions in the pensions provided mean that after a number of years those who should be properly served by the pensions are not so served; that the pensions are not related to the cost of living as they might be.

I think the former Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), and certainly his predecessor John Robarts, will well remember the large numbers of teachers who used to send delegations and come themselves to meet the education committee, protesting the inadequacies of the bill. It has been since amended more than once but I believe that Bill 9 essentially retains this weakness—that with the passage of time there will be inadequacies and inequities that are bound to creep in.

Mr. Foulds: There are three comments on the bill on which I would like some clarification. By and large I think the bill is a good one. It even incorporates some amendments that are commonly known on this side of the House as the Martel amendments.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Hear, hear!

Mr. Foulds: Point No. 1, I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, is on clause 3, section 2a, subsection 1(a). Why does the superannuation commission wish now to have the right to acquire property? I would hope that the building and obsession with buildings that has characterized the rest of the educational bureaucracy of this province since the Sixties will not be the result of passing this clause in this other field, this other portion of this educational field. I would like some clear-cut assurance from the minister to this House on that.

It seems to me extremely unfair also that sub-clause 2 on the top of page 2 could, in fact, contribute unduly to the administrative expense of the plan.

Point No. 2, Mr. Speaker: I would ask the minister to explain to the House why, at this time again, members of the staff of colleges of applied arts and technology, who are recently members of the plan, have the option to opt out at this point. I am sure there is a perfectly reasonable explanation but I would like to receive it.

Point No. 3, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to raise: I would like to suggest to the minister that clause 9 on page 5, which forces the members of the teaching profession to contribute to the plan, at least to the level as if their income is \$5,000, even if their income is below that level, is discriminatory

against the part-time teachers. I would suggest to the minister that this will inhibit the whole freeing of the rigid attitude that we presently have of who is and who is not a teacher.

I am convinced that in the future in the school systems we will be relying on specialized skills which may come more and more from what we currently call part-time people—such as housewives, technicians and people in industry—who might, in fact, be so-called half-time employees of, say a formal school system and industry.

Those are the comments I would like to make and to bring to the minister's attention.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: In the interests of orderly alternating, the hon. member for Downsview should have the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address just one query to the minister in regard to this bill.

Sections 1 to 10, according to the explanatory notes, effect a change so that the province will no longer contribute the employer's share, but the various boards such as the Elliot Lake Centre for Continuing Education and so on will.

What really is the government achieving? All of the institutions listed in that clause receive their money from the government of Ontario, and what great reform is it achieving now? The government is taking it out of one pocket and putting it in another.

If these various organizations have to contribute the employer's share, then the government will have to give them some more money so that they will be able to contribute it. If they don't contribute it and the province continues to contribute it, then the government won't give them the money, but it still adds up to exactly the same thing. So what is the real magic the government is achieving in including in this statute sections 1 and 10?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, at the present time most teachers are required to teach for 40 years in order to qualify for a full position. This is true of any teacher who started to teach at the age of 18, 19, 20, 21 or 22.

Anyone starting to teach at age 27 can draw a full pension after completing 35 years of service. Since the earliest age at which a

person begins teaching is 18, the magic number of age plus years of service is 98. For a 62-year-old teacher who has reached only 35 years of service, the magic number is 97.

What this bill accomplishes, therefore, is the reduction of the present magic numbers of 97 up to 102, down to a magic number of 90 for all teachers of 35 years' experience.

Under the proposed legislation, a teacher will receive a pension based on two factors. First, age plus years of service must equal 90. Second, the pension is to be calculated as two per cent of the average salary for the last seven years, times the years of service—up to a maximum of 35 years of service. That is, the maximum pension can be obtained only if the teacher has given 35 years of service.

On the surface this sounds reasonable until it is examined from the point of view of the number of years the pensioner will draw the pension. The life expectancy is somewhere in the vicinity of 74 years.

Let us compare the effects on two teachers on the staff of an Ontario secondary school. Each is now finishing his 35th year of teaching. I shall call them Mr. Young and Mr. Old, because Mr. Young began teaching at the age of 21 and taught for 35 years, and he will be retiring, or drawing his pension, then, at the age of 56.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where is the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young)?

Mr. Lewis: Near Bridgetown.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Old, starting at 28 years of age after 35 years of experience is now 63. Now you will note that Mr. Young will receive a full pension for seven years longer than Mr. Old, although both have made the same contribution.

Mr. Bullbrook: Start over again.

Mr. Burr: I will start over again from—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We understand it completely.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Young will receive a full pension for seven years longer than Mr. Old, although both have made the same contribution. The new pension scheme will change nothing for Mr. Old, but Mr. Young will be able to retire five years sooner than he would have been able to under the old scheme.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, under the previous scheme—the present scheme.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Old has his own scheme.

Mr. Burr: I am sorry. Old with a small "o"—under the present system.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Forget it.

Mr. Burr: Do you want me to repeat that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Ferrier: The member is even driving the member for St. Catharines out. Keep it up!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: I have no big complaint about the benefit that Mr. Young will get, but why not do something for Mr. Old, because his contribution will be as great as Mr. Young's? Both will have made the same contribution to the fund, yet Mr. Young will receive his pension for seven years longer according to the average life expectancy. The change in legislation, whatever its other virtues, does not treat both teachers fairly.

This situation can be made fairer—not fair but fairer—by not requiring 35 years of service. Perhaps the magic number should be put at 92. In that case, a teacher beginning to teach at the age of 30, would at retirement be 61 years of age with 31 years of service. I could give the whole table but I'll skip down to 20 years. A man beginning at 20 years—

Mr. Martel: Give them the whole table!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: I'll give them the whole table.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Spare us!

Mr. Burr: I shall spare the members.

Mr. Bullbrook: I was on Mr. Young's side for a while—now I like Mr. Old.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, rather than using A and B. I used the terms Old and Young so that some members who are a little weary could distinguish between the two.

An hon. member: Make it easy for them.

Mr. Burr: I was trying to make it easy for them.

A teacher beginning at the age of 20 would retire at the age of 56 with 36 years of service. The way it is now proposed in the legislation, the teacher who starts in his late twenties is heavily penalized. There are large

members in this category, especially among the shop and commercial teachers. The shop teachers must spend several years gaining practical experience and thus, of necessity, they must start their teaching career much later.

The method of calculation of pension will not be any more complicated. If there is an objection to paying the same pension to a teacher retiring at 62 with only 30 years experience as is paid to a teacher retiring at 56 with 36 years experience, remember that the older teacher will be drawing a pension for six years fewer than the other. This will more than make up for the extra superannuation contributions paid in by the younger teacher.

Now, let's go back to teachers A and B.

An hon. member: Mr. Old and Mr. Young.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Go back to Young and Old.

Mr. Burr: All right, now that members are acquainted with Mr. Young and Mr. Old, I had better stay with them and see what would happen using the 92 figure as the magic number.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Mr. Burr: Mr. Young, beginning to teach at the age of 21 would retire at 57, after 36 years of service. Having a total of 93 points, would be able to retire with a full pension. Mr. Old would have been able to retire three years ago at the age of 60, after giving 32 years of service. Each would get the same pension but Mr. Young would get his three years longer.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Burr: This would more than compensate him—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the member prepare this himself?

Mr. Burr: This would more than compensate him for his four years of extra contributions.

Mr. MacDonald: The only difference between him and the Premier speaking on estimates for education grants years ago is that he understands it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member means I didn't?

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Burr: The new proposal would benefit greatly teachers who start at 20. That is, the proposed legislation before us would benefit greatly teachers who start at 20. The later a teacher starts, the less he will benefit from this legislation, until those who start at 27, 28, 29 and 30 will receive no extra benefits.

I have no objection to the new proposed legislation, if it does not insist on 35 years of service, although I fear that there will be considerable expense.

However, reducing the years of service is in line with the latest practice in industry and there is a desire on the part of the public, I think, to enable younger teachers to obtain positions. I would hate to raise objections to any scheme that brings improvement to teachers, but I would like to see a better balance.

If the new proposal becomes law, secondary teachers will probably wake up to find out how discriminatory the legislation is. So Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the magic number be reduced from the 97 to 102 range, down to 92, rather than to 90; and that the 35-year provision be removed. I am confident that this formula would be much fairer to the teachers themselves and less expensive to the taxpayers. I urge the minister to consider this suggestion, otherwise he may well find that he has created a pension scheme that is too generous for some and too discriminatory for many.

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

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have only a couple of minor points to comment on with respect to the bill. It is rather interesting you know that while the teachers were pleasantly surprised with the new Minister of Education's bill, I for one can't understand why the former Minister of Education, who now occupies the seat of the Premier, for three years steadfastly refused to introduce these very amendments, particularly with married teachers and so on. Maybe it was because he said no the first time and he just couldn't change his mind; he felt that he might be losing face.

But I congratulate the new Minister of Education for making the pension schemes for teachers more equitable and removing the clauses which most teachers found so distasteful and which were discriminatory. We could never drive that message home to the Premier though.

There are only a couple of minor complaints, Mr. Speaker. The superannuated teachers were somewhat disappointed. I realize that the minister will probably tell me that because health premiums will be removed and so on that that will offset it, but it really doesn't do much for those teachers who are at \$2,100. It was certainly the hope of the teachers that that area in particular would have seen some improvement, and that is probably the most disappointing aspect of what is a very good bill.

Mr. MacDonald: The government continues to perpetuate poverty.

Mr. Martel: I want to ask the Minister of Education, through you Mr. Speaker, what the department has decided with respect to the common law wife. As I understand it, the Canada Pension Plan now pays the pension to the common law wife and teachers are painted with the same brush as other people in society.

I want to know what assurances there are—and I don't see them in the bill—which would direct the pension of a teacher in a common law marriage to the dependants receiving that part of the pension, rather than as it exists now where, maybe, if it was the first wife, even if not seen for 20-odd years, it would still go that that person. I would appreciate the minister's comments with respect to that matter as well.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate?

The hon. minister.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, may I handle the inquiries that have been made?

In connection with the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Downsview, I think the Leader of the Opposition perhaps would note that in the explanatory note we are not including school boards in this particular matter, so when he makes some reference to that they should know that this is not indeed an increased expenditure to the school boards.

Also in speaking to the point raised by the member for Downsview, we should note that not all of the institutions mentioned here are necessarily in receipt of their funds from the government of Ontario, but concerning those that are, I suppose the point that he makes should be seen in view of the fact that this should be considered good programme budgeting to have these institutions,

as the separate institution from the school board situation, making the contribution as the employer.

As for the points raised by the member for Port Arthur—three particular points—I would draw his attention to the fact that his fears should be put to rest by the conditions that are set out. I am talking now about the point he raises insofar as the building is concerned, namely that the commission requires the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. If he would read that section very carefully as well, he will notice that it deals with “real property on any interest therein necessary for its actual use and occupation.”

I would draw those two points to his attention because we would agree that we would not want the commission to be getting involved in the real estate business itself and really would make some judgements with respect to administrative costs on the basis of whether or not it is more economical to own than to rent that amount of accommodation that it requires for its use.

He makes some reference to the teachers in the colleges of applied arts and technology. I would point out to him that the option really applies only to those members on the staff as of the end of this year, who in fact will elect the option. So really it is for them to make that decision, following which these teachers will be required to look to the college fund for their superannuation benefit if you see that particular section.

Concerning the other point with respect to the minimum of \$5,000—I just forget what section that is now—oh yes, section 9—I would draw his attention to the fact that this really applies only to the private schools which are included in the plan. Certainly, to speak specifically to the point he mentioned, no discrimination was intended, but it is the opinion of the commission that it is necessary here in order to provide the base for the minimum pension.

As for the two other points that were raised, I am sure that it would be no surprise to the member for Sandwich-Riverside if I were to admit that I have had some difficulty in following all of the points that were being made, except to say at this point may I simply reiterate the principle of the legislation.

Really what we are doing in this legislation is removing the penalty which chronology imposed on those who wished to take retirement after completing the mini-

imum period of 35 years service, namely that they could not have the benefit of their pension until they reached at least age 62, and therefore they would have a reduction-on-account-of-age if in fact they wanted to retire prior to age 62. We are still insisting on the 35 years of service, but then, if, in fact, the years of service plus age equal the minimum of 90, the teacher or the contributor to the pension is allowed a fully earned pension.

We think this is consistent with what is going on in the private sector, and indeed is consistent with good pension policy.

With regard to the other points, perhaps it would be sufficient to say at this time that I would certainly ask the commission to review in some detail the point which the hon. member makes and ask for some report from them.

However, the principle of these amendments—

Mr. Deans: We will come to the minister's office in the morning and go over it with him.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —is in fact to provide a full pension provided the minimum number of years—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The whole thing was left in such a mess for the minister to fix up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought they would have surrendered by now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —the number of years of service have been rendered.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is this filibuster?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are getting the old and the young.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The only point that I haven't covered is the point raised by the member for Sudbury East—if I have dealt sufficiently with the young-old dialogue—which we will leave for another time.

An hon. member: How about the Martel amendment?

Mr. Stokes: That is not the Martel bill.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is the Martel bill? This is the bill of the government of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the Martel meanderings.

Mr. Martel: Did the minister forget himself?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am sorry. What was the particular point the member wanted to know?

Mr. Martel: The common law situation.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I am sorry. As far as the common law situation is concerned, I think that is covered by policy which is already incorporated.

Mr. Martel: The teachers aren't aware of it, then.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh, I see.

Mr. Martel: They are in that predicament. We are being crude again.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

MANAGEMENT BOARD OF CABINET ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill 13, An Act to establish the Management Board of Cabinet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I know how anxious the government is to complete the list of bills, but I understand we are going to be sitting in the morning at 10:30 and I think it might be wise to save the government partial reorganization bills until that time.

The Premier wants to proceed with the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might do two of them tonight and

get them out of the way. If there need be some general observations, the management board of cabinet really is very similar to the existing Treasury Board; it's a change of name. Perhaps the discussion could take place on the executive council bill; we might get two of these through.

Mr. MacDonald: That is okay.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Will that be all right?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading.

Agreed.

POLICY AND PRIORITIES BOARD OF CABINET ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill 14, An Act to establish the Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I thought for some reason that the Premier was going to hold that one over, so that we could have it—

Mr. MacDonald: Hold the next one over.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the Premier mean The Executive Council Act, which allows him to pay the provincial—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it provides for the appointment of provincial secretaries, which is included in the planned reorganization.

Mr. Deans: We can have all the debate on the one bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

EXTRA-JUDICIAL SERVICES ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I think that at 2:40 in the morning it is a little ludicrous to get into a bill or two that will probably

involve some debate. I would suggest again that perhaps this is the time to adjourn and we can deal with these tomorrow.

Hon. J. White (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Had enough?

An hon. member: Does the member agree with them or doesn't he?

Mr. Singer: I don't agree with them, no; and I am going to disagree with them at some length. Do we want to go on or are we going to adjourn?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Well go ahead!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: On we go.

Mr. Singer: All right.

Mr. Lewis: What is this, an initiation for the government's new members?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A baptism of fire!

Mr. Lewis: What is it all about?

Mr. Singer: What is the point? What are they trying to prove?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No one is trying to prove anything. There have been some informal indications that a number of the members opposite would like to see second readings completed this evening, so we could go through the committee stage tomorrow.

Some hon. members: No, no!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We said we would cooperate with whatever the government wanted to bring forward, but it is now 2:40 and other bills have been brought forward.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not the impression that was left over here.

Mr. Speaker, this would be a suitable time to adjourn because apparently we are going to sit at 10:30 in the morning, and the House leader suggested that we are not going to rise for lunch. Probably we could finish by this time Saturday morning if we really put our minds to it, even though we adjourn now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are not going through the Sabbath.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think any of us want to be sitting here until this hour on Saturday morning. Certainly we are not anxious to sit any later or earlier this morning than anyone else, but I do want to

make it rather clear that the government was under the impression that at least some members opposite thought there was some wisdom in getting second readings out of the way this morning.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Fine then, Mr. Speaker. I am quite prepared to go ahead with these bills tomorrow, and of course if necessary we can sit a little later. In fact, I have even left Monday and Tuesday free in my schedule.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let us sit right through Christmas!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, right through to Christmas if necessary, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to think it is not necessary.

Mr. MacDonald: We could have come back in November.

An hon. member: Which Christmas, Ukrainian Christmas?

Mr. Speaker: I must point out that there is a motion before the House and we must dispose of the motion, probably by withdrawal of the motion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Liberals just lost the York-Forest Hill vote.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, let me move the adjournment of the debate on Bill 16.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A very courageous act.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I thought it was very clever of me.

Mr. Singer moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2:45 o'clock, a.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, December 16, 1971

Supplementary estimates, Municipal Affairs, concluded	249
Supplementary estimates, Public Works	254
Supplementary estimates, Social and Family Services	263
Day Nurseries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wells, second reading	283
Day Nurseries Act, reported	284
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, second reading	294
Income Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, second reading	297
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Winkler, second reading	305
Corporations Securities Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Carton, second reading	320
Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welch, second reading	320
Public Service Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading	325
Management Board of Cabinet, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, second reading	325
Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, second reading	326
Extra-Judicial Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, on second reading	326
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	327



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, December 17, 1971

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971



CONTENTS

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1971

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors with us today, in the east gallery, from Thornhill Secondary School of Thornhill, and from Jones Avenue School, of Toronto; in the west gallery, Herron Valley Junior High School, of Toronto; and in both galleries, students from R. H. King Collegiate Institute of Scarborough.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

TRIAL OF KINGSTON PENITENTIARY INMATES

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, did not the Attorney General tell me earlier in the week that he was going to make a statement to the House giving his views on the plea bargaining that was reported from the Kingston trials, and also explaining any participation of himself or his staff in such bargaining?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier in the House that I thought it would be most unwise and perhaps unfair for anyone, especially the Attorney General and others in public life, to be making statements to the press while the appeal period was still going on. The appeal period is not up as yet so I envisage that it would be my responsibility to make a statement some time after the appeal period is up. I believe the appeal period ends December 22.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the minister comment on the reports in the Toronto Sun that the involvement of his department and his deputy was predicated on the cost of the trial which seemed to be escalating with the use of legal aid personnel?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I would not want to comment on that.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Nor to deny it?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Nor to deny it. Nor to comment on it in any way—to deny it or to accept it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The difficulty I have in this, of course, is when a previous question was asked of me earlier I said, yes we were involved—

Mr. Singer: Why didn't the minister make a full statement at that time rather than just blurting out "Yes, we were involved"?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I blurted it out, did I? My word.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No, it was a very considered response, unlike others.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I must comment on the part that, of course, involvement, no matter how meagre-minded some people can be in respect of what they may consider an involvement, it has to be down one lane only. There can be many ways in which one can be involved and for many purposes, not just one.

Mr. Singer: The minister is practising to be a Davis! That is a good statement that last one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is not wearing his Davis pin! He is going to get into trouble!

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

CHECKER-BOARD METHOD TO ESTABLISH PROPERTY TITLES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, another question of the Attorney General: Will he make some comment to the House on the importance of the decision of the court of appeal not to hear questions on this checker-board method of establishing title to property

which was put forward by people in his department at the request of the former Minister of Trade and Development, or the former Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs in connection with the Whiterock situation?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The report has been received by me from the Lieutenant Governor and the report has not yet been—

Mr. Singer: The Lieutenant Governor?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That's right.

Mr. Singer: Court of appeal?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That's right.

Mr. Singer: Does the Lieutenant Governor give decisions to the courts of appeal?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, and—if the member has got something to say, stop muttering and stand up and say it!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): The member for Downsview is going to lose his QC for that! He knows that.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): It is that red shirt he has got on this morning!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It is my duty to transmit the report from the Lieutenant Governor to the Lieutenant Governor in council. This was received only yesterday by me. Obviously the executive council hasn't had time to consider it and when it does, there will be a statement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Since the executive council would probably be looking for the opinion of the Attorney General or the chief law officer of the Crown—what a nice phrase—in this connection, would the minister tell the House whether or not he feels that the title of the people who have bought Whiterock lands is in jeopardy?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That will be considered by the executive council.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the Attorney General telling us that decisions of the court of appeal are transmitted through the Lieutenant Governor and if so, when did this start?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I can't give the hon. member today the history of our traditions in this province but—

Mr. Lewis: I think it was Sir Edward Cope in 1192.

Mr. Singer: When the court of appeal gives a decision, it gives a decision.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, that's not true.

Mr. Singer: It is not true?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I won't go into it this morning but at some time or other if—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why don't they get together in the hall?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes! If the hon. members of the House as a whole are interested in it, I would be glad certainly to dig up some legal research and have a lecture given. I am sure most of the hon. members aren't interested in that type of technicality. I am surprised the hon. member isn't aware of the procedure.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is restricted to the legal fraternity.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary, can the Attorney General advise us whether or not the government has any intention of bringing in some legislation to protect those people who in good faith apparently were taken advantage of by the looseness of the laws of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the government's intention will be known in due course.

Mr. Deans: That should have been the first question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA AND ITS INSURANCE COVERAGE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, pressed as I have been by the legal fraternity in this House, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

The question is, how does he intend to handle the dilemma of the Law Society of Upper Canada which insured itself and its members on errors and omissions insurance with the Guardian Insurance Company of Canada, paid out \$550,000 worth of

premiums, received \$5,300 in actual return by way of losses, and saw another \$94,100 set aside to cover claims under way. Then the company terminated the contract with the Law Society of Upper Canada, departing with a clear profit of around \$450,000, something which the Law Society of Upper Canada says in the language of lawyers:

In these circumstances we were greatly surprised [to put it mildly] to receive notice dated September 23, 1971, that the Guardian did not intend to renew the contract beyond its expiry date of December 31, 1971.

Can I ask the minister, having been right to the question throughout, what he intends to do on behalf of the Law Society of Upper Canada in its legitimate plight? How can insurance companies get away with this kind of thing in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): If they can do it to the Law Society of Upper Canada, think what they can do to the public.

Mr. Lewis: I think that accounts for the turmoil on the opposition benches this morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the government hire a lawyer?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Labour and Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Superintendent of Insurance is looking into this matter presently. I also understand the Law Society of Upper Canada say that they are not going to let this go by without some action on their part—

Mr. MacDonald: And people's rights may finally get protected!

Hon. Mr. Carton: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am personally interested because I, too, was insured under the—

Mr. Lewis: I gather that they are now entering a three-year contract with Lloyds of London. Will this be scrutinized by the Superintendent of Insurance? Quite apart from woeful penury of the legal profession and the implications this has for them, how does this kind of thing occur without the Superintendent of Insurance having some control over the behaviour of insurance companies?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That policy is to protect them from insurance companies!

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Suppose it wasn't a group contract?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Any contract that is made with an insurance company—or rather, every contract is not looked into by the Superintendent of Insurance! I think the member for Scarborough West would appreciate this. However, when it does come to the attention of the Superintendent of Insurance, certainly he looks into it.

An hon. member: An obstacle course.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would the minister advise me if I am not correct in saying that the contract to which the hon. member for Scarborough West was referring was written for one year, and the letter from which he reads an extract merely is a notification to those members of the Law Society that the company decided that at the end of the year it didn't want to renew?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I believe so.

Mr. Singer: That is correct. Sure it is.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. member for Scarborough West has further questions.

Mr. Lewis: It was then an ill-advised contract. I would be pleased to act on behalf of the legal profession in any future undertaking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: May I—I have had experience! I have dropped out of both the U. of T. law school and Osgoode Hall! I have a record in this field. Can I ask—

Interjections by hon. members.

COMPLAINTS BACKLOG BEFORE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS BRANCH

Mr. Lewis: It is not bad for seven hours later! Can I ask the Minister of Labour a further question in his primary capacity. Is it true that there are 1,500 to 2,000 complaints by way of backlog before the employment standards branch at this moment? That the employment standards branch cannot handle them? That they will be delayed for more than three months in several instances? That they have required additional staff and Treasury Board says "no," and that they are actually referring some people to prosecute under The Master and Servant Act rather

than using the employment standards branch for the purposes for which it was intended?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member states, there is a backlog in the employment standards branch, and particularly in certain areas; it is a case of getting additional staff, which I am hoping I will be able to get.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, who covers the costs for people who are forced to engage in legal prosecution rather than using the facility of government which the legislation provided?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will let me know the specific people who are involved in this matter, I certainly will take it up. I don't think the reason why—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): This is a general problem—not just one or two.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Howard of his branch probably would tell the minister.

Hon. Mr. Carton: In any event, will the member give me the specific names of the people who have been told this, because I am not certain that this in fact is the case?

Mr. Lewis: I will ask the director of the branch for the names and convey the names to the minister.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: Is it correct that the minister is having difficulty with the Treasury Board in getting approval for this extra staff to catch up on the backlog?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We all have difficulty.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I never have trouble with the Treasury Board, and I am hopeful that this will do the job.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He just never gets his way—that's all! We all have trouble.

METRO CENTRE MEETING

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question, I guess in the absence of other ministers, of the Minister of Trade and Development. Can he tell me for what purpose a private meeting was held Wednesday, December 15, involving a number of government departments, including the Ontario Housing Corporation, the Ontario Water Resources Commission and the Departments of Trade and Development and Transportation and Communications—all

at the behest of The Department of Municipal Affairs—to discuss matters relating to Metro Centre, with the Metro Centre developer present? What was the purpose of the meeting? Why was it held in private? And what was discussed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as I am not familiar with the fact that such a meeting was held, I will get the information and find out if in fact it is true, and if in fact the information can be given to the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Could the minister also find out whether any meetings will be held with those who represent an alternative public view rather than just those who are necessarily protagonists purely for the Metro Centre view?

One further supplementary attached to that: Could the minister also find out whether at the meeting it was clear that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would announce before Christmas that they have reached an agreement with Metro Centre Development for location of their studio facilities in the area immediately north of Front Street, what this means in terms of the ultimate project, and whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs will therefore recommend it to the OMB?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is part of the scheme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

Mr. Lewis: Good.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has further questions?

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

FARMERS' DRAINAGE CLAIMS

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. What is the reason that thousands of farmers have been waiting for the payment of drainage claims in the amount of many thousands of dollars each since last August? I had a man in yesterday who has been owed \$3,000 since last August, and there is no way of him getting paid because the minister's staff said they were flooded with claims and couldn't process them. My point is that if a man owes the government \$3,000, he is going to—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member should confine his remarks to the question.

Mr. Sargent: Why can't the minister step up this need for the funds right at this time?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the question quite well. It is the difficulty in processing the number of applications for capital grants and I assume that is what the application is for—a capital grant. We have been besieged with applications. We realize that we are behind. I believe the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) the other day said we were caught up until September, I had hoped that was the case. The member for Grey-Bruce says it is an application from August.

Much of the problem associated with the delay in processing these applications less rapidly than we would like, is because there may be something lacking in the application. Perhaps a receipt is missing, and they have to go back to be properly made out. It requires a great deal of correspondence back and forth in many of the cases, and all of this holds up the processing of the applications.

Then, of course, the grants are finally approved by our department. They are then sent over for consideration by the Provincial Auditor's department to Treasury for the processing of the cheque. This seems like a long, cumbersome way of doing it, and it will be changed within the next few months so that our department may be able to process them all, as has been recommended by the committee on government productivity. I think it will speed things up greatly. The process, however, is somewhat delayed today. We are trying to get it straightened out.

The hon. member may recall the debate in the House on my supplementary estimate the other day of \$6 million for capital grants. It gives members some idea of the enormous increase in the demand for capital grants from the \$6 million budget we had for this year, we will now require another \$6 million, up to \$12 million. The applications are greater already this year than I would say they have been in any previous two or three-year period combined, certainly in any two-year period combined before.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary: I appreciate that, but the fact is that the minister's department—

Mr. Speaker: Question; question!

Mr. Sargent: The question is, Mr. Speaker, why should this man be able to get his cheque today because a member of Parliament called on his behalf yesterday? What happens to the other thousands of people who don't go to a member of Parliament? Do they sit and wait until the minister's department is ready? In other words, is it true that he doesn't have enough staff? He said he did not have enough staff, so this is probably the reason. Again the people will suffer because you are not properly co-ordinated.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Is there any response to that question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I don't really think that was a question; it was just an antagonistic remark directed at the department. If the hon. member had been in his seat the other day rather than out parading around somewhere he would have heard me say—

Mr. Singer: Parading—that is not a criminal offence.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—that there were three people in that department in other times—in that branch in other years processing these applications. The number of people processing them now has been stepped up from three to 14, and there has not been new staff engaged. We have simply taken them from other branches and put them in there to concentrate on picking up the backlog of applications. I gave the undertaking, Mr. Speaker, to the House the other day that we would not only continue with that amount of staff but we would try to get an arrangement through the provincial Treasurer's office that we could process these applications and pay the cheques directly rather than go through this circuitous route that I just described. We are hopeful that that can be accomplished.

Mr. Sargent: Would the minister not agree that if he were in private business he would starve to death, because one can't run a business that way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How is the member for Grey-Bruce doing?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor, West.

WINDSOR HOUSING UNITS

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Can the minister inform the House, in the proposed sale to the residents of the housing units in the Bridgeview area of Windsor, why OHC refused to accept the second appraisal price, even though the tenants were asked by OHC to pay half the cost of the second appraisal price to determine the sale price of the homes and, secondly, the tenants had agreed to pay the price as determined from the second appraisal even if those prices were higher than the first?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I was closely involved with that a few months ago, it seems to me. Were there not three appraisals? Will the hon. member remind me?

Mr. Bounsall: Only two as far as I know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if I recall, in the first instance the prospective purchasers weren't satisfied with the appraisal which OHC came up with. They thought the prices were too high. And I believe, at the meeting which I had with the tenants subsequent to that, another appraisal was ordered. It depends on whether you put it positively or negatively—is the glass half full or is it half empty? The hon. member said "even though the tenants paid half of the cost." It seems to me that we offered to pay half of the cost for another appraisal so that they wouldn't be put to too much expense if they weren't happy with the first one. Indeed, I can't recall whether there was an additional appraisal because they weren't happy with the second one.

The independent appraisal, which I think they ordered—and I stand to be corrected on this; I'm trying to answer this question because this will probably be the end of this session and I want to make sure that I give as much information as I can—it seems to me that at one stage the appraisal which the tenants themselves, the prospective purchasers, had ordered—and we either paid half of it for them or all of it, I can't recall—but that appraisal came up with higher prices than the ones which the OHC appraisers had come up with, and they were dissatisfied with that! I may not have the chronological events in detail correctly in my mind.

I can assure that hon. member we did everything possible to make sure that there was a fair appraisal put on those homes because we were very anxious, and still are, to

make it possible for any tenant of OHC to own his own unit. Indeed, we have been working on a plan which will make it possible, hopefully, if it turns out to be practical, for thousands of tenants of OHC units to have some equity in them and eventually own their own property.

But within the context of that policy—or the hope for such a policy—we have to make sure we are fair to the taxpayer. That a tenant isn't getting a house for \$8,000 or \$9,000, for example, when the taxpayer may have paid \$19,000 or \$15,000 for it. I am taking these figures out of the air; they don't necessarily reflect the actual situation. But we have to make sure equity is done, not only for those whom we want to purchase the homes but for the taxpayer who has an investment.

I am not too sure what the status is now because I haven't heard about it in the last month or so, as far as I can recall. If the hon. member has any further information I will be glad to have it. In any case I will ask for an up-to-date report from OHC and will be glad to advise the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the plan for purchase of OHC homes by tenants that the minister has just talked about anything different to the plan his predecessor talked about at least three years ago, at which time I tried to convince him that such arrangements should be made for Lawrence Heights? Has any progress been made in the past three years to allow tenants of Lawrence Heights to purchase Ontario Housing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not familiar with the Lawrence Heights situation, Mr. Speaker. That will all be thrown into the hopper when we are discussing, and hoping to finalize, the policy I refer to about making it possible for tenants to be homeowners.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary.

Mr. Singer: The minister talked about it for three years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I didn't.

Mr. Singer: Well, his predecessor did.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West with a supplementary.

Mr. Bounsall: Does the new plan which the minister has for purchase of housing units by the tenants of OHC include an arrangement

whereby some of the rent paid by the tenants over the years, in some cases a great many years, can be applied toward the purchase price of the units?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am not in the position to advise the House as to whether the plan—if indeed we can come up with a plan which is practical—does anticipate this. All I can say in general terms is that we would be very happy if all of the tenants of OHC became owners—

Mr. Singer: The minister said it was a good idea and why didn't he look into it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and we will do everything possible to accomplish that. Mind you, it cannot be done as easily as if the hon. member for Downsview was in charge, because he has simple answers to everything.

Mr. Singer: It has been done. They did it in Moosonee a couple of years ago, although they did not tell the minister that.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for St. David.

TORONTO-CENTRED REGION

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics. In the study now proceeding on the implementation of the concept contained in "Design for Development: The Toronto-Centred Region", is the minister contemplating the provision of monetary incentives for those land-holders engaged in agricultural pursuits in zone 2, the commuter-shed?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether incentives would be the right term, but certainly very much part of the thinking of the government are those people, for example, in zone 2, who by reason either of a municipality's official plan or by reason of stated action of the provincial government, will in fact not be allowed to develop their land to the potential to which they otherwise might have. Certainly it is part of our thinking that the assessment on that land should reflect the lack of development rights, if I can put it that way.

I may say this is not only true in zone 2 of the Toronto-centred plan, but I think it is something which the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) and the assessment people generally have very much under consider-

ation, that assessment perhaps should be more closely related to official plans and, therefore, the value of land, the market value of land, should be more truly reflected in the assessed value, which is one of the reasons for reassessment across the province. But certainly nowhere is the problem more acute, or nowhere is action more necessary, than in zone 2 of the Toronto-centred plan. I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that those of us on the Treasury benches have been effectively—

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is answering questions like these interminably over the past several months. He still talks that way, and this is one of his members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —I was about to say the matter has been very effectively brought to our attention by the member for St. David, and we listen to our members.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the Treasurer answer them?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. Renwick: By way of a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Renwick: Is the Treasurer going to compensate landlords in the province—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I respectfully point out to the hon. members that on two occasions I have requested your co-operation by indicating when you rise that you do have a supplementary. Then we will not find ourselves in the position where I am passing by an hon. member when he does, in fact, have a supplementary. So, if the members would please try to co-operate in that respect, it would be much appreciated.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question to the Treasurer, is the Treasurer planning to compensate land-owners in the province for loss of development rights?

Mr. Lewis: Which was the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would not put it that way at all, but I think that the assessed value should recognize the potential of development rights, or if there are no development rights then presumably the assessed value should be less.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. David on a supplementary.

Mrs. Scrivener: I believe I have been misunderstood.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mrs. Scrivener: The purpose of my question was to raise a query about something which, I hope, is under study inasmuch as I consider that agricultural pursuits in the zone 2 commuter-shed area are desirable and an important amenity for this area. My question was whether or not there will be an incentive to keep these lands in agricultural pursuits. If I have misstated my question I am sorry.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should apologize.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member for St. David.

Mr. Lewis: One down, one to go.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Don't count on it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Don't count on it, no.

Mr. Lewis: No, I am not counting on it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion is an excellent one. I believe there are studies under way on this matter and in due course the results of those studies will be related to the House and translated perhaps into legislative action. I can only assure the hon. member that this government has a great interest in those people who are engaged in agricultural pursuits—

An hon. member: They all talk like that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and we will look after those people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has become a ministerial parody of himself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Singer: Has the minister been taking courses on how to answer questions in the Davis style?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Why doesn't the member take some lessons on how to ask them?

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister take some on how to treat the farmers with politeness?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where did the polite bit come from?

Mr. Singer: Like me.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Rainy River.

MERCURY LEVEL IN FISH

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Has he been in dialogue with the minister in Ottawa who has dual responsibility with regard to raising the allowable tolerance level of mercury to one part per million from 0.5 parts per million?

Mr. Lewis: That means, has the minister talked to them?

Mr. Reid: I understand Sweden has done this already.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of the Environment): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not been in direct contact—I assume the member is talking about Mr. Davis, the federal Minister of the Environment—But I might say that the staffs of each of our departments, along with, of course, the provincial Department of Lands and Forests, have been in constant consultation regarding the standard or criterion for mercury in fish.

There have been some changes, as the hon. member has mentioned, as far as the so-called experts in Sweden are concerned and those people involved with the World Health Organization, but it is in a state of flux and to a certain degree in a state of confusion.

Mr. Reid: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has any research been done by any Ontario government department to indicate that perhaps the 0.5 parts per million is perhaps a much higher level than need be and that we could raise the tolerance level to one part per million?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if there has been research to the extent of finding out what the effect would be on human health, or whether our Department of Health or any other department would be involved with that. What we are doing is trying to decide if one part per million or 0.5 parts per million is a reasonable standard, and our conclusions will be based on whatever the World Health Organization standards are. I doubt very much if there

is research going on in Ontario as far as the effect on health is related to those standards.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, a new question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has the reply to a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Sudbury.

COMMERCIAL FISHING DISPUTE

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Yes, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member asked me, regarding the continuing dispute between the commercial fishermen and tourist operators in the Killarney area, if the minister had come to a decision regarding the commercial fishing line in the Grondine Point area.

Mr. Speaker, we plan to amend the line to further restrict commercial fishing activity in in-shore waters adjacent to the mouth of the French River and Grondine Point. The exact location of the line is being worked out, but it will provide more separation between the recreational fishery and the commercial fishery. This is in line with the objective we have had for years of assuring that fishery resources will be fully utilized to produce maximum economic and social returns to the people of Ontario.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister realize that the decision to remove the line outward will result in causing and aggravating the unemployment situation in the Killarney area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would say that this question of conflict between commercial fishermen and sport fishermen is one that is before our department continually. We certainly do not want to do anything to adversely affect the commercial fishermen; at the same time, the sport fishing industry is a most important one, and with the information available we try to come to the best decision. As I indicated yesterday, as to employment for this winter, we have quite an extensive winter works programme; so I feel that all these factors will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Germa: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that most of these camp operators with whom we have the conflict in fact are not citizens of this country?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Speaker, we in this province do not differentiate between camp operators because of their origin. Camp operators in Ontario are providing employment, they are contributing substantially to the economy of this province, and I do not believe that really this is relevant.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Just like the multi-national corporations.

ALLEGED DISMISSAL OF UNION ORGANIZER

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) which I think we should have this morning.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This involves D. M. Martel and Sons Limited at Chapleau. There are three applications before the Ontario Labour Relations Board at present. One is the application for certification and the other two are in connection with relief under section 79 which deals with the discharge application.

With respect to the certification application, there was a hearing held on December 8 and an examiner has been appointed to look into the appropriateness of the bargaining. He has set January 3, 4 and 5 for hearings at Chapleau.

In connection with the other two cases, a field officer has been appointed and he is examining everything. He has already made a trip to Chapleau and he will be reporting back to the OLRB.

Mr. Speaker: Also, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman).

HOUSING SITUATION IN ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question raised by the Leader of the Opposition on December 15, and one by the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier).

On December 15 the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked if I would report on what activity is taking place on the Malvern site. Mr. Speaker, on September 22 Ontario Housing Corporation awarded a contract for nearly \$2 million for servicing of the first

neighbourhood of 160 acres. As of this date, the work is more than 50 per cent completed. Does that disappoint the hon. member for Downsview? And construction of housing units should begin in the spring as scheduled.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As scheduled in 1954?

Mr. Singer: Yes, it has been scheduled every year since.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I answer the other one?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has another answer?

SENIOR CITIZEN HOUSING IN TIMMINS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, for the hon. member for Cochrane South who asked a question on December 15: Was it Ontario Housing's intention to have the job constructing 103 senior citizen units in Timmins begun and then closed down for the winter?

Mr. Speaker, following our Prime Minister's announcement of an increase of construction work to help employment, Ontario Housing Corporation began a heavy schedule of proposal calls, and in a six-week period ending December 15, OHC issued 57 proposal calls for the construction of 3,281 family and senior citizen dwellings in 42 municipalities under its winter works programme. These will have a construction value of over \$40 million.

The Timmins senior citizen project which the hon. member referred to in his question, was priced last summer without a contingency for winter work. There was a contractual obligation requiring a completion by September 30, 1972, which apparently can be met. While there is no contractual obligation to enforce the builder to undertake the extra expense of winter construction, OHC is anxious to keep work on all projects going during the winter. Therefore, officials of Ontario Housing Corporation initiated discussions with federal officials to determine if assistance can be obtained through winter work provisions in an effort to have them share the additional cost of arranging construction on this project in Timmins continued through the winter.

The hon. member also asked a supplementary question: Could the minister inform us as to whether it is the policy of Ontario Housing to close down all jobs in wintertime

once they have begun, especially in northern Ontario? **Mr. Speaker,** the answer is no. Most projects continue during the winter.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Attorney General also has an answer which I presume the hon. members would like to ask as this may be the last day of the session.

FAMILY COURT PERSONNEL

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yesterday, sir, the hon. member for High Park asked me the following question:

Why has the Attorney General's department refused essential help to the family court in Toronto? Specifically, why has the department refused to supply an Indian interpreter despite the fact many Indian families have attended the court? Why has it insisted on allowing only one clerk-typist for all six judges which means they can't reply to their correspondence which has produced problems which we have gone through before?

It is a two-part question, sir. On the first part, I have been advised that at no time have the officials of The Department of Justice refused the services of an interpreter to any party in the court proceedings or wherever such interpreter services were required by the judge.

Each court, and that includes the provincial court family division for the judicial district of York, has a roster of interpreters who are available at short notice whenever the need for such an interpreter arises. These rosters include persons knowledgeable in various dialects or languages of the North American Indians and of the eastern Indians as well.

The second part of the question, sir, relates to the secretarial services. The provincial court family division at 311 Jarvis Street has been provided with one secretary to the senior judge of that court and one additional private secretary for the remaining five judges. As well, on occasion, the use of court reporters for these purposes is available to the judges. Upon the recent appointment of the two additional family court judges to the Toronto family court bench, provisions have been made in the departmental estimates of The Department of Justice for additional secretarial help. These estimates right now are proceeding through the government procedures relating to the approval of those estimates.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker: Is the Attorney General not aware that at least one of his judges has complained that they have been unable to get the services of an Indian interpreter? Secondly, that none of the correspondence is being answered because it is impossible to answer it with only one girl to look after all of these judges? Can he not supply them some immediate secretarial help preliminary to his estimates going through?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No. The answer to that simply is the estimates of the departments have to be approved by the members of this House. They will be presented to the House in due course.

Mr. Shulman: As a further supplementary, does that mean that correspondence is not going to be answered for the many months that are to go on before—surely, the minister must have some secretarial help in his department he can transfer?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Believe me, I receive correspondence from them. The provincial judges don't happen to publish them in the newspapers but I receive some correspondence from those judges.

Mr. Lewis: Wait until the government cuts their pay.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury has been trying to gain the floor.

PROPOSED AMALGAMATION OF SUDBURY, COPPER CLIFF

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would ask the minister if he would consider reversing his decision not to allow the Ontario Municipal Board to conduct hearings into the application by the city of Sudbury to amalgamate with the town of Copper Cliff.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when applications of that nature go to the Ontario Municipal Board, they—under provisions of the Act—ask the department whether there are plans for changes in the structure of government in the areas concerned. In this instance we simply advised the board that such is the case and the matter is under intensive study at the present time. On that basis we recommend they not proceed with annexation applications and it is left with the board.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister inform the House when we may expect regional government in the area of Sudbury?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of government policy and it will be announced accordingly.

Mr. Deans: While the minister is on his feet, how about Hamilton?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

ALLEGED OPP LENIENCY DURING THE ELECTION

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Does the Attorney General have any information with respect to my question I asked on Monday last?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I have gathered some partial information, but I'm afraid it is not in a form to be delivered to the House today. If the hon. member doesn't mind, sometime in the near future I will have to reply to him by correspondence. The investigation isn't complete.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle presented a report under subsection 2 of section 2 of The Fisheries Loan Act.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I table herewith, pursuant to subsection 5 of section 6 of The Expropriations Act 1968-1969, copies of three 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 like to emphasize, sir, that an exemption of this nature obviously does not prohibit the application of any other provision of the Act.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Could the Attorney General tell us when, so we know. This is the beginning of something. Where are they?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If the House requires an explanation, sir, the first order in

council permitted an exemption from the inquiry provisions, relating to certain parcels of land acquired by the corporation of the city of Bloomfield, Ontario, for the purpose of a cemetery which at that time was maintained by the Hicksite Friends. The transaction was approved by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs and all parties agreed to the matter.

The second order in council permitted the corporation of the city of Owen Sound to expropriate certain parcels of land for the purpose of reconstruction and relocation of 10th Street West in the city of Owen Sound. An inquiry was held in the matter, but due to the city solicitor's prolonged illness, the plans were not registered within the three-month period. It should be noted that the properties involved were vacant lots with no buildings situated thereon and, therefore, on an application to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, it was really felt that a second inquiry would have served no useful purpose.

The final order in council permitted the expropriation of lands from the Bay State Developments Limited. The Bank of Montreal officials signed a permission to construct and a waiver to a hearing of necessity. There was some urgency to commence the construction and, as both parties agreed that an inquiry was not necessary, the order in council was therefore passed.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister tell us who was the expropriating authority in the last instance?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It is contained in the order in council.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, it is in the record?

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF SNOWMOBILES ACT

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, there are two main purposes of this bill. The first is to prevent the operation of snowmobiles upon any highway in this province, and the second is to limit the amount of noise that can be emitted from these machines.

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed to the orders of the day, I have a ruling to make. On Monday last, the hon. member for High Park raised what he alleged to be a matter of privilege under which he made certain allegations relating to the recent election in three electoral districts and asked me as Speaker to refer his allegations to the committee on privileges and elections.

Firstly, I must repeat what has been said by my predecessors on several occasions. A matter of privilege must pertain to one of those special privileges that the assembly, and its members individually, enjoy which are not enjoyed by other citizens. I refer you in this respect to standing order No. 42.

The matter raised by the member for High Park is of equal interest to the whole electorate and is not one of those special parliamentary privileges.

Secondly, I as Speaker have no authority to refer any matter to a committee for consideration. Such referral can only be made by order of the House on motion properly moved after notice and passed.

Thirdly, if offences and irregularities as alleged have taken place, the proper remedies exist under federal and provincial laws. For example, if any person has evidence that another person is guilty of the offence of personation he should lay a charge under The Criminal Code of Canada. The Ontario Election Act defines those things which are election offences and prescribes the proper procedures to be taken. Similarly, it provides the action to be taken if serious irregularities are alleged.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to your reply?

Evidence of personation was taken by me, sir, to the Crown attorney of this province and they have refused to lay charges. What I would ask, sir, is that there be a consent of the House that we return to motions so I may make a motion in this matter which can then be properly debated by the House.

Mr. Speaker: The routine proceedings, of course, under motions is at the prerogative of the government or the House leader to undertake.

Mr. Shulman: We are asking for unanimous consent, sir.

Mr. Speaker: I think that a motion may not be introduced under that particular heading at this time. We always have had to have unanimous consent to revert, and in the

absence of an opportunity to introduce a motion at this time I am afraid we can't go back on it.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask for unanimous consent of the House, sir?

Mr. MacDonald: We will bear your cooperation in mind for future occasions.

Mr. Speaker: Do I have the unanimous consent of the House to revert to motions?

I do not have that unanimous consent.

Mr. Sargent: What are they afraid of over there?

Mr. Shulman: I would just like to point out on a point of order, sir, this is the first time unanimous consent has been refused. It will not be granted again in the next four years by this side.

Mr. Sargent: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Lewis: And the government is going to want it. It is going to want to revert—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order. If the hon. member for High Park will check the record he will find he refused unanimous consent to this House on other occasions.

Mr. Shulman: Never! Never!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If I might speak to the point of order, surely it would be a shame if some commitment of the type that the hon. member for High Park has made on behalf of his party now—

Mr. Shulman: On behalf of myself.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right. Well, I would simply like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that even if unanimous consent had been granted—and as far as I am concerned, and the members of my party are concerned, it would be a wise thing to revert to that for this occasion—I would suggest to you, sir, that you would rule such a motion that I would contemplate would be in the mind of the hon. member for High Park out of order since the—

Mr. Shulman: The member hasn't even heard the motion.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The only ones that would be possible would be the routine direction of the business of the House and there is plenty of precedent, much to my chagrin, when Speakers in the past have always directed any motions from a private member

to private members' hour. We don't even have such an hour set aside under our present circumstances.

But I would regret, Mr. Speaker, if one member would make a commitment for four years that would mean unanimous consent would be something we could not even consider.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. It would have been perfectly appropriate for the member for High Park to move a motion to refer this matter to the committee on elections and privileges when struck. The government has denied that right by refusing unanimous consent. The member for High Park has indicated his position. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in his political career the member for High Park speaks for himself, rather than for the party as a whole.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the season that we are in I will ameliorate my position and say we will allow him to revert to motions.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out to the hon. members that proper notice of such a motion must be given.

Mr. Deans: Nothing about notice.

Mr. Lewis: What notice?

Mr. Sargent: You've had four days to think about it.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I am informed by the Clerk that such proceedings as routine motions must be instituted by the House leader for the government side of the House. There is no way in which we can deal with that otherwise.

Mr. Shulman: But we now have had unanimous consent? May I present my motion under "motions"? If you wish to rule it out of order at that time, you may do so.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I have already ruled that a motion is out of order.

Mr. Shulman: How can you rule it out of order before you hear it?

Mr. Speaker: Any motion reverting to the order of motions would be out of order at this time.

Mr. Shulman: We have had unanimous consent of the House. Surely you will have to hear my motion before you can rule me out of order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You have had unanimous consent to revert to motions.

Mr. Shulman: Since we now have been reverted, I am now rising under motions to present a motion.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And the Speaker has said you would be out of order.

Mr. Speaker: That's right.

Mr. Shulman: I can't be out of order if he hasn't heard what I have to say.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are out of order because you have no right as a private member to introduce a motion.

An hon. member: Well, let the motion be introduced—

Mr. Speaker: I had asked for the unanimous consent of the House to revert to motions. We did not receive that unanimous consent, and that disposes of the matter.

Mr. Lewis: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I remember his words—in the charity of the season or in the spirit of the season, the House leader, who speaks for the government in this instance, said that he would revert to motions. I think, therefore, that the motion must necessarily be put; otherwise, at what point in the routine proceedings of the day does a private member on the opposition side have an opportunity to put motions if not under this item?

Mr. Speaker: I must again repeat that in order to introduce such a motion, notice must be given, and it is introduced during the private members' hour. If we are to abide by the standing orders, I don't see how we can entertain this sort of procedure.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, where, under the standing orders, does it say notice must be given? Would you direct my attention to that particular order?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At the time that this exchange originally took place—I haven't got Hansard in front of me—I recall the Speaker saying, or someone with authority indicating, that if the ruling went against the member, the member would have to proceed by way of motion to refer to the committee on election privileges. That was one of the alternatives which was available after the privilege was ruled out. That seems to constitute notice. The House was put on notice five days ago that this would be the procedure.

Mr. Shulman: On this particular point of order—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On this point of order—

Mr. Shulman: Is it the same point of order?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The problem has been a continuing one—there is no doubt about that—because on more than one occasion in the past, members from opposition parties have attempted to put forward procedural motions during the regular order under the term "motions" when it is called by the Clerk of the House.

The precedent, and I regret the precedent, has been that such motions are always put on the notice paper as a notice of motion called in private members' hour. Personally I regret that, but the precedent has been established. In my view, it is one that should be abandoned; in fact, any member of the House should be able on "motions" to put forward a matter dealing with the business of the House and the referral of such business, not necessarily matters pertaining to policy which would open up debate in that field.

In my view, the motion would be in order. Unfortunately, you have a precedent that has been supported by large majorities supporting the government in the past which would enable you to rule this out of order. But, Mr. Speaker, the notice you are referring to is the formal notice of motion that is normally called forward in private members' debate, and in this short session there is no possibility of a debate under the rules that have been established in the past.

Mr. Sargent: Respectfully, the Chair has ruled that the House has not granted consent. Any private member has the right to call for a standing vote, and I so ask, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I did rule that we did not have the unanimous consent of the House to revert to motions. I think the hon. members will recall that this was the ruling I made. In listening to the various points raised, speaking to the point of order, I did suggest to you that we require the proper notice. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated it quite clearly, and I concur, that this is the procedure for dealing with such a motion. My ruling was, and is, that there is no manner in which we can, at this time, entertain a motion such as suggested by the hon. member for High Park. I so ruled.

Mr. Shulman: I appeal your ruling.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you—

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. member for High Park said something?

Mr. Sargent: He appealed your ruling.

Mr. Shulman: I appealed your ruling that we do have unanimous consent. I suggest to you we do now have unanimous consent and you must call motions.

An hon. member: The member has a rule of his own.

Mr. Speaker: It was the hon. member for High Park in the first instance who said we did not have unanimous consent. I based my—

Mr. MacDonald: The House leader came in and gave it.

Mr. Speaker: —ruling on the original statement of the hon. member for High Park that we did not have unanimous consent.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask for unanimous consent now?

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Speaker: We do not now have unanimous consent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker says it doesn't make any difference.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as a precedent for any future occasion, I think it would have helped greatly, sir, and I say this respectfully to you, had your ruling been delivered yesterday rather than today when you necessarily frustrate any further opportunity for members to pursue it. It was introduced on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Scarborough West. It would have been desirable had it been possible to deliver the ruling. However, in view of the report that I asked for from the hon. member for High Park—and it is quite a lengthy report—I had to give fairly extensive consideration to it before arriving at a decision in order to make a ruling. I regret that I was not able to deliver it before this morning.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the orders of the day, I

would ask you to call the government notice of motion on the notice paper.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Brunelle—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order. I would have thought there was another equally generous ruling coming from the Speaker before the day has ended, upholding the rights and privileges of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite correct. I am sorry—I overlooked it.

Mr. Lewis: I saw the look on the Treasurer's face and wondered if he anticipated a ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I presume that the hon. member for Scarborough West refers to the matter that was raised in committee yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that could be, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Yes the Deputy Speaker in fact did confer with me on that particular matter and I just happen to have a ruling with me.

Mr. Lewis: Which you just happened to forget about momentarily.

Mr. Speaker: The Deputy Speaker referred to me a matter raised in committee of supply by the leader of the New Democratic Party as a matter of privilege. At the outset I must point out that privilege, again, only relates to those special privileges which the members of the House enjoy individually and the House enjoys collectively, but are not enjoyed by non-members. I refer you again to standing order No. 42. The matter raised by the hon. member does not appear to relate to any of those special privileges.

Mr. Lewis: What? The right to a correct answer, the right to truth in the Legislature is not a privilege of the Legislature?

Mr. Speaker: There is no indication that any privilege was breached insofar as the member is concerned. I was listening, I might say, to the exchange.

The question then arises, could it have been raised as a point of order? Again, it appears that the standing orders and precedents are against this procedure. Standing order No. 16(a), item 8, states clearly that one member may not make allegations against another. And item 10 prohibits a member from charging another with uttering a deliberate falsehood. I realize it did not go

that far. I am just reciting the examples in the section which covers the thing.

Mr. Lewis: I would never let the words cross my lips.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member would not. Moreover, May's parliamentary practice, the 18th edition, at page 419, cites a number of cases supporting the proposition that one member may not accuse another of misrepresentation. Although some cases are shown to be out of order, the accusation must be deliberate misrepresentation.

Mr. Bullbrook: Unless it could be proved of course.

Mr. Speaker: It would therefore appear—

Mr. Bullbrook: That is the qualification to that.

Mr. Speaker: —that the leader of the New Democratic Party himself committed a breach of order in making his accusation.

Mr. Deans: Nonsense.

Mr. Speaker: There are other ways, of course, that the New Democratic Party leader could have his point without offending the rules and precedents of the House.

Mr. Deans: Like suing.

Mr. Speaker: If he could not find a proper vehicle in the supplementary estimates, he could, of course, during the oral question period ask the ministers concerned if they would not agree that there was an inconsistency in the statement they had made in House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you very much. That is a very enlightened opinion, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with matters when the House has been misled, and with great respect sir, I cannot pay heed to it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Come on, boys, let's go or we will be here until 3 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Speaker: Before we come to the orders of the day—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): You can say whatever you like over there and you are not beholden to say you can't misrepresent.

An hon. member: That is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before we come to the orders of the day I have some-

thing else for the hon. members. Those hon. members who have served in previous Parliaments will have some knowledge of the long and valuable service rendered to the House by Major B. Handley Geary, VC. This very distinguished soldier and gentleman has carried out the duties of Sergeant-at-Arms of this House since the session of 1947, during which time he has gained the respect and the admiration and deep affection, not only of the members he has served but of his colleagues in the service of the House.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The story of the action which led to the award of his Victoria Cross is one of great fascination and well repays the reading. Suffice it to say it is a story of extraordinary valour such as would be expected of him by those fortunate enough to enjoy his friendship and association. I would ask the major if he would kindly come forward at this time.

Unfortunately for the Legislature, the time has come when the major feels that he should pass on his duties to someone else. It is to express in a very small way the appreciation, the affection and the regard of this Parliament and its predecessors that I present to him today this scroll. I should like to read what is written upon this scroll:

The Province of Ontario,
to Major B. Handley Geary, VC on behalf
of the government of Ontario, I convey to
you our most sincere gratitude for your
devoted service as Sergeant-at-Arms of
the legislative assembly of Ontario from
1947 to 1971. Throughout those 25 years
with consistent loyalty you have made an
outstanding contribution to the public
good and more directly to the members
of the Legislature. It is our hope that
you will enjoy the years to come in good
health and happiness.

The Parliament Buildings,
Toronto,

December 17, 1971.

The scroll bears the signature of the Prime Minister of Ontario, Hon. William Davis, and the seal.

Major Geary, I am very pleased to present this to you, sir.

Interjections by hon. members.

Orders of the day.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 1, by Hon. Mr. Brunelle:

RESOLVED. That Arthur K. Meen, member of the assembly for the electoral district of York East, may bargain for, and purchase from Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Ontario as represented by the Minister of Lands and Forests, the lands at a price of \$100, described as being:

All that parcel or tract of land in the township of Wicklow, in the county of Hastings and Province of Ontario, containing by admeasurement 0.13 acres, be the same more or less, and being composed of that part of lot 4, concession XIII in the said township designated as part 1 on a plan and field notes of survey dated September 10, 1971, signed by M. J. McAlpine, Ontario land surveyor, of record in The Department of Lands and Forests, at Toronto, as location MJ 262 and of record in the Office of Land Titles at Belleville as plan 21R-483.

And his seat in the assembly shall not thereby be vacated nor shall he thereby be rendered ineligible as a member of or to sit or vote in the assembly.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this resolution be concurred in?

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I am just interested in the law on the subject. Is it the case when any member of this House is engaged in buying—not just selling but buying—Crown lands that the process of disclosure of this kind is requisite?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that we amended it about three sessions ago to get around the old requirement, I think, that it actually required a statute to permit it. We amended the statute about three sessions ago to permit it to be done by resolution of the House—section 9, I am informed, of The Legislative Assembly Act.

Resolution concurred in.

Clerk of the House: The 10th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

EXTRA-JUDICIAL SERVICES ACT

(continued)

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I moved the adjournment of the debate last night. I wonder if before we get started in this debate we might not deal with this matter and the next order of business more expeditiously by agreeing to debate both Bills 16 and 17 at the same time, because the remarks are common remarks.

So if you want, sir, perhaps you will want to call that order and we will have them both before us—or just an agreement; I don't care.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): I think, Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent idea and I think we will just do it by agreement, if that suits you.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Mr. Singer: Well, therefore, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the principles in both Bills 16 and 17, at the outset let me say that I am very surprised at the approach of the Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) in introducing these bills at this time, and flying in the face, I think, of established tradition in the Province of Ontario, certainly flying in the face of economic conditions, and certainly taking unfair advantage of an important group in our community who have little ability to be able to defend themselves or to put forward their representations.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, as I have watched the proceedings in this House for a considerable period of time, I have no recollection at all of the government bringing in a bill cutting somebody's salary. In fact, the trend since I first came here has been to have salaries increased, and I just do not understand what kind of vendetta the Attorney General is carrying on with the judiciary of this province and why he has taken this action in the face of very committal statements made by his predecessor in the face of undertakings given by his predecessor, and why he took these steps without any consultation in advance of the steps having been taken. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised at the Attorney General, the first law officer of the Crown; for some particular reason he seems to feel that he should cudgel the bench and cudgel the bar and not be their foremost defender here in the House. I think that is one of his responsibilities.

In the question period today, sir, we did have some reference to that question of plea

bargaining or fixing, as the cold, grey Globe and Mail chose to term it in a front-page, eight-column-headlined story just a few days ago. I would have thought the Attorney General would have been one of the first to rise in his place in this House—in fact, he had a duty to rise in his place in the House—to explain just what this means, how it is done and why it is done.

And since obviously there was an involvement of his own department—and I don't criticize this at all; from the facts I know the involvement of his department was proper and correct—he should have explained to those eminent gentlemen who write news stories for The Globe and Mail and who write peculiar editorials just what was involved in this and whether or not any public good is being served. In fact, I commend to his attention, if he hasn't already read it, not the editorial columns of The Globe and Mail but the rather excellent column written by Scott Young just a day or two ago that dealt with this question of plea bargaining.

I would have thought that the Attorney General, in keeping with his very important position—he is the senior law officer of the Crown in Ontario, he is the spokesman for lawyers and judges and the public—would have hastened to rise in his place when this story appeared in such a dramatic fashion and to set out—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): What has that got to do with this bill?

Mr. Singer: I am just saying that the minister doesn't have a feeling of responsibility.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That still has got nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. Singer: Well, it has indeed. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General says it has nothing to do with this bill, but I say it has, because to my mind the Attorney General has a responsibility to treat the legal profession and judges in a manner that is befitting this honourable profession. Many of us in this House are lawyers, and we are proud of our profession and of the bench; we don't think, particularly as far as the bench is concerned, that they should suddenly be presented with a *fait accompli* wherein arbitrarily and unfairly their salaries in fact are reduced.

What's the purpose of this? Are we talking about large savings in money? No, we are not, Mr. Speaker. In essence, there are about 93 county court judges and about 32 Supreme Court judges, and if my arithmetic is any-

where near correct, we are talking in round figures of something in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million dollars. And having listened to the supplementary estimates go through—the government has just got another \$180 million—the sum of \$250,000 really doesn't loom very large in the general financial picture of the Province of Ontario.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is taking advantage of a group of persons who are unable to defend themselves publicly and because it is difficult—and I recognize it's perhaps difficult politically—to get up and say persons who are getting salaries of \$30,000 or \$40,000 should be defended as far as their salaries are concerned, particularly if they are judges, because people like the Attorney General apparently don't like judges or lawyers—so why bother to defend them at all.

It is very hard to put this proposition forward in any way that can possibly be calculated to bring down any public approval of it. But, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Attorney General should have taken the lead in presenting the other side of this picture.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It's getting so I don't like MPPs.

Mr. Singer: It was fascinating, Mr. Speaker, to review the remarks that the Attorney General made on first reading. One of the things he said, and it is reported in Hansard on page 55, is:

Ontario subscribes to the principle of a national scale of salaries for all judges. We feel that the adoption of such an objective would promote the maintenance of equality in the administration of justice across Canada.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, we have got to the day and age when the principles that Ontario subscribes to are as long as the Attorney General's foot.

Arthur Wishart having gone, any principles he subscribed to are no longer those principles Ontario subscribes to. It occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, to look at Hansard when the former Attorney General, Arthur Wishart, brought in Bill 3 which amended The Extra-Judicial Services Act in 1968. As reported on page 398 of Hansard of that year, this is what Mr. Wishart had to say:

Now I do not propose to suggest that all judges will work the same level of extra activity, although in the Supreme Court this is nearly the case. They are assigned to their duties and they do serve and some of them, I think, perhaps longer and in matters of greater import than others. I think one cannot expect to have judges rated on the basis of how many days they serve or how long they serve because as I mentioned in my previous remarks, judges all across Canada under the federal juris-

diction are paid the same salary. I think the judges in Ontario where we have extremely heavy court sittings and a great deal of litigation are busier than judges in any other province in Canada. That I think is apparent to everyone.

It was in that tenor, Mr. Speaker, that that Attorney General advanced an increase in The Extra-Judicial Services Act from \$4,000 to \$6,000.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Would the member send those words over here to me?

Mr. Singer: Yes, sure. The Attorney General has asked me to send him the second reading on that debate and I have just sent it across to him. I would suggest he look through it because there is a considerable debate. The hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) took part in it. Mr. Sopha, the then member for Sudbury took part in it, and others.

It is interesting to note that Ontario has been for some considerable number of years the only province that felt that this kind of emolument to judges should in fact be paid. I think it was Mr. Wishart who said that really in Prince Edward Island he found it a little difficult to believe that there was as much Supreme Court business or county court business as there is, say, in the Province of Ontario. On that basis it made some sense to enunciate the principle that Mr. Wishart enunciated in 1968—the principle which now the present occupant of the office says is unfair, impractical and not Ontario's point of view.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, first of all, what has changed Ontario's view? Has Ontario's view changed only because a new incumbent has begun to occupy that office? If that's the only reason—and it must be a little more authentic than that—one wonders why the Attorney General is particularly piqued at judges. Have judges been snarling at him lately? Why didn't he take them into consultation—and that's the second thing—in advance of the Act?

Why didn't he sit down and say: "This is one of the things we have in mind, my lords and the hon. justices of the Supreme Court and the hon. judges of the county courts. This is what we have in mind and don't you think I am being reasonable?"—recognizing, Mr. Speaker, that these people are not able, by and large, to participate in this kind of a discussion. Some of them have become a little braver and I am very happy about that. I have a letter here from Mr. Justice Galligan addressed to the Attorney General that has been referred to in the press. I think Mr.

Justice Galligan makes some very good points and I am going to read that into the record in just a moment.

Why the break in this practice? Doesn't the Attorney General agree, Mr. Speaker, that the job of occupying an important position on the bench in the Province of Ontario is more arduous, more time involving, more difficult, than the job in probably any other province in Canada? In connection with that, Mr. Speaker, why then shouldn't there be in fact some recognition?

Ontario has chosen to make this kind of recognition over a very long number of years. It is only now, apparently, in 1971, that a new Attorney General has decided Ontario has a different posture. Why does Ontario now have a different posture?

I haven't noticed the Attorney General, or any of his colleagues, standing up and saying, "Isn't it a terrible thing that those administrators of school boards, who are getting \$30,000 and \$32,000 and \$35,000 and \$38,000 and \$40,000 are too highly paid and therefore in keeping with our idea of economy we are going to order a cutback of their salaries." The Attorney General has the power if he wants to do it. He can bring in a statute and do it, but he hasn't chosen to do that. No, let's pick on the defenceless judges.

Well, they are getting a little less defenceless and I am glad to see that. Because, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay in this House the highest tribute to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, Mr. Turner. In the few years that he has occupied that office the calibre of the appointments that he has made to the bench, I think, has been outstanding.

We have people like Bora Laskin on the bench of the Supreme Court of Canada. We have people like John Brooke on the bench of the court of appeal in Ontario. We have people like Pat Galligan on the Supreme Court of Ontario; people like Pat Hart on the Supreme Court of Ontario. That latter gentleman I just mentioned has been appointed as head of the Law Reform Commission in Ottawa.

There is Mr. Justice Osler, who is known to many of my friends over here, a fine judge who brings to the bench an intimate knowledge of labour matters; Mr. Justice Holden, who brings to the bench an intimate knowledge of mechanics' lien work and that sort of thing. The reason, Mr. Speaker, that gentlemen of this calibre have been attracted to the bench has been because at long, long last the powers-that-be in Ottawa—and, up to the present Attorney General, the powers-

that-be in Ontario—have felt that the salaries those people were going to be paid were enough to take them out of private practice and to bring them into public service.

For some peculiar reason that doesn't appear in any of the remarks made by the hon. Attorney General when he introduced this bill. He now wants to reverse the procedure.

Before I leave the Supreme Court position and the argument insofar as Bill 16 is concerned, let me read into the record this letter written by the hon. Mr. Justice Galligan to the Attorney General. It is dated December 8 and it starts:

Dear Mr. Attorney:

Re: The Extra-Judicial Services Act

The Chief Justice of Ontario has provided me with copies of your letters to him dated November 26 and December 3. I want to go on record as saying that I do not agree to the proposed reduction and that I am opposed to it.

I was not a member of the judiciary at the time The Extra-Judicial Services Act was amended to increase the allowance paid to the Supreme Court judges under the Act to \$6,000. However, I remember reading newspaper accounts of the proceedings in the Legislature at the time that the amendment was before it.

Whatever other reasons may have motivated the government in presenting the amendment to the Legislature, my recollection is that the government was then reported to have strongly recommended the increase to the Legislature upon the merits, namely, that because the federally appointed judges in Ontario had far greater caseloads than in any other of the provinces of Canada, calls upon them for extra-judicial services placed a much heavier burden, not only upon the judges involved, but upon their colleagues who had to cover their duties while so engaged, than upon judges elsewhere in Canada and therefore the increase in the allowance was well justified.

And as the hon. Attorney General reads through the debate on the second reading of Bill 3 in 1968 in the Hansard which he has in front of him at the moment, he must agree with me that that was the tenor of that debate and that certainly was the tenor of the remarks made by his predecessor, Mr. Wishart, and that Mr. Galligan's recollection of what happened at that time is 100 per cent accurate.

That was the argument put forward by Mr. Wishart and it was a compelling argument and I think it applied then and I think it continues to apply now.

Mr. Justice Galligan goes on to say:

The same situation holds true today. It strikes me that at a time when people in virtually every occupation in this province are obtaining increases in salary, a 50 per cent reduction in the statutory allowance paid by this province to its Supreme Court judges will leave the public with the impression that the government of this province has some reservation about the quality of service rendered by these judges. This apparent lack of confidence on the part of the government will not very greatly assist the judges in performing their tasks, both judicial and extra-judicial.

However, you have probably considered these factors and the main reason for writing to you is to point out that when I decided to submit my name to the Minister of Justice for Canada to be considered for appointment to this court I weighed and considered a number of factors. Most of them would be of little interest to you but one of them was whether, considering my responsibility to maintain and educate a family of four young children, none of whom have yet reached high school age I could afford to become a judge at my age. I took into account the fact that, in addition to whatever federal allowance would be available from time to time, there was an additional allowance of \$6,000 from the province. I did not for one moment anticipate that such allowance would be reduced, except in circumstances where salaries of all public servants were being reduced.

I am unaware of any precedent for the singling out of judges for reduction of allowance, and certainly I did not have any reason to anticipate this reduction. Because of the nature of the duties they have to perform, judges traditionally have refrained from speaking out in respect to issues that affect them. In truth, they do not even have anyone to speak out on their behalf.

Hopefully, this time they have at least one person who is speaking out on their behalf.

It strikes me as incredible that the government of Ontario would single out for reduction in allowances a group of persons whose positions would lead you to expect that there would be no public opposition to the move. If there is at this time a

situation of financial difficulty in the province that requires a general reducing of salaries of public servants, I will readily agree to a rateable reduction of my allowance.

I think that is perfectly fair and perfectly obvious. If that \$15,000 that the government is asking for provincial secretaries were reduced by the 50 per cent, it would make a little more sense, but that bill, I'm afraid, is going to go through in its \$15,000 form.

But I consider it grossly unfair and discriminatory to reduce only the remuneration of those whom you can reasonably expect will not take public objection. You will notice that I have not made this letter a personal one. I am writing to advise you for the record that I do not acquiesce in the reduction of a statutory allowance to which I became entitled upon my appointment to the bench I oppose the reduction and I consider it unfair.

I think that is an eminently sensible letter. It's reasoned, it's temperate and it presents the case very, very well. I think that the Attorney General should pay close heed to the remarks of a very able new, younger judge, to whom we can look forward hopefully, to providing many years of outstanding service to the people of Ontario and the people of Canada.

I think enough for that; let me move just for a moment to the county court judges. The county court in the county of York, which I know very well—I practise in Toronto and I make frequent appearances before that bench—is undoubtedly the busiest court in Ontario. Quite recently, Mr. Speaker, we have increased the jurisdiction of that court to \$7,500 from—what was it before?

An hon. member: It was \$4,000.

Mr. Singer: From \$4,000 up to \$7,500, the monetary jurisdiction. Needless to say, that was done to improve the efficiency of the court and to take some of the load off the supreme court whose calendars were getting bogged down and to improve the speediness of trial. But, by necessity, Mr. Speaker, it meant by increasing the compulsory monetary jurisdiction to \$7,500—unlimited on consent—that the caseload in civil actions had very substantially and materially to increase.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have recently, and I think quite properly, given to the county court judges in this province the additional responsibility of handling divorce matters. Divorce matters, in light of the

changes in the federal legislation, occupy more and more time of our courts. The list gets longer and longer and more people have to be dealt with. It is because of the volume of that kind of work that the jurisdiction was transferred from the supreme back to the county here in the Province of Ontario.

In addition to that, there is hardly a day goes by when the government isn't approaching one of the county court judges or one of the supreme court judges and saying, as you said to His Honour Judge Vannini a few days ago, "Please come and investigate for us what happened when Kosygin was in town." His Honour Judge Vannini is carrying on an investigation. While Judge Vannini carries on that public inquiry, as is his responsibility, someone has to look after the affairs of the courts in Sault Ste. Marie, and there is an additional burden on all of the other judges who are going to have to take up that slack. Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, that kind of thing doesn't go on in other provinces of Canada with the volume or the intensity that it happens here.

The Attorney General, I know, is going to say in view of the magnificent and munificent salary increase that the Government of Canada has given to those judges—up to \$40,000 or \$41,000 for Supreme Court judges and up to \$30,000 for county court judges—why then should Ontario not step back?

I see no reason at all to say that is a valid argument. I see no reason at all to say that we have asked less of our judges or that this kind of system of extra pay and the allowances that have been made to judges over a period of many years should now be begun to be cut back because the present Attorney General apparently doesn't have the same kind of views as his predecessors.

I don't necessarily want to compare the abilities of the two gentlemen who occupied the office. I do say that the predecessor, Mr. Wishart, was a man older than the present occupant of the portfolio, a man who had been in practice much longer, a man of greater humanity—let me put it that way—and of greater understanding and of greater experience before the courts, a man who understood some of the trials and tribulations and pressures that are brought to bear on the bench.

I would commend again to the hon. minister the reading of the remarks of Mr. Wishart in that volume of Hansard that I sent across to him. I am sure that if he reads it carefully and understands the kind of sentiment that Mr. Wishart was expressing, he

should have, and perhaps will have—or maybe that is a vain hope—some second thoughts about pushing these bills forward.

There is the case, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a good case. I don't see any real basis for cutting back these salaries at this time. I don't see any real basis for changing the philosophy that has been the philosophy of the Government of Ontario for so many years—it was enunciated clearly, succinctly and logically in this House in 1968, by the Attorney General's predecessor—and reneging, and this is my last point, on a substantial promise made by Mr. Wishart.

Mr. Wishart said, and made a commitment, not that he was going to decrease these allowances but in fact that he was going to increase them. But along comes the present Attorney General, and he says, "Forget about Wishart. I'm here. We'll cut it back. We're not going to give you an increase; we're going to cut it down."

For the public good, for the saving of money, for the logic and for restoring or keeping some faith with our judiciary—and I think it's a good judiciary—I would urge the Attorney General to have some very serious second thoughts about these bills. Let them sit here on the order paper and if, over the two- or three-month recess, he still thinks it is important, bring them back again in the spring. I am sure that if the Attorney General has an opportunity to have some second thoughts, we won't see these bills again.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this? The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, we won't take any great time on this legislation. We don't take any great umbrage with it nor do we set up any stalking-horses or straw men to flagellate under this head. By and large, we think the move that the minister is making—

Mr. Singer: Galligan is the stalking-horse. Is that what the member means?

Mr. Lawlor: —is perfectly legitimate and sensible under the circumstances. If the responsibility of the provincial government under the heading of the administration of justice is in those areas where provincial statutes require time and effort by judges to adjudicate upon, then obviously, we should make, some contribution to that end. I suspect that's rather minuscule by and large in the Supreme Court of Ontario and probably

more important in highway traffic and other law down with the provincial judges.

In any event, the law is basically common law across the whole province and the whole country. What we've got to be careful about—and I think we are all cognizant of this—is that the judges must always be paid salaries commensurate with integrity. In other words, men, including the judiciary, if their salaries were skimmed or were on such a scale as to make them feel a pinch, could perhaps be susceptible to bribery, and that would be the last thing that we could possibly want under the circumstances. Therefore, we must look with a shrewd eye to see whether the level of salaries that is presently enjoyed or which is going to be enjoyed shortly by county and Supreme Court judges is adequate as a defence against that particular iniquity.

Now \$41,000 isn't bad, you know. That puts a man within the top five per cent, maybe three per cent, of the total population in income-earning power. That puts him in an extremely elite class, divorced from the great mass of the unwashed, who certainly don't come anywhere close. Therefore I think that \$41,000 is a figure that would put the average man, and certainly the judges who have been trained in tradition, beyond any peradventure of being susceptible to any outside influences other than the straight and objective determination of issues before them without fear or favour of anybody.

If that is the case, then why should the province in effect, over the years—as was said by the former Attorney General and others over the years—subsidize the federal treasury with respect to this in order to attract to the bench of the province the best talent we could possibly get? Because it is not unheard of that a man of very high qualifications and merit at the bar will refuse to become a judge simply because he says the salary scales are inadequate; that the standard of living that he feels requisite to his family for their educational upbringing, that the salary was such as to preclude their bringing that about.

No pretence can possibly be made under the present legislation that such is the case. In the case of the one statute in the surrogate courts, obviously this is the kind of extrajudicial service which is intrinsic to the system. Somebody has to look over the administrations and the testamentary instruments that come before the court and give approval to them, and on occasion adjudicate upon them, and therefore some sum of money must be set aside in this regard.

I consider the sum being placed forward in Bill 17 perfectly adequate to that end. I am surprised to hear a judge of the Supreme Court, you know, use the word "entitled" to a particular remuneration—surely there is no right or entitlement. It is a subject of legislative discretion. It is a privilege in effect enjoyed, and is not an entrenched right. It can be amended as it is presently being amended, and amendment in legislature in no way destroys an existing established position and I think that is completely out of order.

The basis of the extra-judicial work of judges is set forth elaborately and I won't pretend to go over them this morning. In chapter 45 of McRuer we know his numerous animadversions against any wider powers or taking judges away from their established chores and duties precisely because it loads their fellow judges and is a disservice to the judicial system and to the people of the bar.

But I feel that practice, because of McRuer's nostrums, has pretty well died out and that there is not the same degree of extra-judicial chores that were here in effect five or 10 years ago. We now say to the judges "stick to your lasts and don't get lost off on side alleys" and that, by and large, is the established position and the increasing tendency. And in those areas where, by way of arbitrations or royal commissions, et cetera, it can be possibly avoided into the future I think the present Attorney General would agree with me that that is the position to take and the affirmation to be made.

To save the time of the committee of the whole House as far as I am concerned, I have only one question to ask. It strikes me—and I haven't really had time to look it up—that there is a section in the federal Judges' Act in which it says that \$2,000, or some such sum, will be given to the judges appointed, I think, under the Supreme Court judges, for services—unless the province comes in and gives money, in which case the \$2,000 isn't forthcoming, or some such arrangement as that. So that if we eventually get to the position where we don't feel particularly under Bill 16, The Extra-Judicial Services Amendment Act, that we ought to be under any obligation whatsoever with respect to federal judges—people who are, in effect, federal judges, whom we have no disposition or appointment over in this regard—if we withdraw from this area entirely, as I think would be commendable, would they not under these circumstances be rewarded or at least partially compensated by the federal government itself as a result? I don't think

under the present legislation the government will achieve that objective, still vouchsafing \$3,000 a year to the judge.

Therefore, the section in question wouldn't apply. As things presently stand on that previous piece of legislation of two years ago, the position of this party—I remember speaking on the matter—was we opposed the increase. We felt that it wasn't requisite or necessary at the time. We felt that the levels of judges' salaries were adequate to the need. We weren't slavering at the lips because of it.

I don't think we appealed the situation or fought too bitterly on it but at the same time I think common sense has to prevail in these matters, too. The general level of services rendered to the community by people so trained—with the kinds of responsibilities involved; with the nature of leisure involved also taken into account—against a host of similarly trained or highly qualified people ought to bear. I think by and large our judges do fairly well.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in relation to the bill.

Firstly, I would in some measure support the views enunciated in this House by the member for Downsview. I say very simply that from a political point of view, I quite appreciate, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, that astute politician that he is, it is very difficult to defend an increase at the county court level from \$24,000 to \$30,000 and the same increase—or a similar increase—at the Supreme Court level.

I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, if one was to have a referendum, for instance, on the minister's own salary or on some high-level civil servant's, from a political point of view the public would say, "Yes, we don't mind cutting you down from \$35,000 or cutting down some senior civil servant from a certain level. Cut him down a couple of thousand." Let's face it, anybody making over \$25,000 or \$30,000 shouldn't have any reason to complain at any stage.

The frightening part of it that I see is the approach that was taken in this particular bill. It seems to be indicative of the approach sometimes taken by this present minister, the Attorney General, and this particular government in relation to the federal approach to certain problems.

We have on one hand the federal Minister of Justice. I would agree with the member for Downsview that he has succeeded over the past years in increasing the quality of the judiciary. Let's face it, one of the facts of life, when one wants to attract calibre or talent, especially in a specialized field, is the salary. This is certainly one of the things that we have to consider. I think that the federal Minister of Justice has by and large increased or ameliorated the calibre of the judiciary.

We have the Attorney General of this province who looks at the particular situation and sort of undercuts the approach taken by the federal government. As regards the reason given for doing it—saying that from a national point of view we want to put everybody on the same level—I would agree fully with the member for Downsview that this is not accurate. First of all the case-load in Ontario is higher than in most other jurisdictions. Secondly, especially at the county court level, the county court judges are doing work in this province which is not done in any other province. I could accept the minister's comment on the saving—we are saving about \$250,000—if he was prepared to assure the House that this saving will be reflected in some efficiency within the system elsewhere. But I am sure this will not be the case.

For instance, and I think I can't very well sit down without making this comment, if he were prepared to say that we are saving this much money but we'll increase the efficiency in areas, for instance, like the judicial district of Ottawa-Carleton—

Mr. Singer: Very important.

Mr. Roy: —where, for instance, the civil list at the Supreme Court level is so long that if you are No. 1 on the list, you still have another year to wait before your case is heard. If he were prepared to say that we are going to make a saving here but we are going to increase the efficiency elsewhere, then one could have a certain sympathy for this bill.

But this is not the case. The federal Minister of Justice takes a particular approach and attracts a certain amount of talent, but here we have the Attorney General of this province turning around and saying, "Don't worry. Here, fellows, you are faced with a fait accompli. I feel we must equalize the standard of judges right across the whole of Ontario." He is trying to do something that cannot be done, because of the differences in

population and economic situations right across this province.

Mr. Speaker, just to repeat, from a public or political point of view, I am sure there wouldn't be much public sympathy to say, "Well, those poor Supreme Court judges are only going to make \$40,000 a year now." But I still feel that in some ways the approach taken—without, as has been mentioned before, any consultation with the judicature, at the Supreme Court or county court levels, and especially since the federal Minister of Justice has taken a particular approach—is that the Attorney General of this province has presented the judiciary of this province with a fait accompli. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, my comment is really brief. The quandary or the problem which I have is that this is—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we should deal with another matter. Under the rules of the House that we are operating by this week, we are required to rise at 12:30; we will have to take a special action to sit through the noon hour if that is the intention. Or shall we rise?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I will move that regular rules of the House be suspended and we sit past the hour of 12:30.

Mr. Speaker: We can't proceed with another order of business without an adjournment from this particular procedure. Would the member for Riverdale move we adjourn?

Mr. Renwick moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the regular rules of sitting be suspended and that the House sit past the hour of 12:30 o'clock, p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

EXTRA-JUDICIAL SERVICES ACT (concluded)

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, the quandary in which I find myself is simply that in the bill entitled, An Act to amend

The Extra-Judicial Services Act, the extent and nature of the extra-judicial services the judges are being asked to perform have never been specifically clear in my mind. It seems to me it is incumbent upon the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) to indicate clearly the services that are performed by the judges at the present time and the lightening of that burden which must be envisaged by the minister if in fact he is going to cut that portion of the remuneration of the judges in half for whatever other reasons he may have.

It seems to me that if judges are appointed to the bench on the expectation that they are going to receive a certain remuneration for a certain burden of work, and realizing that the burden of work with respect to extra-judicial services varies from time to time, it would seem to me at least the judges are now entitled to think that in some way or other their obligation to perform extra-judicial services will be lightened. It has been, I think, a criticism for some time now that the judges have been required to perform an unnecessary burden of extra-judicial services, and I would ask the minister, if it is possible for him to do so, to enumerate in relative detail exactly what the burden of those services is. What is the nature of them and the extent to which he envisages, through other mechanisms, that that burden would be lightened.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak before the hon. minister sums up? The member for Ottawa East? Ottawa South. Well, we will get it!

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Get it straight. He came second in that riding too.

Mr. C. Bennett (Ottawa South): But with a 12,000 difference in votes, yes, I agree. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cassidy: The member did as badly as any Tory in 30 years!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Only in horseshoes do they count the seconds, unfortunately.

Mr. Bennett: The hon. member for Downsview is correct. To the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, may I say first of all that I have some reservations on going half way.

I believe if the minister's remarks as presented on page 56 of Hansard are to be accepted this would seem to have been an opportune time to give notice to the federal government and to those appointments they make in the judiciary, to indicate to them that

as of January 1, 1973, the payments made by the Province of Ontario to them will be discontinued completely. It would appear that the minister justifies the fact that we should get out of payments to federally appointed judges completely at some given time, as members will notice on page 56.

The question to the minister: First of all, is it our intention to indicate to the federal government and to their appointees that it will be the policy of this government, at a very early date, to discontinue payments completely to their appointed judges? May I say that there are some questions regarding the pay increase at this time.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that this would have seemed to have been an opportune time—when we look at judges being given a pay increase of roughly 27 per cent or 27½ per cent—to implement this legislation. I think we should have gone one step further and eliminated it completely or at least gone on notice that the payments by the Province of Ontario would be discontinued at January 1, 1973.

My question to the minister is, is it the intention of this government to go on notice with the federal people and their judges as to our position in the future?

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak before the minister sums up? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in dealing this way with both bills, certainly I think some further general statements by me would be necessary. Of course these, generally speaking, would be applicable to both the Supreme Court bench and the county court bench.

Certainly I support, and the government supports, the proposition that there will be discussions and serious considerations given in the future respecting separate allowances and the economies and the efficiencies relating to the value of the services to the people of this province by the people who sit on the bench in this province.

Certainly those discussions have continued, and will be continued in the future with the representatives of the bench. The present method of paying provincial allowances to members of the bench is completely artificial in this province at the moment. This is the main point particularly, I would suggest to the hon. members, in respect of the county court bench.

If a provincial allowance—and I say *if* a provincial allowance—to a member of the

bench is appropriate, surely it should be related, as the hon. member for Riverdale implies, to the responsibilities that are taken by that member of the judiciary in respect of those outside judicial duties. And not a fiction which has been relied on in the past in relation to a salary for a surrogate court judge. It has been a fiction. It has been artificial. It has been a façade.

The reason for it? I don't care what has been said in the past, in this House or outside of this House. But the real reason for the artificiality obviously has been the strong view of this government and preceding governments that federal judges were not being paid enough by the federal government. The view now is that those salaries are approaching a reasonable level in respect of those judges.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Doesn't the minister realize that belies his own argument—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, sir.

Mr. Bullbrook: —when he says approaching. Goodness gracious! It has either approached or hasn't approached.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Certainly now, and I give the present incumbent of the office of the Minister of Justice at Ottawa full credit, realization has finally reached Ottawa and they have done something about it. The amendments to The Judges Act of Canada in 1967 that led to the prohibition of judges receiving fees for extra-judicial work, and the \$2,000 allowance to judges not receiving a provincial allowance showed, in my mind, that Ottawa opposed outside allowances from the provinces. This was certainly shown by the position taken by the Minister of Justice to the then Attorney General of this province in July, 1970, when our position was asked and given to the federal minister at that time.

We shared a concern as to the propriety of provincial allowances and how it affects a national judiciary. Unfortunately, at least one judge obviously looks upon this provincial allowance as a salary. That is not correct. Under the constitution it is a federal duty to provide that salary. There are many constitutional opinions that what has been done in the past by this province to pay what is, in fact, a salary has been unconstitutional.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister ask the judiciary that question? Ask His Honour this question!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is all part of the inconsistency, of the façade, of the artificiality and, in my mind, the impropriety of the present system.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Who wrote that speech for the minister?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Why doesn't the hon. member go home?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Finally, with all of the jurisdictional changes that are taking place—and there are jurisdictional changes taking place—what counts really are what are those duties, those extra-judicial services, that must be met by an allowance—or if they should be met by an allowance.

Certainly, with the Ontario Law Reform Commission studying and hopefully soon reporting on the administration of courts in this province, we are going to be in for what I would hope would be some very exciting times as far as reform of the whole administration of justice in this province is concerned!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Good for you.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This question is part and parcel of the whole matter. The time is now, in fairness to all concerned, when these increases have come about at the federal level; when there has been a realization at the federal level of, I would say, past inequities in respect of salaries to judges. That realization has now been met and therefore, in my mind, there is no longer the need for this type of allowance.

The hon. member for Ottawa South asks for a commitment respecting the complete abolition of these allowances. As I have indicated, I think, on the first reading, certainly it is our present intention. If need be, I am now giving notice—

Mr. Singer: If it is so obvious why doesn't the minister do it all at once?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —it is our present intention that those allowances should be abolished in their entirety either on the intervention of some more realistic way of paying for these extra-judicial services or at the time when a further federal increase comes along.

The main principle here, as I have said before, is unassailable. The member for Downsview can attempt to castigate me all he wants about changes of opinion. His main question to me, I believe, was simply what

had changed Ontario's view. First of all, as I think he has learned, this is a different government. It does have different opinions; it does have different views. But what has changed Ontario's view basically is the realization that Ottawa, at long last, is fulfilling its obligation under our constitution in respect to the salary of judges.

But if he wants to say we are changing our mind, let me just refer him to almost the same page of Hansard he was quoting a little while ago. The then Liberal member for Sudbury, a well-respected defence counsel of this province, had this to say—and I assume he was speaking for more than his own view in that debate on March 4, 1968, in this House. He made this "final plea," and it was a very worthwhile plea, in this House—and I quote from page 395:

But I just wish that in revamping our constitution, which the first citizen [there's a phrase we haven't heard this session yet] says will take 10 years—I think it is likely to take longer—that we might return to the original concept of saying to the government of Ottawa, "You appoint the judges, you pay them." [And he goes on to say] I think that is a fair proposition.

Not everyone is changing their minds in any event.

Mr. Singer: He wasn't the Attorney General though.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In respect to the question that has been brought up in a letter that has been quoted—and I must say that I am not in the habit of releasing my correspondence to the press, at least without prior authority from those to whom it is sent—obviously there has been a reply to the justice involved in the case. But, as I say, I do not intend to make it public. But on occasion the member for Downsview has stood in his place in this House and complained that other people have known what is going to be in legislation before the members of this House have known what is going to be in that legislation.

I consulted with the chief justices of the court of appeal and the high court of this province as long ago as November 18 respecting this matter, and I did so with some trepidation that I might be criticized in the House for doing so. But nevertheless they knew of my views and opinions and the government's intention in this matter as long ago—

Mr. Singer: But the Attorney General consulted with them after he made up his mind.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence:—as November 18. And that proposition was put forward to them at that time.

Mr. Singer: Sure, after the decision was made. That's what I am complaining about.

Mr. W. Newman: The member has made his speech; why doesn't he be quiet.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No final decision on this matter was taken until just recently. Certainly those in the other level of the bench in this province were not informed until a few days later, and they had no difficulty in obtaining representative views of that bench, which is a larger bench; indeed, I even met the executive of the County Court Judges Association in my office some time after that. So I really cannot consider as valid at all the representations that this is a hurried matter that's been jammed through in an autocratic way, with no consultation and no exchange of views at all. Even though they have not been published in the newspapers, I can assure the hon. member and the members of this House that I have received a great deal of correspondence—

Mr. Singer: I wouldn't expect that!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence:—from people who are concerned. There has been a very free and frank exchange of views on these matters.

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes, "We will not change our minds."

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I believe I have covered most of the points. I think I have covered all of the points that have been brought up.

Mr. Sargent: What about the backlog in the courts?

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 16. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Singer: No, no, no! Call for ayes and nays.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion being carried will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Pretty weak.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Singer: I just want it recorded that I don't support the bill.

SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill 17, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill 15, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I think before we can intelligently discuss this bill we should know what we are talking about.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is a good idea.

Mr. Sargent: It might be a first, eh?

Mr. W. Newman: Is the member stalling until his leader comes?

Mr. Sargent: I don't think that anyone in the House knows what the government has up its sleeve! I am, as a member of this House, to sit here for the next four years and to have a super-power group, as I understand it is going to be—the executive think-tank type of operation—controlling possibly the actions and policies, or the direction of the people of this province, for years to come. It is a scary thing! My personal feelings on the capabilities of the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the fact that he might be the No. 1 power—we talk about who is the real Premier of the province, I wonder whether it is Davis or McKeough. That is my area of concern.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Well, it is Davis.

Mr. Sargent: We don't know sometimes.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): It is "Darcy Davis."

Mr. Sargent: We have the case of the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I might remind the hon. member that we refer to the members not by their names but as "the hon. member for so-and-so."

Mr. Sargent: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for that.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Bob is back. You can sit down now, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: That is the worst part of being in the government! The members can't say anything intelligent over there. They have got to be lackeys!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking on behalf of a lot of people in this province who are concerned about the power group who have taken over the reins here and will now further consolidate their power into the hands of four or five people, as I understand it. We don't know how much money we are talking about insofar as the salaries they are going to pay these people are concerned; who they are, what their functions will be. Insofar as I am concerned, I am opposed to discussing this thing until we know what we are talking about; until the Prime Minister or someone tells the House what we are involved with. Again I am saying that the think-tank operation, with the executive taking over, the executive group controlling the legislative process is my area of concern.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): Has the member read the report?

Mr. Sargent: I have read parts of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, if the member reads it all, his questions will be answered for him very simply.

Mr. Sargent: Well my main concern is that I understand many departments, as we know them now, are going to disappear in this set-up today.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not because of this bill, but go ahead.

Mr. Sargent: We also have a concentration of the power of municipalities. We have done away with the mayors and reeves association as a single unit; it is combining with the Ontario Municipal Association.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member opposed to that?

Mr. Sargent: I certainly am.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We did not force it.

Mr. Sargent: I know that, I say to the Prime Minister. I'm concerned that there are 7.5 million people directly governed by mayors and reeves in this province who are now part and parcel of the paid people in the municipal field. I know who is going to control the shots in that group, because the municipal association has the ears of the cabinet, as I understand it.

More and more the people have less say. This government has complete control of our lives now. Even assessment taxation is controlled at the Queen's Park level. The government controls every aspect of our lives from Queen's Park. What else is there left for the people to do? The township and city councils across this province control about 12 per cent of the money they collect; everything else is mandatory from Queen's Park.

I have more to say about this now, Mr. Speaker, because I am concerned about the central control of every aspect of our lives by boards and commissions, bodies run not by elected people but by appointed political hacks responsible only to the government. My main concern is what is going to happen to the democratic process in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak? The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, as usual there is a small kernel of truth in what the hon. member for Owen Sound has to say.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very small.

Mr. MacDonald: He says it is rather difficult to speak about this bill until one knows exactly what it involves. I think this is something of the problem one faces in discussing it other than in general terms, because as the burden of my remarks in the latter part will indicate, there are some very commendable objectives the government is seeking to achieve. As one reads them, they fall rather automatically into the category of motherhood—one couldn't object to them—therefore, the whole test is going to be to what extent they are fulfilled. That isn't something we are going to learn about today; that's something that only time will indicate.

It seems to me we have got to have a look at some sort of machinery to make certain that we know what is happening to the recommendations and to what extent they are fulfilling the stated objectives of the report.

Which prompts me, Mr. Speaker, to take just a moment or two to place this government effort at reorganization in historical perspective. I think it underlines something of the problem that we have got and warns us of some of the pitfalls we must avoid.

Back in the latter part of the 1950s there was a private investigation established by this government headed by Walter Gordon, which brought in a report in September, 1959, entitled, "The Report of the Committee on the Organization of Government in Ontario."

Quite frankly, I never was able to discover, though I have been rather intimately involved in Ontario politics since then, the extent to which the recommendations of this report were heeded by the government or implemented by the government. If one were to ask the government, as is the case always when one asks them with regard to the implementation of any royal commission report, they will say that there were 127½ recommendations and they fulfilled 79¾ of them, therefore they are two-thirds of the way along to complete fulfilment of the report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is usually 125.

Mr. MacDonald: Which of course is a meaningless kind of proposition until one goes back and takes a look at the substance of what they are talking about.

What I do recall rather vividly is that the government of the day apparently came to the conclusion that what we needed was a select committee of this Legislature that would review what had been done or what should be done from the Gordon commission recommendations. That committee was set up in 1960 under the chairmanship of the late Kelso Roberts.

We met for one period between sessions. We brought in an interim report and it was reconstituted to meet again in the fall of 1961. But the fall of 1961 you will recall, Mr. Chairman, was a period of leadership races and the chairman of the day became involved in the leadership race. Do you know, a very interesting thing happened. The select committee established to look into the implementation of the Gordon report just drifted off into limbo. It never reported back.

As a matter of fact, its status I think is going to be worthy of a PhD thesis at some point because I didn't think it was possible for a committee duly and officially appointed to quietly disappear—but this one did. It never reported back. Obviously, implicit in that are some lessons that should guide us.

A second study of Ontario government that I think is worth just reminding the House about is an independent one that was done by Professor Fred Schindeler of York University. He, originally as part of his PhD thesis, did a pretty thorough examination of the operations of government here at Queen's Park. He subsequently rewrote the material and it appeared in a book which is significantly entitled "Responsible Government in Ontario."

There isn't a question mark at the end of that title but the thesis of his book is, in effect, to put a question mark at the end of it. Have we really got responsible government in Ontario? The whole burden of his text was this, that in analysing the sort of legislative executive responsibilities and their growth in keeping with the fantastic growth of government responsibilities in recent years, he came to the conclusion that the legislative branch, and I quote, "The legislative branch has become almost completely dominated by the executive."

He raised some other interesting questions as to what should be done to see if one couldn't correct that balance. Surely the Legislature, as the forum where the elected representatives of the people gather and express their views, is rather an important area that shouldn't be eclipsed and become completely dominated by any other section of government, even the executive council.

Clearly, that report is an independent report that has been useful; in fact, one of the few definitive studies available in academic circles. It has not had any appreciable impact here at Queen's Park. I don't know whether it has even been studied and any consideration given to implementing it.

That brings us, Mr. Speaker, to the current committee report. I had the opportunity last year, as a member of the public accounts committee, to have some considerable exposure to the Committee on Government Productivity and its reports. It is true that our interest was focused in the central purchasing agency and we brought various officials from the Committee on Government Productivity to come and give us the benefits of their views on what was being done here.

We once again became conscious of the problems involved in implementing the recommendations of a study; secondly, of somebody other than those who are immediately responsible for that implementation becoming aware of what was taking place. In short, the government as a whole, or more

particularly the Legislature, should become aware of what is taking place.

When we pressed for example, on the issue of when some standards were going to be laid down which would become mandatory for all government departments with regard to central purchasing, we were told that there really was no power in the recommendations. Ultimately that power would have to derive from the Treasury Board, as it was then called. At that point, in effect, there would be orders-in-council to implement a Treasury Board order—or Treasury Board directive—and all government departments would have to abide by the guidelines as they had been laid down. In short, it raised, Mr. Speaker, the whole proposition of how we are going to implement not just the interests of the central purchasing agency but more broadly the recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity—how we are going to implement their proposals.

I was rather interested a month or so ago to find out that the government had appointed one of its younger and I would think more imaginative deputy ministers, Tom Eberlee, then in the ministry of Labour, as, according to the news reports, the man responsible for giving direction or leadership, or to have the main responsibility in implementation of the Committee on Government Productivity report. I think the House would be interested in knowing, at least in some general way, what exactly is the role of Tom Eberlee in the pattern of the implementation process.

As I go to the report here, Mr. Speaker, I note that on pages 8 and 9 it refers to the original seven recommendations that were made in reports 1 and 2 and it comments:

All of these recommendations have been accepted and their implementation is now underway. It has already produced a notable strengthening of the cabinet's workings.

Here is where my misgivings begin to come to the fore. I have a couple of misgivings with regard to the whole operation of this committee that I want to express. They are not blanket criticisms and condemnations; let me state them and perhaps they will speak for themselves.

The first one is that the committee is made up of a combination of technocrats and business. There are top civil servants, most of them deputy ministers or secretaries to the cabinet or secretaries to the Treasury Board, and businessmen from quite a variety

of industries in the Province of Ontario, with Dr. Fleck from York University—as a key man on the committee personnel—executive director I think he is called.

I respect the need and the desire to create greater efficiency in government. I sometimes, however, begin to have misgivings when people in the business world insist in rather a categorical way that governments should operate just as the business world operates; in fact that they should operate in a business-like way, placing efficiency as the prime objective of government activity.

One has to get a balance here, and efficiency is not necessarily the prime objective of government activity. The objective of government activity is not, as in the business world, to make profits. The objective is to provide services to people. It may well mean that one has got to strike a balance between efficiency and services to people; that in providing services to the people in the most effective way we maybe do not have the most efficient way, in strictly business terms.

Therefore, I am just a little hesitant to accept, without a rather careful look, recommendations that come from a group of people which is a combination of businessmen and technocrats. It seems to me they could miss another rather important set of ingredients that have to be considered. Among other things, neither of them is responsible to the elected representatives of the people; neither of them is responsible directly to the people. They are not elected officials.

The second problem I have with regard to this committee—and we made these criticisms at the outset, and I will be frank with you, Mr. Speaker, my views on this are somewhat modified. Our original reaction to the committee was that it was an “in” committee. We didn’t know how it was going to operate. It never really had public hearings in the normal sense of the word.

I do know that some of the officials, including Dr. Fleck, visited various individuals; certainly they visited me in my capacity as leader of the party some two or three years ago and sought my views of certain things. But there were no real public hearings. It was an “in” committee that was doing its own thing, coming to its own conclusions—and I think I am factually correct in stating that in some instances their conclusions were

in the process of implementation even before the recommendations became part of a public document.

On the one hand, I think there are legitimate reasons for some misgivings in wanting to watch the operation of this kind of a strange political animal. No committee that I have been aware of in our experience around Queen’s Park has operated that way in the last 15 or 20 years.

On the other hand, and this is where the qualification of my original view has crept in to some degree, I am also getting a little weary of committees that tend to be detached from those that are working with the problems of the day. They come up with beautifully tailored recommendations that, once they are published, those who have to implement them take a look at them and say, “What in heaven’s name does one do with that? How do we move from where we are to where we want to go?” The result is that too many recommendations and too many reports of royal commissions are unrelated to the real world to an extent that they automatically find their place on that proverbial shelf and gather dust from that point forward.

To avoid that kind of thing, I can see advantages in having an “in” committee that is a working committee and an implementation committee and is involved with the people who are living day to day with these problems; therefore their recommendations presumably are going to have some relationship to the real world. So I reserve final judgement on the operations of this committee, which brings me to the main concern that I want to raise in speaking to second reading of these bills.

As one looks at the objectives of the third report and the problems that the committee envisaged, one could recognize them as being obvious problems in the context of modern government. For example, on page 1 it says:

Acknowledging Ontario’s history of growth, the report puts forward four reasons for the proposed changes involved in this recommendation. First, ministers do not have sufficient time for policy-making.

Well, I think any fair-minded person would acknowledge that there is something the matter. Indeed, any member of the Legislature has a great deal of difficulty in finding time to devote to reflections on policy-making as he tries to deal with the routine, day-to-day business that he has to cope with. At the ministerial level, I think to be fair,

that problem would be one of even greater proportions.

Second, the organization of the provincial government has grown so large and complicated that it has become difficult to manage.

Once again we are painfully aware of the fantastic growth in government responsibilities, and it's interesting to have an official committee confess to the fact that there is difficulty in management.

Third, because the demand for services is outstripping available revenue, an improved priority-setting system is required.

Again, something that everybody would acknowledge is an important problem. And finally:

Fourth, the operation of individual government departments as separate and distinct entities is no longer appropriate to cope with issues that increasingly involve more than one department.

Now this is something that we have laughed about and had our fun about in this House for the last five or six years since I think Dr. Krueger most graphically presented the whole thing in a report that was almost as humorous as a Gilbert and Sullivan skit in terms of the rivalry, the empire-building and the battling and warring that went on between government departments that were supposed to share responsibility in implementing a given programme. Clearly we have got to have some kind of a new approach there.

All of that is fine, that's rather clear; but I am also interested to discover that interlarded with its initial comments as to the objectives of its recommendations are two others. On page 2, referring to the policy minister:

A policy minister's freedom from administrative responsibilities is also intended to allow him to initiate improvements in the linkages between government and citizens.

Fine! We are back to the old question of the insensitivity of big government and how we can devise ways and means that that government can become more sensitive; in fact continually sensitive.

On page 11, there is another rather interesting comment by way of the objectives. This is the third report on government reorganization:

Its primary and overriding objective is to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and responsiveness of government.

The fascinating thing, Mr. Speaker—I am only going to mention this, then leave it to some of my colleagues who want to deal with it in more detail—is that the responsiveness of government, anything to deal with the responsiveness of government, surely would be centred in the Legislature where the elected representatives of the people have their role to play? Yet there is, at this stage, virtually nothing in the report on government reorganization in reference to the Legislature. In fact I think I am correct in saying there is nothing.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Nothing at all!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): It is excluded by terms of reference.

Mr. MacDonald: It is excluded?

Okay, then I have been too generous in my comments with reference to the extent to which this committee was in relationship to the real world, because there is a real contradiction emerging. If the objective of this report, interlarded in its comments here, is to create this linkage between the ministers and the people, to develop a greater responsiveness on the part of government, how in heaven's name can it do that when it is excluding the one area in the whole government setup which presumably has the greatest contact with the people?

Mr. Deans: That is the whole problem with what the government is doing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is not.

Mr. Deans: We will talk about that.

Mr. MacDonald: At a quarter after 1 on this day, Mr. Speaker, I find myself a little puzzled to know how I can make my point as briefly as possible without taking any more than the necessary amount of time. Let me try to do it this way. On page 12, there is a listing of—I can't count them—maybe a dozen different objectives.

The new organization is designed to make it possible for the government: "1. To ensure that elected representatives will remain fully responsible for policy decisions and for all organizations accountable to the Legislature."

Now who could challenge that? Who could object to that? I repeat—it's motherhood! I join my friend from Owen Sound. To what extent this report is going to achieve that objective I don't know, he doesn't know, the Prime Minister doesn't know. The only way we can find out is to see the implementation of these recommendations; and that presents us with an interesting problem.

How does one pursue it? How does one review the implementation of the recommendation? How does one keep on top of it in a day-to-day fashion when it is an "in" thing being done within the government so that one can find out, firstly, what is happening; and secondly, assess the extent to which what is happening is fulfilling the stated objectives of the report?

Let me take the second one: "To develop fuller two-way communications between the public and the government." Good, another motherhood statement! Nobody could object to it.

Third, to adapt, evolve and restructure itself in response to changes in the society which it serves. There is a platitude if I ever heard one. Again, nobody could—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member has used it.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course, we have all used it!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am saying we did! I remember one speech—

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, we have all used it, but maybe because I have used it and because I know what a vacuous comment it can be and nothing more, what I am wondering is if we have got anything other than vacuity in the recommendation here or in the process of implementation that is going to follow?

The next one is: "To be alert to inconsistencies in policy among departments and the interrelationship among them." Well, Mr. Speaker, one could take a lot of time—and I am not going to do so today—in discussing what are the most interesting, and on the surface the most important, changes in this proposed reorganization of government.

The establishment of the management board of cabinet, as I understand it, really is only a new name for the old Treasury Board. There may be a few new responsibilities there, but it essentially is the same old animal with a new tag. But the proposition of the policy and priorities board, in which we have the Prime Minister and the finance minister and three—can I use the word super-minister or am I violating the image the Premier is trying to create?

Mr. Cassidy: Go on, use it.

Mr. MacDonald: —three policy ministers who are going to be responsible for a cluster of departments that have overlapping responsibilities; this obviously is a move in the

right direction to reconcile this internecine warfare that sometimes has gone on in the departments and has frustrated the implementation of policies to meet the needs of the people. If we can get greater co-ordination there, fine.

I come back and just restate this as my concluding comment, Mr. Speaker. One could take hours talking, elaborating, speculating upon what is in this report, and it really means nothing. What we have got to do is take the objectives, which in the initial statement are little more than platitudes, and we have got to examine what the government has done, what the government will be doing in the days, the weeks and the months that lie ahead. We have got to examine the mechanism for doing it and the personnel, such as Tom Eberlee who presumably has been given a major and rather key responsibility in this. I put to the Prime Minister and the provincial Treasurer, what is the mechanism by which they propose this process to be implemented?

Last year, as I indicated earlier, the public accounts committee performed something of this role and quite frankly, as a member of that committee, I think it developed almost a hidden interest in that kind of thing. If I am on the committee again, I would almost like this to come back to that committee, because I think it's a very important kind of development. But, let's be fair, Mr. Speaker, this would be so preoccupying that the normal responsibilities of the public accounts committee would get completely lost, pushed out of the picture—and I don't think that should happen.

Therefore it seems to me we've got to look to either another committee—now we are back to square one in how to avoid getting too many committees and make them operative. We have got to find some sort of a mechanism, because we simply will not have achieved what we wanted to achieve in the reorganization of the government if, since the government excluded the Legislature from the terms of reference, we don't now devise ways and means by which the Legislature can at least be brought into the process of examining what is being done elsewhere in the government, to say nothing of what should be done about re-examining our procedures in the Legislature itself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think you are aware

of my interest—almost at times my preoccupation—in government reform. Up until a few weeks ago it used to be quite interesting to contemplate how the cabinet might be reformed and made more efficient, if you would pardon the use of that word, and responsive. That of course is now postponed for four years but, Mr. Speaker, my interest is maintained, believe me, not only by the prospects of implementing some changes on behalf of the people of Ontario and myself but also to contemplate just what has gone into the proposed changes in these bills and what we might expect when they are more fully implemented in the next few months.

I have been quite interested in what has been said already by the two hon. members who have spoken. I suppose we have to think of Les Frost. When he took over as Premier in 1948 the budget was about \$230 million; by the time he got to 1956, we were spending \$500 million, a tremendous sum—not as big as our deficit this year, but a tremendous sum.

The public service had grown by leaps and bounds from 1948 to 1956 and, with I suppose the wisdom of a good commonsense lawyer from Lindsay, he thought, well, I am going to have to get some outside advice about this. Government is becoming monolithic and even I, he might have said, cannot fully control every one of its ramifications. And as the member for York South has said, he went downtown to get the most objective and able management expert that he could find, a chap named Walter Gordon, who produced the report that was referred to.

It is a strange report in many ways; you cannot even find who sat on the committee with him. It was really a private committee, established by order in council, and I have looked through the report many times because, on more than one occasion, we have urged from this side that the executive council and its method of developing policy and administering that policy was something less than perfect.

I recall talking about centralized purchasing and hearing the former Treasurer, the present Minister of Transportation (Mr. MacNaughton), objecting about how difficult centralized purchasing would be until he finally implemented it and did find that, under his direction, it was not only difficult but impossible, and that centralized purchasing technique has almost completely lapsed.

I remember the discussions on the requirements for post-audit which were likewise objected to strenuously by the government

until finally they accepted the recommendations of the committee that had a great deal to do with the composition of the bill that we are debating now.

There were other areas; the overlapping of responsibilities in the planning area have already been referred to here. It was almost laughable at the time that Professor Krueger referred to it, but it became simply hilarious even after Krueger's warnings when we saw the now Treasurer, then Minister of Municipal Affairs, vying with the Treasurer in those days and the Minister of Trade and Development and the Minister of Highways, as to just who, in fact, was going to have pre-eminence in planning.

The former Treasurer stated, of course, that he was the chief planner, and now that he has vacated that position and we have a new Treasurer, there is no doubt about the fact that the Treasurer is the chief planner.

I think that no matter how a Premier, with the advice and consent of the Legislature, attempts to reorganize government and come out with plans that are attractive in their design and apparently workable when you examine them, it is still on a basis of personality. And if somebody with truculent bombast is going to take over the pre-eminent position of expressing views and having them accepted, even around the cabinet table—and I believe, you know, that that is what has happened here—then I think finally, when all of the gravel and the dust has settled and sifted out, and while there is no doubt who is Premier, there is also no doubt who is really pulling the levers, and whoever gets the job is going to be chairman of the management committee.

That individual must be torn as to whether, in fact, he wants to be—

Hon. Mr. Davis: He won't.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, if the Premier does not know then I guess I—

Mr. Sargent: Did they scare you?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It must be a terrible strain for the present Treasurer to decide whether in fact he wants to be chairman of the management committee or Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs because both of those jobs would be so tremendously attractive to him.

Imagine being Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs; he would have the same authority to do what he loves to do, vis-à-vis Ottawa, and at the same time do what he

loves to do vis-à-vis the municipalities, and that is to tell them off; tell them what to do; instruct them from on high.

My view here is that while the structure of reform is very important, and we are all interested in it, and, believe it or not, I am going to talk about it in a few minutes, that still the personalities of the individuals involved, in fact, impose the aura—a word that the member for York South used a moment ago—the aura of government on the system.

And the member for Chatham-Kent has got his own aura which I think is going to cling through all the ramifications of any kind of structure that is designed and implemented by this House or by this Premier.

I sometimes think that if the individual I have been talking about could only be in the company of his charming wife all of the time—his personality improves and I think his effectiveness improves, political and otherwise—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I was hoping to be through by about 3 this afternoon but the member is holding things up.

Mr. R. F. Nixon:—but I suppose it is just not possible to have her there as a moderating influence on all occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I am now impressed by the Committee on Government Productivity. I believed at the time it was announced that it was just something that had been decided between the Premier and the member for Huron, the former Treasurer—"Let us stop all of this criticism about methods of reforming the government, and we will establish this committee and our own men will be on it; in fact, we will be able to point to it with pride. We will be able to refer things to it when it becomes necessary to refer a problem."

Perhaps we were unjust in getting that impression. It came naturally from our experience with the former administration that that is really what its function would be. I believe it has been a good committee. I was most interested in hearing the views expressed by the member for York South when he talked about it partly being in and partly being out. I think we have been well served by all the members, particularly the ex-officio member or whatever he is called, Dr. Fleck. I can't help but say I think the Premier is wise in grabbing him out of that committee and putting him in his own office because he is going to be a real addition. The fact, I think, that he has a sort

of a rural background from Oxford county doesn't harm his qualifications and credentials.

I wanted to say a good deal comparing—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Tillsonburg.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say something in comparison of this approach to the reform of the administration with the Glassco approach. It certainly was interesting for a day or two in the newspapers when the full report came tumbling down to the government. As is so often the case, and this has already been said too, it is almost impossible for a government to take scores of recommendations and even take the time to winnow out from them something that is useful.

The Glassco report was a good one but I don't think its implementation has been as good as this can be with the concept of regular reports leading to a continuous reform and improvement of government. These bills, of course, are going to implement at least part of the reforms suggested in the third report of the Committee on Government Productivity. It appears that it calls for the abolition of several departments as we now know them. I have tried to make a list.

There is the Department of the Provincial Secretary, as we now know it. I think that is a good thing; we don't need a Provincial Secretary any more. The Provincial Secretary and the Premier used to write out bills in longhand, over lunch, and come into the House and introduce them. It is now in the dim and distant past but I can remember my dad, the former member for Brant, talking about some of these practices in days gone by. The Provincial Secretary's function became much stronger with the companies branch and so on, but obviously this function is no longer needed.

The Department of Citizenship: Certainly the branch dealing with this would be maintained but I always felt that the role of a department of citizenship was largely political window dressing, certainly in the hands of the present incumbent anyway. We don't need it in that form.

Lands and Forests: I doubt very much if the Premier is going to have the nerve to say we don't need a department by that name any more. It does not appear in the list. We are going to have a minister of resources. As a matter of fact, in our deliberations leading to the publishing of that

book called "A Blueprint for Government" which was presented to the Premier by an august person a couple of evenings ago, we considered a long time about a department of resources which, in fact, should include Agriculture as well as Lands and Forests, as well as Mines—the whole ambit. I have got to say that I felt that we could not do without a Department of Agriculture, per se—not that I was put to the final test, by a narrow margin—but I can see that there are certain concerns here.

The idea of having one minister—and I would call him a super-minister as, in fact, these ministers will be, no matter how the Premier protests otherwise—to have somebody speaking for the policies associated with the development of our resources is an attractive idea to me. Lands and Forests is gone in the recommendations.

Mines, Northern Affairs, Tourism—even Municipal Affairs, by that name; although of course, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs will have that whole ambit in his control. I can't help but think that the member for Chatham-Kent is going to find that completely irresistible. It just has too much to recommend itself to him.

The concept that is going to be effected is that of the Premier. I notice in the design here he is signified by the symbol "P" which, of course, could stand for Premier or Prime Minister. I am not going to resurrect the old debate, but it seems to me that I recall, I think the present incumbent, setting up an elaborate committee or giving a task force the requirement to find out just what he should be called. I have a few recommendations to make for the one-man task force which would probably be unacceptable and it isn't really an issue. But I say, probably for the last time, that for the sake of clarity I think the head of the government of the province should be called the Premier and the head of the government of the nation should be called the Prime Minister.

I think it would mean that at the federal-provincial conferences there wouldn't be so much confusion and it has other advantages too, but, like the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), I might make a mistake when I say I will not raise the matter again. What, in fact, the policy and priorities committee, chaired by the Premier, would turn out to be—with the three policy ministers and two others associated with them—would be a super-cabinet.

In my view, there are two things wrong with this. It does unnecessarily concentrate

decision in too small a group. Our concept was that it should be concentrated much more than it is presently where the lines of responsibility cannot be traced to an individual, other than the Premier himself, who must finally be put on the spot. But this concentration in five—six, counting the chairman of that committee—I think is an undue concentration because, try as you may, there is no way that you can convince either the other members of the cabinet or the members of the Legislature or the people in the community that the ministers are all of equal rank.

After all, that policy and priority group is the group which under certain circumstances will retire to some place in Muskoka to decide when the election will be, what you are going to do about the separate schools and things like that. There are going to be ministers who will feel just a bit out of things when, in fact, they are left simply writing the nice letters that are requested by various people in the community and answering questions in the Legislature.

The second point is even in the Legislature itself there will always be at least two ministers, three counting the Premier, among whom responsibility can be juggled. Our experience here in question period which, important though it may be, is not all-important but it is sort of an indication of the way it will appear to the community, is that there is always one of the ministers away, and it will always turn out that he is the man who has the information and the power to make the decision in a certain circumstance. So I object; I really think it is a flaw in the plan that, even though we are going to have the concentration of authority in six individuals, we are not going to have a clear delineation of the lines of authority that is required if democracy is going to be served. It may serve some of the purposes of a government in office—small "p" political purposes—to keep the ball in the air a bit longer, but if we are going to make decisions that are going to exist for quite a long time that this is one flaw that I see which is going to be a difficulty.

When I talk about these people being truly super-ministers, there is one quote in here that struck me—I believe it is on page 2, and I did get further than that—on page 2:

A policy minister's freedom from administrative responsibilities is also intended to allow him to initiate improvements in the linkages between government and citizens. An important part of this process would

be to explain government policy and obtain reactions from the citizens.

This is the essence of politics and it is, in my view, the essence of political power. A couple of the putative super-ministers have already been doing that. I remember the present Treasurer and a couple of others went on great tours through the province calling meeting after meeting—and I couldn't help but admire their stamina under the circumstances—in which they were explaining government policy and getting reaction. Their explanations were bad and the reactions they got were bad. At one time I thought it might do a little damage but—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You were hoping?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, counting on it, but Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the ministers in the cabinet empowered with that responsibility are, in fact, going to be the political movers and shakers. The others are going to be administrators, certainly, but they will be definitely in a secondary position. As I say, no matter how you protest, this cannot be changed, and those ministers in the cabinet now who sense that they are not going to be in the super-group are already surely very sensitive about that fact. So, a criticism: We are unnecessarily concentrating authority in too small a group so that the lines of responsibility still remained blurred, and are in fact tangled.

Talking about specific recommendations, I can't see why the recommendation would be to maintain a ministry of Revenue and Government Services. It is sort of neat, it is sort of interesting, but it looks almost as if the government is trying to maintain a position just for the sake of finding another position. I don't want to be personally critical. It has nothing to do with the present incumbent of either the Treasury or The Department of Revenue.

I think last night during the debates on the tax bills it was apparent that we don't need two ministers. In fact we are spending a lot of money setting up a whole new office for the Minister of Revenue somewhere else while I guess the government air conditions the Treasury, it may be that the treasurer has decided to stay on there after all. I just feel that the requirements for a separate ministry of Revenue are still very, very hard to justify indeed.

I think that Education should have one minister. It has been said many times it would be far too big for one person to operate, but there are recommendations here

that with assistance from elected people outside the cabinet we could do this. It would be clearly understood that those people reporting to the Minister of Education would be in a secondary capacity. I venture to suggest to the Premier that there are those among us, in the 78, who have not now got special responsibilities who would be quite willing to accept the position, understood to be secondary, so they could have a role to play in the administration. I don't think the Premier would have any trouble filling any of those positions. I am, in fact, talking about something that might be called a legislative or parliamentary secretary.

I don't think the Premier is prepared to accept that; he wants to keep a big ministry. The alternative is a smaller ministry with some of those outside of it having special responsibilities. Frankly I favour the latter. I believe this plan gives us the worst of both worlds—unnecessary concentration of power in the hands of six people and still sort of an external cabinet whose position would be made secondary.

I think that Correctional Services as a department should not be continued; it should be an adjunct to The Department of Education. I have spoken about that before, I feel that quite strongly. The Premier still feels it should be part of the administration of justice. There is a difference of opinion here; I am convinced I am right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member has been convinced of a number of things.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right. I haven't seen anything yet to change my mind.

As I look around the 78, Mr. Speaker, I have also felt sure that one of the continuing problems that the Premier would want to get away from, in his experience as—

Hon. Mr. Davis: As we look over there we think the Leader of the Opposition is the one who has to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —an ordinary member of cabinet for so many years, was this pulling and hauling among strong personalities in the cabinet for jurisdiction over such an interesting, productive and politically powerful function as planning. For that reason I still believe the main planning responsibility ought to be an adjunct of the Premier's office.

I feel this most strongly. I know he can argue with me 10 ways, but if he gives it to any other one individual or any section then he is in for trouble. If the Premier says this

whole thing is designed to make the planning function flexible over a number of areas, then he is simply asking for more trouble of the type that he has had.

The Premier simply can't have three ministers sharing responsibility for speaking for such things as the Toronto-centred region and any other plans that surely will be forthcoming in the near future. If that is anything less than a prime ministerial direct responsibility he is going to have troubles.

The other thing in this connection is federal-provincial relationships. It looks neat and tidy to say; "Ah, let's have one minister dealing with both the municipal and federal inputs into provincial policy." It looks neat and tidy, but I just don't believe that it is going to be an effective way to do things. I still think federal-provincial affairs should be the responsibility of the Premier. He can select anybody he wants as a spokesman when he goes to those conferences. Over the last many months we have been dealing primarily with financial matters and so the Treasurer has emerged as a major spokesman at this level.

That doesn't mean in the future that the emphasis is not going to be on certain other aspects. I do not like the concept of a Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. It is neat, but I don't believe it is going to be effective or workable. It is going to depend too much on the personality of the individual concerned and I think that is, with great respect, risky.

There is one other aspect with which I, too, agree—the most important thing from our standpoint. It is the lack of some reference to the Legislature. I would think that if you were to speak confidentially and personally to a good number of the new members here they would be something less than enthralled with their experience this week.

Before the government gives the obvious answer that we are responsible for that, let me tell them that the ordering of the business here and the role of the private member is a responsibility we all share. Frankly I haven't heard any good answers from any individual member.

We have all said upgrading the committee system, that sort of thing, is going to do it. I doubt if it will make the role of the private member—and I don't know what the right word is, so for want of the right word I say relevant. We can blame the party system, particularly the Progressive Conservative Party system. One talks to individual members and they say: "How do we get paid around here?"

The Premier was proud of the fact that on opening day that there had been no caucus of his members until that very day, when there had been tremendous support for his leadership and they were going to go on into the next few decades continuing that support. That may well be, but it seems incredible that the Progressive Conservative Party didn't undertake to sit down with the 28 new Tory members and say: "Listen boys, this is what you do around here and this is what you can do."

This is a very superficial approach to making the role of a member relevant. On the other hand, the Premier is going to find that a good many of his private members, as this short session closes, are probably wondering just what the devil they've got into here. I think a good deal has to be done aside from the structure of the thing.

One of the things that I did read in the Gordon report comes from page 4: "The power and authority that governments nowadays possess make special demands upon Parliament, under our democratic system, to exercise effective supervision and control." I think probably what he was thinking about was not legislative control but executive control.

There is the feeling and it is growing more and more, we have had it for certainly the 10 years that I've been around here, that the Legislature simply exists to respond to the ringing of the bells and vote as directed. There has got to be some way to improve the role of the elected member in the Legislature, yet the Premier says the terms of reference have specifically excluded it.

I was quite intrigued with the last paragraph where they talk about concepts for the future, because one of the most important concepts we must come to grips with is the role of this Legislature as something other than simply the source of power. It's got to be improved considerably beyond that.

Some of these concepts are most interesting. One called contract mechanisms is a very attractive one; as a matter of fact it is associated with a little debate we had here the other day about whether the government ought to be building buildings and roads itself. The feeling I have had and I am not so sure there is much disagreement—is that the government should not maintain road construction gangs and building gangs, but in fact almost like a private enterprise they tender for almost all the work that they have done, including legal advice and things like that. But they talk about something here

that is most interesting. They want to contract out, or they suggest in the future it might be possible to take this approach. It said: "Widely applied, this concept could result in significant reprivatization."

When I saw that word I realized that our committee had certainly shown a lot of initiative in dreaming up that word, but "re-privatization" is something I think we can look to, if in fact the present Treasurer becomes both the chairman of the management committee and the minister for intergovernmental affairs, which is probably what he has really got in mind. The citizen contribution to government decision-making, however, is the section in The Concepts for the Future which must involve the Legislature—the citizen's contribution to decision-making.

We know about how groups of citizens such as CORA have in recent months contributed to decision-making—citizen groups like CORA and Dalton Camp probably in equal parts. We are going to be doing a lot more of this. The gangs that come to the front door with signs are nothing new. Actually we haven't had too many of them in recent months, that seems to be becoming somewhat passé, but over the years this has always been sort of the final alternative for citizens who feel they can't make governments take notice of them. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the role of the private member here is the answer to citizen participation.

The former Premier (Mr. Robarts) used to talk about the fact that we are all ombudsmen. I think we accept that; that is what being a member is. That is why we say we should have offices in our ridings and our wives should not be the secretary for the local member all the time—that sort of thing.

But that is only a small part that all of us feel; not only that we must, but that we want, to serve the individual citizens in our constituency and see that they get the right letters; and if they don't get the right cheques at the proper time, that we assist them in that. That is very worthwhile work, but it has got to be more than that.

The members in this chamber have got to feel that they have, and that rotten word comes into play, a meaningful role to play in the development of policy and the administration of governmental decisions. If a small group, now 23 but soon to be reduced to six, plus some other fellows who are well paid is all the government is, then you are going to have a lot of trouble with the opposition, before the next four years are over; but

even as difficult for you will be that mob of fellows who have already learned there is no sense sitting in here because nothing happens in here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Doesn't the member wish he had that problem?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I believe I could have solved it better than you so far are attempting to solve it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are going to solve it, but doesn't the member wish he had it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is one reason, Mr. Speaker, why government should change on occasion so that the feeling associated with complete confidence and the amiability of that everlasting smile is replaced with a new idea that what we have is something less than perfect.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to spend a moment or two speaking about the one thing that I think is perhaps, as the minister said, intentionally omitted but which I happen to feel is perhaps the most important part of it all. I want to begin by telling you that I have no particular problem with the acceptance of the changes within the cabinet, none whatsoever. I happen to think, in fact, that the response is basically a response to a public demand, that people are increasingly dissatisfied with the lack of efficiency within government, the obvious lack of efficiency.

As my colleague from York South said, the one thing we have to be careful about is that we do attempt to protect the responsiveness of government while guaranteeing the maximum degree of efficiency.

I didn't realize, frankly, that the Legislature had been specifically excluded from the terms of reference. I perhaps ought to have known that, but I didn't. But it was evident to me, as I read the report, that the Legislature, whether specifically excluded or not, certainly had been excluded. I read on page 6 about the Concepts for the Future. They titled them, and they did it rather well. They gave the following titles in the report: The Ministry Offices, The Separation of Policy Formulation and Programme Delivery, Contract Mechanisms—this is the one that the Leader of the Opposition was talking about—Organizational Decentralization, and Citizen Contribution to Public Decision-Making.

I always thought, in my sort of naive way, that we did have citizen contribution to public decision-making. I thought it before I got here. Over the last four years I have become increasingly more aware that citizen contribution depends to a great extent on who the citizen is. It is not a matter of simply saying that every citizen has access or entrée to the decision-making mechanisms. It depends to a great extent who that citizen is and what that citizen represents.

I felt, before coming here in 1967, that part of the way this contribution was made was through the efforts of the members of the Legislature. That in fact historically and traditionally the members of the Legislature brought before the government the complaints, suggestions, offerings of the people whom they represented for consideration, and that consideration was given by the government to those kinds of things.

I recognize that in the days immediately after and in the months immediately preceding an election, politics perhaps plays a much more important role in the things that happen around here than maybe the actual process itself.

I did think, obviously naively, that the whole process that took place here was aimed at hearing the views of individuals and listening to those views—not only giving the individual member an opportunity to speak, but in fact listening to what he had to say. Perhaps even discussing with him, if there was a point raised that was worthy of discussion, in the privacy of another part of this building the things that he was suggesting. Maybe even pursuing them a little bit to try to look into them and find out whether or not there was any merit in going further with them.

I discovered in four years that this is not the way it works. If any consideration is given at all to suggestions that are made in this Legislature, that consideration certainly must be paid in privacy and the discussion will take place between the government members themselves. I cannot recall a single occasion—although my views have been on occasion publicly acknowledged by ministers as being worthy of consideration—I do not recall ever having been asked to expand on them beyond the fact that I raised them in the House. Obviously it goes no further than just the exchange across the floor.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sometimes we reread them.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sometimes we reread them.

Mr. Deans: I said that; I recognize that in the privacy of their own offices maybe they do take a look at them and discover they are worthless, absolutely worthless. The things you thought were worthwhile are useless. Fair ball; but they cannot all be useless, we are not all stupid and—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That mineral exploration programme that originated over here is working very well!

Mr. Deans: What I want to say, to begin with, is that I can understand the desire of the government to establish a much more efficient operation. I understand the desire of the government, perhaps to relieve certain ministers of administrative responsibilities and to give them much wider policy areas over which to reign.

Okay; a good idea; it gives the individual minister a chance perhaps to dig much more deeply into the background and the substance of policy suggestions; an opportunity perhaps to do for himself some of the research that previously he had to rely on individual members of his department to do; he had to rely on their advice rather than having the opportunity to pursue it by himself.

I can also understand the concept of moving toward a much more managerial function. I do not agree with it necessarily, but I can understand that kind of a recommendation would come from this kind of a committee. It is the application of it that matters.

I am a little concerned that what is going to happen is that we are going to further divorce the decision-making from the realm of the Legislature. That in fact what little bit there may have been emanating from the Legislature that was considered by the government will, by virtue of these decisions, become even less. I am sure that is not a good idea, and it is evident to me that in the discussion and in the decision that has been arrived at, in spite of the directive not to consider the Legislature, there has been a tremendous amount of conflict in the committee to try and avoid considering the Legislature. It is extremely difficult to discuss policy-making and to discuss the function of government without taking into consideration the role that the Legislature is going to play. And I think that it was wrong in the first instance to ask the group specifically to exclude the Legislature. They have dealt with

federal-provincial relations. They have dealt with the relations of local government, as they ought to have dealt with them, and then they moved out—and they had to move out—they moved out to deal with the relationship between government and the public, and as has been said before, that relationship, out of necessity includes the relationship between government and the Legislature. It includes the relationship between government and the total Legislature, not the opposition, necessarily, and not necessarily the backbenchers of the government side. And I think that it was an error on the part of the government to think that you can restructure the cabinet without considering the role that the Legislature has to play in the policy-making and the decision-making and the review of government policy.

I do not think it is possible to restructure the cabinet without giving consideration to these things, because it is a necessary part of the procedure. If it is not a necessary part of the procedure then why don't you abolish it altogether? If it is going to become more irrelevant than it was in the past, then it doesn't make any sense to go through this façade of making speeches if they are only going to be considered as political speeches and only going to be made when the gallery is filled.

I think that what you end up having is this: You hold an election and if you are lucky enough to be on the side that wins, you get appointed to the cabinet. If, for some reason—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not all luck.

Mr. Deans: To a great extent it is luck.

Mr. MacDonald: I don't know how some people ever got into the cabinet if it is not luck.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: No, well, I concede it is not all luck. I did not say it was. But I say if you are fortunate enough, in the fortunes of the election, to be in the party that gets elected, and if from that you are put into the cabinet, fine. But if you are not in the cabinet all your functions cease, and you end up sitting somewhere out here not knowing what the government is doing, not being consulted about the government's actions, and in fact, really playing even a lesser role than the opposition does, then what is the function, what is the purpose of coming here at all? Why then don't you just simply deal by virtue of the cabinet, send out the decisions

that you have arrived at and continue on your merry way, because that is exactly what happens.

You can't tell me—at least, you can tell me if you like but I would have trouble believing—that on Monday morning when you held your caucus meeting you took the time to sit down and explain to the newly elected members and to the members returning who are not a part of the cabinet, the philosophy and the ideology and the processes of the decisions that you came to in the legislation that we had placed before us this week.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Two of these bills were here five months ago—four months ago.

Mr. Deans: Two of these bills, but I am talking about the total package of bills introduced into this House. How many of the government backbenchers were given an opportunity to express any kind of an opinion prior to the introduction—

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): You don't know what goes on.

Mr. Deans: —prior to the introduction of that legislation? How many?

Mr. MacDonald: We have the history of Bill 99—we found out how it goes.

Mr. Deans: I know how it goes. You can shout and scream, but if you were here you would be honest and tell it. So what I am going to ask you is this—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Come to our caucus some time. It may enlighten you.

Mr. Deans: Well, fine, I might come. Just to listen, as an observer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You might even decide to stay.

Mr. Deans: Oh, no, I have my doubts about that. But it is traditionally the case—and you are not out of step with what has happened in the past—it has been traditionally the case that every time that a restructuring of government has been considered, the Legislature was ignored. In every instance that I have been able to dig up, in the discussion of the restructuring of government, the Legislature or the Parliament has been ignored. For some reason or other it's considered that the things that go on in the Parliament or the legislative chamber are okay—they are fine—and that the only changes that need be made are the changes in the

actual managing of the government's business. And that isn't the case; it isn't the case.

I think that you can take a look at the role of the opposition. You say, and rightly so, that the ministers don't have sufficient time for in-depth policy perusal and discussion, and I think it is true. But it goes equally that the same thing is true of the Opposition; that in fact, having respect for all of the things that traditionally go on in this chamber, we don't have any more time and yet our role is no less. Yet the role of the opposition is, in fact, traditionally and practically a reasonable role and a functional role.

For some reason the motives on both sides—and this is the politics of it, and this is the aggravation of it—the motives on both sides are always in question, so that if we ask, or suggest, or attempt to find out what it is that has motivated the legislation that's being introduced we are considered to be obstructive—

An hon. member: Oh no.

Mr. Deans: We are. We are! While on the other side, fairly, we have—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have never questioned the hon. member's motives.

Mr. Deans: I am not saying that. But you look; you listen. The opportunity to speak is always available in the Legislature; but the right to be heard is an entirely different thing.

It is a question of whether or not there is a responsiveness from the ministry; whether or not the ministry is interested in the views that you are expressing. And that is the most important part.

It is not whether you can say what you want to say; you can do that by press release, or you can do it down in any hotel, to any gathering. When you speak in the Legislature about legislation, it is the need to have the minister actually listen to what is being said, and to pay some recognition to it.

The way we do it here isn't going to serve the changing community; it isn't going to serve the changing needs. And as the cabinet is reshuffled and changed, therefore—there must be some kind of change in the relevancy of the total Legislature to those decisions. There should be the opportunity to be a part, in some small way perhaps, but a part nevertheless and a recognized and needed part, of the decisions that the government makes. Now it may be easier to do those

things among the government members, it may be more difficult to do them with the opposition.

What I am saying is that the government has always to recognize—and this is not intended to be political; I say it in a friendly way; the government has always to recognize that regardless of the majority—78 in this instance, a large majority—regardless of the large majority, there will historically be a time—and it will happen and there may even be somewhere on the benches of the government an individual who will still be in the Legislature—when the Conservatives sit in opposition. That may happen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Deans: No, I am not holding my breath, believe me. But I am telling hon. members opposite that it will happen, just as surely as they are sitting there, it will happen. And on that day they will look back and decide, sitting on this side, that there is a need to make more relevant—that's that nasty word that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't like—more relevant, the role of the Legislature; to try to include the members of the Legislature in a meaningful way in the things that go on.

What I am going to ask you to do is this: I think that now that you have completed the study and you are on your way to restructuring the cabinet—and no doubt we will see the results of that in a year and we will look at it and hopefully we will be able to see improvements that have been made and we will all be applauding the fact that things are more efficient, less money is being spent and we are getting better value for the tax dollars that we raise—but in this interim period, I ask you to ask this committee to take a serious look at the role of the Legislature. I ask you to structure a committee—

Hon. Mr. Davis: This House will determine that, not some outside committee.

Mr. Deans: No. That has been the problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member should look to his colleagues there. They would agree with that.

Mr. Deans: That has been the problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it is the only proper way.

Mr. Deans: It is not the only proper way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, ask the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Deans: It is entirely possible and correct to have a committee structured that will look at the relevancy of the Legislature to the policy-making areas and to come up with the kinds of suggestions that will include, by right, the individual members prior to the ridiculous debates that we carry on in the Legislature.

You know, we went a little step in that direction. It was a small step, but when we moved out of here into committee with the estimates, it afforded for the first time a tiny entrée into the department. It gave every member, backbencher on the government side or opposition member, an opportunity to sit down with the people who actually make the effective decisions and to ask them, face to face, how they arrived at the decisions they made.

This, instead of going through the ridiculous façade of asking the minister and having him cover his microphone and lean forward and whisper in the ear of the deputy, who in turn handed a note to the deputy's deputy, who sent it to someone under the gallery, who sent the note back to the deputy who read it, whispered to the minister whose hand was over the microphone and then the minister answered as if he knew what it was all about. That's the kind of thing I am saying is absolutely ridiculous and that's the kind of thing I am saying which a committee could quite readily sit down and look at and come up with ways of improving and of making participation much more meaningful.

We can't go on the way we are doing. The Premier may be able to establish a managerial function and he may be able to manage the affairs of government, perhaps the way management manages the affairs of International Nickel, or Westinghouse, or any other major corporation. But they are not responsible to the people. They don't have to be. Their role doesn't require that; the Premier's role does. His role requires that, and his role requires that he try to involve as many people as possible and that he actually seek their opinions. This government may last forever, you know, if he does that. It may just last forever.

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): Heaven forbid!

Mr. Deans: Well, it would be bad. But the one thing that will happen, at least, is that you will—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I like that attitude.

Mr. Deans: That's right. But the one thing that will happen if the Premier does it is that he will give every single person in this Legislature, once he is elected, an opportunity to play some kind of a role in what we do. It's not nearly good enough to go through this nonsense we went through this last week, and it is about that that I am talking, quite frankly. Coming charging in here in the second week of December, to deal with what we think is major legislation, contrary to what the Premier thinks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We think it is too.

Mr. Deans: Well if it is major, the Premier has to recognize that we are going to have some views on it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a strange way to handle it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No one is scorning—

Mr. Deans: It is ridiculous to try to set a five-day period to deal with all of those important bills and important spending estimates and to sit until 3 o'clock in the morning, knowing full well that from the hours of 10.30 o'clock until 3 a.m. anything that is done that is productive is minimal.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Who caused the delay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought we produced something.

Mr. Deans: Surely it makes more sense among civilized people to deal in a way in which you get the maximum from the abilities of every individual and that doesn't include sitting in the middle of the night and and it doesn't include the kinds of rigmarole that we go through in a one-week period trying to cram legislation and estimates through the House.

That is what I am saying to the Premier. There have to be ways to change that and those ways are important to me. They are important to me, whether I am here or not. Whether I am here or not, this place will remain and I want to know when I am out working someplace else some day—

Mr. Havrot: Working?

Mr. Deans: That was cruel. That in fact what goes on here involves the people that I vote for and elect, whether my man gets elected or somebody else does. And I don't want to see it get worse and worse and I ask the Premier to give serious consideration or

tell me why, constitutionally, the Premier cannot structure a committee that will take a serious look at the role of the Legislature, and try to come forward with some meaningful and purposeful suggestions about change.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): I would like to say a few words regarding the bills which are before us, dealing with the restructuring of government. The two main proposals, of course, are the formation of the management board of cabinet and the policy and priorities board.

If these groups accomplish the purpose of forming a managing co-ordinating group and a policy co-ordinating group, I think the purposes of the bill will be good indeed. If on the other hand, they serve merely as a vehicle for centralizing and polarizing power within the cabinet into small groups with great and far-reaching powers, they will serve no useful purpose.

I think, to look properly at the establishment of these two boards of cabinet, we must go back to the original concept within the part 3 report on government improvement in that we are grouping various present cabinet portfolios around a policy minister. This should have some good effects, I think, if it does in time result in co-ordination of management and programmes within certain allied departments of the present government. We in opposition have long argued against the policies that do exist now, where one department of government seems to be working in opposite directions from another department, and there is in fact no co-ordination either of policy or of programmes. This has been brought to our attention on numerous occasions.

In fact, we have on one occasion even had two ministers within the Legislature answer yes and no to the same question at the same time. We have had examples where The Department of Highways was planning a road to bypass St. Jacobs directly over the property where the Ontario Water Resources Commission was planning a sewage disposal plant. Surely we can look forward to a higher degree of co-ordination both within programmes and within policies among the various departments of government. That is some of the good that should result from this reorganization.

Dealing now with the matter of the two main groups: The management board of

cabinet, of course, is going to be most important. The representation from the policy groups to management board is there, not through the policy ministers but a minister of one of the various cabinet positions looking after certain departments. The co-ordination between the management board and the policy and priorities board is through the three super-ministers, as they have been called—which really is a simple way of designation—and the Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs. It is on that position that I would like to make a few remarks.

To begin with, I think we must look at the responsibility which is going to be placed on this particular minister, the Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs. First of all, he is going to have the present duties of the Treasurer. He is going to have the duties of economic development and most of the duties of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

When I first saw the release of this report I phoned the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs. At that time I was not aware of where they fit into the scheme of things. He was not there but I spoke to one of his assistants. They informed me that at the present time they didn't know either where their department was going to fit into the scheme of things as it had not filtered down from above. We know that most of the present duties of The Department of Municipal Affairs will be transferred to this minister who, in my view, will be a very powerful voice within both the board of management of cabinet and the policy and priorities board. His duties will be most onerous. I think, in fact, they will be almost impossible to carry on at a level where there can be proper liaison between that minister and the general public.

Perhaps in no other department of government is there as much inquiry and should there be much of a liaison as in what we now refer to as our Department of Municipal Affairs. In that department, we have the wellbeing of all our municipalities; we have municipal and provincial relations; we have all of our municipal subsidies and our grant structures—all are related to this department. On top of that, we now find that the question which we have been asking for the last two years has been answered. Who is really doing the planning in the province—the community planning branch or the economic development branch of the Treasury? We now find that all of the planning will now be

under the jurisdiction of this new Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs.

I find it almost impossible to believe that one ministry could look properly after such a wide area of responsibility. Added to this, we have the last part, that is intergovernmental affairs, and on this I would like to say a few words. This means all intelligent dialogue, all co-ordination between the governments, the provincial government and the federal government will be under this one ministry. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we could think for a moment of the importance that provincial, municipal and federal relationships will have in this province in the next 20 years, from now until the turn of the century.

Trilevel conferences are something we just started to talk about in the last few years. They are just starting to scratch the surface of their importance. I personally feel that the whole futures of our urban centres across Canada have got to be looked at not only by municipal governments and provincial governments and federal governments separately, but in complete dialogue in trilevel conferences. I do not look on this as bleakly as does the Premier, who is quoted in the November 19 Globe and Mail as saying that no meaningful trilevel dialogue can take place without constitutional reform and, if it does, it would be of short duration and probably stopgap measures.

I think what we are confusing here is dialogue regarding policy and dialogue regarding programme.

Every time there is any kind of dialogue between the provincial government and the federal government, it seems that those responsible for the dialogue here, from Ontario, right away want to talk about programmes, money, how much are we going to get. Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs is going to have a very grave responsibility in representing the Province of Ontario to work out, first of all, policy on a national basis at trilevel conferences that will tell us a few things. What kind of cities do we want in the future? What size of city? What population restrictions should we put? Where should our population be in the province? What about our communications and transportation systems across the country? Once we have solved these policies, which can easily be done within our present constitutional framework, then we can tackle the matters of what programmes are needed to accomplish these wide policy wishes.

I think this is going to be one of the main functions of the Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs, which he is going to have to take very seriously to heart. I do not believe that we can relegate the office and the portfolio of Municipal Affairs to an adjunct of the provincial Treasurer. This is what I feel is going to happen in this present set-up. The very life of our province depends on what goes on at the municipalities. Many of the larger municipalities have pressures put upon them which are shaping the course of that city, and these pressures are beyond their control. They are pressures from without, and these are the problems that are going to have to be solved.

Might I say this in closing? With this restructuring, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier give very serious consideration to see that this particular aspect of government operations receives its full and proper place within the course of things that are going to be reorganized.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My remarks are going to be very, very brief.

I am sure the Premier is well aware of the apprehensions that are shared by a good many people in northern Ontario about the government restructuring. They feel that the departments which they feel traditionally represents the lifestyle in that part of our province might lose their identity and, in the process, it may lead to government being less accessible, less responsive to their aims and aspirations.

We do have, in the far north, two ministers, one responsible for Mines and Northern Affairs, another one responsible for Lands and Forests. A good many people in the north feel that those two gentlemen are their ministers.

I happen to think that if you have adequate representation, it does not matter whether you happen to be on the side of government or otherwise. If you have people who are interested and able to articulate the problems of those people they will get the attention they deserve and merit.

However, I raise this on the basis, Mr. Speaker, of two headlines that appeared in the two Thunder Bay dailies on Saturday, December 11. In the News-Chronicle it says: "Government Reshuffle Blow to the North. Departments may Vanish?"

Hon. Mr. Davis: Question mark. I saw a question mark.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. I would like to quote briefly from the article, Mr. Speaker. It says:

The other headline to which I refer is: of the question marks in a report released here today. Both The Department of Mines and Northern Affairs, and The Department of Lands and Forests, traditionally the most important government departments for northerners, disappear under the proposals recommended to the government by the Committee on Government Productivity. Mines and Northern Affairs would be swallowed up by three new policy fields or ministries under the recommendations. Most of the work of the departments would be assumed by an environment and resources development policy field which would comprise six ministries.

A new Natural Resources ministry would absorb most of the Mines department responsibilities and the ministry might also take in mine safety, although it could go to a public protection ministry. The Northern Affairs Department which currently does little more than operate a string of information offices throughout the north, would become the responsibility of a super-ministry to be called the Ministry of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs.

The other headline to which I refer is: "Davis confirms Government Changes. Major Northern Ontario Departments cut."

I think that it is incumbent upon the Premier when he speaks, preferably today, and hopefully within the not-too-distant future, that he does assure those people—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not entirely in my hands.

Mr. Stokes:—that he does speak with some knowledge and some conviction and gives that assurance that these departments aren't going to be swallowed up by some maximiser down here and the whole process—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They call him "Super Darce."

Mr. Stokes: Yes. I think it is Prince Darce, isn't it? The whole process of government and the accessibility of—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the hon. member says my name, he is swearing.

Mr. Stokes:—and the accessibility of government and the responsiveness of government as it affects the people of northern Ontario will not be swallowed up by this governmental reorganization.

As I say, I don't share that apprehension, but I am assured that a good many people in the north do, and I hope that the Premier will comment on it and give that assurance at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, regarding the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought he spoke?

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. member speak previously on this bill?

Mr. Sargent: At the outset, but there are three bills we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member can only speak once on second reading.

Mr. Sargent: It is on the management bill I am talking.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member can only speak once on second reading. We are dealing with them all.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on arising, I was the only one in our party able to speak at the time, and I am just—

Mr. Speaker: It is most unfortunate, but the hon. member may not speak twice on second reading.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There were other people there; the member mustn't flatter himself. The Liberals are not down to one.

Mr. Sargent: No one was going to speak for our party, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are two or three things in a lot of this report and the proposals of the Premier and so on about which I had a feeling of déjà-vu. Déjà-vu means that you have already seen it, for members of the government who do not speak French. In fact this same kind of experiment was tried up in Ottawa beginning about four years ago—in late 1967 and 1968—under Prime Minister Pearson and then Prime Minister Trudeau, not to quite the extent that is being proposed here; but

I think the Premier should at least have regard for what happened there. I think he will find that maybe some of the problems that have emerged in the federal government would be very instructive and would reveal some dangers in the proposal that he has for the restructuring of government. Perhaps specifically—and I am sorry that he may be leaving the House—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will be right here.

Mr. Cassidy: All right. He is proposing to have what amounts to an inner cabinet. He may say it isn't an inner cabinet, but it certainly looks like one to me and to a lot of people on this side of the House. He is proposing to have underneath that inner cabinet an inner cabinet of mandarins, of deputy ministers and policy secretaries, who would also meet and seek to coordinate work for the policy and priorities committee. He is proposing to have the super-ministers, the three or four super-ministers—to strengthen the cabinet secretariat and to strengthen the secretariats working with the policy ministers. It is very hard to see anything but that this would lead to the same consequences that occurred in Ottawa, and in Ottawa what occurred was that the super-group that emerged within the cabinet office, within the policy ministers' offices and within the Prime Minister's office, gradually took on more and more control and gradually became less and less sensitive or even aware of what was happening out there among the public.

I think that it is a contradiction which I hope the Premier and his cabinet can dissolve, to set up this structure and then to assure us in the same breath that they hope the policy ministers will be able to act as channels of communication and to be aware of what is happening out among the public. It hasn't happened in the last four years in the only major government where this kind of reform has been tried so far in Canada.

We have got another contradiction here too, and I have been reading through the report again in order to just try to understand this. It does read a bit like a management consultants' report. I suppose two or three of the people working on it either were management consultants or have them as friends. As the member next to me said, it really reads like motherhood. If you can do it all that is great; but when you look at it closely, it really is difficult to understand exactly what it means. For example, it says that a policy minister would not have respon-

sibility for, nor control over, a minister's programme management or his policy proposals. It says that the departmental minister would also play the principal role in the development of policy for his department.

That is on the one hand. But then it says that policy ministers would assume a leadership role in initiating, developing, assessing, and modifying new policies and programmes, and they would attempt to anticipate emerging issues within their policy fields. Now, when we come to question these ministers, I really want to know who is going to be responsible for policy, and it really depends on whether you are reading page 15, page 16, or page 17, and maybe we will have to play that accordingly. I think, however, that there is a real contradiction here in the role of these policy ministers. We are assured that they are not super-ministers. We are told that they will be responsible for policy while the departmental ministers will be primarily responsible for administration. Now, the separation between policy and administration is very tough. I would suggest that if it is the Premier's feeling that a super-group or a super-cabinet of half a dozen ministers is a desirable way in which to run the province, let him simply say so and not try to pretend that, in fact, it is a cabinet of equals in which only he, as Premier, is first. I would suggest that he really admit that the structure is having six or seven ministers—a very concentrated cabinet—and a bunch of other guys who have been raised up from parliamentary secretary status in order to give them better pay, but who really do not have the same kind of—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Ottawa environment has affected the member's assessment of this.

Mr. Cassidy: This is my assessment! That is right. I am trying to—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was just saying that the Ottawa environment is affecting the member's assessment.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No, this is what, in fact, will happen.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, yes! Irresistibly it will happen.

Mr. Cassidy: When the day comes that we wish to ask about the development of a particular policy proposal that applies, let us say, in the field of public protection, will we ask the minister responsible for public protection

or will we ask the policy minister in the justice field? I suggest that we should ask the minister in the justice field.

When we come to a supposedly administrative matter that bears on policy as well—for example, the member for Sudbury East was asking the other day whether the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells) would move in making some allowance for welfare recipients who have to pay more than they can afford for rent. An administrative matter or a policy matter? Frankly, I cannot really tell.

I suggest that any time questions from this side of the House fall into a grey area, they will go to the policy minister concerned. They will not go to the departmental minister because the departmental minister will have to admit that he is not really responsible for policy; he just does errands for the "big blue machine," the half dozen people who are running things.

I think there is a third contradiction here, too. We are told that the three policy ministers will be freed from departmental responsibilities. The purpose of that is so that they can spend time in developing policies. That is fine. I must confess that I sympathize with a number of things that the government is trying to achieve. I am just not so sure whether it will be able to do it, considering the number of times these very same experiments have been tried in Britain and in this country and in other parliamentary systems.

However, there is one minister in the whole setup who, surely of all the ministers, ought to be relatively free in order to concentrate on questions of policy. That, of course, is the Minister of Financial and Intergovernmental Affairs, the present provincial Treasurer. He would be responsible for federal-provincial relations. He would be responsible for the economic management of this province and for proposing policies to the cabinet; for bringing down budgets. He is now responsible as well for Municipal Affairs.

It is suggested that in this field, unlike the other three policy fields, any legwork that has to be done on his behalf be done by parliamentary secretaries who presumably will be responsible for the north; or responsible for the negotiating with the municipalities; or responsible for maybe doing a bit of work up in Ottawa.

Can we really be asked to accept that ministers in the federal government will want to talk to a parliamentary secretary in the Ontario government—in a provincial government, in a junior government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who said they were going to?

Mr. Cassidy: Can we expect that Ab Campbell and Mayor Dennison and the other troglodytes who run the government here in Toronto will be satisfied talking to a parliamentary secretary, somebody who comes from one of the nether regions of the province? I really find that very difficult to accept.

I suggest to the Premier that the Minister of Financial and Intergovernmental Affairs is going to bear a crushing burden if he tries to do his job and do an adequate job. I cannot see how he would be able to combine responsibilities for economic management and all of these other duties, plus sitting on both the management committee and the policy and priorities committee—a sort of Lord Pooh-Bah of the proposed new cabinet. I am afraid that the proposal may just not work.

I wish the Premier luck in putting this whole package together. Perhaps he would respond that he has had some luck in the past! However that was in politics and not in administration! I suggest that in administration it may be that for a government to come seven days after receiving a report and decide that the positions of policy ministers and the super-position of the Minister of Financial and Intergovernmental Affairs will be accepted—to decide that in a week is really to do it in a great deal of haste.

The Premier perhaps forgets that this report was prepared by a group of technocrats and businessmen and that possibly after a week or so's political input, possibly from his great knowledge of the way in which the cabinet system works—after all he has been within the system and the people preparing the report have been outside it—it may be some modification could and should have been made to make the thing workable.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow up on what my colleague, the member for Wentworth, was saying to the Prime Minister. It seems to me that, if we make certain distinctions, we can overcome the hurdle which was evident in the response that the Prime Minister made to the member for Wentworth. I say at the beginning that I am not at all speaking about the role of the individual member in his private electoral capacity as a representative of a constituency and the responsibilities which he has in

that regard. That in itself is almost a separate and distinct field for consideration and involves matters which have been dwelt upon time and time again in this assembly. Again we are also not concerned about the sense of undue pride or concern about whether or not we should get advice and assistance from outside.

It would seem to me that very clearly the government, that is, the elected representatives who form the government of the Province of Ontario in the cabinet had no difficulty in appointing a committee on which there were no members representative in an elected sense, but who were responsible to them, and delegating the authority to produce these reports. It would, therefore, follow, it would seem to me, that it would be quite possible for this assembly as an assembly to have assistance on efficiency and management matters related to the conduct of the affairs of this assembly, not within this chamber, but within the committee structure, which is the basic part of the framework.

It would also be quite possible, I think, to so structure, under the authority and the grant of this assembly a committee which would be made up of persons who have outside skills which are not always immediately available to us in this assembly, along with a membership, for example, of perhaps some former members of this assembly who are knowledgeable about matters of the assembly. I will give you two or three examples. I am quite satisfied that a committee made up of persons such as formed the productivity committee, along with for example, the former member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), along with for example, the present and past member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson and Mr. Frost), along with my former colleague, the member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock), to give four examples of persons who have a sense of what the responsibility of the chamber is.

It would be possible for them, along with counterparts from other areas related to efficiency of management, relating to cost efficiency, to deal with some of the basic questions which are going to be dealt with willy-nilly in a piecemeal, ad hoc fashion, unless we know where we are going because, let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that whether we here like it or not we are going to have to respond in our way to the restructuring which the government is undertaking. The restructuring is, of necessity as it develops and takes root, going to force a

response from us as to how we deal with the restructured government.

I think it would be most advantageous to us on this side of the House, if rather than that that response be ad hoc and piecemeal and unsatisfactory and always indefinite, that there was some opportunity by which the change in the structure of government with respect to policy, with respect to management, with respect to cost efficiency, was reflected in some way with certain assistance by way of either new structures or guidelines or revamping of existing structures to permit us to make a proper response to it. The Prime Minister agrees, as we all do, that we have a specific role in our capacity as members of the parties which are in opposition to the government.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that we did take the one step with respect to making the rules somewhat more responsive, but that again is the prerogative of this assembly. And I think that the rules—if there were any further changes to be made in the light of any report which might finally come forward—would be the responsibility, again, of the continuing committee with respect to the procedures of this House.

If I may use a parallel example, I have urged on the Minister of Justice on a number of occasions, the essential necessity with respect to the administration of justice to retain, in conjunction with experienced members of the judiciary and the legal profession, managerial consultants, for want of a better term, to work collectively upon the question of the efficient administration of the courts. Not at the expense of the meting out of justice but for the purpose of enhancing the meting out of justice.

I want, Mr. Speaker if I may, to ask the Prime Minister to try to remove the obvious mental or emotional obstructions which he apparently has to this suggestion; to see whether it is not possible under his initiative; or under the authority of this House, coming as it must from his initiative, to establish that kind of a committee which would now look at what the response should be of this assembly, in its functioning, to the restructuring of the managerial aspects and the policy-making aspects of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to express a concern—a general concern, which fits into what I have said but one which has impinged upon us over the years in this assembly—and that is that it is possible to have something

called adequate policy-making; it is possible to have something called management accountability and it is possible to have something called cost efficiency and to have all three of those things without warping an institution solely in the model of the dominant institution of our times, the business corporation.

We have made this point with respect to the universities; we made the point with respect to the police forces in the province. I am now making this plea to the House and, Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister that we run a very grave danger, if it is not counteracted by the kind of committee that we're fending about in the comments that have been made by myself and by the member for Wentworth, and implicit in the remarks of the member for York South—we are running a very grave danger of producing the managerial corporate equivalent of government at the expense of the democratic process unless there is such a committee. It is required not just to counterbalance for the purpose of counterbalancing, but for the purpose of permitting the opposition in the Legislature to respond in an effective, intelligent and directed way, to the change which is taking place in the government structure.

I commend these various comments to the Prime Minister because, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, whether he believes so or not, in fact we are going to have to respond. In our limited way and with our limited resources we are going to have to respond to that change in structure. Just to give a minor example, already the question has come up, do we now restructure the responsibilities of the members of this caucus with respect to their departmental responsibilities as opposition critics for the estimates, because there are now going to be policy ministers dealing with policies of a number of departments?

All of these questions we are going to have to deal with and if they are not dealt with the added assistance of an expert and informed committee to assist in the development of such responses, then we think that there will be a continuing devaluation in the role of the opposition; and we don't think that it need be devalued. We don't think it wise that it be devalued. We think that there are specific things which can maintain the unique features of the opposition in a unicameral assembly to perform a role, along with the private members of the assembly who belong to the government party, in the committees of the Legislature and in this assembly, in the

instructive, intelligent criticism of policy, in the instructive and intelligent assessment of what alternative policies may be available and in obtaining the information and the resources and the facilities which will permit us to carry on such a role.

I am saying to the Prime Minister that in my view nothing less would be adequate for the purpose of allowing the opposition as an integral part of the democratic system as we understand it, to function properly, in view of the far-reaching reorganization of the structure of government inherent in the report which has now come forward for implementation in the three bills standing in the name of the Prime Minister.

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

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention one or two things that concern me in the structure of this new executive council.

One is—and perhaps the Prime Minister can give us some basis for relieving our fears in this; and I think it is the fear of the people of Canada and Ontario, when they think of these things—the area of accountability of the executive to the institution of Parliament. I think it is an important part of any such restructure, because basically, the checks and balances are the important thing in this House and in the structure of Parliament in the democratic countries of the western world.

It has taken nearly 700 years to develop our system. Changes that would come to that system have to be very carefully thought out and adapted.

I am particularly interested in the words of the member for Riverdale in the area of the methods of supply. Do we, in this structure, now have to have two ministers present; one to account for the administration features, and one to account for the policy features? I think that is an important point, if we have only one minister there and the other one is accountable for the other important part.

Another thing I would like to have the Prime Minister mention to us is that this committee requested submissions from members of this Legislature and this House and from the general public. I am wondering how much input or participation took place in this area, because I think that is an important part.

Another point I would like to suggest is of great concern, and it brought about the reason for my resolution which was on yesterday's notice paper. Today we see the leaders of our

country, in private meetings in places like New York or Washington, and other places of the world, making decisions that affect us as citizens without thorough reporting to the Houses of Parliament. I am very much concerned in this area, because we continuously see or read in our papers where people like our Prime Minister of Canada go to Washington, meet with President Nixon, and whether they did or whether they did not make commitments in our name remains to be seen. Among federal-provincial conferences, at least the original Confederation of Tomorrow conference was established by resolution of this House and with our permission and our participation and suggestions on how that conference should take place. Most of the federal-provincial conferences that have taken place since that time have been done without resolution of this House, and I suggest also without very great accountability to us as members of this Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: A rubber stamp and nothing more.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Sure, it is true that we have seen some position papers, but position papers and the actual participation in what takes place are sometimes two separate things.

I believe also that our form of government here in Ontario—and I am not a member of the government party in the sense that I am a government member. I am a supporter of the executive as I see my position in this House, and it is with my support, and the majority of support of these members, that they sit and hold office.

Mr. Renwick: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It is a very unique distinction.

Mr. Cassidy: That is a revolutionary doctrine.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: There is a very distinctive difference.

Mr. Cassidy: Vote against them sometimes.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I am wondering, in this restructuring of government—

Mr. MacDonald: A member of that government almost voted against it some years ago.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: —if we couldn't have done it in a very similar way to what we already have. That is, that those members who sit on the Treasury benches are the senior members of the executive and to a major

degree are responsible for more than their own actual administration functions. I see very little to be concerned about in that area, if it had been done in that way.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: But I think we are fearful because we do not understand or do not know and that is the area of concern to me.

Mention has been made in this House of the new members not knowing what it was all about.

Mr. Sargent: We don't either—we still don't know.

Mr. Cassidy: It's true over on the member's side of the House.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I think it is true over on that side, because, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you one thing, and I think it is very, very important. That is that we as members of this House have a respect for each other and it seems to me that we don't even have that at times. Too often we hear first names mentioned by members back and forth across this floor, rather than "honourable member." And I believe the decorum of this House is important.

Also the difference between—

Mr. Lewis: Show a better example of respect.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: —Throne Speech, budget speech and the matters of supply, and the rules of this House in regard to matters conducted in committee of the whole. Because yesterday, when the matter of the Spadina Expressway was expressed in this House—

Mr. Sargent: You are out of order.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I am not, I am right on, Mr. Sargent—member for—the hon. member—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: There you are!

Mr. Deans: What is it you were saying about decorum and propriety?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It is the hon. member for Grey-South and it is a good example.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: That is better.

Mr. MacDonald: You have respect for yourself.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: But I do believe that when we realize we don't hold ourselves in high respect—we find that someone entering this building, for example, will find out who the cabinet minister is, but he can't find out who his own member is. It is very, very important, because in most Legislatures that I've seen there is a place in the main lobby that at least shows who your member is, where his office is, where you might get hold of him, and we don't have it in this one.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe that is deliberate.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: But I think it is important that we do these things, because if we don't, we have nobody to blame but ourselves. If our institutions are being degraded, as a nation, and our position as members, we have no one to blame but ourselves for that.

Mr. Cassidy: There is a lot to hide on the Tory backbenches.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: But I do believe that I am very much concerned in the areas of checks and balances on the executive—in the areas of accountability. If the Prime Minister can ease my concern in this it would be most helpful and pleasing to everyone, I am sure, to have had this enlightenment on what is the problem we are faced with at the moment.

Mr. Sargent: Nice fireside chat for Christmas.

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

Mr. Lewis: I would like to have the fireside spirit for just a moment. I shall be brief, Mr. Speaker.

The Committee on Government Productivity has been an interesting one all the time that it has deliberated on matters affecting the activities of this Legislature. It has won from members, from time to time, a considerable respect, both for the analysis shown in the documents and for some of the recommendations which flow from them.

I hadn't intended to enter this debate but I've been more than a little impressed with what my colleagues and others have said during the course of the discussion and I

would just like to add a counterpoint if I could. I think that somehow the Premier has to make provision in his government reorganization for the private members of the House and for the role of individual members of the assembly. And if it isn't wrong for me to do so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the appeal almost as much on behalf of the government members as on behalf of members of the opposition. It is not because I am presumptuous or want to intrude on the affairs of the Premier. It is only that I know that if some government members have to go through another four years or eight years in the manner which has been characteristic in the past, it will be extremely difficult for them.

Because as we centralize the government process, as the executive council accrues power, as the super-group emerges, then the amount of influence, real or otherwise, felt by individual government members depreciates accordingly. And I'm naive enough to believe, innocent enough to believe, that in government terms backbenchers have a very considerable role to play in this Legislature, which for whatever reason hasn't been played in my life in the Legislature; and I don't mean to be demeaning to the backbenchers on the government side.

It is a question of the opportunity to exercise the role. And of what does that opportunity consist? In the Legislature it consists of a Throne debate contribution or a budget speech contribution. The estimates discussion in the House is taken up almost exclusively by opposition questioning of the cabinet minister. Inevitably, because of the pressures of time or because of the protocol of the executive council, government backbenchers participate hardly at all.

When we go into the estimates committee in a more informal atmosphere downstairs, again the opposition members monopolize the discussions which take place, not because we are monopolists by temperament but because the government backbenchers defer, not to us, certainly not to us, but to the process, which requires their attendance as a matter of ritual but not their participation.

When we set up other kinds of committees in the House the same thing tends to happen, and as a result the role of the private member in the House in the formation of policy, whether in caucus or out, in the affairs of the Legislature, is considerably telescoped.

I would like to find some way of expanding that. I have no idea how one achieves it. I don't pretend to know. I know that it won't be achieved—with the greatest of respect in the world, I think I can say this to the Premier through the Speaker—it won't be achieved by the establishment of three or four select committees to occupy time over the next couple of months.

It is again part of the ritual performance as we grab one alternative after another out of the air and try to invest our work with substance when we know that it isn't happening, that in fact we are going through some kind of ornate process rather than really influencing policy decisions. When I say "we" in this instance I mean "we" on the government backbench side; and I want to urge the Premier that that particular area somehow be refurbished, and if the committee on government productivity can do it then every encouragement to them.

The members who are the backbenchers of the Conservative Party feel an undying loyalty to their chief. They view with suspicion everything that comes from opposition members, particularly when we are inclined to be complimentary or to speak on their behalf.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With some justification!

Mr. Lewis: But I ask the private members of the government to remember some of this debate one year hence, or two years hence, when some of them individually are overcome by the frustration which delimits their performance and their contribution in this House. I cannot believe that need be true; I cannot believe there aren't alternatives. But when the Committee on Government Productivity is enlisted into service by the Premier, what is the focus? The focus is on a redistribution of cabinet departments; the focus is on a redistribution of executive council priorities; the focus is on the emergence of ever more powerful ministers. That may be the way it has to work.

Again, you are vastly more familiar with it than I am and expect to be for the next little while. All of that aside, there is a sort of irresistible truth about the process—that it gets more and more centralized and that the four or five people whom you choose to be your closest confidants and set up as these provincial secretaries will have more and more of the public attention.

Even when the Premier went off to Honey Harbour—or was it Muskoka Lodge? Or was it Muskoka Sands? Or the Talisman or whatever?—recently, it was said in the paper that the Premier retired—it was in all the press—with the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Welch), with the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), with the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). When the Premier rose in his seat the other day to answer my colleague from Hamilton East (Mr. Gisborn) about who was there, et cetera, he said there were up to 10 cabinet ministers.

No one in the press reported anything about other cabinet mortals attending that meeting. All they talked about was the group of five—the chosen—who are about to make the decisions. Maybe they have to make the decisions. Maybe that is the way the process will work but it is also the way in which the public will view it, as the member for Victoria-Haliburton says, with a certain apprehension and anxiety about the centralizing of power.

The way in which the Premier provides the buffer to that is by investing in his back bench, I think, kinds of authority which up to now they have not had. May I add a footnote to that? It means that he invests in the opposition the same kind of authority because, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, if I may say to the Premier, we want to make this place work.

We do everything in our power to make this place work effectively but its irrelevance at times is easily discernible by all. The way in which the worth of individual members is depreciated is discernible by all. Something has to be done to facilitate, for opposition as well as for government, the kind of expertise, the kind of opportunities for intervention, the kind of organization of our own staff facilities, response to government initiatives, which will give weight to this parliamentary process.

I mean, we can play games with the parliamentary process for ever and gradually the erosion continues until one day it becomes an object of derision rather than an object of veneration. The continued concentration of power in the executive council intensifies, accelerates that process.

I am not asking for any special boons; not asking for vast favours, undue self-indulgence like a secretary for each member or some absurdity like that! All I am suggesting is that there should be for opposition, as well as for government, an appraisal, an overall look. My colleague for Wentworth, Mr.

Speaker, was dead on. Why can't the Committee on Government Productivity take a look at the legislative process; take a look at the opposition's role; take a look at the way in which it performs and how its functions can be improved in terms of what the Premier is doing in the context of governmental reorganization?

The suggestions are not offered in an antagonistic way. If the Premier feels satisfied with the organization he is doing, he has to live with it. One therefore necessarily accepts the kind of judgement he makes on his own legislation.

I think he is leaving out the government backbench and I think he is leaving out the role of the opposition. His committee might well be asked by him, respectfully, to take a little time to look at the other appendages of the legislative process; those private, inconsequential members of the Legislature who like to make an occasional contribution to the debate. They think they were elected to serve a purpose rather more than simply to support the executive council, like standing to agree to a government position on second reading; or on clause by clause debate; or pounding their desks in that harmonious cacophony when the Tories are in full resplendent support. It is a little more than that. You have it within your power to make it rather more real to the members of the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wish it had been Honey Harbour. I like it—no disrespect to Muskoka.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to enter this debate? If not, the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess after all the discussion I haven't quite ascertained whether the members opposite are voting in favour of the principle of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: That is because you look at it as an adversary always.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I sense that in some respects they will be. I think, Mr. Speaker, that, not unfortunately, it has been very helpful that perhaps the debate has centred around something that is not an issue as far as the bills are concerned and that is the functioning of the legislative assembly, or the legislative process and the role of all members—not just private members but members generally. With great respect to the member for Riverdale, as I see the recom-

mendations—and I will deal with the concern of the member for Thunder Bay very shortly—as I sense the recommendations, the actual restructuring of government departments, what I think is the basic change in this, the concept of having a minister of cabinet dealing basically with policy considerations, in my view doesn't really alter the function of this House, or whether it is functioning as appropriately or as effectively as it might.

In other words, I don't think that the restructuring itself will have that great a significance on the operation of the House itself. I have some views, Mr. Speaker, and there will be occasions to discuss this some time, hopefully not too late in the new year, as it relates to some thoughts on the functioning of the House, and the role of the private members. I am very delighted that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Scarborough West are that concerned about the role of the government backbenchers. I say to the Leader of the Opposition—and it was one of the very few times that I was upset during the campaign—I sensed his feelings here today, perhaps, were in some sense an apology for the observations he made about some of the government members and their activities during the campaign, which I didn't happen to share.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What do you mean, that I said all they did was sit around waiting for the bells to ring?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, and also card playing, et cetera. I would like to take this occasion to say I never felt that about any of my colleagues or any of his colleagues in this House. I have always held the members in this House in very high regard on all sides of the House and, as I say, it was one of the very few occasions in the campaign when I must confess I was a little upset.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There was at least one other.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was the main one. I've only been a member here, Mr. Speaker, since 1959, and while I have had debates with members on all sides of the House, I have regarded them as men of integrity and capacity and I feel very strongly about this and the members who make up this House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Now you feel badly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, getting around to the points at issue—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You are misconstruing my comments about the capacity—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Maybe, but the reports I read were relatively definitive in your observations. Getting around to some of the concerns that have been expressed about the question of accountability, Mr. Speaker, once again, proposed changes in structure don't alter the question of accountability of the executive council to the Legislature of this province. There is an alteration in function envisaged by the authors of this report and, that is, the function that has three or four ministers who, apart from day-to-day operational responsibilities, will be trying to integrate policies in certain designated areas, and who, in turn, will be part of a priorities board which, incidentally, has been part of a committee-structured cabinet now for a period of time.

It is not that revolutionary, we have been operating in a limited way in this capacity. The recommendations are subject to the approval of the total cabinet. Every cabinet minister is equal, as far as input is concerned, as far as the decision-making process is concerned. All legislation, all policy matters, have to be approved by this House. There is no change in accountability; it remains exactly the same as it does now.

Mr. MacDonald: That is part of the problem as Schindeler points out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It may be part of the problem, but I am just trying to assure the member for Victoria-Haliburton, who has a deep sense of tradition, that this part of the reorganization doesn't affect the principle or concept of accountability whatsoever.

Mr. Cassidy: That is pretty pertinent—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I recognize and I sensed very early in the session that the member for Ottawa Centre has solutions to many of the problems that we face, and I am looking forward to his contributions over the next period of time. I must confess there are those of us on this side of the House who do not purport to have all of these answers so readily available, but we do work at them; we try, we do our best and, I must say, Mr. Speaker, being very modest about it, it has worked relatively well over the past period of time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: That is pretty pertinent!—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I must also say to the member for Ottawa Centre—

Mr. Singer: He's playing the humble role now!

Mr. Deans: Where is the button located that the Premier pushes to have this desk-banging start?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I say to the member for Wentworth, oh, that they should have such enthusiasm in their group. Oh, that they should have it!

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It is the only exercise they get!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some of them play hockey with the member for—well, never mind, that would be concerned about the decorum.

I would say to the member for Ottawa Centre, Mr. Speaker, that he should be very careful not to relate this concept and this restructuring to the experiments, some of them more successful than others, that have taken place in other governmental jurisdictions. This is not the same as what the federal government has done. This envisages a minister who is divorced from operational responsibility. He doesn't have the double task of operating a department dealing with policy matters and trying to determine some priorities for government. It is a very real distinction; it is not the same.

The authors of this report obviously assessed the Ottawa situation—and I won't comment for them. If the member wants to ask them, some of them are here and they may tell him. It is not the same thing. They have assessed the experience in the United Kingdom and other jurisdictions; this is a development for this province related to what they feel are the needs for Ontario and it does not relate specifically to any other kind of approach taken by other governments. And, with great respect to the member for Ottawa Centre, I think one should make an effort to recognize what is unique in this, what is relevant and let's see if we can't constructively find ways and means of making it work effectively.

Mr. Speaker, as head of this government, I would say to you this is not the easiest report for the government to say, "We are going to do it." It is far easier in this day and age, in the political process, to sit back here in the government benches, after having been

relatively successful, and say to the public that we have this report and there are complexities in it. It is difficult, there are changes, and it will not make our life any easier as ministers, as private members, or as members of this House. Let's put it on the shelf for a couple of years. Let's appoint a committee of the House to study it; let's analyse it very carefully. And two or three years elapse—

Mr. Sargent: And why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, if the member for—where is he from again? When he moved back a row, I sort of lost track—

Interjection by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member for Grey-Bruce is saying that his party, if they had been successful and had received this report, would have put it on the shelf, if that is the way they would do business, well, I really don't think that of the Leader of the Opposition. I don't think he is that kind of individual.

Mr. Sargent: Not with six people!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government doesn't operate that way. We are not motivated that way. We have not resisted the difficult decisions and the choices we have had to make. We have made them and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Lewis: Particularly when the pollsters find it is advisable for them to have definite policies.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no! We will debate that during the Throne Speech debate. I am looking forward to that with some degree of enthusiasm.

Mr. Lewis: When will that be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, some time in 1972—I would hope not too late in the year.

But it was not an easy decision for government to say yes, we are going to implement this report. At the time that this was presented to the public and to the press, I made two or three observations of a general nature. Firstly, we were accepting the basic principle, being the establishment of concern for policy priorities, with ministers involved in policy areas—there would be no super-ministries no inner or outer cabinets; all minister would have the same status, the same responsibility, with the total cabinet making the ultimate decision. This is what is different from some jurisdictions. This we have accepted.

I expressed certain reservations at the time the report was made public, relating to two or three areas. I share the concern about the question of identification with the north. I said very specifically that we did not necessarily accept the names that were being suggested. The hon. members will see that it has been suggested the term, "Provincial Secretary for Justice," say, or "Provincial Secretary for Policy Development," would be a much better term than "policy minister," which to me just didn't make sense in our process. I had reservations about other names. We have made it very clear to the public service, and I would like the members of this House to understand, that we are going through the recommendations one by one.

We are appointing task forces from the various departments concerned to see whether or not all of the recommendations are, in fact, right or relevant both in the administrative and in political terms, and I mean by that, small "p" political terms. This report, we think, is an excellent document, but it is like any document. I would say this to you—and you must observe this yourselves—if we were to say, "Yes, we are going to buy every recommendation in this report," then, with great respect to the authors, we would not be doing our job. I have certain reservations. I expressed concern as it related to the area of the Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs. You will find this on the record at the time of the press conference.

I should also assure, I believe it was the member for Ottawa Centre, that when it comes to federal-provincial matters, the first minister of this province, whether he be Premier or Prime Minister, is the one who has the ultimate responsibility for whatever federal-provincial discussions or negotiations are held. The concept and the philosophy behind this, if you read it carefully, make it abundantly clear that some of the input, some of the research, some of the ideas that are created, flow from an agency or department that is outside the Prime Minister's office. We are moving from a department to an office. I am sure that will delight the Leader of the Opposition; I don't know why.

We are moving from a concept of having too much centralized control within the Prime Minister's department to seize upon the expertise and the advice of people who will have other responsibilities, say, in the field of federal-provincial relations. But ultimately the responsibility is that, and must

be that, of the Prime Minister or Premier of this province; that does not change. All we are doing is finding a more rational approach to the function.

I would also point out to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that I made an observation at the press conference, in looking at the report, that in my view we would probably have a ministry of housing, that the responsibilities of the now existing Department of Social and Family Services, coupled with what I think are significant areas of concern in the field of housing, probably would indicate a rationale for having a ministry of housing, once again within that same general policy area, but as an operating department separate and distinct from The Department of Social and Family Services.

This may happen in one or two other areas of determination of the number of ministries, and the names, Mr. Speaker. We are not wedded to everything that is in this report, but what we do see here is a recognition that traditionally—and this applies not just to government, but I think it applies—certainly even in the academic community, certainly in the business world—there has been the approach that everything you restructure, or every kind of programme that is added, has been done so in the vertical sense, department after department. This is not a criticism. They have added programmes in some sort of vertical, administrative approach, when all of us in this House—and I refer back to my days as Minister of Education, dealing with problems related to education, health, social services—realize there is a very real recognition that so many of these problems, administratively, should be treated in a horizontal fashion.

This is what we are trying to achieve, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay full tribute to the authors of this report, and also say through you, to the public servants of this province, that this is going to test to a substantial degree, their capacity to react to some of the changes. We have to depend very substantially on the people within the public service to want to make this programme work. I look forward in the spring session to some constructive comments from the members opposite after they have had an opportunity to digest this report thoroughly. There will be information flowing from the task forces. We talk about it here, but it is without question the most significant reorganization of government that has been, at least contemplated,

and we believe will be successfully undertaken, by any jurisdiction in this country for many, many years.

The member for Wentworth goes back into his history. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, I have only been a member here since 1959. There has never been a restructuring attempted of this magnitude, certainly in my memory in this province. It is going to—

Mr. Deans: I said in other jurisdictions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say with respect, in other jurisdictions in Canada.

Mr. Deans: I said there have been studies in other jurisdictions, never including the legislative chamber or—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that there has been nothing of this magnitude, to my knowledge, attempted in this country, certainly in recent times. I look forward to the constructive interest of the members opposite as it related to the restructuring of administration. I separate that from the concern that I have expressed here, and others have expressed and, that is, about the functioning of the legislative assembly of this province. They are not related in the content of this report.

The authors of this report were asked specifically to deal with the administrative problems, the problems of the time of ministers; executive responsibility; they were not asked to deal with the day-to-day workings of the House, the private members, and so on.

This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that is of concern to the government. We will have some thoughts to propose in the spring session to the members of this House because we are as anxious to make this—and I will use the word, because I haven't found a better one—a meaningful situation for the private members and that includes the members of the opposition. I shouldn't make this confession but during my ten years as Minister of Education, there were occasions, and I don't say that in a patronizing sense, there were a number of occasions—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Never, never! Perish the thought.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There were a number of occasions when observations were made by members opposite that might not immediately find their way into declared government policy as it related to the field of education but over a period of time the contributions were very constructive and very helpful

indeed. Now, that doesn't apply to all the contributions we have, all the time, from members opposite but it is—

Mr. Bullbrook: That's called posterior credit isn't it?

Mr. Singer: Or selective patronization.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the season, I am making it very clear—and this doesn't relate to the season—that this government recognizes the very important role of the Opposition. We try to approach our task here constructively, and I give the opposition full credit for attempting to approach their task in the same fashion. But we are not going to solve some of these problems by the appointment say of the Committee on Government Productivity, with great respect to the authors of that report.

I am not talking about efficiency in the House; maybe that is important. I am talking about people, members, relating to the policy considerations, to the estimates, to what have you, in a way that has some meaning for them. I don't think it is an efficiency situation and I don't think that would be the appropriate group to assess the functioning of this House, the members, and what we should be doing as it relates to the basic administrative changes that they are recommending in their report.

Mr. Sargent: The authors were all a corporate group, though. There were no union people among the authors.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, and the member for York South acknowledged this, and this is one of the very positive aspects of this report, the reason we are able to move ahead with it in real terms far more rapidly than might otherwise be the case is because the report was prepared by people who had experience, day-to-day working experience, within the public service of this province. They are people who have a great deal of expertise and talent, who have a great deal of experience in this field, and they worked along with people from outside who were basically interested in the management, the efficiency side, to a greater extent. This, in my view, is what has made it possible to implement this report much more rapidly than would otherwise have been the case.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Prime Minister respond to the plea for the establishment of some ongoing machinery for reviewing

the implementation of the recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is a question of establishing any sort of machinery. We will be coming back to the members of this House for legislation; there will be the estimates and for the member for Victoria-Haliburton, the operating ministers will be dealing with the estimates of the operating department. There will be a relatively small estimated amount for the provincial secretary for, say, social development, as it relates to the activities of that particular office but the operating minister will be dealing with the bulk of the estimates for that area and I would think that in the debates or discussions on the legislation, on the estimates, Mr. Speaker, this will be one way for the members, all members, to sense how the implementation is taking place.

I don't know how any sort of ongoing committee, at this moment in time at least, can assess this because we ourselves are in the process of establishing the task forces that are necessary to develop the very complicated recommendations that are here. I think it would be far too premature to start establishing something at this point.

Mr. Deans: There is a finer way to look at it though. It is like asking the Minister of Revenue to answer for the Provincial Secretary. We have tried that. It doesn't work.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, you know it is a very minor thing and I have taken far longer than I had intended. The point was raised by the member for Ottawa Centre and I recognize it was said in a spirit of some jest and perhaps facetiousness. I would say to him as it relates to the question period in this House that, whether the question should be to the policy minister or the minister responsible for the operation of the department, as long as he gets an answer to his question, surely the determination at this moment as to who he should ask is not as relevant as getting an answer which will not always satisfy him no matter from whom it comes. It is as simple as that. I think we are—

Mr. Singer: Or even how much you paid Buckminster Fuller.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will send it to him in a Christmas card. I will get it to the mem-

ber for Downsview. But I think the relevant—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The relevant thing is that there should be the opportunity for exchange, there should be the opportunity to get the information that the hon. members logically should have and want to have.

As to who answers the question, I can't tell the hon. member at this point. It will take a period of time. I think to give an example, if the leader of the New Democratic Party asked a question in general terms about the Williston report, that the minister, the provincial secretary for social development, would probably answer a question that in general terms relates to the Williston report, because it does cut across several departmental areas of responsibility. If he were to ask specifically about the report card for child A and school B in a certain municipality he would ask the minister responsible, say, for The Department of Education.

These are things, Mr. Speaker, that I can't answer definitively today. It will take a period of time and experience to do this. I do say to the hon. members that this change that we are starting here on this occasion—this is really, I guess, the first or initial step—really will test our capacities. There is no question about it.

We think without any doubt it will lead, not in terms of dollar efficiency necessarily but in terms of the decision-making process, to policies that are more relevant for the people whom we all collectively serve. There is no question that this approach holds out the hope that we can, as a government, face some of the difficulties which we will all experience over the next period of time.

With the concerns that I have expressed, the recognition of the difficulty of it, Mr. Speaker, I do urge upon the members of the House the recognition that this is a step forward. It is the right direction to go. As a government, we will be more than prepared to keep the members informed because they will have more than ample opportunity in the latter part of February, certainly by the early part of March.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The bill has been ordered for third reading.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call item No. 8 on the order paper.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT BY MUNICIPALITIES

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 4, An Act to facilitate the Relief of Unemployment by Municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre, I believe, wanted to speak on second reading?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I haven't quite worked out when this magic moment comes to get up to speak, Mr. Speaker. I really want to return to one matter that came up yesterday. There is obviously nothing that one can oppose about the bill specifically but I do want the minister to give us some more full details about the home improvement plan which he states is really covered by the bill. When one reads the explanatory notes on the bill, it says simply it "authorizes municipalities to enter with consent and spend money on private property in furtherance of winter unemployment programmes."

When I asked the department about this I was told it was elm trees, demolishing buildings and this kind of thing. It appears that the minister had not been talking to his department because they certainly were not aware that the home improvement programme was being carried out under their auspices. If the department doesn't know, it suggests certainly that municipalities cannot have been made aware by the department that they are now responsible for the home improvement plan.

I don't wish to go into any detail about why we on this side of the House think that the home improvement scheme that was announced by the Premier on October 8, is a good one. I do suggest, if there has been flip-flop on the part of the government first to scrap it and now to hurriedly rescue it, that the minister let the municipalities know the programme has been rescued.

I would appreciate it if the minister could assure the House that in fact he will now undertake to inform the municipalities they can go on to private property with the home improvement programme; that the home improvement programme will be looked on favourably by the department; that he

encourages them to do it, in line with what the Premier had announced on October 8 and that he will get the details out to them, let us say, before Christmas. Could we have that assurance from the minister?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to enter the debate?

Mr. Lewis: It is, Mr. Speaker, in short, our impression that the \$10 million home improvement programme has been abandoned entirely, as was the \$20 million land bank! The money will no longer be deployed in any way in the fashion that was indicated on October 8. Quietly the government has scuttled yet another \$10 million and is endeavouring to get through this week without anyone knowing about it!

Mr. Speaker: Of course, that has nothing whatever to do with this bill.

Mr. Lewis: It is central to the principle of the bill because presumably the money which is being spent through this bill, part of that money, would be to facilitate home improvement. There is nothing from the minister to indicate that.

Mr. Singer: He is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is really nothing in this bill—

Mr. Lewis: I would like to urge, Mr. Speaker, that the efforts of my colleague from Ottawa Centre be responded to and that the minister give some guarantee to the House. Otherwise, it is \$20 million on Wednesday and \$10 million on Friday—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Lewis: There will be an emasculated budget by the end of next week.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, does anyone else wish to participate?

Mr. Speaker: There was no one else indicated, except the hon. member for Scarborough West. He has completed, so the hon. minister may respond.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I made it clear in some remarks yesterday dealing with the supplementary estimates that this money has been allocated with the moneys made available to municipalities. There are limitations on the powers of municipalities at the present time to carry out work on private property.

Mr. Lewis: But that is not what the minister's promise was.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, if we might deal with this matter, I had meetings with the provincial-municipal liaison committee at the end of October in reference to these matters of work on private property in its various phases or programmes. Under the provisions of The Municipal Act there are restrictions on the work that can be carried out on those properties, by limiting it to the areas where the municipalities can require work to be done by individuals on their property.

We believe that under this programme there is the kind of flexibility we need to permit the municipalities to enter on private property with the concurrence and agreement of the owner to do certain work. We are not limiting or setting out that the area they are to cover is simply cutting down elm trees or other such work. I have instructed our people in dealing with the matter that we want to look at the kind of programmes they can bring forward. I am going to have some further discussions with the municipalities about this matter in dealing with the improvement of properties, and we need this legislation in order that this can be effectively done.

The moneys for this programme have been added in to the others so that we are not restricting it to one type of programme alone, but rather incorporating it with moneys that we can make available through the municipalities because their needs are quite different, depending upon the area, and we can use it in that way. Rather than the province working directly with individual homeowners, we will work through the municipalities in doing this.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The debate has really been concluded at this point. It is not normally the procedure to question further after each member has been given the opportunity to speak.

The motion is for second reading of Bill 4.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Lewis: No. Mr. Speaker, we would like to go to committee of the whole.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that order number 7 be called and we consider Bill 4.

Mr. Speaker: Before the committee convenes, perhaps I might indicate to the hon. members that I have had a request from the people at the Hansard office to ask the hon. members to please not turn their microphones but to leave them pointing directly, straight at them. There are apparently some difficulties in transcribing and hearing the voices in the Hansard office, so if you would try to not turn your microphones; leave them straight.

Clerk of the House: The seventh order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT BY MUNICIPALITIES

House in committee on Bill 4, An Act to Facilitate the Relief of Unemployment by Municipalities.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 4, An Act to Facilitate the Relief of Unemployment by Municipalities. Are there any comments, questions or amendments to this bill; and if so, to which section?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Section 2.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything on section 1? All right, section 2 then; the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I was trying to ask the minister a question, Mr. Chairman, and maybe he could answer it right now, now that we are in committee.

He has assured this House this week, in response to questions from this side of the House, that in fact municipalities may embark on a home improvement plan. Am I not correct that this is the first assurance the municipalities have had in any public way that they could use the provincial-municipal employment scheme this winter for the purposes of home improvement?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No.

Mr. Cassidy: If that is the case, when were they told earlier? Were they told on November 5? If they were I cannot read it in the circular that was sent out to municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, when I had the meetings with the liaison committee, we discussed this matter. We sent out the notice as the municipalities received it. We have made some further changes, and I have had discussions with that group since on this

whole matter and the types of programmes that may come forward. We wanted to get a notice out immediately, and that was done. There have been questions since then as to the different types of programmes that might be undertaken, particularly relating to other than straight labour programmes, and this has been one of them. We are continuing our discussions with them. We are anxious to create as many jobs as we can in as many different fields as possible right away.

Mr. Cassidy: Could the minister read us the notice that was sent out to municipalities informing them that powers would be given to them to do home improvements, and tell us on what date it was sent out to them?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I didn't say I sent out a notice to them. I said we had discussions with the provincial-municipal liaison committee.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That doesn't mean anything as far as the municipalities are concerned!

Hon. Mr. Bales: We had to deal with this matter at Treasury Board and it was dealt with that way.

Mr. Cassidy: How many of the 962 municipalities are represented on the provincial-municipal liaison committee?

Hon. Mr. Bales: All of them in groups.

Mr. Cassidy: All of them?

Hon. Mr. Bales: All of them in groups.

Mr. Cassidy: Nine hundred and sixty-two representatives were there?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I said in groups.

Mr. Cassidy: In groups!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): How many people are there?

Mr. Cassidy: How many were there?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The provincial-municipal liaison committee has about 20-odd people on it representing the different types of municipalities.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Were they sent the information on it?

Mr. Cassidy: Did the minister ensure that the information was sent out by the Ontario Municipal Association, the Association of Ontario Mayors and Reeves and the other associations?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, we send those notices out ourselves.

Mr. Cassidy: But the minister just told us he did not inform them, by way of notices from his department, that home improvement was now an eligible kind of a programme.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, I said that we discussed this matter with them and with their representatives. They will be getting further notices from us all the way along. They received a further one, dated December 3, with reference to the federal programme—

Mr. Martel: That is as good as one in July!

Hon. Mr. Bales: —and they will be receiving further information from us.

Mr. MacDonald: They have yet to get one on this programme!

Mr. Cassidy: They have not yet received one on this programme, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: That's the point! Why not admit it instead of playing games?

Mr. Lewis: When the Premier (Mr. Davis) made his announcement on October 8 last, it was clear that the \$10 million for home improvement would mean provincial involvement, not necessarily through municipalities, that homeowners would be able to subsidize home improvement with individual tradesmen or groups of tradesmen, I assume, who needed employment. That was what the \$10 million would be used for; now the minister says that somehow he learned, after making a \$10-million public announcement—

Mr. Cassidy: A commitment!

Mr. Lewis: After making a \$10-million public commitment, the minister then discovered, lo and behold, that there are certain limitations in terms of what the municipalities can do by way of entry upon private property for the purpose of home renovation. And apparently the nature of the limitation is so extreme that by the middle of December, 1971, more than two months later, the minister has not been unable to send out a single notice indicating to a single municipality what their rights will be under this mythical \$10-million programme.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have.

Mr. Lewis: He hasn't! The minister has indicated it himself.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear: We knew there had to be a change in legislation before we could advise the municipalities of all aspects of this matter, and we brought this bill forward the first day the House met—

Mr. Martel: They would have to do that with the mental health and the daycare centres.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member mentions daycare centres; the minister informed municipalities to plan for daycare centres under the legislation—

Mr. Martel: It is a lot of nonsense!

Mr. Cassidy: —which he expected and anticipated this House would pass at this session. He informed municipalities they would have a certain quota of funds under a supplementary estimate which he expected and anticipated this House would pass. He did not inform municipalities they could embark on a home improvement programme under legislation which he expected and anticipated this House would pass.

Now could the minister explain why he anticipated legislation by this House, in two of those cases and in the third one the department remained mute; dumb, completely silent on this particular programme until the session met.

Mr. Martel: Give us a good answer to that one!

Hon. Mr. Bales: There is nothing strange about that. We had a programme for \$25 million that we wanted to get started as early as we possibly could. That was done. We anticipate certain refinements to this one; we made them at this session and they will get further advice.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on this section of the bill?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Really, the date of notice has nothing to do with this particular bill.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk about the date of any notice. I think it is fair to say that when the announcement was made, homeowners believed there would be some place to which they could apply for subsidy assistance to permit them to carry out improvements on their homes. That doesn't require

the passage of any bill to permit municipal authorities to go onto their properties.

Was it ever the intention of the government that a homeowner would have the opportunity to make an application to get some assistance, along with his own funds, for the purpose of getting some repairs or improvements done to his house property? Because that, on the one hand, is entirely distinct from the obvious legal barrier about a municipality being able to go on somebody's property without his consent for the purpose of removing a dead elm tree. That is an entirely different problem.

Will the minister answer, specifically, the question: Was it ever intended that a homeowner, either by approach directly to the provincial government or through his municipal government, could make application and receive funds which, together with his own funds, would permit him to go out and make a contract for certain repairs or improvements to his home?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Our intention was to create work during a possible high-unemployment season of the year, and to do that in a variety of ways, including assistance to homeowners in reference to their property or improvements to it. We are doing it through the local municipalities because we feel it is the most effective way, taking into account the different types of circumstances and situations in various places in the province.

Mr. Renwick: Then I take it, Mr. Chairman, that in fact a homeowner will be able to go somewhere and in fact arrange to get some funds for home improvement purposes; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The work will be carried out under the aegis and direction of the municipality in reference to homes within the municipality. Not all properties, but rather those which may come—

Mr. Lewis: That is not home improvement of any kind.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is indeed.

Mr. Lewis: Not of any kind.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is indeed, because they will have a programme within their municipality and they will be considering applications or circumstances or types of improvements they want to undertake and make, dealing with the individuals.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, how many jobs were attached to that \$10 million when the announcement was made?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No specific number of jobs was attached to each programme.

Mr. Lewis: Sure there were, sure there were!

Hon. Mr. Bales: The total picture—

Mr. Lewis: Your \$25 million part had a very specific job figure attached to it in terms of job-creating potential. What you are really saying to this House is that it is so late, it is the end of the session, that you don't want to pursue it any more. But it should be on the record, what you are saying to this House, is that the \$10 million public commitment, during the course of the campaign, for home improvement means nothing.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It does.

Mr. Lewis: It doesn't mean a thing. There is not a single homeowner who thinks of home improvements in any sense in the manner it is treated here. You know, fixing a recreation room, making certain simple structural alterations, bringing in professional tradesmen, sheet metal worker, electrician, plumber; none of that is eligible under what we now have before us. The only way in which a municipality will be able to enter upon private property will be for the purpose of cutting down a dead elm tree or cleaning up some refuse or something of that kind.

Hon. Mr. Bales: No.

Mr. Lewis: The traditional sense of home improvement which any homeowner thinks of will be totally beyond the provisions of the original announcement or of this bill. Why do you play these games? What point is there in it? What is the political point of it? The minister creates a \$10 million programme and then decides it is not workable and he has to bring in a piece of legislation; the months pass and he can't even work out with the municipalities, to this date, what is going to be about.

We are already into January, to all intents and purposes. How can the minister pretend that the \$10 million is going to have any application to the peak period of unemployment this winter? Not a penny of it!

And why does the minister pretend that it is for home improvement? Not in any definition of that term is it for home improvement.

So the minister took a favoured Social Credit policy in BC and Alberta where they have these home improvement loans. They do exactly what my colleague from Riverdale said. They provide a subsidy to an individual homeowner to defray costs of improvement to his home in traditional ways. The minister thought it made a good election proposition. He threw out the sum of \$10 million and he added X number of jobs, and on December 17 next or today, he abandons it. Well it is the most extraordinary way to run the government and it didn't catch up with him on October 21. One day it will catch up with him; one day it will.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Let me make it very clear, Mr. Chairman. This programme has not been abandoned. It is there for assistance to the people through the municipalities and it is going to be carried out that way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: I want to make the one point. In my riding of Riverdale, where there are many homes which are 30 and 40 years old, that particular programme announcement by the government was interpreted by everyone as an opportunity to rehabilitate their individual homes, under their own control, by application for financial assistance coupled with their own funds. It has nothing to do with somebody in the municipality coming on their property to do something that the municipality wanted to do.

I put it quite bluntly to the minister. I would have had 60 per cent of the vote in my riding instead of 50 per cent if it had not been for that particular programme. If it doesn't exist, I think I will perhaps have to issue a report to my riding indicating that it doesn't exist.

Mr. MacDonald: Calculated deception!

Mr. Lewis: In fact—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Lewis: —the minister was deliberately misleading the electorate and I would like an apology.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The member for Windsor West has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The member was doing his best in that way.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I have a direct question, again related to what has been said. Can I or can

I not tell a constituent of mine who reads Hansard and has followed the remarks about the home improvement programme, that he can apply or cannot apply for an addition to his house in the form of an additional bathroom which interests him? And if he can apply, to whom does he apply?

Mr. Lewis: Is the municipality of Windsor going to fix someone's bathroom?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Is it the intent that the municipality will carry out work on private property?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Keep quiet!

Mr. Lewis: No, no.

Hon. Mrs. Bales: The municipality will decide what kind of programmes they want to carry out and they will make application to us for approval, which we will give on a very wide basis. They will then make that programme available to the individuals within that municipality.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister envisage the municipality of Windsor or the corporation of Essex approving structural alterations to homes; additional bathroom facilities for example?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I can see some areas doing certain basic improvements to homes, bringing them up to a standard within the area.

Mr. Lewis: Like what?

Hon. Mr. Bales: All sorts of things.

Mr. Lewis: Like what?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Like new roofs, for example, on property. Perhaps bringing houses up to standard where there are no bathroom facilities—being able to do something of that nature; not adding a second bathroom, but installing a basic facility.

Mr. Martel: What staff will process the application?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the minister if I can go back to my riding and tell about 12 or 15 municipalities that they can tell their people that this is available to them as of now.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The municipality can decide what kind of programmes they want to carry out and submit them to us for approval.

Mr. Lewis: They haven't.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment. So the average taxpayer cannot get access to this through the government?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Not directly through us. We are going to work through the municipalities.

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: How much is available to each municipality?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Each municipality has been informed of its amount—

Mr. Lewis: When?

Hon. Mr. Bales: —as of early November; the basic amount. We have to see as of the end of December the amounts of money that have been used, and they will be given a further allocation for those areas—

Mr. Sargent: How did the minister apportion the moneys available to each municipality?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The basis, as I said yesterday, was that they would not receive less moneys than they had last year. Each municipality received a basic amount, and the larger amounts were calculated on a formula basis depending upon the amount of unemployment or the number on welfare.

Mr. Martel: At \$1.25 a head?

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not talking about the \$10 million!

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! The minister had the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bales: This is the basis on which the original allocations were made. Additional moneys are going to be made available to them. They will be advised after December 31, taking into account their requests for programmes or for moneys to carry out the programmes, and the moneys that are available.

Mr. Cassidy: So they won't have a nickel for home improvements for the coming year.

Hon. Mr. Bales: They will have now, as of when we deal with the matter.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, a question of the minister: Is the \$10 million then included in the \$25 million of supplementary estimates that we have passed this week?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Good: Or is it in addition to the \$25 million?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, we have had to divide that money as between now, December and the end of the fiscal year, March 31; and then so much money for the months of April and May in the next fiscal year. There is a total of \$25 million for the present fiscal year and \$10 million for the last two months of the programme—or the first two months of the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 2 stand as part of the bill? The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister for some help, because he has put us in a very difficult situation on this side of the House, and I would have thought the members of the Tory backbenches as well.

I have a group named Action Mechanicsville in my area, a group of about 600 families in an older area of a town, a village if you will, with older properties. Many of the people are older and they have very small incomes. Their incomes are in the \$3,000, \$4,000 and \$5,000 range. They are very concerned about preventing a blockbusting kind of urban renewal in their area. When this announcement was made by the Premier they were delighted, because they have been looking for some means by which they can improve their area themselves rather than have it taken over, by private developers or by public agencies, for urban renewal.

They are now the subject of a public urban renewal scheme. When they contacted me and asked how they get these home improvement loans I started inquiries with the ministry, and got no answers. I advised them to go after federal money because it seemed this would be a more fruitful approach.

I think probably that was good advice. However, I am afraid they did not take that. Would the minister offer to apologize to Action Mechanicsville and to all of the individuals who have asked, if we find that the city of Ottawa or other municipalities in the same situation decide they will not make home improvements a priority and leave these groups and individuals hanging in the lurch? Will the minister at least apologize for the words of his Premier when he offered a new grant programme to provide positive incentives for home improvements and repairs through the peak of unemployment period? Would the minister at least apologize to groups who find they can't get this help in any way or in any fashion?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Cassidy: In writing.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —there is assistance provided for a number of groups. For example, if you want to go to one of the federal programmes, the community—I have forgotten what they call—

Mr. Cassidy: These people were waiting because they thought this was a great programme.

An hon. member: Right!

Hon. Mr. Bales: Just a minute; you are talking about individuals seeking direct assistance. They can do it through that kind of programme and—

Mr. Renwick: Grants; grants on home improvements?

Hon. Mr. Bales: —through the federal programme.

Mr. Renwick: We are not talking about the federal programme.

Mr. Cassidy: We are talking about the minister's programme.

Hon. Mr. Bales: All right; but we have told you how they can do it under this programme. There is also another one. They can deal directly with Canada Manpower Centres to get aid for groups and associations; that is the community development programme which we have no control over or part in.

Mr. Martel: You have control over the \$10 million.

Mr. Sargent: I am awfully sorry to hold this up. I am very stupid, I guess, but I

don't know what I am going to tell my people, the man on my street who wants to improve his home. Now what does he do to get that loan? Tell it over again, will you please?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It depends. Under this arrangement—the municipality will consider what type of programmes they want to carry out, what additional programmes they may wish to carry out, including assistance—

Mr. Sargent: I am not talking about programmes, I am talking about a man fixing his home.

Mr. MacDonald: They are talking about the programme for 1974.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —including assistance to that individual; and they will submit a programme to us. If there is a group of people who want to get money directly and create employment in that way there is a federal fund which they can use, or at least apply for. I haven't seen any applications for it.

Mr. Sargent: Sit down, you make me mad! Sit down! That is ridiculous.

Section 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comment, question or amendment to any other section of the bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 4 reported.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 2, An Act to Amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 2, An Act to Amend The Corporations Tax Act. Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of the bill; and which section please?

Mr. Renwick: Section 1.

Mr. Chairman: Section 1? Will the member carry on?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister if he would advise us of the specific factual information on which the proposal is made that the employment support moneys granted by the federal government will be deducted for tax purposes? What is his estimate of the cost to the Treasury of the Province of Ontario of this handout?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, as I said last night the relief

that we are granting here is for the reason I stated. Since the Act is just before us, we haven't done a calculation on what the tax loss might be.

Mr. Sargent: We didn't expect to hear it anyway!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will try to get that information for you.

Mr. Renwick: In addition to that, I would like to know whether the minister has any information as to the number of manufacturers, as defined in the federal Employment Support Act in the Province of Ontario, who have made application to the employment support board in Ottawa for grants under this legislation, and the aggregate amount of the application or the amounts requested in the application?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will try to get that at the same time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): My first question—and I only have two—has to do very closely with what my colleague has asked the minister. What specific studies were made? What was the basis of the information that he received upon which he felt this bolstering of an already cemented situation was necessary on his part? That is the first question. In other words, where were his studies and what is his background information?

The second question: Would the minister perhaps agree with me that there were good and sufficient reasons the federal government took the stand it took, against the gratuitous one that he has established for himself, on the basis that the federal government had already given—from July 1, 1971 until December 31, 1972—an 18-month grant of a seven per cent tax cut, plus the wiping out or elimination of the three per cent surtax which was previously on corporations; so that they have already given 10 per cent. To have granted this three per cent on top, or to have granted this particular subsidy on top of that seemed to the federal government perhaps just a little too much of a good thing. The minister never seems to think it is enough of a good thing. Were these the reasons and were these reasons in your mind, these substantial tax cuts, that I am talking about, when you came along with this grab-bag?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, that is of course not so. The fact of the matter is we were

concerned about the immediate situation in the Province of Ontario regarding secondary industry when the United States moved as it did. The reason for the position we took was not only to support those industries in regard to employment, because the situation did appear to be critical, but in fact we felt that to give the consideration and then to tax it certainly loses the spirit in which the policy was adopted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): You do it in every social measure you have.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

M. Lawlor: As the Minister of Revenue, I would take it you had foremost and uppermost in your mind, concentrating with the greatest intensity possible, the fact that the federal government had granted a seven per cent cut, plus a three per cent by knocking out the surtax. This was very evident to you was it, when you made this gesture?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I think that would be a fair statement to make.

Mr. Lawlor: Well I am glad I put the words in your mouth, because I don't think it was.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I simply take it that the government in fact had no information—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: May I add a little to the reply that I made. I think the federal government, in doing what they did, were reinforcing the position they had taken and have taken. Our position doesn't have to be the same.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am going to take it that in fact, the government had no information of any kind, made no inquiries of the employment support board, gave no thought whatsoever to the loss in the revenue of the Province of Ontario but simply came by some divine intuition to the thought that it was about time certain selective corporations got an upwards of \$3 million tax cut.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think, Mr. Chairman, the member for Riverdale made that particular point very clear last night and I think it's a philosophical difference.

Mr. Renwick: It is not philosophical.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't agree with what he says—

Mr. Renwick: It's actually proven now.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and the position we have taken and the grants we are giving are for the purposes I've outlined; and I am sure they are going to achieve their objective.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to make the point abundantly clear that there is no information available in this Legislature on the basis of which the government made that decision.

Mr. Lawlor: No justification whatsoever!

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

Agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the bill be reported? Bill 2 reported.

THE INCOME TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 1, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Could I make a statement initially here?

I said last evening, and I want to say again today, that this is an Act that we are bringing forth at this particular time since it must be in existence when, if and when, the tax bill in Ottawa comes into force. All of the sections of the bill, with the exception of three—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): What bill are you talking about?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): You have the wrong bill

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): No, not income tax.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What are we on here?

Mr. Renwick: Bill 1.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is what I have. I have got it.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you get some help over there?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is okay. Section 3, under sub-clauses (f), (g) and (h), which refer to the reduction we are granting; and then on page 4, where there is a typographical error in the explanatory notes—the section

number should be 7—that is the section that takes care of the tax for the next year.

These are the two provisions in the bill, in actual fact, that we are presenting for the relief we are granting in regard to income tax. As I said last evening, and I reiterate now, the balance of the bill is required to be available when the federal tax bill does receive Royal assent in Ottawa. It doesn't mean that all of the sections of this bill will be applied, but they must be in readiness and they must be available to use if the tax bill in Ottawa develops as it is at the present time. If it changes, then of course these will change. The experts in my department tell me they just must be at hand when that Act is passed.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, first, on section 3—

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 3?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Carried.

Mr. Chairman: Right, section 3. The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Section 3. Am I to understand from the minister that the 30.5 per cent is equivalent in estimated revenue to the 27.5? How did you get to the 30.5 per cent to begin with?

It seems to me if you have a three per cent reduction that you are trying to bring about in the coming year—to get a reduction of \$36 million in income tax received—the original figure that you are working from must have been 31.5; because if you reduce three per cent of 31.5 you get down to about 30.5. The minister has not explained how he got to 30.5. Fortunately, we have the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) note or statement to understand how he got from 28 to 27.5. It does not say anything in the bill to explain that. I think we would like to know from the Treasurer how he gets this 30.5 per cent figure.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That 34.5 is the base that was established—

Mr. Deacon: No, 30.5.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —30.5 was established by the federal government to fit into the terms of the new bill, and that 30.5 produces the same revenue for the Province of Ontario as the old rate of 28 per cent.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, if the 30.5 produces the

same rate as the old 28, and you are endeavouring to give us a reduction, where is the reduction?

Mr. Good: Exactly the point!

Mr. Deacon: Why don't you tell us how you are getting this reduction? What you are telling us right now is that the—

Mr. Renwick: Section 7.

Mr. Deacon: Section 7?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Section 7 takes care of that.

Mr. Deacon: I am glad to see that, but it is not explained in any of the notes; none of them bring you to that.

Mr. Lawlor: Well they do things in a rather back-doorish fashion.

Mr. Deacon: I am glad somebody told you where it comes up.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this section stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, is the reason you reached that 30.5 not because, as you say, the federal base of the calculation of the tax previously, so far as you were concerned, excluded certain items in order for you to reach your fundament where you started. The federal government has passed new legislation forcing you, in terms of the Old Age Security tax, in terms of the social development tax and others, to recalculate the whole base. They will not permit you to calculate with certain deductions now, because you are going to have to collect your own tax. Previously you were within the umbrella of the federal government, now they say: "We are not going to bear the load; you give a true picture to the people of Ontario of what precisely the income tax being levied by you is." And if you calculate it to yield 28 per cent—what was previously 28—you fellows are going to have to make clear disclosure that it is really 30.5. Is that not true?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is a recalculation of the entire return of income tax, because as you know as well as I do we merely sign the flexion agreement with them. They determine what that base—

Mr. Lawlor: There are other deductions too.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I must admit; I am not going to say to you that it is part and parcel of this situation. It is simply because of the change of the entire bill as it is before the House up there now, and so as it will develop the same amount of revenue for us this rate change had to be made. Certainly it is quite evident that they are going to make us, as they have in the past, indicate what our percentage of the income tax for provincial purposes is; and that change will take place on the form.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on subsection 2, the next following subsection. Normally in the course of debate, Mr. Chairman—let me make disclosure of my foul purposes—normally in the course of debate I would have asked a series of questions under this particular heading, simply and solely to embarrass the minister. He may or may not have in front of him numerous notes in order to spell the thing out, but I just want to say that, in the Christmas spirit that he indicated and so quickly withdrew this morning, I, too, feeling the same way, won't really try to press you to the wall. I will just mention, though, why the question I was going to ask had to do with the latter part of that section: "computed as if the taxpayer were not entitled to any deductions under section 126 or 127 of that Act."

The question is, why not? Why do you exclude the logging tax provisions under that Act? Why do you make the exclusions with respect to foreign taxes of some residents in Canada? I don't know the rationale of these things. But if you haven't got the material immediately at hand, perhaps you can supply me with it subsequently.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will do that, but it will be my impression right now that they are not part of what we anticipated. They are not part of the agreement we had before. If that is wrong, and it has to be included here for future tax purposes, I will certainly give it to you subsequently.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comment on any of the first five questions? Any comment, questions or amendments on sections 6 to 10 inclusive?

Any comment, questions or amendments on any other section of this bill? If not, shall the bill be reported.

Carried.

Bill 1 reported.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

House in committee on Bill 3, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Mr. Chairman: Any comments, questions, or amendments on any sections of this bill; and if so which section?

The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I am still, bemused, to say the least.

Mr. Chairman: Which section?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 1.

Mr. Chairman: Section 1.

Mr. Lawlor: Subsection 2—the 15-year business again, the most extraordinary provision. I'll try to get it straight in my mind.

After January 1, with respect to dispositions, as they are called, or gifts that were made during the lifetime, you want to reach your long arm back well beyond the grave, because they are dead now you know, and you are reaching back and going to find out what gifts this individual gave within a 15 year span.

I am suggesting to you that, administratively speaking, within your department you now have one devil of a time with five years. You can hardly handle that, because people don't remember. "Did, or didn't Grandfather Moses give me the ormolu clock in 1963, or was it 1962?"

Of course they will go for 1962 every time; it will take them outside the rules. I can't for the life of me see the justification for this long reach back, simply because you're reconstituting the gift provision, or rather the dispositions provision within your Succession Duty Act. Could you explain it to me, slowly and simply again.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, okay! Mr. Chairman, again in the spirit of the season, I want the hon. member to know that I know he was talking in the area of hypotheses, but if perchance he has someone there in the tree that presents him with a dear old hand-carved family clock, and if he makes special representation I will see that it isn't included in the tax schedule.

Mr. Lawlor: Good for you! You are dealing with the taxpayers' money now, be careful.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: To get to the practical aspects of your question, I would like to say this. There will be no gift tax for us in effect

as of January 1. You understand that. There is no gift tax in effect for us as of January 1. We believe there will be a vehicle shortly after January 1.

I know that some of you gentlemen across the way said last night, "Okay, we can make the provisions of it retroactive." I don't think retroactive tax is good tax; but we put in the 15-year provision merely as a safeguard on the flow of revenues back to the Province of Ontario until such a time as we are satisfied the provisions of the model Act will give us that which we believe is ours under the new arrangement with Ottawa. I don't know if that is clear enough for you, and I give you my commitment on behalf of the government that when that happens we will certainly and immediately reconsider that clause.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister for a little advice? If I'm intending to give some money away should I give it away on Christmas Day or on New Year's Day?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As far as I am concerned, it all depends on when you want to die. In the practical sense, I think I would be inclined to give it away pretty fast.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, also going back to an example. I understand clearly that since Ottawa's gift tax ceases as of the end of the year, it would be necessary for us to have a gift tax effective as of the beginning of 1972. Otherwise, if someone has money in Ontario and they want to get it across to a relative and we weren't going to bring in a gift tax on January 1, they could make their gift. In a retroactive Act there might be some problems in making the retroactive Act stick, so I can understand the government's wish to bring this Act in today and apply a gift tax. Why put in the 15 years versus the five years? This is what we are all puzzled about on this side of the House. Ottawa's gift tax that is now being lifted reached back five years.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Three years.

Mr. Deacon: Provincially it was five years, but three years was considered sufficient. Now when we understand, as you advised us, that Ottawa is going to be bringing in means of collecting gift tax and the other provinces are going to bring this matter up and impose it retroactively, why do we worry about

changing the terms from the five years we formerly had. I don't understand that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I think the easy answer to that one is that we have the five years now. There has always been a conflict between Ottawa and Ontario, because Ottawa uses three and we use five.

Mr. Lawlor: Why doesn't the minister continue it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well, to achieve—that's established as another question. If we are going to maintain the cash flow out of this area of revenue it has been calculated that we will at the present time establish the 15-year outreach as of January 1, 1972. I simply reiterate for my hon. friend that immediately that Gift Tax Act comes into effect and we adopt it, we will then immediately reconsider this provision, provided of course it supplies us with the cash flow back to our Treasurer.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say this if I might? I tried to get into this with you on principle last night. Obviously, I thought for a moment it was just because of my own particular personal stupidity that I couldn't grasp it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member said that last night.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have great admiration for the member for York Centre, the member for Riverdale and the member for Lakeshore and they can't grasp it either! I wish I had a copy of the Treasurer's—The member for Lakeshore might help; at the bottom of page 22 of the Treasurer's statement,

Ontario is currently negotiating with the federal government and most provincial governments in order to formulate an appropriate provincial gift tax to be administered by the federal government.

The minister is telling us right now that it was incumbent upon him to put the people of Ontario through the trauma—I mean the administrative trauma—of regarding themselves under law, as of January 1, 1972, as being subject to a 15-year extension—a 10-year extension, I am sorry—a 10-year outreach attending a uniform provincial statute to be administered by the federal government. The Treasurer tells us the government is negotiating right now.

It seems to me really that the mandarins over there are really leading the minister down the garden path. He is more concerned for that outreach provision than he is for the administrative burden he places upon the

people of Ontario. I still can't grasp the reason for it.

If the government is negotiating with the federal government right now, surely the minister must anticipate that he would come before this House, by say April, 1972, with a model bill for us to look at?

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, is what the minister is saying this: That he is trying to build up the size of estates so they will produce more revenue by going back to include gifts that have been made 15 years prior so that he will have a larger amount of revenue until he gets his own gift tax?

Why doesn't he just increase the rate on the settling of those estates for that interim period of time instead of going through all this process of going back 15 years to establish gifts so that the estates will be larger when people settle them? This is what the minister is trying to do. And the member for Sarnia is right; those people who have to settle these estates are going to have a nightmare going back 15 years to find what has been outlived and what hasn't been outlived. It is ridiculous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, in answer to both the hon. members, I am going to say this: It may seem that 15 years is a long period. I might add I have some degree of agreement with them. I sat in Ottawa when the negotiations began for the new model Act that we are expecting to come in at the beginning of the year. If it does come in and if the provisions satisfy us, I have given the members a commitment that we will use it. We are not absolutely certain that it is going to come forward. It has happened before. I am not going to stand here and criticize Ottawa, but I am going to say that if that Act satisfies us, if it brings us the flow of revenues back from Ottawa that we currently have, we will then move on the provision of this Act here, and I think we can deal with any injustice—

Mr. Bullbrook: But—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Just a moment now—with any injustice that occurs. In the meantime, as of January 1, if we did not put some provision in there as a protection for the entire Province of Ontario and its revenues, then I think we would be remiss in our duties, even and although my friends opposite may think at this moment that is somewhat wrong.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, has the minister really thought of the implications for people who have done estate planning, changing wills on the strength that they had already outlived the five-year gifting period and they now find that gifts which formerly had been legitimately out of their estate are now back in?

An hon. member: He is going back.

Mr. Good: Exactly, this is what he is doing. It means there has to be a whole reorganization.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): No, no! That is completely wrong!

Mr. Good: That is what the minister is telling us!

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): They are two different things.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, they are two different things. But I still think the important thing that matters here this afternoon is the commitment I am giving to the House: We are doing this as a protection for the revenues of Ontario, and I can assure the hon. members that if the model Act pleases us or is in line with what we should get in a revenue flow, I will make the adjustment; and make it quickly.

Mr. Good: And the poor guy who dies in between is going to be hurt!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He won't be hurt.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you very much. To contend with this legislation, one would have to read the full 3,000 pages of Proust, to remember things past, old heraldic things and battles long ago. The minister really means what he says! I thought it was simply an actuarial thing, some kind of manipulation whereby he had to reach back ostensibly, but not really, for 15 years, in order to maintain the gift tax in operation because of some lapse that is going to take place in the next few days. But that's not the way it is at all.

The minister spoke disparagingly of other provinces such as Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island not having these Acts and having to impose what the minister himself said is a most unfortunate thing—retroactive legislation. But he now acknowledges quite openly that Ontario too is contemplating and knows the necessity for retroactive gift tax legislation, and that he is going to bring

it in in the spring. It will be dated back to January 1, 1971, and it will I trust—and I have no doubt if the minister has seen some period of time mentioned, and he has discussed it, he says—the time period will again be either five years or less, because of the time span of human memory.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am sorry, I was not with the member for his opening discussion. What is the point he is making?

Mr. Lawlor: My question is that the minister said he was up in Ottawa looking at the model Act—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, no. I didn't say that!

Mr. Lawlor: —or at least discussing some of its terms. I daresay on no occasion during the course of that discussion a period of 15 years was mentioned as being the time span in which gifts would be captured within the provisions.

I suggest that the longest was five years, the present provincial situation, or the federal position up until now which was three years—either one or the other—something sensible. But this government is proposing something quite preposterous in this legislation. And if this retroactive legislation is not passed and brought in; or if for some reason or other because of the way the government despoils largess these days, it just simply sticks by this provision in lieu of a decent gift tax Act, then the people of Ontario are caught in their administration of estates and testamentary dispositions by this particular long-term reach.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I might say that when we were in Ottawa we discussed the model Act; we didn't see it. We will have that very clear.

I think perhaps where we are stymied is in not being absolutely certain of what is going to happen. The member knows that the five-year period is now in existence and the provisions of this Act only apply after January 1, 1972. We are not going back there. We are looking ahead 15 years, not back 15 years.

Mr. Renwick: We understand.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Surely if a model situation is going to present itself to us—and I will tell you even by the opening of the next session—I believe if it is going to exist it is going to exist in that period. You are going to be covered in the five-year period anyway, the member for Waterloo will—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, right now; three years federal, five years provincial. I can assure you.

I can't give you that commitment by standing here and saying that is the way it is going to be, because if the provisions of that model Act don't please us, something else will have to be done. But you are going to be caught in the five-year situation anyway, I simply say when we get the commitment we want or the arrangement we want, then the 15-year situation will change.

In the meantime, I don't think that the argument that you raise, that it is going to throw planners and everybody else right off the street, will exist, because there will be that area in there until this decision is made.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: I still can't understand why it makes any difference to the revenue of the province to not have the five-year provision continued. What does the—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It does continue.

Mr. Deacon: For all gifts made prior to December 31, 1971, five years apart. Why wouldn't we still have the five years apply in this new provision for January 31, 1972? What difference does it make to the revenue of the province? This is my problem here.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I haven't yet been able to comprehend the reason for changing the number of years from five years to 15 years. I don't understand the difference that will make on the revenues to the province.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It might not make any difference. Certainly, it won't make any difference in that first five years. But if there is not a compatible situation between Ontario and Ottawa, it certainly will make a whale of a difference in the next 10 years.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, would it not be much easier for the province to stick to the five-year period, and if it needs more revenue change the gift-tax rate and get the revenues that way, rather than have people having to reach back 15 years? If the federal model Act isn't implemented, and we continue under this new Act of ours—let's forget the federal government doing anything, we have to continue in this—why don't we just continue using the five

years we have been accustomed to using in the past and change the rates of gift tax to bring the revenue to the point that we have been expecting to have it in past legislation?

Mr. Bullbrook: And you won't miss anything. It is still going to be retroactive anyway.

Mr. Deacon: We won't miss anything. We are not going to—

Mr. Lawlor: That is what they are going to do, maybe.

Mr. Deacon: Then we won't be making it so difficult and complicated for people in the matter of tracing these gifts.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the way it comes through to me is that in fact the province, with respect to gifts made after the end of this year, is extending the taxing net to pick up gifts dating back to that time forward for 15 years. What we will really end up with is a continuing Succession Duty Act with provision that if there is gift tax paid from the time the new Act, the model Act, comes into force, you will get a credit for it against succession duty. But in fact you are permanently extending the tax, at least until the point in time, if you ever decide to do it, which we hope not, that you repeal The Succession Duty Act. So you are in fact enlarging the taxing net of the Province of Ontario by this change.

In other words, if I make a gift on New Year's Day of this year, of this coming year, January 1, 1972, and I make a gift of \$50,000, if I should have that, and die then in 1986, my estate will include in its value the \$50,000. And presumably if I also had to pay gift tax on it I would get a credit for that gift tax paid during my lifetime.

I take that to be a different situation than now exists, because under the present laws if I make the gift of \$50,000 on Christmas Day, and I die after Christmas Day 1976, then that gift will not be included in my estate for succession duty purposes. So the net is being substantially increased and the value of estates may be substantially increased; and the only alleviation, really, that a person will have is a credit for gift tax, if and when a gift tax is imposed on inter vivos gifts. Is my understanding correct?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I think that is a correct understanding, bearing in mind the hypothetical situation the member is talking

about. The member is absolutely correct. But when the gift tax, as I said before, becomes applicable, if everything is acceptable to us, then long range application is going to be modified; we will probably come back to five years.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments to any section of this bill?

The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I just want to refer the minister to, I think it is section 2, subsection 4, about the explanatory note thereto. The explanatory note reads as follows:

The effect of the amendment is to exempt strangers from duty on estates valued up to \$100,000 and to double the rate of duty payable by them.

You know that is quite misleading. It is not true. Literally speaking it's true, but the implication of the thing is that the minister is doubling the succession duty with respect to the stranger class exceeding a certain figure, namely \$100,00.

But the minister is not really doubling at all, is he? All he is doing is picking up the slack that exists because the federal people have stepped out of the picture. There is a short fall there of \$30 million, even in the process of that particular manipulating. So that the individuals being taxed in that category are paying less under the minister's present scheme than what they would be paying previous to the scheme.

The province by and large, in an overall way, is again making a substantial gift to people who are in better financial circumstances than others, namely those who are in a position to leave estates, estates of a size that will attract succession duties. I think this should be pointed out.

In too many ways these days we have misleading statements before us. If the minister cares to reply to that it is fine. I think I will just leave it at that. It is something that I find quite unpalatable.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I must say to the hon. member there is a slight shortfall in the entire application of this particular bill as opposed to what happened before, but the fact of the matter is that the rates are established—as the member knows they will have to be established—and they are doubled.

Mr. Lawlor: I have a few comments to make with respect to subsection 8 of section 2, having to do—

Mr. Bullbrook: Please may I be permitted then to continue on subsection 4 for a moment? I stood and voted in favour of the principle of this bill last night, and I still believe in the equitable principle of any progressive piece of taxing legislation. It might be that I sounded as if I were speaking out of both sides of my mouth, but I want to, if I might, record here with no equivocation that this, in my opinion, is a horrendous exemption for the stranger class. It borders on being unconscionable.

The Treasurer said in his statement, and with justification, that we have to give some concern to small family businesses, small family farms and other enterprises of that nature. He was worried about the encroachment of outside capital in taking over these types of things.

I think personally that we have gone too far. I think \$500,000 is too much. But you realize, of the three considerations put forward by the Treasurer in his statement on Monday, not one of them has any application to the exemption of \$100,000 that this government is prepared to afford to the stranger class. I say it is unconscionable how the government can do this. The Treasurer has been kind enough to give me some of his time personally—and as he is now in the House, if I misquote him he'll rise. But basically, as I understand it, the philosophy behind it is this. That is, it is similar to the state having no place in the bedrooms of the nation; the state apparently has no place in telling the deceased who is going to be the beneficiary of his largess.

I disagree with that unequivocally, because people do not acquire wealth in the Sahara Desert. People acquire wealth because of the economic climate created by a state and by a government; and if you accept that philosophy, that is the essential philosophy concurrent with the right of the state to tax wealth.

I say to you that can be tempered with justification by the Treasurer's three examples, but it cannot be tempered with justification in connection with this type of exemption for the stranger class.

It is too late in the season. We've been put through too much in one week to start getting into a bunch of technical amendments at this time. But I wanted, as one individual member here, to record that I am unalterably opposed to that type of exemption.

I go this far personally. I don't think there should be any exemption in the stranger class at all.

Mr. Lawlor: Why not \$10,000?

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, maybe \$10,000, fine, if you wish. We'll give the profligate nephew \$10,000 to have a year on the state, but not \$100,000.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As I understand it, again it gets into the philosophical thinking on the policy aspect of the business. But I would like to tell the hon. member—and I am sure that in his own business life he will know this and know it well—that there are very few times when these people will become eligible. It is mostly under very unusual circumstances. We do get these in the department, which the member will know, and I've had the pleasure of serving a fair few people.

In my humble opinion, there are only a very, very small handful that it will affect.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say then, I am going to stop this. I assure all fellow members I am. I want to say that the Treasurer again was kind enough to point out—and I entirely agree with him—that really the restructuring here doesn't bring back in the total context of provincial revenues that much money. I say that argument really begs the question.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, but I want to talk on another section.

Mr. Chairman: Does that section stand as part of the bill then?

The member for Lakeshore on another subsection, I should say.

Mr. Lawlor: Section 2 is a very long section, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we are on subsection—

Mr. Lawlor: Subsection 8, having to do with the widow's exemption.

Within the past 24 months we have gone from \$75,000 widow's exemption, and widower's now too, to \$500,000. We jumped—and the committee on taxation thought we should go to, as I remember, \$90,000—because we felt that the acquisition of wealth through the Canadian Pension Plan, as it matured, through the inflation in housing, through the amount of insurance people by and large possess, could very easily reach \$100,000, so \$90,000 seemed a pretty fair figure.

The government came out shortly after that, as a result of those recommendations, with \$125,000. None of us on this side of the House resisted it at all. We don't resist

what would be the full contribution of a woman or of a widower to the joint venture of the marriage and the fruits thereof derived after death.

This equally applies—and it must be made abundantly clear, because the government, invidiously, sometimes kind of passes it back in our teeth that we don't make adequate provision—for dependent children. If the dependent children are mentally retarded and their dependency lasts for a lifetime, so be it. There must be full provision made for such people.

And people going to university must be supported. The present age that was recommended, again in the committee work, was the age of 25, with a decreasing measure going through to that age. In other words, a smaller exemption; I think it reached \$25,000. The government didn't bring that into being. I think the allowances, which are not being touched in this amendment, are now \$15,000 per dependant.

Anyhow, we have therefore shown our good faith in the direction of the protection of the—I'll concentrate on the widow in this particular instance—we went to \$125,000; then we subsequently went to \$250,000. We still didn't raise our hands or voices.

All right; again under inflationary conditions it is quite conceivable you don't want to have to amend the Act every two or three years. It is quite conceivable that was a just cut-off point. Now you've gone to \$500,000, and I strenuously object. What does Smith say about this? Again I am saying to you Smith is no wild-eyed radical; he is a real throwback, by and large, and I don't think he would take any offence at the terminology. He would be rather proud of it.

Anyhow at page 178 of the report on taxation he says:

Preferential tax treatment is given to dependent beneficiaries to avoid causing unnecessary hardship for those who relied on the deceased during his lifetime. We believe that the tax should be structured to ensure that there may pass, free of duty to these dependants, an amount which, when wisely invested, would be sufficient to keep them in modest comfort. Once such an amount has been provided for, there is no reason to differentiate between various beneficiaries.

Let's, in the gratuity of the season, let it go even a little beyond modest comfort and say they may live in fair luxury. I would

think that an amount of \$250,000, wisely invested, would keep me in a fairly floating state for the rest of my life. I could think of things—the wide expanse of literature, the marvellous hours spent in remote conversations; I would never turn another hand as you know.

Here you are then; now what do you do? In the process of achieving this particular thing you did what the dunces up at the federal level did too. Why? People are so purblind; people are elected to high positions and have so little forfending of the benefits to the whole population as to open these loopholes so wide as to drive a foreign hand through them and do it deliberately.

They are told time after time what they are doing, but it makes no impact at all. What happens in this, or could happen—and it is the job of legislators to see that these things don't happen—what is to prevent the widow, having got \$500,000, the theory of the federal government is that as between husband and wife it would pass freely—

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): And then what?

Mr. Lawlor: —but without a thought that when the succession rolled over to the next generation, then the whack would come, then social weal would be given its contribution and recognition. What happens though, and what is going increasingly to happen, and what you are subsidizing, is that the widow will pick up the bundle and head for Nassau. She'll join E. P. Taylor and the rest of the gang who have made their ill-gotten gains here in our fair province, and derived all the benefits. I am speaking directly to the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), because I think he is the only one who really feels in his heart that I am right.

She takes their \$500,00 out of the country. It disappears forever. There is no way of preventing it. It is free and clear. It is lost to investment. It is lost to capital growth. It is lost to future generations in this province. It is just down the drain.

Mr. W. J. Nuttall (Frontenac-Addington): And you are the one who chased it down there!

Mr. Lawlor: You are legislating it here this afternoon, and giving full cognizance to that proposition. Are you derelict? Are you completely out of your mind?

An hon. member: Most of the Conservatives are.

Mr. Lawlor: He is stripping the province of what has been gained to this province over long periods of time. I say to you that you are making out-of-hand gestures here on such a scale as to be illiberal and as to be positively irresponsible with respect to your taxing responsibility.

I don't know how much more strongly I could say it, but I hope it—

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Sit down; you have said enough.

Mr. Lawlor: You can say that. You were here for a month—

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments to any section of the bill?

The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have been studying the bill, so I may be making a digression.

An hon. member: On how to make a million?

An hon. member: Are you staying for a few hours?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I must apologize for having missed a portion of the debate—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member missed all day.

An hon. member: It is unusual for the member for High Park to be in the House after 4:30.

Mr. Shulman: If this question has been asked before, I will not pursue it. I would like to ask the minister, has the question been brought up—enlighten me if am wrong—or is it correct that the exemption is not entirely exempt? In other words, say the amount of the exemption is \$500,000; if the estate is \$501,000, is the entire amount then taxed? What is the taxation going to be? Is the taxation only on that \$1,000 above?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am very pleased the member asked that question, because we get around to the notching provisions that his leader was getting at last night.

Mr. Sargent: The minister might know the answer to that one!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: This is where the notching provisions come into effect, and the tax that is taken off after the exemption does nothing to diminish the exemption. In other words, the guarantee of the \$125,000, which is the tax payable on \$500,000, is paid in any event on an estate of that size. Then the notching provision comes in, and the tax taken after that cannot be such over the amount of \$500,000 that it reduces the \$500,000 exemption.

Mr. Lawlor: What the minister is saying is that the floor is the \$100,000, let's say, in most of the cases.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Exactly correct!

Mr. Lawlor: If it falls one buck short of that, it is out of the tax picture. Once taxing starts, notching goes all the way up from that point on.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Right.

Mr. Chairman: Any comments, questions or amendments on any other section of the bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 3 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report four bills without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report four bills without amendments.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 8, An Act to amend The Corporation Securities Registration Act.

Bill 9, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Bill 10, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Bill 11, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.

Bill 13, An Act to establish the Management Board of Cabinet.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): May I briefly say, Mr. Speaker, that I want to register my opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order for just a moment please. With respect, I must point out to the hon. member that debate may be engaged in at third reading. However, the principle of the bill has been passed, the operations have been covered in committee of the whole. The only thing that can really be discussed at third reading is whether or not the bill be now read for the third time, and remarks must be restricted to whether or not the bill is now read the third time.

Mr. Sargent: I very definitely want to register my feeling on that. I do not expect that I will change anyone's opinion—

An hon. member: That is for sure.

Mr. Sargent: —but I want to point out a few reasons why this legislation should not be rushed into at this time.

The motivation, I suggest, could be that the Prime Minister has read our blueprint for government and he would want to set it into action as soon as possible. But may I say that in the last election 46 per cent of the people of Ontario wanted you in and 54 per cent of the people, or 4,500,000, did not want you people in power.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): It didn't go over too well on October 21.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister without Portfolio): The voters read it too and didn't like it.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): How many people wanted the member in in his riding?

Mr. Sargent: Enough to get here anyway. It was pretty shaky but—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Prime Minister): What per cent voted for the member?

Mr. Sargent: I do not know, but I got here.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Well it is a crying shame.

Mr. Sargent: I always spoke well of the provincial Treasurer too.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: But in the next four years the Conservative Party is going to be here, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that 4,500,000 people do not want you to have this power. We are

going to restructure our way of doing business here, and the true fact is that we are going to centralize our power into the hands of six people.

We have had enough of glorified commissions to know what happens. We will have the further screening of questions from the opposition and public scrutiny will not be at the level it should be at, as in the past. We have seen what has happened in the setting up of commissions across this province and it is very doubtful whether or not this House will be responsible to the Legislature or approachable by the Legislature.

This government has been talking about doing things for people and I will tell you the people they have been doing things for. They have been doing things for their friends in the area of big business—

An hon. member: What has this got to do with the principle of the bill?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that on page 51 where we talk about contract mechanisms, where we have the issuance of requests for proposals, and in this third paragraph which reads:

Widely applied, this concept could result in significant reprivatization—

Mr. McNeil: After the member's speech he should be sitting in the third row.

Mr. Sargent: It goes on:

That is a delegation of a substantial degree of responsibility for programme delivery to agencies outside the government. Its primary advantages would be greater flexibility and access to sources previously untapped.

That is a beautiful word that, untapped. Do you know what we have been charging to get a brand of liquor on the board—\$10,000 to the government's bagmen. Who is their bagman now? I suggest to you—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Order.

Mr. Sargent: What do you mean, order? There should be some order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: There will be less and less to say when the government has passed the control it has now.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Major Daley's machine in Chicago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The machine of Mayor Daley of Chicago, Tammany Hall, will be like peanuts compared to this new—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not speaking properly to this bill.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly am, because we are talking about this clause of contract mechanisms. There is nothing in this bill we are talking about to reform Parliament, to give a break to the ordinary member.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Like you.

Mr. Sargent: I have a girl running my politics at home and I have a girl down here and she can't do the job of two members. We need a girl for every member of this House, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Sargent: The ladies in the back row have nothing to worry about with these guys at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please! Order!

Mr. Sargent: There is nothing here, Mr. Speaker, to give the members of the House the machinery to run our business properly.

Mr. Speaker: The principle of this bill has been debated completely.

Mr. Sargent: I know, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell you why I am opposed to this. We've seen the chaos by the new man in charge—

An hon. member: The member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: —and what he has done in assessment across this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not speaking properly to this bill on third reading.

Mr. Sargent: We've seen the mess he made at the time he was Minister of Education, with \$500 million down the drain through conversion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order! I indicated clearly to the hon. member that on third reading we must realize that the principle contained in the bill has already been approved. The operating sections of the bill have already been discussed in the committee of the whole House. The only matter to be discussed, that may properly be discussed, at this time is whether or not this bill should be now read a third time. The hon. members must restrict any debate around that particular aspect. We cannot talk about the principle. We cannot talk about the operation—only whether or not the bill is to be now read a third time.

Mr. Sargent: The reason it should not be read a third time is this—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Give him the reasons why then.

Mr. Sargent: We don't know how much this restructuring is going to cost the taxpayers of Ontario. We have no idea.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I am talking of why it should not be passed. We have seen the inability of this government to cope with the affairs of the people of this province. The mess in subdivisions, assessment, taxation—in every area—the same man who will be running this show now has been responsible for all these things. There is nothing in this bill, to the Prime Minister, comparable to what they have in the States for housing, urban development, nothing for cities. Sixty per cent of our people—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The member is certainly straying far from the bill.

Mr. Sargent: These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, it should not be law.

Mr. Speaker: Not in the opinion of the Chair. This is not proper debate on third reading.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, may I say to you, sir, that I think that you are protecting the government every way in the first five days we've had.

Interjections by hon. members.

Some hon. members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member realizes, of course, that is part of my responsibility to represent all members. I represent all members.

Mr. Sargent: I don't think you represent the taxpayers of Ontario when you won't let me say what I have to say about this bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: In sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. History will record that giving more centralized control to six people is very dangerous and I am opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for third reading of Bill 13. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

THIRD READINGS

(continued)

Bill 14, An Act to establish the Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet.

Bill 1, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.

Bill 2, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill 3, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill 4, An Act to Facilitate the Relief of Unemployment by Municipalities.

Bill 15, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Bill 16, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

Bill 17, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

ACT GRANTING CERTAIN ADDITIONAL SUMS OF MONEY

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Additional Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; without unanimous consent of the House, is it possible to introduce a bill at this time that is out of order? I am asking your ruling, sir.

Mr. Sargent: The member must be kidding!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): No, he's not.

Mr. Speaker: The supply bill is always in order at the end of the session when all bills

have been passed. This is a normal procedure during the session.

Mr. Shulman: Is it possible to call any bill except in the proper order of business?

An hon. member: Just the supply bill.

Mr. Speaker: Only the supply bill at the end of the proceedings of the session.

ACT GRANTING CERTAIN ADDITIONAL SUMS OF MONEY

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 22, An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Additional Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1972.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: On second reading of this bill, is it open for debate?

Mr. Speaker: I know of no reason why it can't be debated.

Mr. Shulman: Well, in that case I have numerous comments to make, sir.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Trade and Development): I bet he has.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition) This is Santa Claus.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, I will start with the moneys that have been voted for The Department of Correctional Services. I wish to complain about the large sum of moneys that has been voted for the rehabilitation of adult offenders programme, and I am—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must point out to the hon. member that we cannot entertain repetition. Anything to do with this particular supply bill has already been debated during the second reading and the committee stages so we cannot have any repetition at this time.

Mr. Shulman: I shall take great care not to repeat anything that has been said before, sir.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How would the member know?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I have taken the trouble of reading Hansard, gentlemen. They may not have noticed that.

Sir, I am objecting to the funds that are being voted for the rehabilitation of adult offenders programme on the grounds that the funds that have already been voted in the past are being misused and not properly used. I would like to cite you an example, sir—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Do we have a closure rule?

Mr. Shulman: —to illustrate what I have in mind. Two weeks ago, sir, the group of offenders, of inmates, was being transferred to Burwash Industrial Farm.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This guy comes crashing in at 5 o'clock on Friday afternoon and decides to entertain us with these stories!

Mr. Shulman: The method of transferring these men was to put them in a truck without sufficient safety belts. A very serious accident took place, sir, as a result of which a number of the inmates were seriously injured.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't somebody get the leader of that party?

Mr. Shulman: The reason this accident took place—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That makes the reason for the Legislature more relevant.

Mr. Shulman: Gentlemen, members will learn that courtesy runs both ways. They did not offer it to me earlier today and I am returning the favour.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member was out of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The House leader of the Conservative Party gave unanimous consent to it.

Mr. Shulman: Those neanderthals back there did not give unanimous consent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How long do we have to suffer this?

Mr. Shulman: About half an hour. In any case, what I am objecting to is that because of the misrunning of that particular department, a number of people were seriously injured. The men have not received any recompense or offer of compensation

despite their complaints. I am suggesting, sir, that before any further funds be voted under this particular programme, further discussion is necessary of the administration of the department.

Similarly, under the rehabilitation of juveniles programme, one of the major complaints which I made in the past week—and which, unfortunately, we have not had an opportunity to debate because one of the ministers was not here in the last few days—was the practice, in their rehabilitation programme, of transferring some children from training schools to the wards for the criminally insane at Penetang.

I am suggesting to you, sir, that funds should have been made available from amounts voted earlier to set up a proper ward in a training school where children who are having difficulties or are having quarrels could be segregated rather than sending them to adult wards where they will learn from hardened criminals how to become criminals—which, in effect, is what has happened to at least one 14-year-old and one 15-year-old at the present time.

I would like to suggest, sir, that under other departments, including The Department of Health where funds are being voted here for the mental health programme, the very same problem exists and the very same criticism should be offered. I am suggesting to you, sir, that under The Department of Transportation and Communications, serious errors are being made in the building of highways. Unfortunately, I did not bring my file up with me. I have a lengthy file.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Give us the highway safety speech anyway.

Mr. Deans: Go home and get it.

Mr. Shulman: If the members will all wait, I'll go and get it. I've had a complaint, sir, which was sent to me by a large group of people in Fonthill that the ecology of the area north of that town is being destroyed because the highway that is being built north of there has been badly planned. It could have been put through without destroying the natural scenic area and the areas where wildlife is living. Yet this area is being completely destroyed.

I would like to suggest to you, sir, for that reason I am objecting to the passing of these supplementary estimates. I could continue at some great length but my own party is becoming rather uneasy behind and beside me—

An hon. member: Oh, no, go ahead!

Mr. W. Newman: I am glad the member got the message.

Mr. Shulman:—and for their sake, if not for my neanderthal friends opposite, I will now cease.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THIRD READINGS

(continued)

The following bill was given third reading upon motion.

Bill 22, An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Additional Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1972.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Davis moves that a select committee of this House be appointed to continue the inquiry and review of the law affecting the corporations in this province as reported on by the select committee of this House appointed on June 22, 1965, and reappointed on July 8, 1966, and on July 23, 1968, and in particular to inquire into and review the law relating to mergers or amalgamations, the rights of dissenting shareholders in the event of various fundamental corporate changes, the purpose, function and scope of the annual return, the law relating to the protection of the creditor and the dissolution of the ordinary commercial corporation in Ontario.

And, further, to inquire into and report upon such specialized types of corporations as insurance companies, loan and trust companies, corporations without share capital, finance and acceptance companies and extra-provincial companies, together with the legislation of other jurisdictions relating to the same matters, and that the select committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to employ counsel and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable, and to call for persons, papers and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations for which purpose the hon. Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants, and the said committee to consist of 11 members to be composed as follows: Mr. Meen,

chairman; Messrs. Clement, Good, Hodgson (York North), Johnston, Lawlor, Reilly, Renwick, Scrivener (Mrs.), Singer and Smith (Simcoe East).

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I ask on a point of order, is it possible, without unanimous consent of the House, to make a motion out of order?

Mr. Speaker: It has been the tradition of this House for many, many years that the motion setting up select committees is introduced properly at the end of other deliberations before the House adjourns or prorogues.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Davis moves that a select committee of this House be appointed to review the report of the interdepartmental task force on foreign investment and the current status of opinion and information on economic and cultural nationalism in Canada and to prepare a preliminary report by March 1, 1972, and that the select committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to employ counsel and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the hon. Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants, and the said committee to consist of 11 members to be composed as follows: Mr. Rowe, chairman; Messrs. Deacon, Deans, Hamilton, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Kennedy, Leluk, Martel, Newman (Ontario South), Smith (Nipissing) and Walker.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Davis moves that a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the utilization of educational facilities. The committee would be guided by the following terms of reference:

1. The committee should inquire into the potentialities and possibilities for the increased use of educational facilities throughout Ontario at all levels, including post-secondary facilities;

2. Specifically, the committee should examine such matters as (i) the wider community use of its educational facilities; (ii) the year-round use of such facilities for educational

and/or community programmes; and (iii) ways and means by which the above-mentioned activities could be brought about and emphasized;

and that the select committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to employ counsel and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things, and to examine witnesses under oath; and the assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the hon. Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants; and the said committee to consist of 11 members to be composed as follows: Mr. Smith (Hamilton Mountain), chairman; Messrs. Beckett, Birch (Mrs.), Foulds, Gaunt, HENDERSON, Jessiman, Laughren, McIlveen, McNie and Newman (Windsor-Walkerville).

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. members, I should point out that the government is contemplating—as it related to our discussion earlier about the question of the role of private members—the establishment at the next session of two or three more select committees, and to point out to the personnel on the select committee that relates to cultural and economic nationalism that we would like the preliminary report by March 1—that is, not a definitive or final report, but if we could get some information in, this could relate to the beginning of the session and perhaps we would have something to work upon.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): They should visit the jurisdictions named in the report for the purpose of understanding it fully.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker. It will be up to the determination of the committee as to how broad a field they wish to cover.

Mr. Speaker, I also understand that His Honour is waiting to—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Can I ask the Premier, since the select committee on corporation law was a continuation, in effect—a reconstitution of a previous committee—and since he has now indicated there may be other select committees, can he undertake that there will

be appointed, a reconstitution of the committee on election law for the purpose of analysing the sources of funding during an election campaign and a limitation on election expenses, and would he consider setting up such a select committee and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the government of course is always prepared to consider any useful purpose for a select committee. I have some thoughts that relate to other aspects of the election procedures. I think that really at this precise moment these are the more immediate priorities and as I really don't anticipate an election for another four years—

Mr. Lewis: While this election is still fresh in the Premier's mind and all the data immediately available, so perhaps it would make sense to do it now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would not be a member of such a committee, so even though these events would be fresh in my mind, not being a member of the committee I don't know how relevant that is.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, we could summon the Premier before the committee. Get a Lieutenant Governor's warrant.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that the government is considering—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Justice): A Speaker's warrant.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, maybe the member will be called too—we have two or three committees that we are thinking of and I would really have to give some thought to that suggestion.

Mr. Lewis: With the Premier there I would have less to tell.

An hon. member: That is the way it worked out on October 21, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I say, His Honour is waiting.

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 several 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 Income Tax Act.

Bill 2, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill 3, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill 4, An Act to Facilitate the Relief of Unemployment by Municipalities.

Bill 5, An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and to pro-Health Insurance Commission and to pro-Ontario Health Insurance Plan.

Bill 6, An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act.

Bill 7, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Bill 8, An Act to amend The Corporation Securities Registration Act.

Bill 9, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Bill 10, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Bill 11, An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.

Bill 13, An Act to establish the Management Board of Cabinet.

Bill 14, An Act to establish the Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet.

Bill 15, An Act to amend The Executive Council Act.

Bill 16, An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act.

Bill 17, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario, in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government, and humbly beg to present for Your Honour's acceptance,

a bill intituled, An Act granting to Her Majesty Certain Additional Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1972.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accept their benevolence and assent to this bill in Her Majesty's name.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislative assembly of Ontario: This first session of the 29th Parliament of Ontario concludes after undertaking, in a period of only one week, an extremely worthwhile and significant programme of legislation. I congratulate you on the diligence with which you have attended to your duties on behalf of the people of Ontario.

In declaring this session prorogued, I pray that under Divine Providence each of you will enjoy to the full, with your families, friends, and constituents, the pleasures and relaxation of Christmas and the New Year.

In our Sovereign's name, I thank you.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker and hon. members of the legislative assembly, it is the will and pleasure of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor that this legislative assembly be prorogued and this legislative assembly is accordingly prorogued.

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

The House prorogued at 5:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, December 17, 1971

Trial of Kingston Penitentiary inmates—views of plea bargaining, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Singer	331
Checkerboard method to establish property titles—importance of appeal court decision, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Nixon	331
Law Society of Upper Canada and its insurance coverage, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Singer	332
Complaints backlog before employment standards branch, questions to Mr. Carton, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald	333
Metro Centre meeting involving several provincial departments and developer, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis	334
Farmers' drainage claims—delays in payment since August, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Sargent	334
Windsor housing units—OHC non-acceptance of second appraisal price, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Singer	336
Toronto-centred region—incentives for farmer-landholders in zone 2, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mrs. Scrivener, Mr. Renwick	337
Mercury in fish—raising tolerance level, questions to Mr. Kerr, Mr. Reid	338
Commercial fishing dispute in Killarney area, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Germa	339
Alleged dismissal of union organizer by Martel Lumber of Chapleau, question to Mr. Carton, Mr. Laughren	339
Housing situation in Ontario—Toronto shortage, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Nixon	339
Senior citizen housing in Timmins—construction closedown for winter, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Ferrier	340
Family court personnel—Indian interpreter, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman	340
Proposed amalgamation of Sudbury, Copper Cliff—OMB hearings, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Germa	341
Alleged OPP leniency during provincial election, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Gaunt	341
Presenting report on Fisheries Loan Act, Mr. Brunelle	341
Tabling copies of three orders in council re expropriations, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	341
Control and regulation of snowmobiles, bill to provide for, Mr. Shulman, first reading	342
Presenting scroll to Major B. Handley Geary, V.C., Mr. Speaker	346
Resolution re Crown land purchase by Mr. Meen, Mr. Brunelle, concurred in	347
Extra-Judicial Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	347
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	358
Executive Council Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	358
Relief of unemployment by municipalities, bill to facilitate, Mr. Bales, second reading	389
Relief of unemployment by municipalities, bill to facilitate, reported	391
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	396

Income Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	389
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, reported	400
Third readings	407
Certain additional sums of money for the public services, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, bill for granting to Her Majesty, Mr. McKeough, first, second, third readings	409
Motion to appoint select committee to continue enquiry and review of law affecting cor- porations, Mr. Davis, agreed to	411
Motion to appoint select committee to review report of task force on foreign investment and economic and cultural nationalism, Mr. Davis, agreed to	412
Motion to appoint select committee on utilization of educational facilities, Mr. Davis, agreed to	412
Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	413
Prorogation	414

INDICES

Provincial Parliament Council Members	5
Provincial Parliament Members	6
Alphabetical List of Bills	9
Numerical List of Bills	10
Subjects and speakers (alphabetical by Subjects)	12
Speakers and subjects (alphabetical by Members)	33

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1971

Members of the Executive Council

- Hon. W. G. Davis, *Prime Minister and President of the Council*
- Hon. A. F. Lawrence, *Minister of Justice and Attorney General*
- Hon. W. D. McKeough, *Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics*
- Hon. R. S. Welch, *Minister of Education*
- Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence, *Minister of Health*
- Hon. J. Yaremko, *Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship*
- Hon. A. Grossman, *Minister of Trade and Development*
- Hon. W. A. Stewart, *Minister of Agriculture and Food*
- Hon. C. S. MacNaughton, *Minister of Transportation and Communications*
- Hon. J. A. C. Auld, *Minister of Public Works*
- Hon. R. Brunelle, *Minister of Lands and Forests*
- Hon. D. A. Bales, *Minister of Municipal Affairs*
- Hon. T. L. Wells, *Minister of Social and Family Services*
- Hon. F. Guindon, *Minister of Tourism and Information*
- Hon. J. H. White, *Minister of Colleges and Universities*
- Hon. G. A. Kerr, *Minister of the Environment*
- Hon. C. J. S. Apps, *Minister of Correctional Services*
- Hon. G. R. Carton, *Minister of Labour and Financial and Commercial Affairs*
- Hon. L. Bernier, *Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs*
- Hon. E. A. Winkler, *Minister of Revenue*
- Hon. J. W. Snow, *Minister without Portfolio*
- Hon. R. T. Potter, *Minister without Portfolio*

Provincial Parliament Members

Allan, James N. (P.C.),
Haldimand-Norfolk
Apps, Hon. C. J. S. (P.C.),
Kingston and the Islands
Auld, Hon. James A. C. (P.C.),
Leeds

Bales, Hon. Dalton A. (P.C.),
York Mills

Beckett, R. B. (P.C.),
Brantford

Belanger, J. Albert (P.C.),
Prescott and Russell

Bennett, Claude (P.C.),
Ottawa South

Bernier, Hon. Leo (P.C.),
Kenora

Birch, Mrs. Margaret (P.C.),
Scarborough East

Bounsall, E. J. (N.D.P.),
Windsor West

Braithwaite, Leonard A. (L.),
Etobicoke

Breithaupt, James R. (L.),
Kitchener

Brunelle, Hon. Rene (P.C.),
Cochrane North

Bullbrook, James E. (L.),
Sarnia

Burr, Fred A. (N.D.P.),
Sandwich-Riverside

Carruthers, Alex (P.C.),
Durham

Carton, Hon. Gordon R. (P.C.),
Armourdale

Cassidy, Michael (N.D.P.),
Ottawa Centre

Clement, John T. (P.C.),
Niagara Falls

Davis, Hon. William G. (P.C.),
Peel North

Davison, Norm (N.D.P.),
Hamilton Centre

Deacon, Donald M. (L.),
York Centre

Deans, Ian (N.D.P.),
Wentworth

Downer, Rev. A. W. (P.C.),
Dufferin-Simcoe

Drea, Frank (P.C.),
Scarborough Centre

Dukszta, Dr. Jan (N.D.P.),
Parkdale

Dymond, Dr. Matthew B. (P.C.),
Ontario

Eaton, Robert G. (P.C.),
Middlesex South

Edighoffer, Hugh (L.),
Perth

Evans, D. Arthur (P.C.),
Simcoe Centre

Ewen, Donald Wm. (P.C.),
Wentworth North

Ferrier, Rev. William (N.D.P.),
Cochrane South

Foulds, James F. (N.D.P.),
Port Arthur

Gaunt, Murray (L.),
Huron-Bruce

Germa, Melville C. (N.D.P.),
Sudbury

Gilbertson, Bernt (P.C.),
Algoma

Gisborn, Reg. (N.D.P.),
Hamilton East

Givens, Philip G. (L.),
York-Forest Hill

Good, Edward R. (L.),
Waterloo North

Grossman, Hon. Allan (P.C.),
St. Andrew-St. Patrick

Guindon, Hon. Fern (P.C.),
Stormont

Haggerty, Ray (L.),
Welland South

Hamilton, Maurice (P.C.),
Renfrew North

Handleman, Sidney B. (P.C.),
Carleton

Havrot, Edward M. (P.C.),
 Timiskaming
 Henderson, Lorne C. (P.C.),
 Lambton
 Hodgson, R. Glen (P.C.),
 Victoria-Haliburton
 Hodgson, William (P.C.),
 York North

 Irvine, Donald R. (P.C.),
 Grenville-Dundas

 Jessiman, James H. (P.C.),
 Fort William
 Johnston, Robert M. (P.C.),
 St. Catharines

 Kennedy, R. Douglas (P.C.),
 Peel South
 Kerr, Hon. George A. (P.C.),
 Halton West

 Lane, John (P.C.),
 Algoma-Manitoulin
 Laughren, Floyd (N.D.P.),
 Nickel Belt
 Lawlor, Patrick D. (N.D.P.),
 Lakeshore
 Lawrence, Hon. Allan F. (P.C.),
 St. George
 Lawrence, Hon. A. B. R. (P.C.),
 Carleton East
 Leluk, Nicholas G. (P.C.),
 Humber
 Lewis, Stephen (N.D.P.),
 Scarborough West

 MacBeth, John P. (P.C.),
 York West
 MacDonald, Donald C. (N.D.P.),
 York South
 MacNaughton, Hon. Charles (P.C.),
 Huron
 Maeck, Lorne (P.C.),
 Parry Sound
 Martel, Elie W. (N.D.P.),
 Sudbury East
 McIlveen, Charles E. (P.C.),
 Oshawa
 McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy (P.C.),
 Chatham-Kent
 McNeil, Ronald K. (P.C.),
 Elgin

 McNie, Jack (P.C.),
 Hamilton West
 Meen, Arthur K. (P.C.),
 York East
 Miller, Frank S. (P.C.),
 Muskoka
 Morningstar, Ellis P. (P.C.),
 Welland
 Morrow, Donald H. (P.C.),
 Ottawa West

 Newman, Bernard (L.),
 Windsor-Walkerville
 Newman, William (P.C.),
 Ontario South
 Nixon, George (P.C.),
 Dovercourt
 Nixon, Robert F. (L.),
 Brant
 Nuttall, W. J. (P.C.),
 Frontenac-Addington

 Parrott, Dr. Harry C. (P.C.),
 Oxford
 Paterson, Donald A. (L.),
 Essex South
 Potter, Hon. Richard T. (P.C.),
 Quinte

 Reid, T. Patrick (L.L.)
 Rainy River
 Reilly, Leonard M. (P.C.),
 Eglinton
 Renwick, James A. (N.D.P.),
 Riverdale
 Reuter, Hon. Allan E. (P.C.),
 Waterloo South
 Rhodes, John R. (P.C.),
 Sault Ste. Marie
 Rollins, Clarke T. (P.C.),
 Hastings
 Root, John (P.C.),
 Wellington-Dufferin
 Rowe, Russell D. (P.C.),
 Northumberland
 Roy, Albert J. (L.)
 Ottawa East
 Ruston, Richard F. (L.),
 Essex-Kent

 Sargent, Edward (L.),
 Grey-Bruce
 Scrivener, Mrs. Margaret (P.C.),
 St. David

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Shulman, Dr. Morton (N.D.P.),
High Park
- Singer, Vernon, M. (L.),
Downsview
- Smith, Gordon E. (P.C.),
Simcoe East
- Smith, John R. (P.C.),
Hamilton Mountain
- Smith, Richard S. (L.),
Nipissing
- Snow, Hon. James W. (P.C.),
Halton East
- Spence, John P. (L.),
Kent
- Stewart, Hon. Wm. A. (P.C.),
Middlesex North
- Stokes, Jack E. (N.D.P.),
Thunder Bay
- Taylor, James A. (P.C.),
Prince Edward-Lennox
- Timbrell, Dennis R. (P.C.),
Don Mills
- Turner, John M. (P.C.),
Peterborough
- Villeneuve, Osie F. (P.C.),
Glengarry
- Walker, Gordon W. (P.C.),
London North
- Wardle, Thomas A. (P.C.),
Beaches-Woodbine
- Welch, Hon. Robert (P.C.),
Lincoln
- Wells, Hon. Thomas L. (P.C.),
Scarborough North
- White, Hon. John (P.C.),
London South
- Winkler, Hon. Eric A. (P.C.),
Grey South
- Wiseman, Douglas J. (P.C.),
Lanark
- Worton, Harry (L.),
Wellington South
- Yakabuski, Paul J. (P.C.),
Renfrew South
- Yaremko, Hon. John (P.C.),
Bellwoods
- Young, Fred (N.D.P.),
Yorkview

Alphabetical List of Bills

- Cabinet Management Board, No. 13
Cabinet Policy and Priorities Board, No. 14
Corporation Securities Registration Act, No. 8
Corporations Tax Act, No. 2
- Day Nurseries Act, No. 11
- Executive Council Act, No. 15
Extra-Judicial Services Act, No. 16
- Granting additional sums of money for the public service, No. 22
- Health Insurance Commission and Health Insurance Plan, No. 5
Health Services Insurance Act, No. 6
Hospital Services Commission Act, No. 7
- Income Tax Act, No. 1
- Public Service Superannuation Act, No. 10
- Succession Duty Act, No. 3
Surrogate Courts Act, No. 17
- Teachers' Superannuation Act, No. 9
- Unemployment Relief by Municipalities, No. 4

Bills

- Bill 1—An Act to amend The Income Tax Act—Hon. E. A. Winkler**
First reading 28. Second reading 297. In committee 398. Third reading 409.
Royal assent 413.
- Bill 2—An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act—Hon. E. A. Winkler**
First reading 28. Second reading 294. In committee 396. Third reading 409.
Royal assent 413.
- Bill 3—An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act—Hon. E. A. Winkler**
First reading 28. Second reading 305. In committee 400. Third reading 409.
Royal assent 413.
- Bill 4—An Act to facilitate the Relief of Unemployment by Municipalities
—Hon. D. A. Bales**
First reading 28. Second reading 389. In committee 391. Third reading 409.
Royal assent 413.
- Bill 5—An Act to establish the Ontario Health Insurance Commission and
to provide for the Advance Organization of the Ontario Health Insurance
Plan—Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence**
First reading 28. Second reading 56. In committee 104, 119. Third reading 123.
Royal assent 413.
- Bill 6—An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act
—Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence**
First reading 28. Second reading 86. Third reading 123. Royal assent 413.
- Bill 7—An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act
—Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence**
First reading 28. Second reading 86. Third reading 123. Royal assent 413.
- Bill 8—An Act to amend The Corporation Securities Registration Act
—Hon. G. R. Carton**
First reading 29. Second reading 320. Third reading 407. Royal assent 413.
- Bill 9—An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act
—Hon. R. Welch**
First reading 29. Second reading 320. Third reading 407. Royal assent 413.
- Bill 10—An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act
—Hon. W. D. McKeough**
First reading 30. Second reading 325. Third reading 407. Royal assent 413.
- Bill 11—An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act—Hon. T. L. Wells**
First reading 30. Second reading 283. In committee 283. Third reading 407.
Royal assent 413.

BILLS—Continued

Bill 13—An Act to establish the Management Board of Cabinet

—Hon. W. G. Davis

First reading 55. Second reading 325. Third reading 407. Royal assent 413.

Bill 14—An Act to establish the Policy and Priorities Board of Cabinet

—Hon. W. G. Davis

First reading 55. Second reading 326. Third reading 409. Royal assent 413.

Bill 15—An Act to amend The Executive Council Act—Hon. W. G. Davis

First reading 55. Second reading 358. Third reading 409. Royal assent 413.

Bill 16—An Act to amend The Extra-Judicial Services Act

—Hon. A. F. Lawrence

First reading 55. Second reading 326, 347. Third reading 409. Royal assent 413.

Bill 17—An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act—Hon. A. F. Lawrence

First reading 55. Second reading 358. Third reading 409. Royal assent 413.

Bill 22—An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Additional Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1972

—Hon. W. D. McKeough

First reading 409. Second reading 410. Third reading 411. Royal assent 414.

By Subjects

Accidents, motor vehicle

Germa 200-1; Martel 226-7; Shulman 410-1.

Accountants' associations

Renwick 300.

Action Mechanicsville

Cassidy 395-6.

Advertising/publicity

Auld 255-6; Davis 98; R. F. Nixon 44-45, 98, 255; Stokes 279-80; Wells 280.

Advisory groups

Carton 175; Haggerty 175; Wells 268.

Age

Burr 323.

Aged, homes for

A. B. R. Lawrence 50; Paterson 50; Wells 263, 265.

Aged/senior citizens

Bullbrook 76-77, 113, 122; Cassidy 240; Deans 81; Ferrier 72, 114, 278; Gaunt 114-5; Good 114; Grossman 340; A. B. R. Lawrence 50, 84, 120-1; McKeough 8, 11; B. Newman 114; R. F. Nixon 60-61; Paterson 50, 65, 113, 122-3; Reilly 119; Renwick 120; Roy 119; Singer 79.

Agriculture department personnel

Paterson 131; Stewart 135-6.

Air carriers, regional

MacNaughton 225-6; Martel 226; Sargent 225.

Air services/aviation

MacNaughton 225-6; Martel 226; Sargent 225.

Aircraft

MacNaughton 225-6; Sargent 225.

Aircraft hangars

Auld 262; Edighoffer 262.

Airports

Davis 43-44; W. Newman 43; R. F. Nixon 42-43; Sargent 43-44, 225.

Alcoholic beverages

Scrivener 171.

Algoma Steel Corporation Limited

Stokes 232.

Amalgamation/annexation

Bales 341; Bullbrook 54; Davis 54; Germa 341.

Appeals

Kerr 168-9; A. B. R. Lawrence 160-7; A. F. Lawrence 15, 331; Paterson 105-6; Renwick 77-78, 107-9; Singer 15; Wells 264, 283.

Appendix

33.

Appraisals, housing

Bounsall 336-7; Grossman 336-7; Singer 336-7.

Apprentices/apprenticeship

Carton 180-2, 186-8; Deans 180-1; Foulds 182; Germa 185-6; Haggerty 187; Martel 181; Paterson 179-80, 188; Renwick 184-5; Sargent 182-4.

Assessment/reassessment

Givens 214; Good 26; McKeough 337; R. F. Nixon 320.

Assistance Plan, Canada

Wells 288.

Associated Medical Services

Shulman 68.

Automotive Transport Association

Bullbrook 227; Gisborn 228; MacNaughton 228.

Autonomy, academic

Welch 93.

Autonomy, municipal/local

R. S. Smith 275; Wells 275.

Autonomy, regional

Good 254.

Bankruptcies

Sargent 52-53.

Bay State Developments Limited

A. F. Lawrence 342.

Beach properties/shorelines

Deans 160; Gisborn 156; Haggerty 202;
Kerr 156, 160; Lewis 24; R. F. Nixon
23-24; R. S. Smith 203; Spence 204;
Stokes 203-4; Young 23.

Bilingual/bicultural

Lewis 93, 95.

Borrowing, provincial

Deans 257-8.

Bottles, returnable/non-returnable

Kerr 46-47; Lewis 46; Shulman 46.

Brush clearing

Cassidy 158, 239-40, 252; MacNaughton
220.

Building permits

Burr 100-1.

Buildings, Ontario government

Auld 257; Martel 259-60.

Bus passenger service

Dukszta 218; Sargent 224-5.

Businesses, small

Bullbrook 307, 404; Carton 180; Deacon
317; McKeough 14; Paterson 179-80.

Bypasses

Germa 217; Martel 226-7.

Cabinet committees/boards

Cassidy 376-8; Davis 27, 384-9; Deans
369-74; Gisborn 26-27; Good 374-5;
R. G. Hodgson 380-2; A. F. Lawrence
332; Lewis 382-4; MacDonald 358-63;
MacNaughton 222; R. F. Nixon 332,
363-9; Renwick 378-80; Sargent 358-9,
407-9; Stokes 375-6.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Lewis 334.

Canadian Driver Pool Limited

A. F. Lawrence 49-50, 102-3; Lewis
49-50, 102-3.

Canadian Pacific Railway

Germa 217.

Canadian Specialized Services

A. F. Lawrence 49-50, 102-3; Lewis
49-50, 102-3.

Carter commission/report

Lawlor 308; Renwick 315.

Cemeteries

A. F. Lawrence 342.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Grossman 174-5; Kerr 52; McKeough 10;
R. F. Nixon 91; Sargent 183; Timbrell
174-5.

Certificates, securities

Carton 29.

Chambers of commerce

Bales 98; Carton 42; Deans 42;
B. Newman 98.

Charitable institutions

Lewis 287; Wells 263.

Children, handicapped

A. B. R. Lawrence 139; B. Newman 139.

Children, retarded

Dukszta 140, 291; Haggerty 140; Lawlor
405; A. B. R. Lawrence 138-9, 141, 143-4;
Lewis 141-2; Martel 143; Paterson 139;
R. S. Smith 284; Spence 138-9; Wells 30-31.

Children's aid societies

Lewis 287.

Children's boarding homes

Lewis 287, 289.

Children's centres, crippled

A. B. R. Lawrence 139; B. Newman 139.

Chiropractors/osteopaths

Paterson 145.

Churches/religious groups

Carton 42; MacDonald 290; Martel
285-6; Wells 286.

Civil rights

Wells 263-4.

Civil servants

Auld 261; Davis 45, 98, 172;
McKeough 170; Singer 172; Worton 150.

Civil service

Davis 386-7; R. F. Nixon 364.

Clinics

Dukszta 63-64; Ferrier 73; A. B. R.
Lawrence 83; MacDonald 76.

Clinics, dental

A. B. R. Lawrence 48; MacDonald 48.

Collective bargaining

Carton 96, 339; Lewis 96.

College of Dental Surgeons

A. B. R. Lawrence 47; MacDonald 47.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Colleges of agriculture

Auld 262; Edighoffer 262.

Colleges of applied arts and technology

Dukszta 279.

Collins, Judge George

A. F. Lawrence 97; Lewis 97; Stokes 97.

Commission on French secondary education

R. F. Nixon 93; R. S. Smith 94;
Welch 93-95.

Committee on corporation law, select

Lewis 412.

Committee on corporation law, select, members of

Davis 411.

Committee on drugs, advisory

A. B. R. Lawrence 20.

Committee on economic and cultural nationalism, select

Davis 412.

Committee on economic and cultural nationalism, select, members of

Davis 412.

Committee on election laws, select

Lewis 344, 412-3.

Committee on estimates, standing

Deans 373; Lewis 382.

Committee on foreign investment

Davis 19; Lewis 19.

Committee on government productivity

Davis 45, 98, 194-5, 385-8; Deans 370;
Good 374; Lewis 382-4; MacDonald
360-3; McKeough 14, 169-71; R. F. Nixon
44-45, 98, 365; Renwick 315, 379; Sargent
74; Stewart 335; Stokes 376.

Committee on government reorganization, select

MacDonald 359.

Committee, medical advisory

Wells 268.

Committee, Northern Ontario Resources Transportation

Brunelle 197; Ferrier 196-7; Stokes 198.

Committee on poverty, senate

Renwick 314.

Committee on Prince Edward dunes

Brunelle 24; R. F. Nixon 24; Reid 24.

Committee, provincial-municipal liaison

Bales 235, 237, 390-1; Cassidy 239, 391;
McKeough 9.

Committee on public accounts, standing

MacDonald 360, 363.

Committee on transportation, technical

Givens 213, 223; MacNaughton 223.

Committee on utilization of educational facilities, select, members of

Davis 412.

Committee on youth, select

Lewis 276.

Committees, select, re

Davis 412; Lewis 383.

Commuters/commuter services services

Stokes 229.

Community centres

Grossman 174-5; Timbrell 174-5.

Community development

Bales 396.

Community programmes

Bales 238.

Commuters/commuter services

Gisborn 228.

Compensation, farmers

McKeough 337; Renwick 337.

Compensation, fishermen/allied industries

Brunelle 51; Reid 51.

Compensation, injured prisoners

Shulman 410-1.

Conference, Confederation of Tomorrow

R. G. Hodgson 381.

Conferences, federal-provincial

Bales 242, 250; R. G. Hodgson 381;
A. B. R. Lawrence 120-1; R. F. Nixon 58,
302, 368; Stokes 130.

Conferences, federal-provincial-municipal

Bales 250; Good 375.

Conferences, interprovincial

Bales 250; Bullbrook 305-6; A. F.
Lawrence 166; Stewart 132-3.

Conservation

Brunelle 23-24; Lewis 24; R. F. Nixon
23-24; Shulman 103; Young 23.

Conservation areas

Davis 194-5; Kerr 155-60; Lewis 169-71,
193-5; McKeough 170-1.

Conservation authorities

Bales 235; Cassidy 158; Good 155-6;
Kerr 155-61; McKeough 9; B. Newman
158-9; Paterson 155; Stokes 157; Worton
157.

Conservation officers/game wardens

Brunelle 199-200; Stokes 198.

Consolidated Computer Limited

Grossman 53; Sargent 52-53.

Constitution

Good 375; A. F. Lawrence 356-7.

Construction

Carton 50; Deans 50; Grossman 175;
Timbrell 175.

Construction, hospital

Martel 148; R. F. Nixon 61.

Construction, housing

Bales 243; Cassidy 251-2; Ferrier 98-99;
Grossman 98-99; McKeough 10.

Construction industry

Auld 261-3; Deacon 258-9; Deans 257-8;
Grossman 340; Shulman 31-32.

Construction, roads/highways

Brunelle 199; Bullbrook 227; Ferrier
228-9; Givens 215, 223; MacNaughton
220, 223; Martel 226-7; Roy 223.

Consumers

Lawlor 299.

Contractors

Auld 263; Kerr 156, 160; MacNaughton
223-4; Stokes 198; Worton 151.

Contracts, highway

Bullbrook 227; MacNaughton 223-4.

Contracts, union

Bullbrook 112-3; A. B. R. Lawrence 112-3.

Co-operatives

Lewis 287; MacDonald 290; Martel
285-6; Wells 286-8.

Corporations

Lawlor 294-5; R. F. Nixon 294; Renwick
295-6.

Correctional institutions

Apps 148-54; Auld 254, 256; Ferrier
149-50; Gisborn 153; Haggerty 148-9;
Lawlor 151-2, 154; Lewis 154; MacDonald
150; Roy 152; Singer 153; Worton 150-1.

Correctional officers

Apps 148-9, 152; Haggerty 148-9; Lawlor
151-2; Worton 150.

Counselling services

Ferrier 142.

Court reporters

A. F. Lawrence 340-1; Shulman 341.

Courthouses

Auld 254, 256, 259; Edighoffer 259.

Courts, appeal

A. F. Lawrence 332; R. F. Nixon 331-2;
Singer 332.

Courts, county/district

A. F. Lawrence 55-56.

Courts, juvenile/family

A. F. Lawrence 166-7, 340-1; Lewis 166;
Shulman 166, 173, 341.

Courts, provincial/magistrates

Auld 254.

Courts, supreme/high

A. F. Lawrence 55-56; Renwick 107;
Shulman 6; Stewart 133.

Courts, surrogate

Lawlor 352; A. F. Lawrence 55-56.

Credit companies/bureaus

Carton 16; R. F. Nixon 16.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Credit counselling

Wells 267.

Criminal code

Carton 41.

Crown attorneys

A. F. Lawrence 167; Shulman 166.

Crown land

Lawlor 347; A. F. Lawrence 347.

Cultural organizations

Carton 42; Davis 176-7; R. F. Nixon 177.

Day-care centres

Auld 261; Cassidy 204, 293-4, 392;
Duksza 291; Germa 281-2; Gisborn 273;
Haggerty 282-3; Lewis 47, 141, 283, 286-7;
MacDonald 286, 289-90; Martel 265,
285-6; McKeough 10; Renwick 316; R. S.
Smith 285; Wells 30-31, 47, 263-4, 271,
274, 281-9, 291-4.

Deaf/hard of hearing, schools for

Auld 261; Edighoffer 261.

Decentralization of government

R. F. Nixon 255.

Deficit, budgetary

McKeough 8, 14.

Demolition, building

Cassidy 252.

Denticare

Ferrier 146; A. B. R. Lawrence 146.

Dentists/dental services

R. F. Nixon 166.

Denturists/dentures

Cassidy 48; Ferrier 278; A. B. R.
Lawrence 47-48; Lewis 47; MacDonald
47-48; R. F. Nixon 166.

Depressed/slow-growth areas

Bernier 231.

Design for Development: Toronto-centred region

Davis 43; McKeough 337; R. F. Nixon
368; Scrivener 337.

Designated areas

Bernier 233-4.

Detention centres, adult

Apps 148-9, 152, 154; Auld 255; Gisborn
153; Lawlor 151, 154; Roy 152; Singer 153.

Detention centres, juvenile

Apps 148; Deans 256; Lewis 154.

Dikes/diking

Kerr 155, 157-9; Paterson 155, 157.

Disclosure, public/financial

Lawlor 347; A. F. Lawrence 347.

Discrimination

A. F. Lawrence 97; Lewis 97; Stokes 97.

Division, House

319.

Divorces

Singer 351.

Doctors

Deans 80-81; Duksza 63-64; Ferrier 278;
A. B. R. Lawrence 83, 144-6; Martel 148;
R. F. Nixon 57, 59-60, 62, 144-5; Shulman
69.

Doctors' fees

Duksza 145; Ferrier 73; A. B. R.
Lawrence 83, 109, 144-6; Martel 147;
R. F. Nixon 144-5; Shulman 69, 104-5.

Doctors' training

Ferrier 146.

Dollar value/revaluation

McKeough 8.

Dow Chemical Company

Kerr 102; A. F. Lawrence 102; Singer 102.

Drainage

B. Newman 159; Sargent 334-5; Stewart
134-5, 335.

Drivers, taxi

Carton 96; Lewis 96.

Dropouts

Foulds 182.

Drug abuse

Haggerty 140-1.

Drug costs

Cassidy 20-21; Ferrier 74; A. B. R.
Lawrence 20; Shulman 20.

Drug pricing index

A. B. R. Lawrence 20-21; Shulman 20.

Drugs, medical

Cassidy 20-21; Ferrier 74, 146, 278;
A. B. R. Lawrence 20-21, 146; MacDonald
75-76; Shulman 20.

Ecologists/ecology

Brunelle 23-24; Lewis 24; R. F. Nixon 23-24; Shulman 411; Young 24.

Eddy Forest Products

Germa 201.

Education

Davis 387-8.

Election officers/poll clerks

Shulman 5.

Elections/by-elections

Gaunt 22-23, 341; A. F. Lawrence 22-23, 341; Shulman 4-6.

Employers

Bounsall 80; Bullbrook 112; Carton 180; Germa 185-6; McKeough 11; Paterson 66-67, 179-80, 188; Sargent 183.

Employment

Apps 148-54; Bales 390-6; Brunelle 339; Cassidy 53, 157-8; Davis 53; Deans 159-60, 174, 180-1; Ferrier 149, 197; Gisborn 153; Givens 215; Haggerty 187, 202; Kerr 155, 157-60; Lawlor 151-2, 154, 294; Martel 265-6, 268; McKeough 10, 174; B. Newman 158-9; Paterson 179-80; Renwick 295-6; Sargent 182-4, 188; Singer 209, 222; Winkler 296.

Employment loans programme

Bales 238; McKeough 10, 17; R. F. Nixon 17.

Employment, seasonal

Bales 18, 28, 235-7, 241-3, 250-2; Bernier 231; Brunelle 196-204; Cassidy 238-42, 251-3, 389-92, 395-6; Edighoffer 262-3; Ferrier 98-99, 196, 228-9; Foulds 229-30; Grossman 99; Lewis 392-3; MacDonald 18, 290-1; MacNaughton 220; Martel 199, 265; McKeough 7, 9; R. F. Nixon 236; Paterson 230; Renwick 392-4, 396; R. S. Smith 264-5; Spence 262; Stokes 197-8; Wells 264, 271, 279-80, 284-5.

Employment standards branch

Carton 334; Lewis 333-4.

Employment, youth

Dukszta 278-9; McKeough 9; Wells 263, 265, 280.

Environmental control

Kerr 45; Lewis 45-46; Singer 45-46.

Erosion/erosion control

Kerr 155, 157-9; Paterson 155, 157, 230.

Estimates, supplementary

Agriculture and Food 123-36; Correctional services 148-54; Environment 154-61; Health 136-48; Labour 179-88; Lands and Forests 196-204; Mines and Northern Affairs 230-4; Municipal Affairs 234-44, 249-54; Public Works 254-63; Social and Family Services 263-83; Transportation and Communications 204-30.

Estimates, supplementary, re

McKeough 6; R. F. Nixon 27, 124; Stewart 124-5.

Ethnic groups

Davis 176-7; B. Newman 114; R. F. Nixon 177.

Expansion, economic

McKeough 7.

Expenditures, provincial

McKeough 14.

Exploration/prospecting

Bernier 230-1; Stokes 231-3.

Exports

Stokes 233.

Expressways/freeways

Davis 172-3; Dukszta 217-8; Germa 217; Gisborn 228; Givens 20, 171, 212-6, 223; MacNaughton 205-12, 220-9; Singer 172, 204-12, 222.

Expropriation

Haggerty 202; Kerr 157; A. F. Lawrence 341-2.

Family service agencies

Wells 263, 267.

Family/welfare benefits

Burr 155; Carton 185; Haggerty 275; Kerr 155; A. B. R. Lawrence 106; Lewis 275-7; Martel 268-71, 277-8; McKeough 8; Renwick 184-5, 316; R. S. Smith 267, 274-5; Wells 264, 266-8, 274-5, 277.

Farm income/prices

Deans 127-9; Gaunt 125-7; Spence 129-30; Stewart 134; Stokes 130.

Farm machinery/equipment

Deans 128; Stewart 125.

Farm ponds

Deans 129; Stewart 134.

Farm products/produce

Deans 128.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Farm structures

Auld 262; Deans 129; Edighoffer 262;
Gaunt 127; Paterson 131-2; Ruston 130;
Stewart 134-5; Stokes 130.

Farmers

Deans 128; Gaunt 135-6; Paterson 131;
Ruston 131; Sargent 334-5; Stewart 335;
Stokes 130.

Farming

R. F. Nixon 124; Stewart 124-5, 129, 132-6;
Stokes 130.

Farming, beef

Stewart 132-3; Stokes 130.

Farming, fruit/vegetable

Paterson 131; Stewart 134.

Farming, grain

Paterson 101, 131-2; Ruston 130; Spence
129; Stewart 101, 135.

Farming, poultry/poultry products

Deans 127-9; Gaunt 123-7, 135-6; Ruston
130-1; Spence 129; Stewart 99, 132-4.

Farms, corporate

Stewart 135.

Farms, family

Bullbrook 307, 404; Deacon 317; Deans
129; McKeough 14; Stewart 135.

Farms, marginal

Deans 129.

Federal-municipal affairs

Deans 249-50.

Federal-provincial affairs

Bennett 355; Bullbrook 306-7, 401; Cassidy
378; Davis 43-44, 386; Deans 371; Gaunt
127; Good 375; Kerr 169; Lawlor 295,
353; A. F. Lawrence 356; W. Newman 43;
R. F. Nixon 42-43, 301-3, 368; Reid 169;
Renwick 300-1; Roy 353-4; Sargent 43-44;
Winkler 400-4.

Federal-provincial agreements

Bales 238, 242-3; Brunelle 51; Bullbrook
306; MacDonald 291; McKeough 13;
R. F. Nixon 17, 302; Reid 51; Wells 292;
Winkler 304.

Federal-provincial co-operation

Bales 237, 243, 249-50; Deans 174, 249-50;
McKeough 7, 10, 17, 174; R. F. Nixon
17, 57, 237.

Federal-provincial-municipal affairs

Bales 235, 237-8; Cassidy 239.

Ferries

Bullbrook 227; MacNaughton 220.

Films

Grossman 97, 176; Lewis 97.

Financing regional governments

Good 253-4.

Fines/penalties

A. F. Lawrence 23; Worton 23.

Firefighters/firefighting

Auld 262.

Fish/fish management

Brunelle 200; Kerr 338-9; Reid 338;
Stokes 198.

Fish hatcheries/restocking

Auld 261; Brunelle 199; Stokes 197-8.

Fishing camp operators

Brunelle 339; Germa 339.

Fishing, commercial

Brunelle 339; Germa 175, 339.

Fishing, sport

Brunelle 339; Stokes 197.

Flooding/flood control

Kerr 155-9.

Forest fires

Auld 262.

Forest management

Brunelle 196; Stokes 197-8.

Forest rangers, junior

Brunelle 196.

Foresters/Lands and Forests personnel

Auld 262; Brunelle 199-200; Edighoffer
261-2; Stokes 198.

French Canadians

Lewis 95.

French language

Brunelle 200; R. F. Nixon 93; Roy 200;
R. S. Smith 93-94; Welch 93-95.

Fuller, Buckminster plan

Davis 24-25, 172-3; Givens 171, 213, 215;
MacNaughton 221; Singer 24-25, 172,
209, 211.

Galligan, Justice

Singer 349-51.

Glassco commission/report

R. F. Nixon 365.

Gordon commission/report

MacDonald 359; R. F. Nixon 364, 368.

GO-transit service

MacNaughton 171; Scrivener 170-1.

Grange, Rick

A. F. Lawrence 49-50, 102-3; Lewis 49-50, 102-3.

Grants, day-care centres

Gisborn 273; Wells 274, 283, 288.

Grants, drainage

Sargent 334-5; Stewart 335.

Grants, employment support, federal

Lawlor 397; McKeough 12, 17; Renwick 396-7.

Grants, farmers

Deans 127-9; Gaunt 124-7, 135-6; Paterson 131-2; Ruston 130-1; Spence 129-30; Stewart 124-5, 134-5; Stokes 130.

Grants, home improvement

Bales 390-6; Bounsall 394; Cassidy 53, 240, 242, 251-2, 389-92, 395-6; Davis 53; Good 395; Lewis 390, 392; Sargent 394-6.

Grants, hospitals/health facilities

Ferrier 136; A. B. R. Lawrence 137-8; R. F. Nixon 57.

Grants to Indian groups

Wells 30-31.

Grants, municipal

McKeough 9-10; Wells 30-31.

Grants, pipeline/sewerage

Kerr 52.

Grants, pollution abatement

Good 52; Kerr 52, 167.

Grants, regional

Good 253-4; McKeough 8.

Grants, regional/district municipalities

Bales 235-6, 241, 250-1; Cassidy 241; Gisborn 250-1; Good 253-4; R. F. Nixon 236.

Grants, transportation

Bullbrook 227-8; Cassidy 218-9; Dukszta 217-8; Germa 216-7; Givens 213-5, 223; MacNaughton 205-12, 219-30; Singer 204-12, 222; Stokes 229.

Grants, welfare

Cassidy 293-4; Dukszta 290-1; Germa 281-2; Gisborn 273; Haggerty 282-3; Lewis 286-9; MacDonald 290-1; Martel 285-6, 291; R. S. Smith 274-5; Wells 284-94.

Grants, winter/seasonal works

McKeough 9-10.

Guardian Insurance Company

Carton 333; Lewis 332-3.

Haggart, Ron case

Lewis 56.

Hall commission (health)

R. F. Nixon 62.

Handicapped/disabled persons

Martel 268; R. S. Smith 267, 285; Wells 267-8, 285.

Hansard

Winkler 27.

Health care/services

Bullbrook 77; Deans 80-81; Dukszta 63-64; A. B. R. Lawrence 29, 84-85, 120-2; MacDonald 75; B. Newman 71, 114; R. F. Nixon 56-62; Paterson 65, 105-6, 109-10, 122-3; Renwick 78, 108-9; Singer 121-2.

Health costs

Bullbrook 77; Dukszta 62-63, 145; Ferrier 72-73; A. B. R. Lawrence 144-6; MacDonald 75-76; B. Newman 71; Paterson 65, 67, 145; Sargent 75.

Health Council, Ontario

Dukszta 64; A. B. R. Lawrence 29.

Health hazards

Gisborn 156; Kerr 338-9; A. B. R. Lawrence 48; MacDonald 48; Reid 338.

Health insurance

Deans 80-81; A. B. R. Lawrence 29; McKeough 8, 10-11; R. F. Nixon 62; Paterson 66-67, 110; Renwick 77, 110; Shulman 68.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Health Insurance Commission

Auld 254-5, 260; Bounsall 80; Bullbrook 76-77, 112-4, 122; Burr 79-80; Deans 80-81, 111-2; Duksza 62-64; Ferrier 72-74, 114; Gaunt 114-5; Good 114; A. B. R. Lawrence 29, 81-85, 105-15, 120-2; MacDonald 75-76; B. Newman 71, 110-2, 114; R. F. Nixon 56-62, 105; Paterson 65-68, 105-6, 109-10, 113, 122-3; Reilly 119; Renwick 77-78, 106-10, 119-20; Roy 119; Sargent 74-76; Shulman 68-70, 104; Singer 78-79, 121-2; G. E. Smith 71.

Health Insurance Registration Board

R. F. Nixon 59, 105.

Health/medical facilities

Ferrier 146.

Health units

MacDonald 76.

Hicksite Friends

A. F. Lawrence 342.

Highway/road maintenance

Brunelle 199; Stokes 198.

Highways

Cassidy 218; Germa 217; MacNaughton 220, 223; Sargent 224-5.

Home hospital care

Renwick 108.

Homes for special care

Duksza 291; Ferrier 136, 138; A. B. R. Lawrence 83, 137-8; Lewis 138; Shulman 70.

Hospital boards/councils

Ferrier 73-74; Martel 147; G. E. Smith 71.

Hospital costs

Duksza 64.

Hospital insurance

A. B. R. Lawrence 50; Paterson 50.

Hospital schools, retarded

A. B. R. Lawrence 144; Lewis 141-2; Paterson 139; Spence 138.

Hospital Services Commission

Auld 254-5, 260; Bounsall 80; Burr 79-80; Ferrier 72; Gaunt 114-5; A. B. R. Lawrence 82, 120; MacDonald 75; Martel 148; R. F. Nixon 56-62, 105, 255; Sargent 74.

Hospitals/hospital services

Bullbrook 76; Duksza 63-64; Ferrier 72-73; Haggerty 140-1; A. B. R. Lawrence 84, 141; MacDonald 75; Martel 147-8; B. Newman 71; R. F. Nixon 57; Paterson 65, 105-6; Sargent 74-75; G. E. Smith 71.

Hospitals, psychiatric/mental

Duksza 64; Ferrier 138, 142; Haggerty 140-1; A. B. R. Lawrence 141, 143-4; A. F. Lawrence 166-7; Lewis 166; R. F. Nixon 57, 61; Shulman 166, 411; Spence 138.

Hospitals, shutdown

A. B. R. Lawrence 84; Sargent 74-75.

Hospitals, teaching

Duksza 64; Ferrier 146.

Hotels/motels

Givens 214; Paterson 139.

Hours of business

Bales 98; B. Newman 98.

Hours of work

Lawlor 151.

Housing

Bales 243.

Housing Corporation, Ontario

Bounsall 336-7; Cassidy 253; Deacon 259; Ferrier 98-99; Grossman 98-99, 175, 339-40; Lewis 334; McKeough 10.

Housing, high-rise

Bales 20; Givens 20.

Housing, low-cost

Bounsall 336-7; Grossman 336-7; Singer 336-7.

Housing, modular

Sargent 183, 188.

Housing, public

Bounsall 336-7; Davis 387; Deans 159-60; Grossman 174-5, 336-7; Singer 336-7; Timbrell 174-5.

Housing, senior citizens

Ferrier 98-99; Grossman 98-99, 340.

Housing shortage

Cassidy 252; Grossman 91; Lewis 275-7; Martel 266, 270; R. F. Nixon 91; Sargent 183, 188.

Human rights code

Lewis 56.

Hydro

Ferrier 196.

Hydro-Electric Power Commission

Kerr 167; Lewis 167-8; MacDonald 168.

Hydro, industrial

Kerr 167.

Hydro rates

Haggerty 167; Kerr 167; MacDonald 168.

Immigrants, skilled

Carton 188; Deans 180-1; Haggerty 187.

Immunization/vaccines

A. B. R. Lawrence 105; Shulman 68, 104.

Imports

Deans 128-9.

Incentives to farmers

McKeough 337; Scrivener 337-8.

Incentives to home owners

Bales 242-3; Bounsall 394; Cassidy 240, 242; Good 395; Renwick 392-3; Sargent 394-6.

Incentives, municipal employment

Bales 234, 238, 241-3; Cassidy 238-42; Gisborn 273; Good 243; McKeough 9; R. F. Nixon 236; Wells 288.

Income supplement

Haggerty 275; Lewis 275-7; Martel 269-70, 277-8; R. S. Smith 274; Wells 270, 275, 277.

Indian associations

Yaremko 175.

Indian bands

Bales 235; Lewis 286; MacDonald 286; R. F. Nixon 165; Wells 286; Yaremko 165.

Indian culture/history

Yaremko 175.

Indian education/students

R. F. Nixon 165; Yaremko 165, 175.

Indian friendship/youth centres

Stokes 165.

Indian people

A. F. Lawrence 97, 340-1; Lewis 97; Shulman 173, 341; Stokes 97.

Indian reservations

Brunelle 199; Stokes 198; Wells 264, 274, 281, 286.

Indian schools

R. F. Nixon 165; Yaremko 165, 175.

Indians, Union of Ontario

Stokes 165.

Industries

Deans 180-1; Winkler 397.

Industries, foreign control/takeover

Carton 16; R. F. Nixon 16.

Industries, relocation of

Kerr 167-9; Lewis 167; MacDonald 168; Reid 169.

Industries, shutdown

Carton 96-97; Lewis 96-97.

Inflation

Lawlor 405.

Inquiries, public

Gaunt 126-7; A. F. Lawrence 341-2; Ruston 131; Stewart 134.

Institute for Studies in Education

Auld 256; Deans 256-7.

Insurance agents

Shulman 176.

Insurance companies

Dukszta 62; Ferrier 72; A. B. R. Lawrence 82, 109; Lewis 332-3; R. F. Nixon 62; Paterson 66; Sargent 74; Shulman 68-70, 104-5.

Insurance costs/premiums

Carton 48-49; Deacon 48; Sargent 49; Shulman 49, 176; Stokes 49; Young 48-49.

Insurance, motor vehicle

Carton 48-49; Deacon 48; Lewis 48; Sargent 49; Shulman 49; Stokes 49; Young 48-49.

Insurance, superintendent of

Carton 333; Lewis 48, 333.

Interprovincial affairs

Stewart 133.

Investment, foreign

Davis 19; Lewis 19.

Judges

Bennett 355; Lawlor 352-3; A. F. Lawrence 91, 355-8; R. F. Nixon 91; Renwick 354-5; Roy 353-4; Singer 78, 347-52.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Judges, appeal court

A. F. Lawrence 357.

Judges Association, County Court

A. F. Lawrence 357.

Judges, juvenile/family court

A. F. Lawrence 340-1; Shulman 341.

Judges, provincial/county/district

Lawlor 352; A. F. Lawrence 23, 55-56, 97, 355; Lewis 97; Roy 353-4; Singer 348-9, 351; Stokes 97; Worton 23.

Judges, supreme/high court

Lawlor 352; A. F. Lawrence 55-56, 355, 357; Roy 353-4; Singer 348-50.

Judges, surrogate court

A. F. Lawrence 55-56.

Jury fees

A. F. Lawrence 91; R. F. Nixon 91.

Justice, administration of

Auld 254, 256; Deans 256; Lawlor 352-3; A. F. Lawrence 55-56, 91, 97, 355-8; R. F. Nixon 367; Renwick 379; Roy 353-4; Ruston 260; Singer 348-52; Stokes 97.

Kaiser Permanente structure

Duksza 63.

Kingston penitentiary trials

Lawlor 16; A. F. Lawrence 15-16, 331; R. F. Nixon 15, 331; Singer 15.

Krueger report

MacDonald 362; R. F. Nixon 364.

Labour Relations Board

Carton 339.

Land acquisition/assembly

Auld 100, 255-6; Brunelle 196, 201-4; Carton 51; Davis 194-5; Deans 204, 256; Edighoffer 100, 204; Foulds 321; Germa 282; Givens 214; Haggerty 202; Kerr 157; Laughren 201; A. F. Lawrence 342; Lewis 169-71, 193-5; R. S. Smith 202-3; Spence 204; Stokes 201, 203-4; Welch 324; Wells 282; Worton 157.

Land banks

Davis 194-5; Lewis 169-71, 193-5, 390; McKeough 169-71.

Land costs

Cassidy 293; Wells 294.

Land developers/development

Burr 100-1; Deans 256-7.

Land leasing

Bernier 233.

Land, mining company

Bernier 233.

Land, recreational

Brunelle 203; Davis 194-5; Lewis 169-71, 193-5; Stokes 203-4.

Land sales

Burr 100-1; Carton 51.

Land use

Davis 172-3; Givens 171; McKeough 337; Scrivener 337-8; Singer 172.

Land-use planning

Davis 25; Singer 25.

Land values

McKeough 337.

Landlord/tenant

Carton 101; Renwick 101.

Law Reform Commission

A. F. Lawrence 91.

Law Society of Upper Canada

Carton 333; Lewis 332-3.

Lawyers

Carton 333; Lewis 332-3.

Lease-back programme

Auld 255-8; Deacon 259; Deans 256-8; R. F. Nixon 255, 258.

Leasing

Auld 257; Burr 259; Carton 51; Deacon 259; Deans 51; Germa 281-2; R. F. Nixon 255, 258; Ruston 260.

Legal aid/clinics

Martel 272-3; R. F. Nixon 331; Wells 272-3.

Legislative procedures

Lewis 343-6; W. Newman 173; R. F. Nixon 343-4; Renwick 178; Shulman 342-5; Winkler 173, 178, 343.

Licences, credit companies/bureaus

Carton 16.

Licences, lottery/bingo

Carton 41.

Licences/permits, alcoholic beverages

Sargent 224.

Liquor outlets, retail

Auld 260; Stokes 260.

Littering/cleanup

Kerr 45.

Loans to farmers

Stokes 130.

Loans to fishermen/allied industries

Brunelle 166.

Loans, home improvement

Cassidy 395-6; Lewis 394.

Loans to industries

Grossman 53; Lewis 168; Sargent 52-53.

Loans to municipalities/school boards

Deans 174; McKeough 174.

Loans, pollution abatement

Kerr 52.

Local initiatives programme

Bales 17-18, 28, 237, 242-4, 249, 252, 391-6;
Bounsall 394; Cassidy 391-2, 395-6;
Deans 243-4, 249-50; Good 238, 395;
Lewis 18, 392-3; MacDonald 18;
McKeough 9, 17; R. F. Nixon 17-18, 237;
Renwick 392-4, 396; Sargent 394-6;
Wells 274.

Logging/lumbering

Brunelle 201; Germa 200-1.

Lotteries

Carton 41-42; Davis 42; Deans 42;
Lawlor 42; R. F. Nixon 42.

Low-income groups

Cassidy 252, 395-6; Deans 111; Ferrier 74;
Lawlor 299; A. B. R. Lawrence 111-2;
Lewis 289; McKeough 11; B. Newman 71;
Paterson 65-67, 105, 109; Renwick 300;
Sargent 75; Wells 288.

Malvern development

Grossman 91, 339-40; R. F. Nixon 91.

Manufacturers/manufacturing

McKeough 12; Renwick 295-6, 397.

Marketing boards, commodity

Gaunt 125-6; Stewart 100, 133-4.

Marketing boards, national

Gaunt 127; Stewart 132-3.

Marketing, grain

Paterson 101, 131-2; Ruston 130; Spence
129; Stewart 101, 135.

Marketing, livestock

Stewart 132-3.

Marketing, poultry/poultry products

Gaunt 99-100, 125-7; Ruston 99, 130-1;
Stewart 99-100, 132-3.

Martel Lumber Company

Carton 52, 339; Laughren 51-52.

Masseurs

Ferrier 146; A. B. R. Lawrence 146.

**Mayors and Municipalities,
Federation of**

Bales 250.

Mayors and reeves/association

Cassidy 391; Sargent 358-9.

McGillivray commission/report

Carton 175; Haggerty 175.

McRuer commission/report

Carton 175; Haggerty 175; Lawlor 353;
Renwick 109.

Medical Association, Ontario

A. B. R. Lawrence 144; R. F. Nixon 60.

Medical schools

Ferrier 146; R. F. Nixon 61.

Medicare

Bullbrook 76; A. B. R. Lawrence 144-6;
B. Newman 71; R. F. Nixon 58-61;
Paterson 65-66.

Members, list of

33.

Members'/ministers' facilities

Deans 370-3; Lewis 382-3.

Mental Health Association

Ferrier 142.

Mental health centres/clinics

Dukszta 143; Ferrier 142;
A. B. R. Lawrence 141, 143-4; Lewis
141-2; Martel 143.

Mental health/illness

Dukszta 64; Ferrier 136; Haggerty 140-1;
A. B. R. Lawrence 138-9, 141, 143-4;
Lewis 286; MacDonald 76; Shulman 411.

Metro Centre plan

Bales 18-19; Cassidy 19; Deacon 173-4;
Givens 214-5; Lewis 18-19, 334;
MacNaughton 163-4; Singer 19, 210.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Minerals/ores

Bernier 230-1; Stokes 231-3.

Mines, abandoned/shutdown

Bernier 230; Lewis 269.

Mines/mining

Bernier 230-4; Ferrier 196-7; Martel 265-6; Stokes 231-3.

Mining companies

Bernier 233-4; Stokes 231-3.

Mining municipalities

Stokes 233.

Mothers, working

Wells 288.

Motor vehicle industry

Givens 214-5.

Motor vehicle repairs

Auld 261; Young 48-49.

Motor vehicles

Bullbrook 227-8; Dukszta 217-8; Gisborn 228; Givens 214-5; Singer 209-12.

Motor vehicles, Ontario government

Auld 261.

Municipal associations

Cassidy 391; Sargent 358.

Municipal Board, Ontario

Bales 341; Bullbrook 54; Davis 54; Germa 341; Lewis 334; MacNaughton 222; Singer 209.

Municipal budgets

Bales 236, 242.

Municipal councils

Carton 41; Cassidy 253; Davis 172-3; Germa 282; Givens 171; Grossman 175; McKeough 9; MacNaughton 221; Singer 172, 210-1; Timbrell 175.

Municipal planning/studies

Bales 241; Davis 172-3; Gisborn 273; Givens 171, 215-6; Singer 172, 210.

Municipal/regional services

Cassidy 240; Davis 43; Grossman 339-40; R. F. Nixon 236.

Municipal work on private property

Bales 235-7, 241, 252, 390-6; Cassidy 252-3, 389-92, 395-6; Lewis 392-3; R. F. Nixon 237; Renwick 392-4, 396.

Natural resources/management

Brunelle 23-24; Lewis 24; R. F. Nixon 23-24, 366; Stokes 197-8, 229; Young 23.

News media/periodicals

Carton 96-97; Lewis 96-97.

Niagara Parks Commission

Haggerty 202.

Northern Ontario affairs

Bales 241-2; Brunelle 196, 203; Ferrier 196-7, 228-9; Foulds 22; Germa 216-7; Grossman 340; Kerr 157; MacNaughton 21-22, 220, 229; Martel 226-7, 291; Reid 21-22; Sargent 225; Shulman 22; R. S. Smith 203; Stokes 157, 197-8, 201, 229, 231-2, 280, 375-6; Wells 291.

Nursing homes

Ferrier 136; A. B. R. Lawrence 50, 84, 120, 137-8; Lewis 137; MacDonald 75; Martel 148; Paterson 50, 137; Renwick 108; Shulman 70.

Nursing homes, chain

A. B. R. Lawrence 137-8; Lewis 137-8.

Offenders

Haggerty 149; MacDonald 150; Shulman 410-1.

Offenders, young

Apps 149, 154; Haggerty 149; A. F. Lawrence 166; Lewis 154; Shulman 411.

OHSIP

Auld 255; Bounsall 80; Burr 79-80; Dukszta 145; Ferrier 72, 146; A. B. R. Lawrence 81-84, 105-15, 144-6; Lewis 145; Martel 147; R. F. Nixon 56-62, 105, 144-5, 255; Paterson 105-6; Shulman 68-69, 104.

OHSIP/hospitalization premiums

Bullbrook 76-77, 113, 122; Deans 111; Ferrier 72-73, 114; Gaunt 114-5; Good 114; A. B. R. Lawrence 82-84, 105-6, 111-2; B. Newman 71, 110-2, 114; R. F. Nixon 59; Paterson 66, 105-6, 109-10, 113, 122-3, 146; Reilly 119; Renwick 77, 106-7, 110, 120; Roy 119; Sargent 75; Singer 79, 121-2.

OMSIP

R. F. Nixon 58-59.

Ontario office, Washington

Davis 44; R. F. Nixon 44.

Ontario Place

Grossman 97, 176; Lewis 97.

Optical services

Ferrier 278.

Paramedical personnel/services

Dukszta 63-64.

Parcost programme

Cassidy 20-21; A. B. R. Lawrence 20-21;
Shulman 20.

Parents' groups

Lewis 287.

Parks, conservation authority

Kerr 157.

Parks, national

Paterson 230.

Parks, provincial

Auld 100; Brunelle 196, 201-4; Deans 204;
Edighoffer 100, 204; Haggerty 202; Martel
199; Spence 204; Stokes 201, 203-4.

Pension Plan, Canada

Lawlor 405; Martel 324.

**Pensioners, old age (*see* Aged/
senior citizens)****Pensions, disability**

R. S. Smith 267; Wells 267.

Pensions, vesting

R. F. Nixon 30; Welch 30.

**Pharmaceutical Association,
Canadian**

A. B. R. Lawrence 20-21; Shulman 20.

Phosphates

Good 52; Kerr 52.

Physiotherapists

Dukszta 63.

Pits/quarries

Bernier 47; Lewis 47.

Planning boards/committees

Davis 172-3; Givens 171; Singer 172.

Planning, economic

Martel 265.

Planning government programmes

Cassidy 377-8; Davis 24-25; Good 375;
R. G. Hodgson 380-2; R. F. Nixon 365-9;
Renwick 379-80; Singer 24-25.

Planning, highway

MacNaughton 224; Roy 224; Shulman 411.

Plea bargaining

Lawlor 16; R. F. Nixon 331; Singer
16, 348.

Police, provincial

Bullbrook 228; Gaunt 22-23, 341;
A. F. Lawrence 22-23, 341; Martel 226-7.

Police, regional

Good 254.

Pollution, air

Kerr 25-26, 46; Martel 25-26.

Pollution, beach

Deans 160; Gisborn 156; Kerr 156, 160.

Pollution control

Kerr 45, 167-9; Lewis 167; MacDonald
168.

Pollution index/monitoring

Kerr 25-26; Martel 25-26.

Pollution, industrial

Kerr 25-26, 167-9; Lewis 167; Martel
25-26.

Pollution, mercury

Kerr 338-9; R. F. Nixon 165-6; Reid 338.

Pollution, noise

Haggerty 46; Kerr 46; Shulman 342.

Port facilities

Paterson 101; Spence 101, 129-30;
Stewart 101.

Prisoners

A. F. Lawrence 15-16; R. F. Nixon 15;
Worton 150.

Project 500

Dukszta 278-9; Renwick 316; R. S. Smith
264-5; Stokes 279-80; Wells 263, 279-80.

Provincial-municipal affairs

Deans 371; Givens 213-4; Good 375;
MacNaughton 221.

Provincial-municipal co-operation

McKeough 6, 10.

Psychiatrists/psychiatric services

Haggerty 140; A. F. Lawrence 166-7;
Lewis 166; MacDonald 76; Shulman 166.

**Public Service Superannuation
Fund**

McKeough 30.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Public works

Apps 149; Auld 254-63; Deacon 258-9;
Deans 255-8; Edighoffer 261-2; Ferrier
149; Martel 259-60; R. F. Nixon 255, 258.

Publications, government

Auld 41; Davis 44-45, 98; R. F. Nixon
44-45, 98; Winkler 27.

Purchasing, central

MacDonald 360; R. F. Nixon 364.

Railway crossings

Germa 201.

Railway passenger service

Bullbrook 228; Sargent 224.

Ratepayers' associations/groups

R. F. Nixon 369.

Real estate/property values

Shulman 31-32; Singer 210.

Records centres

Auld 261.

Recreation

Kerr 157; Stokes 197; Worton 157.

Refineries, metal

Bernier 234; Ferrier 269; Lewis 269.

Regional/district councils

Haggerty 282.

Regional government

Bales 341; Germa 341; Gisborn 250-1;
Good 253-4.

Regional municipalities

Good 253-4; Haggerty 275, 282-3.

Regional planning

Ferrier 73.

Rehabilitation/rehabilitative services

Ferrier 149; Haggerty 141, 149; Renwick
184; Roy 152; Shulman 410-1.

Rent/rent control

Bounsall 336-7; Carton 101; Cassidy 378;
Ferrier 278; Grossman 337; Lewis 275-7;
Martel 269-71, 277-8; Renwick 101; Wells
270, 274, 277.

Rent, Windsor courthouse

Auld 259; Edighoffer 259.

Report, committee on government productivity

Davis 385-8; MacDonald 360-3; Renwick
380.

Report, egg inquiry

Gaunt 99-100; Ruston 99; Stewart 99-100.

Report, Metro Centre plan

Deacon 174; MacNaughton 174.

Reports, annual

Arts council 27; Educational
Communications Authority 103; Fisheries
Loan Act 341; Highway Transport Board
54; Hospital Services Commission 176;
Hydro-Electric Power Commission 54;
Liquor Control Board 176; Mental Health
Foundation 176; Pension Commission 54;
Revenue Department 54; Stockyards
Board 103.

Research, agricultural

Auld 261.

Research, fish/fish management

Kerr 338; Reid 338.

Research, forestry

Brunelle 200; Foulds 200.

Research, mining

Bernier 234; Stokes 232.

Research, pollution/pollution control

Gisborn 156.

Reservoirs, water

Ferrier 196; Kerr 155-7; Worton 157.

Resolutions

Executive Council Act 178; Extra-Judicial
Services Act 179; Income Tax Act 177;
Meen, Arthur K., re, 347; Succession Duty
Act 178; Surrogate Courts Act 179;
Teachers' Superannuation Act 178.

Retarded, associations for

Haggerty 282; Lewis 287; MacDonald
286; R. S. Smith 284; Wells 281, 283-6,
289, 292.

Retarded, homes for

Wells 283, 289.

Retarded persons

Dukszta 140, 290-1; Wells 281, 286,
289, 292.

Retraining

Deans 181; Lewis 168; Martel 265;
Renwick 184.

Revenues, provincial

McKeough 14.

Review boards, nursing home

A. B. R. Lawrence 137.

Roads/highways, northern

Bernier 234; Reid 234.

Roads, private

Brunelle 201; Germa 200.

Roads to recreation

Brunelle 200; Martel 199; Sargent 224-5.

Roads to resources

Bernier 234; Brunelle 197, 199; Ferrier 196; Germa 200; Stokes 198, 232.

Ross, Judge

Stewart 134.

Safety Council, Canada

MacNaughton 22.

Safety, highway

MacNaughton 22, 220.

Safety, motor vehicle

Deacon 21; Foulds 22; MacNaughton 21-22; Reid 21-22; Shulman 410-1.

Sand/gravel

Brunelle 23-24; Lewis 24; R. F. Nixon 23-24; Young 23.

Schindeler, Professor F.

MacDonald 360.

School boards

Bales 235; Foulds 100; McKeough 9; R. F. Nixon 92, 320; Singer 349; R. S. Smith 93-94; Welch 91-93, 100, 324.

Schools, closed

Haggerty 140.

Schools, elementary

Foulds 182.

Schools, French language

Welch 92.

Schools, private

Martel 285; R. F. Nixon 91-92; Welch 91-92, 324.

Schools, secondary

Cassidy 92-93; Foulds 182; R. F. Nixon 91-92; Welch 91-92.

Schools, separate

Cassidy 92-93.

Security guards

A. F. Lawrence 49-50, 102-3; Lewis 49-50, 102-3.

Service clubs

Carton 42; A. B. R. Lawrence 139; B. Newman 139.

Sewage disposal

Gisborn 156; Kerr 156, 160.

Sewage treatment

Bales 236; Good 52, 254; Kerr 52.

Sewerage

Gisborn 156; Kerr 156, 160.

Smelters/smelting

Bernier 234; Stokes 232.

Smith committee/report

Lawlor 309-11, 405-6; R. F. Nixon 313.

Snowmobiles

Haggerty 202; Shulman 103, 342; Stokes 49.

Social/family services

Cassidy 240; Martel 265-6, 268; Wells 31, 263, 265-8.

Social insurance numbers

Bullbrook 113, 122; Burr 79-80; A. B. R. Lawrence 52, 120-1.

Social planning councils, municipal

Wells 263.

Social service costs

Wells 265.

Social workers

Apps 153; Dukszta 278-9; Gisborn 153; Stokes 279-80; Wells 263, 279-80.

Speaker's rulings

342-6.

Sports

Carton 42.

State Farm Insurance

Sargent 49.

Steele commission/report

Gisborn 251.

Strikebreakers/strikebreaking

A. F. Lawrence 49-50, 102-3; Lewis 49-50, 102-3.

Students/graduates, CAAT

Carton 186; Deans 180; Renwick 184.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Students/graduates, secondary school

Cassidy 92; Deans 180; Haggerty 187; Martel 181; Welch 92.

Subsidies, air transport

MacNaughton 226; Martel 226; Sargent 225.

Subsidies, municipal

Bullbrook 227-8; Cassidy 218-9; Dukszta 217-8; Germa 216-7; Givens 212-6, 223; MacNaughton 205-12, 219-30; Singer 204-12, 222; Stokes 229.

Subsidies, road

MacNaughton 221.

Subways

Dukszta 218; Givens 213-4; MacNaughton 220, 222; McKeough 8; Singer 222.

Succession duties/estate tax

Bullbrook 305-8, 319, 401, 404-6; Deacon 317, 400-1, 403; Good 401-2; Laughren 317; Lawlor 308-13, 400-2, 404-7; McKeough 10-12; R. F. Nixon 313-4; Renwick 314-7, 400, 403-4; Shulman 406; Winkler 305, 317-9, 400-7.

Supply management, agricultural

R. F. Nixon 133; Stewart 132-4.

Surtax, federal

Lawlor 397; McKeough 8.

Surtax, provincial

Lawlor 309-10.

Surtax, U.S.

Lawlor 294, 299; McKeough 11-12; Winkler 296.

SWEEP programme

Kerr 155, 158.

Symons, T.

Lewis 93, 95; R. F. Nixon 93; R. S. Smith 94; Welch 93-95.

Tabled documents other than reports

Orders in council exempting inquiry provisions re expropriations 341; Questions on Federal-Provincial Economic Co-operation 7; Reconstruction of Economic and Fiscal Policy Co-ordination 7.

Tapes/cassettes

Yaremko 175.

Task force, government reorganization

Davis 386-7.

Task force, hydro

Kerr 167.

Task force, industrial training

Carton 180-2, 185; Foulds 182; Martel 181.

Task force, metro transportation

Davis 172.

Tax, capital gains

Lawlor 312; McKeough 12; Renwick 300, 315; Winkler 318.

Tax, corporation

Laughren 317; Lawlor 294-5, 397; McKeough 10, 12; R. F. Nixon 294; Renwick 295-6, 315, 396-8; Winkler 294, 296-7.

Tax credits

Lawlor 299; McKeough 7; Renwick 300-1.

Tax exemptions

Bales 242; Bullbrook 307-8; McKeough 313; R. F. Nixon 313.

Tax, farm

Deans 128-9.

Tax, gasoline

Bullbrook 307.

Tax, gifts

Bullbrook 307, 401, 404; Deacon 317, 400-1, 403; Good 401-2; Lawlor 311, 313, 400, 402, 404; McKeough 13-14, 311, 313; R. F. Nixon 313; Renwick 316-7, 400, 403-4; Winkler 318, 400-4.

Tax, income

Lawlor 312; McKeough 11; Paterson 66; Renwick 177; Winkler 177.

Tax, income, provincial

Deacon 297-8, 398-9; Laughren 317; Lawlor 298-300, 399; McKeough 10-11; R. F. Nixon 301-4; Renwick 300-1; Winkler 297, 304-5, 398-9.

Tax, logging

Lawlor 399.

Tax, mining/revenue

Martel 266.

Tax, municipal/regional

Bales 242; Cassidy 241.

Tax, production machinery

Lawlor 295; McKeough 7.

Tax rebates

Lewis 266; Martel 266.

Tax, sales

Lawlor 299; R. F. Nixon 303.

Tax, school

Deans 129; R. F. Nixon 320.

Taxes, provincial

McKeough 6, 10-13.

Teachers

Burr 321-3; Cassidy 240; Foulds 100, 321; Martel 323-4; R. F. Nixon 30; Welch 29-30, 100.

Teachers, CAAT

Foulds 321; Welch 324.

Teachers, secondary school

Burr 322-3; Welch 324-5.

Teachers, specialized

Burr 323.

Teachers, superannuated

Burr 322-3; R. F. Nixon 321.

**Teachers' superannuation fund/
commission**

Burr 321-3; Foulds 321; Martel 323-4; R. F. Nixon 30, 320-1; Singer 321; Welch 29-30, 320, 324-5.

Telegram Publishing Company

Carton 96-97; Lewis 96-97.

Tendering

Auld 257, 260-3; Deacon 258-9; Deans 258; Edighoffer 261-2; R. F. Nixon 255, 368; Wells 274.

Texas Gulf Sulphur Company

Bernier 230-1, 233.

Texmont Mine

Ferrier 196-7.

Tires

Deacon 21; Foulds 22, 230; MacNaughton 21-22; Reid 21-22; Shulman 22.

Titles, property

R. F. Nixon 331-2.

Toronto Transit Commission

Givens 213; MacNaughton 223.

Tourist operators/outfitters

Brunelle 339; Germa 175, 339; R. F. Nixon 165-6.

Tourists

Haggerty 202.

Training, block/modular

Carton 181, 186.

**Training centres/schools
(correctional)**

Apps 154; Auld 261; Lewis 154; Shulman 411.

Transit, public/rapid

Cassidy 218; Davis 172; Dukszta 218; Givens 213-4, 223; Singer 209, 211, 222.

Translators/interpreters

A. F. Lawrence 340-1; Shulman 173, 341.

Transportation

Brunelle 200; Bullbrook 227-8; Cassidy 218-9; Deacon 173-4; Dukszta 217-8; Ferrier 278; Germa 216-7; Gisborn 228; Givens 212-6, 223; MacNaughton 171, 173-4, 205-12, 219-30; Martel 199, 226-7; Roy 223-4; Sargent 224-5; Scrivener 170-1; Singer 204-12, 222; Stokes 198, 229.

Transportation planning/studies

Bales 20; Givens 19-20; MacNaughton 20.

Transportation systems, municipal

Givens 213-6, 223; MacNaughton 205-12, 219-30; Singer 209-11, 222.

Tree nurseries

Stokes 198.

Tree removal/replacement

Bales 237, 390; Brunelle 196; Bullbrook 227; Burr 155; Cassidy 252; Lewis 393; MacNaughton 220; R. F. Nixon 237; Paterson 131, 230; Renwick 393; Stewart 134-5.

Truckers/trucking industry

Bullbrook 227-8; Gisborn 228; MacNaughton 228.

Trust/loan companies

Martel 267.

SUBJECTS—*Continued*

Unemployables

Dukszta 291; Haggerty 275; Martel 268;
Wells 268.

Unemployed

Apps 149-50, 154; Bales 249, 395; Burr
155; Cassidy 240; Ferrier 74; Haggerty
149; Kerr 155, 161; Lawlor 154; Martel
265-6; B. Newman 159; Paterson 65-66,
230; Renwick 184-5; Sargent 183.

Unemployment insurance/ commission

McKeough 170; Paterson 179-80, 188;
Renwick 184.

Unemployment/layoffs

Bernier 231; Brunelle 339; Bullbrook 227;
Cassidy 53, 158, 251; Davis 53; Deans
159-60, 180-1, 249; Ferrier 196-7; Germa
339; Gisborn 273; Grossman 340; Lawlor
294; Lewis 167-8; Martel 268-70;
McKeough 6, 8, 170; Paterson 105;
Renwick 184-5; Roy 152; Sargent 183;
Wells 267, 270-1, 281.

Unemployment, seasonal

Cassidy 239; McKeough 7, 9; Wells 271.

Unemployment, youth

Sargent 182-4, 186; Wells 263, 280.

Union Carbide Canada Limited

Haggerty 167-8; Kerr 167-9; Lewis 167;
MacDonald 168.

Union certification

Carton 52, 339; Laughren 51-52.

Union, lumbermen's

Carton 52, 339; Laughren 51-52.

Unions

Carton 182; Martel 147; B. Newman 98.

Universities, de-Canadianization

Lewis 95-96; White 95-96.

Universities, Council of Ontario (*see* University presidents/ committee)

University faculties/faculty members

Lewis 95-96; White 95-96.

University graduate fellowship programme

White 96.

University, Lakehead

Brunelle 200; Foulds 200.

University, McMaster

R. F. Nixon 61.

University presidents/committee

Lewis 93, 95; Welch 93-95; White 96.

University students/graduates

Cassidy 240; Lawlor 405; Lewis 95-96;
Renwick 184; Sargent 182-3; White 95-96.

University, Toronto

Lewis 283; Wells 283.

University, Trent

Welch 93-95.

Urban blight

Shulman 31-32.

Urban renewal

Cassidy 395-6.

Vacations/holidays with pay

Carton 96-97; Lewis 96-97.

Vocational trades/training

Carton 180-2, 185-8; Deans 180; Foulds
182; Germa 185-6; Haggerty 186-7;
Martel 181; McKeough 10; Paterson
179-80, 188; Renwick 184-5; Sargent 182-4.

Voters/voting

Burr 79.

Wage, minimum

Carton 185-6; Germa 186; Sargent 182-3,
186.

Wages/salaries

Bennett 355; Brunelle 196; Burr 155;
Carton 96-97; Dukszta 279; Foulds 321;
Germa 185-6; Kerr 155-6; Lawlor 352-3;
A. B. R. Lawrence 85; A. F. Lawrence
55-56, 355-8; Lewis 96-97; R. F. Nixon 61,
237; Renwick 354-5; Roy 353-4; Sargent
182-4; Singer 78, 347-52; Wells 279.

Water Resources Commission

Kerr 156; Lewis 334.

Water/water services

Deans 129; Stewart 134.

Welfare administrators/agencies

Carton 42; Dukszta 279; Ferrier 73, 278;
Martel 277; Stokes 280; Wells 279.

Welfare, municipal

Ferrier 278; Haggerty 149; Martel 269-71,
277-8; B. Newman 159; R. S. Smith 267,
274-5; Wells 266, 274-5, 277, 288, 291-2.

Welfare programmes

Dukszta 278-9; Ferrier 278; Germa 281-2; Martel 265-6, 268; R. S. Smith 267, 274-5; Stokes 279-80; Wells 31, 264-8, 271, 274-5, 277, 280-3, 288.

Welfare recipients

Bales 237, 243, 395; Cassidy 378; Ferrier 74, 278; Gisborn 273; Good 243; Lewis 275-7, 289; Martel 268-72; Renwick 184-5; Wells 264-8, 270, 272-4, 277, 280, 288.

Welfare, regional

Ferrier 278; Haggerty 275; R. S. Smith 274; Wells 275.

White paper on taxation, provincial

McKeough 12.

White River Air Services

MacNaughton 225-6; Martel 226.

Whiterock Land Development

A. F. Lawrence 332; R. F. Nixon 332.

Widows/widowers

Bullbrook 76-77; Deacon 317; Haggerty 275; Lawlor 309, 405; McKeough 13; Welch 30.

Wildlife harassment

Shulman 103.

Wildlife/wildlife management

Brunelle 196, 200; Laughren 201; Shulman 411; Stokes 198.

Williston report

Bullbrook 138; Davis 389; A. B. R. Lawrence 138-9.

Winter/seasonal works

Apps 148-52, 154; Bales 234-6, 241-3, 250-2, 390-6; Bernier 231; Bounsall 394; Brunelle 196-204, 339; Burr 155; Carton 180, 186; Cassidy 158, 238-42, 251-3, 389-92, 395-6; Deans 159-60, 174, 249-50; Dukszta 291; Ferrier 98-99, 196; Gisborn 156, 273; Givens 215; Good 155-6, 238, 243, 395; Grossman 99, 340; Haggerty 186-7; Kerr 154-60; Lawlor 151, 154; Lewis 392-3; MacDonald 150, 290-1; Martel 265; McKeough 9-10, 174; B. Newman 158-9; R. F. Nixon 236; Paterson 179-80; Renwick 392-4, 396; Roy 152, 200; Sargent 394-6; Stokes 197-8, 201, 279-80; Wells 31, 263-4, 274, 278-9, 281-4, 288, 291-2; Worton 151.

Wives, deserted

Martel 267, 272; R. S. Smith 267; Wells 266, 272-3.

Wives, common-law

Martel 324; Welch 325.

Workers

Bounsall 80; McKeough 11; Paterson 66-67; Singer 209.

Workers, casual/temporary

Burr 155; Deans 159; Kerr 155, 161; Sargent 182-4.

Workers, handicapped/disabled

Carton 185.

Workers, hospital/health

Dukszta 140; A. B. R. Lawrence 109; R. F. Nixon 61, 105.

Workers, hospital school

Paterson 139.

Workers, immigrant

Carton 188; Deans 180-1; Haggerty 187.

Workers, mine

Ferrier 196-7.

Workers, municipal/regional

Bales 237; R. F. Nixon 236-7.

Workers, newspaper

Carton 96-97; Lewis 96-97.

Workers, relocation of

Kerr 168; Lewis 168.

Workers, seasonal

Paterson 179-80; Roy 200.

Workers, skilled

Bales 241; Cassidy 240.

Workers, teen-age/student

Carton 185; Germa 186; Sargent 182-4, 186.

Workmen's advisory board

Carton 175; Haggerty 175.

Workmen's Compensation Board

Auld 256; Carton 50; Deans 50, 256.

World Health Organization

Kerr 338-9.

Zoning/rezoning

Bales 20; Givens 20.

By Speakers

Apps, Hon. C. J. S. (P.C., Kingston and the Islands)

- Correctional institutions 148-54.
- Correctional officers 148-9, 152.
- Detention centres, adult 148-9, 152, 154.
- Detention centres, juvenile 148.
- Employment 148-54.
- Offenders, young 149, 154.
- Public works 149.
- Social workers 153.
- Training centres/schools (correctional) 154.
- Unemployed 149-50, 154.
- Winter/seasonal works 148-52, 154.

Auld, Hon. James A. C. (P.C., Leeds)

- Advertising/publicity 255-6.
- Aircraft hangars 262.
- Buildings, Ontario government 257.
- Civil servants 261.
- Colleges of agriculture 262.
- Construction industry 261-3.
- Contractors 263.
- Correctional institutions 254, 256.
- Courthouses 254, 256, 259.
- Courts, provincial/magistrates 254.
- Day-care centres 261.
- Deaf/hard of hearing, schools for 261.
- Detention centres, adult 255.
- Farm structures 262.
- Firefighters/ firefighting 262.
- Fish hatcheries/restocking 261.
- Forest fires 262.
- Foresters/Lands and Forests personnel 262.
- Health Insurance Commission 254-5, 260.
- Hospital Services Commission 254-5, 260.
- Institute for Studies in Education 256.
- Justice, administration of 254, 256.
- Land acquisition/assembly 100, 255-6.
- Lease-back programme 255-8.
- Leasing 257.
- Liquor outlets, retail 260.
- Motor vehicle repairs 261.
- Motor vehicles, Ontario government 261.
- OHSIP 255.
- Parks, provincial 100.
- Public works 254-63.
- Publications, government 41.
- Records centres 261.
- Rent, Windsor courthouse 259.
- Research, agricultural 261.
- Tendering 257, 260-3.
- Training centres/schools (correctional) 261.
- Workmen's Compensation Board 256.

Bales, Hon. Dalton A. (P.C., York Mills)

- Amalgamation/annexation 341.
- Chambers of commerce 98.
- Committee, provincial-municipal liaison 235, 237, 390-1.
- Community development 396.
- Community programmes 238.
- Conferences, federal-provincial 242, 250.
- Conferences, federal-provincial-municipal 250.
- Conferences, interprovincial 250.
- Conservation authorities 235.
- Construction, housing 243.
- Employment 390-6.
- Employment loans programme 238.
- Employment, seasonal 18, 28, 235-7, 241-3, 250-2.
- Federal-provincial agreements 238, 242-3.
- Federal-provincial co-operation 237, 243, 249-50.
- Federal-provincial-municipal affairs 235, 237-8.
- Grants, home improvement 390-6.
- Grants, regional/district municipalities 235-6, 241, 250-1.

BALES, HON. D.—*Continued*

Hours of business 98.
Housing 243.
Housing, high-rise 20.
Incentives to home owners 242-3.
Incentives, municipal employment 234,
238, 241-3.
Indian bands 235.
Local initiatives programme 17-18, 28,
237, 242-4, 249, 252, 391-6.
Mayors and Municipalities, Federation of
250.
Metro Centre plan 18-19.
Municipal Board, Ontario 341.
Municipal budgets 236, 242.
Municipal planning/studies 241.
Municipal work on private property 235-7,
241, 252, 390-6.

Northern Ontario affairs 241-2.
Regional government 341.
School boards 235.
Sewage treatment 236.
Tax exemptions 242.
Tax, municipal/regional 242.
Transportation planning/studies 20.
Tree removal/replacement 237, 390.
Unemployed 249, 395.
Welfare recipients 237, 243, 395.
Winter/seasonal works 234-6, 241-3,
250-2, 390-6.
Workers, municipal/regional 237.
Workers, skilled 241.
Zoning/rezoning 20.

Bennett, Claude (P.C., Ottawa South)

Federal-provincial affairs 355.
Judges 355.

Wages/salaries 355.

Bernier, Hon. Leo (P.C., Kenora)

Depressed/slow-growth areas 231.
Designated areas 233-4.
Employment, seasonal 231.
Exploration/prospecting 230-1.
Land leasing 233.
Land, mining company 233.
Minerals/ores 230-1.
Mines, abandoned/shutdown 230.
Mines/mining 230-4.
Mining companies 233-4.

Pits/quarries 47.
Refineries, metal 234.
Research, mining 234.
Roads/highways, northern 234.
Roads to resources 234.
Smelters/smelting 234.
Texas Gulf Sulphur Company 230-1, 233.
Unemployment/layoffs 231.
Winter/seasonal works 231.

Bounsall, E. J. (N.D.P., Windsor West)

Appraisals, housing 336-7.
Employers 80.
Grants, home improvement 394.
Health Insurance Commission 80.
Hospital Services Commission 80.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 336-7.
Housing, low-cost 336-7.
Housing, public 336-7.

Incentives to home owners 394.
Local initiatives programme 394.
OHSIP 80.
Rent/rent control 336-7.
Winter/seasonal works 394.
Workers 80.

Brunelle, Hon. Rene (P.C., Cochrane)

Committee, Northern Ontario Resources
Transportation 197.
Committee on Prince Edward dunes 24.
Compensation, fishermen/allied industries
51.
Conservation 23-24.

Conservation officers/game wardens
199-200.
Construction, roads/highways 199.
Ecologists/ecology 23-24.
Employment 339.
Employment, seasonal 196-204.

Federal-provincial agreements 51.
 Fish/fish management 200.
 Fish hatcheries/restocking 199.
 Fishing camp operators 339.
 Fishing, commercial 339.
 Fishing, sport 339.
 Forest management 196.
 Forest rangers, junior 196.
 Foresters/Lands and Forests personnel
 199-200.
 French language 200.

 Highway/road maintenance 199.

 Indian reservations 199.

 Land acquisition/assembly 196, 201-4.
 Land, recreational 203.
 Loans to fishermen/allied industries 166.
 Logging/lumbering 201.

Natural resources/management 23-24.
 Northern Ontario affairs 196, 203.

 Parks, provincial 196, 201-4.

 Research, forestry 200.
 Roads, private 201.
 Roads to recreation 200.
 Roads to resources 197, 199.

 Sand/gravel 23-24.

 Tourist operators/outfitters 339.
 Transportation 200.
 Tree removal/replacement 196.

 Unemployment/layoffs 339.
 University, Lakehead 200.

 Wages/salaries 196.
 Wildlife/wildlife management 196, 200.
 Winter/seasonal works 196-204, 339.

Bullbrook, James E. (L., Sarnia)

Aged/senior citizens 76-77, 113, 122.
 Amalgamation/annexation 54.
 Automotive Transport Association 227.

 Businesses, small 307, 404.

 Conferences, interprovincial 305-6.
 Construction, roads/highways 227.
 Contracts, highway 227.
 Contracts, union 112-3.

 Employers 112.

 Farms, family 307, 404.
 Federal-provincial affairs 306-7, 401.
 Federal-provincial agreements 306.
 Ferries 227.

 Grants, transportation 227-8.

 Health care/services 77.
 Health costs 77.
 Health Insurance Commission 76-77, 112-4,
 122.
 Hospitals/hospital services 76.

Medicare 76.
 Motor vehicles 227-8.
 Municipal Board, Ontario 54.

 OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 76-77,
 113, 122.

 Police, provincial 228.

 Railway passenger service 228.

 Social insurance numbers 113, 122.
 Subsidies, municipal 227-8.
 Succession duties/estate tax 305-8, 319,
 401, 404-6.

 Tax exemptions 307-8.
 Tax, gasoline 307.
 Tax, gifts 307, 401, 404.
 Transportation 227-8.
 Tree removal/replacement 227.
 Truckers/trucking industry 227-8.

 Unemployment/layoffs 227.

 Widows/widowers 76-77.
 Williston report 138.

Burr, Fred A. (N.D.P., Sandwich-Riverside)

Age 323.
 Building permits 100-1.
 Family/welfare benefits 155.
 Health Insurance Commission 79-80.
 Hospital Services Commission 79-80.
 Land developers/development 100-1.
 Land sales 100-1.
 Leasing 259.
 OHSIP 79-80.
 Social insurance numbers 79-80.

Teachers 321-3.
 Teachers, secondary school 322-3.
 Teachers, specialized 323.
 Teachers, superannuated 322-3.
 Teachers' superannuation fund/commission
 321-3.
 Tree removal/replacement 155.

 Unemployed 155.

 Voters/voting 79.

 Wages/salaries 155.
 Winter/seasonal works 155.
 Workers, casual/temporary 155.

Carton, Hon. Gordon R. (P.C., Armourdale)

- Advisory groups 175.
- Apprentices/apprenticeship 180-2, 186-8.
- Businesses, small 180.
- Certificates, securities 29.
- Chambers of commerce 42.
- Churches/religious groups 42.
- Collective bargaining 96, 339.
- Construction 50.
- Credit companies/bureaus 16.
- Criminal code 41.
- Cultural organizations 42.
- Drivers, taxi 96.
- Employers 180.
- Employment standards branch 334.
- Family/welfare benefits 185.
- Guardian Insurance Company 333.
- Immigrants, skilled 188.
- Industries, foreign control/takeover 16.
- Industries, shutdown 96-97.
- Insurance costs/premiums 48-49.
- Insurance, motor vehicle 48-49.
- Insurance, superintendent of 333.
- Labour Relations Board 339.
- Land acquisition/assembly 51.
- Land sales 51.
- Landlord/tenant 101.
- Law Society of Upper Canada 333.
- Lawyers 333.
- Leasing 51.
- Licences, credit companies/bureaus 16.
- Licences, lottery/bingo 41.
- Lotteries 41-42.
- Martel Lumber Company 52, 339.
- McGillivray commission/report 175.
- McRuer commission/report 175.
- Municipal councils 41.
- News media/periodicals 96-97.
- Rent/rent control 101.
- Service clubs 42.
- Sports 42.
- Students/graduates, CAAT 186.
- Task force, industrial training 180-2, 185.
- Telegram Publishing Company 96-97.
- Training, block/modular 181, 186.
- Union certification 52, 339.
- Union, lumbermen's 52, 339.
- Unions 182.
- Vacations/holidays with pay 96-97.
- Vocational trades/training 180-2, 185-8.
- Wage, minimum 185-6.
- Wages/salaries 96-97.
- Welfare administrators/agencies 42.
- Winter/seasonal works 180, 186.
- Workers, handicapped/disabled 185.
- Workers, immigrant 188.
- Workers, newspaper 96-97.
- Workers, teen-age/student 185.
- Workmen's advisory board 175.
- Workmen's Compensation Board 50.

Cassidy, Michael (N.D.P., Ottawa Centre)

- Action Mechanicsville 395-6.
- Aged/senior citizens 240.
- Brush clearing 158, 239-40, 252.
- Cabinet committees/boards 376-8.
- Committee, provincial-municipal liaison 239, 391.
- Conservation authorities 158.
- Construction, housing 251-2.
- Day-care centres 240, 293-4, 392.
- Demolition, building 252.
- Denturists/dentures 48.
- Drug costs 20-21.
- Drugs, medical 20-21.
- Employment 53, 157-8.
- Employment, seasonal 238-42, 251-3, 389-92, 395-6.
- Federal-provincial affairs 378.
- Federal-provincial-municipal affairs 239.
- Grants, home improvement 53, 240, 242, 251-2, 389-92, 395-6.
- Grants, regional/district municipalities 241.
- Grants, transportation 218-9.
- Grants, welfare 293-4.
- Highways 218.
- Housing Corporation, Ontario 253.
- Housing shortage 252.
- Incentives to home owners 240, 242.
- Incentives, municipal employment 238-42.
- Land costs 293.
- Loans, home improvement 395-6.
- Local initiatives programme 391-2, 395-6.
- Low-income groups 252, 395-6.
- Mayors and reeves/association 391.
- Metro Centre plan 19.
- Municipal associations 391.
- Municipal councils 253.
- Municipal/regional services 240.
- Municipal work on private property 252-3, 389-92, 395-6.

Parcost programme 20-21.
Planning government programmes 377-8.
Rent/rent control 378.
Schools, secondary 92-93.
Schools, separate 92-93.
Social/family services 240.
Students/graduates, secondary school 92.
Subsidies, municipal 218-9.
Tax, municipal/regional 241.
Teachers 240.
Transit, public/rapid 218.

Transportation 218-9.
Tree removal/replacement 252.
Unemployed 240.
Unemployment/layoffs 53, 158, 251.
Unemployment, seasonal 239.
University students/graduates 240.
Urban renewal 395-6.
Welfare recipients 378.
Winter/seasonal works 158, 238-42,
251-3, 389-92, 395-6.
Workers, skilled 240.

Davis, Hon. William G. (P.C., Peel North)

Advertising/publicity 98.
Airports 43-44.
Amalgamation/annexation 54.
Cabinet committees/boards 27, 384-9.
Civil servants 45, 98, 172.
Civil service 386-7.
Committee on corporation law, select,
members of 411.
Committee on economic and cultural
nationalism, select, members of 412.
Committee on foreign investment 19.
Committee on government productivity
45, 98, 194-5, 385-8.
Committee on utilization of educational
facilities, select, members of 412.
Committees, select, re 412.
Conservation areas 194-5.
Cultural organizations 176-7.
Design for Development: Toronto-centred
region 43.
Education 387-8.
Employment 53.
Ethnic groups 176-7.
Expressways/freeways 172-3.
Federal-provincial affairs 43-44, 386.
Fuller, Buckminster plan 24-25, 172-3.
Grants, home improvement 53.

Housing, public 387.
Investment, foreign 19.
Land acquisition/assembly 194-5.
Land banks 194-5.
Land, recreational 194-5.
Land use 172-3.
Land-use planning 25.
Lotteries 42.
Municipal Board, Ontario 54.
Municipal councils 172-3.
Municipal planning/studies 172-3.
Municipal/regional services 43.
Ontario office, Washington 44.
Planning boards/committees 172-3.
Planning government programmes 24-25.
Publications, government 44-45, 98.
Report, committee on government
productivity 385-8.
Task force, government reorganization
386-7.
Task force, metro transportation 172.
Transit, public/rapid 172.
Unemployment/layoffs 53.
Williston report 389.

Deacon, Donald M. (L., York Centre)

Businesses, small 317.
Construction industry 258-9.
Farms, family 317.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 259.
Insurance costs/premiums 48.
Insurance, motor vehicle 48.
Lease-back programme 259.
Leasing 259.
Metro Centre plan 173-4.

Public works 258-9.
Report, Metro Centre plan 174.
Safety, motor vehicle 21.
Succession duties/estate tax 317, 400-1, 403.
Tax, gifts 317, 400-1, 403.
Tax, income, provincial 297-8, 398-9.
Tendering 258-9.
Tires 21.
Transportation 173-4.
Widows/widowers 317.

Deans, Ian (N.D.P., Wentworth)

- Aged/senior citizens 81.
- Apprentices/apprenticeship 180-1.
- Beach properties/shorelines 160.
- Borrowing, provincial 257-8.
- Cabinet committees/boards 369-74.
- Chambers of commerce 42.
- Committee on estimates, standing 373.
- Committee on government productivity 370.
- Construction 50.
- Construction industry 257-8.
- Detention centres, juvenile 256.
- Doctors 80-81.
- Employment 159-60, 174, 180-1.
- Farm income/prices 127-9.
- Farm machinery/equipment 128.
- Farm ponds 129.
- Farm products/produce 128.
- Farm structures 129.
- Farmers 128.
- Farming, poultry/poultry products 127-9.
- Farms, family 129.
- Farms, marginal 129.
- Federal-municipal affairs 249-50.
- Federal-provincial affairs 371.
- Federal-provincial co-operation 174, 249-50.
- Grants, farmers 127-9.
- Health care/services 80-81.
- Health insurance 80-81.
- Health Insurance Commission 80-81, 111-2.
- Housing, public 159-60.
- Immigrants, skilled 180-1.
- Imports 128-9.
- Industries 180-1.
- Institute for Studies in Education 256-7.
- Justice, administration of 256.
- Land acquisition/assembly 204, 256.
- Land developers/development 256-7.
- Lease-back programme 256-8.
- Leasing 51.
- Loans to municipalities/school boards 174.
- Local initiatives programme 243-4, 249-50.
- Lotteries 42.
- Low-income groups 111.
- Members'/ministers' facilities 370-3.
- OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 111.
- Parks, provincial 204.
- Pollution, beach 160.
- Provincial-municipal affairs 371.
- Public works 255-8.
- Retraining 181.
- Students/graduates, CAAT 180.
- Students/graduates, secondary school 180.
- Tax, farm 128-9.
- Tax, school 129.
- Tendering 258.
- Unemployment/layoffs 159-60, 180-1, 249.
- Vocational trades/training 180.
- Water/water services 129.
- Winter/seasonal works 159-60, 174, 249-50.
- Workers, casual/temporary 159.
- Workers, immigrant 180-1.
- Workmen's Compensation Board 50, 256.

Dukszta, Dr. Jan (N.D.P., Parkdale)

- Bus passenger service 218.
- Children, retarded 140, 291.
- Clinics 63-64.
- Colleges of applied arts and technology 279.
- Day-care centres 291.
- Doctors 63-64.
- Doctors' fees 145.
- Employment, youth 278-9.
- Expressways/freeways 217-8.
- Grants, transportation 217-8.
- Grants, welfare 290-1.
- Health care/services 63-64.
- Health costs 62-63, 145.
- Health Council, Ontario 64.
- Health Insurance Commission 62-64.
- Homes for special care 291.
- Hospital costs 64.
- Hospitals/hospital services 63-64.
- Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 64.
- Hospitals, teaching 64.
- Insurance companies 62.
- Kaiser Permanente structure 63.
- Mental health centres/clinics 143.
- Mental health/illness 64.
- Motor vehicles 217-8.
- OHSIP 145.
- Paramedical personnel/services 63-64.
- Physiotherapists 63.
- Project 500 278-9.
- Retarded persons 140, 290-1.
- Social workers 278-9.
- Subsidies, municipal 217-8.
- Subways 218.
- Transit, public/rapid 218.
- Transportation 217-8.

Unemployables 291.
Wages/salaries 279.
Welfare administrators/agencies 279.

Welfare programmes 278-9.
Winter/seasonal works 291.
Workers, hospital/health 140.

Edighoffer, Hugh (L., Perth)

Aircraft hangars 262.
Colleges of agriculture 262.
Courthouses 259.
Deaf/hard of hearing, schools for 261.
Employment, seasonal 262-3.
Farm structures 262.

Foresters/Lands and Forests personnel 261-2.
Land acquisition/assembly 100, 204.
Parks, provincial 100, 204.
Public works 261-2.
Rent, Windsor courthouse 259.
Tendering 261-2.

Ferrier, Rev. William (N.D.P., Cochrane South)

Aged/senior citizens 72, 114, 278.
Clinics 73.
Committee, Northern Ontario Resources Transportation 196-7.
Construction, housing 98-99.
Construction, roads/highways 228-9.
Correctional institutions 149-50.
Counselling services 142.
Denticare 146.
Denturists/dentures 278.
Doctors 278.
Doctors' fees 73.
Doctors' training 146.
Drug costs 74.
Drugs, medical 74, 146, 278.
Employment 149, 197.
Employment, seasonal 98-99, 196, 228-9.
Grants, hospitals/health facilities 136.
Health costs 72-73.
Health Insurance Commission 72-74, 114.
Health/medical facilities 146.
Homes for special care 136, 138.
Hospital boards/councils 73-74.
Hospital Services Commission 72.
Hospitals/hospital services 72-73.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 138, 142.
Hospitals, teaching 146.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 98-99.
Housing, senior citizens 98-99.
Hydro 196.
Insurance companies 72.

Low-income groups 74.
Masseurs 146.
Medical schools 146.
Mental Health Association 142.
Mental health centres/clinics 142.
Mental health/illness 136.
Mines/mining 196-7.
Northern Ontario affairs 196-7, 228-9.
Nursing homes 136.
OHSIP 72, 146.
OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 72-73, 114.
Optical services 278.
Public works 149.
Refineries, metal 269.
Regional planning 73.
Rehabilitation/rehabilitative services 149.
Rent/rent control 278.
Reservoirs, water 196.
Roads to resources 196.
Texmont Mine 196-7.
Transportation 278.
Unemployed 74.
Unemployment/layoffs 196-7.
Welfare administrators/agencies 73, 278.
Welfare, municipal 278.
Welfare programmes 278.
Welfare recipients 74, 278.
Welfare, regional 278.
Winter/seasonal works 98-99, 196.
Workers, mine 196-7.

Foulds, James F. (N.D.P., Port Arthur)

Apprentices/apprenticeship 182.
Dropouts 182.
Employment, seasonal 229-30.

Land acquisition/assembly 321.
Northern Ontario affairs 22.
Research, forestry 200.

FOULDS, J.—*Continued*

Safety, motor vehicle 22.
School boards 100.
Schools, elementary 182.
Schools, secondary 182.

Task force, industrial training 182.
Teachers 100, 321.
Teachers, CAAT 321.

Teachers' superannuation fund/commission 321.
Tires 22, 230.
University, Lakehead 200.
Vocational trades/training 182.
Wages/salaries 321.

Gaunt, Murray (L., Huron-Bruce)

Aged/senior citizens 114-5.
Elections/by-elections 22-23, 341.
Farm income/prices 125-7.
Farm structures 127.
Farmers 135-6.
Farming, poultry/poultry products 123-7, 135-6.
Federal-provincial affairs 127.
Grants, farmers 124-7, 135-6.
Health Insurance Commission 114-5.

Hospital Services Commission 114-5.
Inquiries, public 126-7.
Marketing boards, commodity 125-6.
Marketing boards, national 127.
Marketing, poultry/poultry products 99-100, 125-7.
OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 114-5.
Police, provincial 22-23, 341.
Report, egg inquiry 99-100.

Germa, Melville C. (N.D.P., Sudbury)

Accidents, motor vehicle 200-1.
Amalgamation/annexation 341.
Apprentices/apprenticeship 185-6.
Bypasses 217.
Canadian Pacific Railway 217.
Day-care centres 281-2.
Eddy Forest Products 201.
Employers 185-6.
Expressways/freeways 217.
Fishing camp operators 339.
Fishing, commercial 175, 339.
Grants, transportation 216-7.
Grants, welfare 281-2.
Highways 217.
Land acquisition/assembly 282.
Leasing 281-2.

Logging/lumbering 200-1.
Municipal Board, Ontario 341.
Municipal councils 282.
Northern Ontario affairs 216-7.
Railway crossings 201.
Regional government 341.
Roads, private 200.
Roads to resources 200.
Subsidies, municipal 216-7.
Tourist operators/outfitters 175, 339.
Transportation 216-7.
Unemployment/layoffs 339.
Vocational trades/training 185-6.
Wage, minimum 186.
Wages/salaries 185-6.
Welfare programmes 281-2.
Workers, teen-age/student 186.

Gisborn, Reg. (N.D.P., Hamilton East)

Automotive Transport Association 228.
Beach properties/shorelines 156.
Cabinet committees/boards 26-27.
Commuters/commuter services 228.
Correctional institutions 153.
Day-care centres 273.
Detention centres, adult 153.
Employment 153.
Expressways/freeways 228.

Grants, day-care centres 273.
Grants, regional/district municipalities 250-1.
Grants, welfare 273.
Health hazards 156.
Incentives, municipal employment 273.
Motor vehicles 228.
Municipal planning/studies 273.

Pollution, beach 156.

Regional government 250-1.
Research, pollution/pollution control 156.

Sewage disposal 156.
Sewerage 156.
Social workers 153.

Steele commission/report 251.

Transportation 228.
Truckers/trucking industry 228.

Unemployment/layoffs 273.

Welfare recipients 273.
Winter/seasonal works 156, 273.

Givens, Philip G. (L., York-Forest Hill)

Assessment/reassessment 214.

Committee on transportation, technical
213, 223.

Construction, roads/highways 215, 223.

Employment 215.
Expressways/freeways 20, 171, 212-6, 223.

Fuller, Buckminster plan 171, 213, 215.

Grants, transportation 213-5, 223.

Hotels/motels 214.
Housing, high-rise 20.

Land acquisition/assembly 214.
Land use 171.

Metro Centre plan 214-5.
Motor vehicle industry 214-5.

Motor vehicles 214-5.
Municipal councils 171.
Municipal planning/studies 171, 215-6.

Planning boards/committees 171.
Provincial-municipal affairs 213-4.

Subsidies, municipal 212-6, 223.
Subways 213-4.

Toronto Transit Commission 213.
Transit, public/rapid 213-4, 223.
Transportation 212-6, 223.
Transportation planning/studies 19-20.
Transportation systems, municipal 213-6,
223.

Winter/seasonal works 215.

Zoning/rezoning 20.

Good, Edward R. (L., Waterloo North)

Aged/senior citizens 114.
Assessment/reassessment 26.
Autonomy, regional 254.

Cabinet committees/boards 374-5.
Committee on government productivity 374.
Conferences, federal-provincial-municipal
375.
Conservation authorities 155-6.
Constitution 375.

Federal-provincial affairs 375.
Financing regional governments 253-4.

Grants, home improvement 395.
Grants, pollution abatement 52.
Grants, regional 253-4.
Grants, regional/district municipalities
253-4.

Health Insurance Commission 114.

Incentives to home owners 395.
Incentives, municipal employment 243.

Local initiatives programme 238, 395.

OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 114.

Phosphates 52.
Planning government programmes 375.
Police, regional 254.
Provincial-municipal affairs 375.

Regional government 253-4.
Regional municipalities 253-4.

Sewage treatment 52, 254.
Succession duties/estate tax 401-2.

Tax, gifts 401-2.

Welfare recipients 243.
Winter/seasonal works 155-6, 238, 243,
395.

Grossman, Hon. Allan (P.C., St. Andrew-St. Patrick)

Aged/senior citizens 340.
Appraisals, housing 336-7.

Central Mortgage and Housing
Corporation 174-5.
Community centres 174-5.
Consolidated Computer Limited 53.

Construction 175.
Construction, housing 98-99.
Construction industry 340.

Employment, seasonal 99

Films 97, 176.

GROSSMAN, HON. A.—*Continued*

Housing Corporation, Ontario 98-99, 175, 339-40.
Housing, low-cost 336-7.
Housing, public 174-5, 336-7.
Housing, senior citizens 98-99, 340.
Housing shortage 91.
Loans to industries 53.
Malvern development 91, 339-40.
Municipal councils 175.

Municipal/regional services 339-40.
Northern Ontario affairs 340.
Ontario Place 97, 176.
Rent/rent control 337.
Unemployment/layoffs 340.
Winter/seasonal works 99, 340.

Haggerty, Ray (L., Welland South)

Advisory groups 175.
Apprentices/apprenticeship 187.
Beach properties/shorelines 202.
Children, retarded 140.
Correctional institutions 148-9.
Correctional officers 148-9.
Day-care centres 282-3.
Drug abuse 140-1.
Employment 187, 202.
Expropriation 202.
Family/welfare benefits 275.
Grants, welfare 282-3.
Hospitals/hospital services 140-1.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 140-1.
Hydro rates 167.
Immigrants, skilled 187.
Income supplement 275.
Land acquisition/assembly 202.
McGillivray commission/report 175.
McRuer commission/report 175.
Mental health/illness 140-1.
Niagara Parks Commission 202.

Offenders 149.
Offenders, young 149.
Parks, provincial 202.
Pollution, noise 46.
Psychiatrists/psychiatric services 140.
Regional/district councils 282.
Regional municipalities 275, 282-3.
Rehabilitation/rehabilitative services 141, 149.
Retarded, associations for 282.
Schools, closed 140.
Snowmobiles 202.
Students/graduates, secondary school 187.
Tourists 202.
Unemployables 275.
Unemployed 149.
Union Carbide Canada Limited 167-8.
Vocational trades/training 186-7.
Welfare, municipal 149.
Welfare, regional 275.
Widows/widowers 275.
Winter/seasonal works 186-7.
Workers, immigrant 187.
Workmen's advisory board 175.

Hodgson, R. Glen (P.C., Victoria-Haliburton)

Cabinet committees/boards 380-2.
Conference, Confederation of Tomorrow 381.

Conferences, federal-provincial 381.
Planning government programmes 380-2.

Kerr, Hon. George A. (P.C., Halton West)

Appeals 168-9.
Beach properties/shorelines 156, 160.
Bottles, returnable/non-returnable 46-47.
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation 52.
Conservation areas 155-60.
Conservation authorities 155-61.
Contractors 156, 160.

Dikes/diking 155, 157-9.
Dow Chemical Company 102.
Employment 155, 157-60.
Environmental control 45.
Erosion/erosion control 155, 157-9.
Expropriation 157.
Family/welfare benefits 155.
Federal-provincial affairs 169.
Fish/fish management 338-9.
Flooding/flood control 155-9.

Grants, pipeline/sewerage 52.
 Grants, pollution abatement 52, 167.

Health hazards 338-9.
 Hydro Electric Power Commission 167.
 Hydro, industrial 167.
 Hydro rates 167.

Industries, relocation of 167-9.

Land acquisition/assembly 157.
 Littering/cleanup 45.
 Loans, pollution abatement 52.

Northern Ontario affairs 157.

Parks, conservation authority 157.
 Phosphates 52.
 Pollution, air 25-26, 46.
 Pollution, beach 156, 160.
 Pollution control 45, 167-9.
 Pollution index/monitoring 25-26.
 Pollution, industrial 25-26, 167-9.

Pollution, mercury 338-9.
 Pollution, noise 46.

Recreation 157.
 Research, fish/fish management 338.
 Reservoirs, water 155-7.

Sewage disposal 156, 160.
 Sewage treatment 52.
 Sewerage 156, 160.
 SWEEP programme 155, 158.

Task force, hydro 167.

Unemployed 155, 161.
 Union Carbide Canada Limited 167-9.

Wages/salaries 155-6.
 Water Resources Commission 156.
 Winter/seasonal works 154-60.
 Workers, casual/temporary 155, 161.
 Workers, relocation of 168.
 World Health Organization 338-9.

Laughren, Floyd (N.D.P., Nickel Belt)

Land acquisition/assembly 201.
 Martel Lumber Company 51-52.
 Succession duties/estate tax 317.
 Tax, corporation 317.

Tax, income, provincial 317.

Union certification 51-52.
 Union, lumbermen's 51-52.

Wildlife/wildlife management 201.

Lawlor, Patrick D. (N.D.P., Lakeshore)

Carter commission/report 308.
 Children, retarded 405.
 Consumers 299.
 Corporations 294-5.
 Correctional institutions 151-2, 154.
 Correctional officers 151-2.
 Courts, surrogate 352.
 Crown land 347.

Detention centres, adult 151, 154.
 Disclosure, public/financial 347.

Employment 151-2, 154, 294.

Federal-provincial affairs 295, 353.

Grants, employment support, federal 397.

Hours of work 151.

Inflation 405.

Judges 352-3.
 Judges, provincial/county/district 352.
 Judges, supreme/high court 352.
 Justice, administration of 352-3.

Kingston penitentiary trials 16.

Lotteries 42.

Low-income groups 299.

McRuer commission/report 353.

Pension Plan, Canada 405.
 Plea bargaining 16.

Smith committee/report 309-11, 405-6.
 Succession duties/estate tax 308-13, 400-2, 404-7.
 Surtax, federal 397.
 Surtax, provincial 309-10.
 Surtax, U.S. 294, 299.

Tax, capital gains 312.
 Tax, corporation 294-5, 397.
 Tax credits 299.
 Tax, gifts 311, 313, 400, 402, 404.
 Tax, income 312.
 Tax, income, provincial 298-300, 399.
 Tax, logging 399.
 Tax, production machinery 295.
 Tax, sales 299.

Unemployed 154.
 Unemployment/layoffs 294.
 University students/graduates 405.

Wages/salaries 352-3.
 Widows/widowers 309, 405.
 Winter/seasonal works 151, 154.

Lawrence, Hon. A. B. R. (P.C., Carleton East)

Aged, homes for 50.
Aged/senior citizens 50, 84, 120-1.
Appeals 106-7.
Children, handicapped 139.
Children, retarded 138-9, 141, 143-4.
Children's centres, crippled 139.
Clinics 83.
Clinics, dental 48.
College of Dental Surgeons 47.
Committee on drugs, advisory 20.
Conferences, federal-provincial 120-1.
Contracts, union 112-3.
Denticare 146.
Denturists/dentures 47-48.
Doctors 83, 144-6.
Doctors' fees 83, 109, 144-6.
Drug costs 20.
Drug pricing index 20-21.
Drugs, medical 20-21, 146.
Family/welfare benefits 106.
Grants, hospitals/health facilities 137-8.
Health care/services 29, 84-85, 120-2.
Health costs 144-6.
Health Council, Ontario 29.
Health hazards 48.
Health insurance 29.
Health Insurance Commission 29, 81-85,
105-15, 120-2.
Homes for special care 83, 137-8.
Hospital insurance 50.

Hospital schools, retarded 144.
Hospital Services Commission 82, 120.
Hospitals/hospital services 84, 141.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 141, 143-4.
Hospitals, shutdown 84.
Immunization/vaccines 105.
Insurance companies 82, 109.
Low-income groups 111-2.
Masseurs 146.
Medical Association, Ontario 144.
Medicare 144-6.
Mental health centres/clinics 141, 143-4.
Mental health/illness 138-9, 141, 143-4.
Nursing homes 50, 84, 120, 137-8.
Nursing homes, chain 137-8.
OHSIP 81-84, 105-15, 144-6.
OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 82-84,
105-6, 111-2.
Parcost programme 20-21.
Pharmaceutical Association, Canadian
20-21.
Review boards, nursing home 137.
Service clubs 139.
Social insurance numbers 52, 120-1.
Wages/salaries 85.
Williston report 138-9.
Workers, hospital/health 109.

Lawrence, Hon. Allan P. (P.C., St George)

Appeals 15, 331
Bay State Developments Limited 342.
Cabinet committees/boards 332.
Canadian Driver Pool Limited 49-50,
102-3.
Canadian Specialized Services 49-50,
102-3.
Cemeteries 342.
Collins, Judge George 97.
Conferences, interprovincial 166.
Constitution 356-7.
Court reporters 340-1.
Courts, appeal 332.
Courts, county/district 55-56.
Courts, juvenile/family 166-7, 340-1.
Courts, supreme/high 55-56.
Courts, surrogate 55-56.
Crown attorneys 167.
Crown land 347.
Disclosure, public/financial 347.
Discrimination 97.
Dow Chemical Company 102.
Elections/by-elections 22-23, 341.
Expropriation 341-2.

Federal-provincial affairs 356.
Fines/penalties 23.
Grange, Rick 49-50, 102-3.
Hicksite Friends 342.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 166-7.
Indian people 97, 340-1.
Inquiries, public 341-2.
Judges 91, 355-8.
Judges, appeal court 357.
Judges Association, County Court 357.
Judges, juvenile/family court 340-1.
Judges, provincial/county/district 23,
55-56, 97, 355.
Judges, supreme/high court 55-56, 355, 357.
Judges, surrogate court 55-56.
Jury fees 91.
Justice, administration of 55-56, 91, 97,
355-8.
Kingston penitentiary trials 15-16, 331.
Land acquisition/assembly 342.
Law Reform Commission 91.

Offenders, young 166.
Police, provincial 22-23, 341.
Prisoners 15-16.
Psychiatrists/psychiatric services 166-7.
Security guards 49-50, 102-3.

Strikebreakers/strikebreaking 49-50, 102-3.
Translators/interpreters 340-1.
Wages/salaries 55-56, 355-8.
Whiterock Land Development 332.

Lewis, Stephen (N.D.P., Scarborough West)

Beach properties/shorelines 24.
Bilingual/bicultural 93, 95.
Bottles, returnable/non-returnable 46.
Cabinet committees/boards 382-4.
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation 334.
Canadian Driver Pool Limited 49-50,
102-3.
Canadian Specialized Services 49-50,
102-3.
Charitable institutions 287.
Children, retarded 141-2.
Children's aid societies 287.
Children's boarding homes 287, 289.
Collective bargaining 96.
Collins, Judge George 97.
Committee on corporation law, select 412.
Committee on election laws, select 344,
412-3.
Committee on estimates, standing 382.
Committee on foreign investment 19.
Committee on government productivity
382-4.
Committee on youth, select 276.
Committees, select, re 383.
Conservation 24.
Conservation areas 169-71, 193-5.
Co-operatives 287.
Correctional institutions 154.
Courts, juvenile/family 166.
Day-care centres 47, 141, 283, 286-7.
Denturists/dentures 47.
Detention centres, juvenile 154.
Discrimination 97.
Drivers, taxi 96.
Ecologists/ecology 24.
Employment, seasonal 392-3.
Employment standards branch 333-4.
Environmental control 45-46.
Family/welfare benefits 275-7.
Films 97.
French Canadians 95.
Grange, Rick 49-50, 102-3.
Grants, home improvement 390, 392.
Grants, welfare 286-9.
Guardian Insurance Company 332-3.
Haggart, Ron case 56.
Homes for special care 138.
Hospital schools, retarded 141-2.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 166.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 334.
Housing shortage 275-7.
Human rights code 56.

Hydro Electric Power Commission 167-8.
Income supplement 275-7.
Indian bands 286.
Indian people 97.
Industries, relocation of 167.
Industries, shutdown 96-97.
Insurance companies 332-3.
Insurance, motor vehicle 48.
Insurance, superintendent of 48, 333.
Investment, foreign 19.
Judges, provincial/county/district 97.
Land acquisition/assembly 169-71, 193-5.
Land banks 169-71, 193-5, 390.
Land, recreational 169-71, 193-5.
Law Society of Upper Canada 332-3.
Lawyers 332-3.
Legislative procedures 343-6.
Loans, home improvement 394.
Loans to industries 168.
Local initiatives programme 18, 392-3.
Low-income groups 289.
Members'/ministers' facilities 382-3.
Mental health centres/clinics 141-2.
Mental health/illness 286.
Metro Centre plan 18-19, 334.
Mines, abandoned/shutdown 269.
Municipal Board, Ontario 334.
Municipal work on private property
392-3.
Natural resources/management 24.
News media/periodicals 96-97.
Nursing homes 137.
Nursing homes, chain 137-8.
Offenders, young 154.
OHSIP 145.
Ontario Place 97.
Parents' groups 287.
Pits/quarries 47.
Pollution control 167.
Pollution, industrial 167.
Psychiatrists/psychiatric services 166.
Refineries, metal 269.
Rent/rent control 275-7.
Retarded, associations for 287.
Retraining 168.
Sand/gravel 24.
Security guards 49-50, 102-3.
Strikebreakers/strikebreaking 49-50,
102-3.
Symons, T. 93, 95.

LEWIS, S.—*Continued*

- Tax rebates 266.
- Telegram Publishing Company 96-97.
- Training centres/schools (correctional) 154.
- Tree removal/replacement 393.
- Unemployment/layoffs 167-8.
- Union Carbide Canada Limited 167.
- Universities, de-Canadianization 95-96.
- University faculties/faculty members 95-96.
- University presidents/committee 93, 95.
- University students/graduates 95-96.
- University, Toronto 283.
- Vacations/holidays with pay 96-97.
- Wages/salaries 96-97.
- Water Resources Commission 334.
- Welfare recipients 275-7, 289.
- Winter/seasonal works 392-3.
- Workers, newspaper 96-97.
- Workers, relocation of 168.

MacDonald, Donald C. (N.D.P., York South)

- Cabinet committees/boards 358-63.
- Churches/religious groups 290.
- Clinics 76.
- Clinics, dental 48.
- College of Dental Surgeons 47.
- Committee on government productivity 360-3.
- Committee on government reorganization, select 359.
- Committee on public accounts, standing 360, 363.
- Co-operatives 290.
- Correctional institutions 150.
- Day-care centres 286, 289-90.
- Denturists/dentures 47-48.
- Drugs, medical 75-76.
- Employment, seasonal 18, 290-1.
- Federal-provincial agreements 291.
- Gordon commission/report 359.
- Grants, welfare 290-1.
- Health care/services 75.
- Health costs 75-76.
- Health hazards 48.
- Health Insurance Commission 75-76.
- Health units 76.
- Hospital Services Commission 75.
- Hospitals/hospital services 75.
- Hydro Electric Power Commission 168.
- Hydro rates 168.
- Indian bands 286.
- Industries, relocation of 168.
- Krueger report 362.
- Local initiatives programme 18.
- Mental health/illness 76.
- Nursing homes 75.
- Offenders 150.
- Pollution control 168.
- Psychiatrists/psychiatric services 76.
- Purchasing, central 360.
- Report, committee on government productivity 360-3.
- Retarded, associations for 286.
- Schindeler, Professor F. 360.
- Union Carbide Canada Limited 168.
- Winter/seasonal works 150, 290-1.

MacNaughton, Hon. Charles (P.C., Huron)

- Air carriers, regional 225-6.
- Air services/aviation 225-6.
- Aircraft 225-6.
- Automotive Transport Association 228.
- Brush clearing 220.
- Cabinet committees/boards 222.
- Committee on transportation, technical 223.
- Construction, roads/highways 220, 223.
- Contractors 223-4.
- Contracts, highway 223-4.
- Employment, seasonal 220.
- Expressways/freeways 205-12, 220-9.
- Ferries 220.
- Fuller, Buckminster plan 221.
- GO-transit service 171.
- Grants, transportation 205-12, 219-30.
- Highways 220, 223.
- Metro Centre plan 163-4.
- Municipal Board, Ontario 222.
- Municipal councils 221.
- Northern Ontario affairs 21-22, 220, 229.
- Planning, highway 224.
- Provincial-municipal affairs 221.
- Report, Metro Centre plan 174.
- Safety Council, Canada 22.
- Safety, highway 22, 220.
- Safety, motor vehicle 21-22.
- Subsidies, air transport 226.
- Subsidies, municipal 205-12, 219-30.
- Subsidies, road 221.

Subways 220, 222.
Tires 21-22.
Toronto Transit Commission 223.
Transportation 171, 173-4, 205-12, 219-30.
Transportation planning/studies 20.

Transportation systems, municipal 205-12, 219-30.
Tree removal/replacement 220.
Truckers/trucking industry 228.
White River Air Services 225-6.

Martel, Elie W. (N.D.P., Sudbury East)

Accidents, motor vehicle 226-7.
Air carriers, regional 226.
Air services/aviation 226.
Apprentices/apprenticeship 181.
Buildings, Ontario government 259-60.
Bypasses 226-7.
Children, retarded 143.
Churches/religious groups 285-6.
Construction, hospital 148.
Construction, roads/highways 226-7.
Co-operatives 285-6.
Day-care centres 265, 285-6.
Doctors 148.
Doctors' fees 147.
Employment 265-6, 268.
Employment, seasonal 199, 265.
Family/welfare benefits 268-71, 277-8.
Grants, welfare 285-6, 291.
Handicapped/disabled persons 268.
Hospital boards/councils 147.
Hospital Services Commission 148.
Hospitals/hospital services 147-8.
Housing shortage 266, 270.
Income supplement 269-70, 277-8.
Legal aid/clinics 272-3.
Mental health centres/clinics 143.
Mines/mining 265-6.
Northern Ontario affairs 226-7, 291.
Nursing homes 148.
OHSIP 147.
Parks, provincial 199.

Pension Plan, Canada 324.
Planning, economic 265.
Police, provincial 226-7.
Pollution, air 25-26.
Pollution index/monitoring 25-26.
Pollution, industrial 25-26.
Public works 259-60.
Rent/rent control 269-71, 277-8.
Retraining 265.
Roads to recreation 199.
Schools, private 285.
Social/family services 265-6, 268.
Students/graduates, secondary school 181.
Subsidies, air transport 226.
Task force, industrial training 181.
Tax, mining/revenue 266.
Tax rebates 266.
Teachers 323-4.
Teachers' superannuation fund/commission 323-4.
Transportation 199, 226-7.
Trust/loan companies 267.
Unemployables 268.
Unemployed 265-6.
Unemployment/layoffs 268-70.
Unions 147.
Vocational trades/training 181.
Welfare administrators/agencies 277.
Welfare, municipal 269-71, 277-8.
Welfare programmes 265-6, 268.
Welfare recipients 268-72.
White River Air Services 226.
Winter/seasonal works 265.
Wives, deserted 267, 272.
Wives, common-law 324.

McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy (P.C., Chatham-Kent)

Aged/senior citizens 8, 11.
Assessment/reassessment 337.
Businesses, small 14.
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation 10.
Civil servants 170.
Committee on government productivity 14, 169-71.
Committee, provincial-municipal liaison 9.
Compensation, farmers 337.
Conservation areas 170-1.

Conservation authorities 9.
Construction, housing 10.
Day-care centres 10.
Deficit, budgetary 8, 14.
Design for Development: Toronto-centred region 337.
Dollar value/revaluation 8.
Employers 11.
Employment 10, 174.
Employment loans programme 10, 17.
Employment, seasonal 7, 9.
Employment, youth 9.

McKEOUGH, HON. W.—*Continued*

Estimates, supplementary, re 6.
Expansion, economic 7.
Expenditures, provincial 14.

Family/welfare benefits 8.
Farms, family 14.
Federal-provincial agreements 13.
Federal-provincial co-operation 7, 10, 17,
174.

Grants, employment support, federal 12,
17.
Grants, municipal 9-10.
Grants, regional 8.
Grants, winter/seasonal works 9-10.

Health insurance 8, 10-11.
Housing Corporation, Ontario 10.

Incentives to farmers 337.
Incentives, municipal employment 9.

Land banks 169-71.
Land use 337.
Land values 337.
Loans to municipalities/school boards 174.
Local initiatives programme 9, 17.
Low-income groups 11.

Manufacturers/manufacturing 12.
Municipal councils 9.

Provincial-municipal co-operation 6, 10.
Public Service Superannuation Fund 30.

Revenues, provincial 14.

School boards 9.
Subways 8.
Succession duties/estate tax 10-12.
Surtax, federal 8.
Surtax, U.S. 11-12.

Tax, capital gains 12.
Tax, corporation 10, 12.
Tax credits 7.
Tax exemptions 313.
Tax, gifts 13-14, 311, 313.
Tax, income 11.
Tax, income, provincial 10-11.
Tax, production machinery 7.
Taxes, provincial 6, 10-13.

Unemployment insurance/commission 170.
Unemployment/layoffs 6, 8, 170.
Unemployment, seasonal 7, 9.

Vocational/trades training 10.

White paper on taxation, provincial 12.
Widows, widowers 13.
Winter/seasonal works 9-10, 174.
Workers 11.

Newman, Bernard (L., Windsor-Walkerville)

Aged/senior citizens 114.

Chambers of commerce 98.
Children, handicapped 139.
Children's centres, crippled 139.
Conservation authorities 158-9.

Drainage 159.

Employment 158-9.
Ethnic groups 114.

Health care/services 71, 114.
Health costs 71.
Health Insurance Commission 71, 110-2,
114.

Hospitals/hospital services 71.
Hours of business 98.

Low-income groups 71.

Medicare 71.

OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 71,
110-2, 114.

Service clubs 139.

Unemployed 159.
Unions 98.

Welfare, municipal 159.
Winter/seasonal works 158-9.

Newman, William (P.C., Ontario South)

Airports 43.
Federal-provincial affairs 43.

Legislative procedures 173.

Nixon, Robert F. (L., Brant)

Advertising/publicity 44-45, 98, 255.
Aged/senior citizens 60-61.
Airports 42-43.
Assessment/reassessment 320.

Beach properties/shorelines 23-24.

Cabinet committees/boards 332, 363-9.
Central Mortgage and Housing
Corporation 91.

Civil service 364.
Commission on French secondary education
93.
Committee on government productivity
44-45, 98, 365.
Committee on Prince Edward dunes 24.
Conferences, federal-provincial 58, 302,
368.
Conservation 23-24.

Construction, hospital 61.
 Corporations 294.
 Courts, appeal 331-2.
 Credit companies/bureaus 16.
 Cultural organizations 177.
 Decentralization of government 255.
 Dentists/dental services 166.
 Denturists/dentures 166.
 Design for Development: Toronto-centred region 368.
 Doctors 57, 59-60, 62, 144-5.
 Doctors' fees 144-5.
 Ecologists/ecology 23-24.
 Employment loans programme 17.
 Employment, seasonal 236.
 Estimates, supplementary, re 27, 124.
 Ethnic groups 177.
 Farming 124.
 Federal-provincial affairs 42-43, 301-3, 368.
 Federal-provincial agreements 17, 302.
 Federal-provincial co-operation 17, 57, 237.
 French language 93.
 Glassco commission/report 365.
 Gordon commission/report 364, 368.
 Grants, hospitals/health facilities 57.
 Grants, regional/district municipalities 236.
 Hall commission (health) 62.
 Health care/services 56-62.
 Health insurance 62.
 Health Insurance Commission 56-62, 105.
 Health Insurance Registration Board 59, 105.
 Hospital Services Commission 56-62, 105, 255.
 Hospitals/hospital services 57.
 Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 57, 61.
 Housing shortage 91.
 Incentives, municipal employment 236.
 Indian bands 165.
 Indian education/students 165.
 Indian schools 165.
 Industries, foreign control/takeover 16.
 Insurance companies 62.
 Judges 91.
 Jury fees 91.
 Justice, administration of 367.
 Kingston penitentiary trials 15, 331.
 Krueger report 364.
 Lease-back programme 255, 258.
 Leasing 255, 258.
 Legal aid/clinics 331.
 Legislative procedures 343-4.
 Local initiatives programme 17-18, 237.
 Lotteries 42.
 Malvern development 91.
 Medical Association, Ontario 60.
 Medical schools 61.
 Medicare 58-61.
 Municipal/regional services 236.
 Municipal work on private property 237.
 Natural resources/management 23-24, 366.
 OHSIP 56-62, 105, 144-5, 255.
 OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 59.
 OMSIP 58-59.
 Ontario office, Washington 44.
 Pensions, vesting 30.
 Planning government programmes 365-9.
 Plea bargaining 331.
 Pollution, mercury 165-6.
 Prisoners 15.
 Public works 255, 258.
 Publications, government 44-45, 98.
 Purchasing, central 364.
 Ratepayers' associations/groups 369.
 Sand/gravel 23-24.
 School boards 92, 320.
 Schools, private 91-92.
 Schools, secondary 91-92.
 Smith committee/report 313.
 Succession duties/estate tax 313-4.
 Supply management, agricultural 133.
 Symons, T. 93.
 Tax, corporation 294.
 Tax exemptions 313.
 Tax, gifts 313.
 Tax, income, provincial 301-4.
 Tax, sales 303.
 Tax, school 320.
 Teachers 30.
 Teachers, superannuated 321.
 Teachers' superannuation fund/commission 30, 320-1.
 Tendering 255, 368.
 Titles, property 331-2.
 Tourist operators/outfitters 165-6.
 Tree removal/replacement 237.
 University, McMaster 61.
 Wages/salaries 61, 237.
 Whiterock Land Development 332.
 Winter/seasonal works 236.
 Workers, hospital/health 61, 105.
 Workers, municipal/regional 236-7.

Paterson, Donald A. (L., Essex South)

Aged, homes for 50.
 Aged/senior citizens 50, 65, 113, 122-3.
 Agriculture department personnel 131.
 Appeals 105-6.
 Apprentices/apprenticeship 179-80, 188.
 Business, small 179-80.
 Children, retarded 139.

PATERSON, D.—*Continued*

Chiropractors/osteopaths 145.
Conservation authorities 155.

Dikes/diking 155, 157.

Employers 66-67, 179-80, 188.
Employment 179-80.
Employment, seasonal 230.
Erosion/erosion control 155, 157, 230.

Farm structures 131-2.
Farmers 131.
Farming, fruit/vegetable 131.
Farming, grain 101, 131-2.

Grants, farmers 131-2.

Health care/services 65, 105-6, 109-10,
122-3.
Health costs 65, 67, 145.
Health insurance 66-67, 110.
Health Insurance Commission 65-68, 105-6,
109-10, 113, 122-3.
Hospital insurance 50.
Hospital schools, retarded 139.
Hospitals/hospital services 65, 105-6.
Hotels/motels 139.

Insurance companies 66.

Low-income groups 65-67, 105, 109.

Marketing, grain 101, 131-2.
Medicare 65-66.

Nursing homes 50, 137.

OHSIP 105-6.
OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 66,
105-6, 109-10, 113, 122-3, 146.

Parks, national 230.
Port facilities 101.

Tax, income 66.
Tree removal/replacement 131, 230.

Unemployed 65-66, 230.
Unemployment insurance/commission 179-
80, 188.
Unemployment/layoffs 105.

Vocational trades/training 179-80, 188.

Winter/seasonal works 179-80.
Workers 66-67.
Workers, hospital school 139.
Workers, seasonal 179-80.

Reid, T. Patrick (L., Rainy River)

Committee on Prince Edward dunes 24.
Compensation, fishermen/allied industries
51.

Federal-provincial affairs 169.
Federal-provincial agreements 51.
Fish/fish management 338.

Health hazards 338.

Industries, relocation of 169.

Northern Ontario affairs 21-22.

Pollution, mercury 338.

Research, fish/fish management 338.
Roads/highways, northern 234.

Safety, motor vehicle 21-22.

Tires 21-22.

Reilly, Leonard M. (P.C., Eglinton)

Aged/senior citizens 119.

Health Insurance Commission 119.

OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 119.

Renwick, James A. (N.D.P., Riverdale)

Accountants' associations 300.
Aged/senior citizens 120.
Appeals 77-78, 107-9.
Apprentices/apprenticeship 184-5.
Cabinet committees/boards 378-80.
Carter commission/report 315.
Committee on government productivity
315, 379.
Committee on poverty, senate 314.
Compensation, farmers 337.
Corporations 295-6.
Courts, supreme/high 107.

Day-care centres 316.

Employment 295-6.

Employment, seasonal 392-4, 396.

Family/welfare benefits 184-5, 316.
Federal-provincial affairs 300-1.

Grants, employment support, federal
396-7.

Health care/services 78, 108-9.
Health insurance 77, 110.
Health Insurance Commission 77-78,
106-10, 119-20.
Home hospital care 108.

Incentives to home owners 392-3.

Judges 354-5.
Justice, administration of 379.

Landlord/tenant 101.
Legislative procedures 178.
Local initiatives programme 392-4, 396.
Low-income groups 300.

Manufacturers/manufacturing 295-6, 397.
McRuer commission/report 109.
Municipal work on private property
392-4, 396.

Nursing homes 108.

OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 77,
106-7, 110, 120.

Planning government programmes 379-80.
Project 500 316.

Rehabilitation/rehabilitative services 184.
Rent/rent control 101.
Report, committee on government
productivity 380.
Retraining 184.

Students/graduates, CAAT 184.
Succession duties/estate tax 314-7, 400,
403-4.

Tax, capital gains 300, 315.
Tax, corporation 295-6, 315, 396-8.
Tax credits 300-1.
Tax, gifts 316-7, 400, 403-4.
Tax, income 177.
Tax, income, provincial 300-1.
Tree removal/replacement 393.

Unemployed 184-5.
Unemployment insurance/commission 184.
Unemployment/layoffs 184-5.
University students/graduates 184.

Vocational trades/training 184-5.

Wages/salaries 354-5.
Welfare recipients 184-5.
Winter/seasonal works 393-4, 396.

Roy, Albert J. (L., Ottawa East)

Aged/senior citizens 119.

Construction, roads/highways 223.
Correctional institutions 152.

Detention centres, adult 152.

Federal-provincial affairs 353-4.
French language 200.

Health Insurance Commission 119.

Judges 353-4.
Judges, provincial/county/district 353-4.
Judges, supreme/high court 353-4.

Justice, administration of 353-4.

OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 119.

Planning, highway 224.

Rehabilitation/rehabilitative services 152.

Transportation 223-4.

Unemployment/layoffs 152.

Wages/salaries 353-4.
Winter/seasonal works 152, 200.
Workers, seasonal 200.

Ruston, Richard F. (L., Essex-Kent)

Farm structures 130.
Farmers 131.
Farming, grain 130.
Farming, poultry/poultry products 130-1.

Grants, farmers 130-1.

Inquiries, public 131.

Justice, administration of 260.

Leasing 260.

Marketing, grain 130.
Marketing, poultry/poultry products 99,
130-1.

Report, egg inquiry 99.

Sargent, Edward (L., Grey-Bruce)

Air carriers, regional 225.
Air services/aviation 225.
Aircraft 225.
Airports 43-44, 225.
Apprentices/apprenticeship 182-4.

Bankruptcies 52-53.
Bus passenger service 224-5.

Cabinet committees/boards 358-9, 407-9.
Central Mortgage and Housing
Corporation 183.

Committee on government productivity 74.
Consolidated Computer Limited 52-53.

Drainage 334-5.

Employers 183.
Employment 182-4, 188.

Farmers 334-5.
Federal-provincial affairs 43-44.

Grants, drainage 334-5.
Grants, home improvement 394-6.

SARGENT, E.—*Continued*

Health costs 75.
Health Insurance Commission 74-76.
Highways 224-5.
Hospital Services Commission 74.
Hospitals/hospital services 74-75.
Hospitals, shutdown 74-75.
Housing, modular 183, 188.
Housing shortage 183, 188.

Incentives to home owners 394-6.
Insurance companies 74.
Insurance costs/premiums 49.
Insurance, motor vehicle 49.

Licences/permits, alcoholic beverages 224.
Loans to industries 52-53.
Local initiatives programme 394-6.
Low-income groups 75.

Mayors and reeves/association 358-9.
Municipal associations 358.

Northern Ontario affairs 225.

OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 75.

Railway passenger service 224.
Roads to recreation 224-5.

State Farm Insurance 49.
Subsidies, air transport 225.

Transportation 224-5.

Unemployed 183.
Unemployment/layoffs 183.
Unemployment, youth 182-4, 186.
University students/graduates 182-3.

Vocational trades/training 182-4.

Wage, minimum 182-3, 186.
Wages/salaries 182-4.
Winter/seasonal works 394-6.
Workers, casual/temporary 182-4.
Workers, teen-age/student 182-4, 186.

Scrivener, Mrs. Margaret (P.C., St. David)

Alcoholic beverages 171.
Design for Development: Toronto-centred region 337.
GO-transit service 170-1.

Incentives to farmers 337-8.
Land use 337-8.
Transportation 170-1.

Shulman, Dr. Morton (N.D.P., High Park)

Accidents, motor vehicle 410-1.
Associated Medical Services 68.

Bottles, returnable/non-returnable 46.

Compensation, injured prisoners 410-1.
Conservation 103.
Construction industry 31-32.
Court reporters 341.
Courts, juvenile/family 166, 173, 341.
Courts, supreme/high 6.
Crown attorneys 166.

Doctors 69.
Doctors' fees 69, 104-5.
Drug costs 20.
Drug pricing index 20.
Drugs, medical 20.

Ecologists/ecology 411.
Election officers/poll clerks 5.
Elections/by-elections 4-6.

Health insurance 68.
Health Insurance Commission 68-70, 104.
Homes for special care 70.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 166, 411.

Immunization/vaccines 68, 104.
Indian people 173, 341.
Insurance agents 176.
Insurance companies 68-70, 104-5.
Insurance costs/premiums 49, 176.
Insurance, motor vehicle 49.

Judges, juvenile/family court 341.
Legislative procedures 342-5.
Mental health/illness 411.
Northern Ontario affairs 22.
Nursing homes 70.

Offenders 410-1.
Offenders, young 411.
OHSIP 68-69, 104.

Parcost programme 20.
Pharmaceutical Association, Canadian 20.
Planning, highway 411.
Pollution, noise 342.
Psychiatrists/psychiatric services 166.

Real estate/property values 31-32.
Rehabilitation/rehabilitative services 410-1.

Safety, motor vehicle 410-1.
Snowmobiles 103, 342.
Succession duties/estate tax 406.

Tires 22.
Training centres/schools (correctional) 411.
Translators/interpreters 173, 341.

Urban blight 31-32.

Wildlife harassment 103.
Wildlife/wildlife management 411.

Singer, Vernon M. (L., Downsview)

- Aged/senior citizens 79.
- Appeals 15.
- Appraisals, housing 336-7.
- Civil servants 172.
- Correctional institutions 153.
- Courts, appeal 332.
- Detention centres, adult 153.
- Divorces 351.
- Dow Chemical Company 102.
- Employment 209, 222.
- Environmental control 45-46.
- Expressways/freeways 172, 204-12, 222.
- Fuller, Buckminster plan 24-25, 172, 209, 211.
- Galligan, Justice 349-51.
- Grants, transportation 204-12, 222.
- Health care/services 121-2.
- Health Insurance Commission 78-79, 121-2.
- Housing, low-cost 336-7.
- Housing, public 336-7.
- Judges 78, 347-52.
- Judges, provincial/county/district 348-9, 351.
- Judges, supreme/high court 348-50.
- Justice, administration of 348-52.
- Kingston penitentiary trials 15.
- Land use 172.
- Land-use planning 25.
- Metro Centre plan 19, 210.
- Motor vehicles 209-12.
- Municipal Board, Ontario 209.
- Municipal councils 172, 210-1.
- Municipal planning/studies 172, 210.
- OHSIP/hospitalization premiums 79, 121-2.
- Planning boards/committees 172.
- Planning government programmes 24-25.
- Plea bargaining 16, 348.
- Real estate/property values 210.
- School boards 349.
- Subsidies, municipal 204-12, 222.
- Subways 222.
- Teachers' superannuation fund/commission 321.
- Transit, public/rapid 209, 211, 222.
- Transportation 204-12, 222.
- Transportation systems, municipal 209-11, 222.
- Wages/salaries 78, 347-52.
- Workers 209.

Smith, Gordon E. (P.C., Simcoe East)

- Health Insurance Commission 71.
- Hospital boards/councils 71.
- Hospitals/hospital services 71.

Smith, Richard S. (L., Nipissing)

- Autonomy, municipal/local 275.
- Beach properties/shorelines 203.
- Children, retarded 284.
- Commission on French secondary education 94.
- Day-care centres 285.
- Employment, seasonal 264-5.
- Family/welfare benefits 267, 274-5.
- French language 93-94.
- Grants, welfare 274-5.
- Handicapped/disabled persons 267, 285.
- Income supplement 274.
- Land acquisition/assembly 202-3.
- Northern Ontario affairs 203.
- Pensions, disability 267.
- Project 500 264-5.
- Retarded, associations for 284.
- School boards 93-94.
- Symons, T. 94.
- Welfare, municipal 267, 274-5.
- Welfare programmes 267, 274-5.
- Welfare, regional 274.
- Wives, deserted 267.

Spence, John P. (L., Kent)

- Beach properties/shorelines 204.
- Children, retarded 138-9.
- Employment, seasonal 262.
- Farm income/prices 129-30.
- Farming, grain 129.
- Farming, poultry/poultry products 129.
- Grants, farmers 129-30.

SPENCE, J.—*Continued*

Hospital schools, retarded 138.
Hospitals, psychiatric/mental 138.
Land acquisition/assembly 204.

Marketing, grain 129.
Parks, provincial 204.
Port facilities 101, 129-30.

Stewart, Hon. Wm. A. (P.C., Middlesex North)

Agriculture department personnel 135-6.
Committee on government productivity 335.
Conferences, interprovincial 132-3.
Courts, supreme/high 133.
Drainage 134-5, 335.
Estimates, supplementary, re 124-5.
Farm income/prices 134.
Farm machinery/equipment 125.
Farm ponds 134.
Farm structures 134-5.
Farmers 335.
Farming 124-5, 129, 132-6.
Farming, beef 132-3.
Farming, fruit/vegetable 134.
Farming, grain 101, 135.
Farming, poultry/poultry products 99, 132-4.
Farms, corporate 135.
Farms, family 135.

Grants, drainage 335.
Grants, farmers 124-5, 134-5.
Inquiries, public 134.
Interprovincial affairs 133.
Marketing boards, commodity 100, 133-4.
Marketing boards, national 132-3.
Marketing, grain 101, 135.
Marketing, livestock 132-3.
Marketing, poultry/poultry products 99-100, 132-3.
Port facilities 101.
Report, egg inquiry 99-100.
Ross, Judge 134.
Supply management, agricultural 132-4.
Tree removal/replacement 134-5.
Water/water services 134.

Stokes, Jack E. (N.D.P., Thunder Bay)

Advertising/publicity 279-80.
Algoma Steel Corporation Limited 232.
Beach properties/shorelines 203-4.
Cabinet committees/boards 375-6.
Collins, Judge George 97.
Committee on government productivity 376.
Committee, Northern Ontario Resources Transportation 198.
Communications/communication services 229.
Conferences, federal-provincial 130.
Conservation authorities 157.
Conservation officers/game wardens 198.
Contractors 198.
Discrimination 97.
Employment, seasonal 197-8.
Exploration/prospecting 231-3.
Exports 233.
Farm income/prices 130.
Farm structures 130.
Farmers 130.
Farming 130.
Farming, beef 130.
Fish/fish management 198.
Fish hatcheries/restocking 197-8.
Fishing, sport 197.
Forest management 197-8.
Foresters/Lands and Forests personnel 198.

Grants, farmers 130.
Grants, transportation 229.
Highway/road maintenance 198.
Indian friendship/youth centres 165.
Indian people 97.
Indian reservations 198.
Indians, Union of Ontario 165.
Insurance costs/premiums 49.
Insurance, motor vehicle 49.
Judges, provincial/county/district 97.
Justice, administration of 97.
Land acquisition/assembly 201, 203-4.
Land, recreational 203-4.
Liquor outlets, retail 260.
Loans to farmers 130.
Minerals/ores 231-3.
Mines/mining 231-3.
Mining companies 231-3.
Mining municipalities 233.
Natural resources/management 197-8, 229.
Northern Ontario affairs 157, 197-8, 201, 229, 231-2, 280, 375-6.
Parks, provincial 201, 203-4.
Project 500 279-80.
Recreation 197.
Research, mining 232.
Roads to resources 198, 232.

Smelters/smelting 232.
Snowmobiles 49.
Social workers 279-80.
Subsidies, municipal 229.
Transportation 198, 229.

Tree nurseries 198.
Welfare administrators/agencies 280.
Welfare programmes 279-80.
Wildlife/wildlife management 198.
Winter/seasonal works 197-8, 201, 279-80.

Timbrell, Dennis R. (P.C., Don Mills)

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation 174-5.
Community centres 174-5.
Construction 175.

Housing, public 174-5.
Municipal councils 175.

Welch, Hon. Robert (P.C., Lincoln)

Autonomy, academic 93.
Commission on French secondary education 93-95.
French language 93-95.
Land acquisition/assembly 324.
Pensions, vesting 30.
School boards 91-93, 100, 324.
Schools, French language 92.
Schools private 91-92, 324.
Schools, secondary 91-92.

Students/graduates, secondary school 92.
Symons, T. 93-95.
Teachers 29-30, 100.
Teachers, CAAT 324.
Teachers, secondary school 324-5.
Teachers' superannuation fund/commission 29-30, 320, 324-5.
University presidents/committee 93-95.
University, Trent 93-95.
Widows/widowers 30.
Wives, common-law 325.

Wells, Hon. Thomas L. (P.C., Scarborough North)

Advertising/publicity 280.
Advisory groups 268.
Aged, homes for 263, 265.
Appeals 264, 283.
Assistance Plan, Canada 288.
Autonomy, municipal/local 275.
Charitable institutions 263.
Children, retarded 30-31.
Churches/religious groups 286.
Civil rights 263-4.
Committee, medical advisory 263.
Co-operatives 286-8.
Credit counselling 267.
Day-care centres 30-31, 47, 263-4, 271, 274, 281-9, 291-4.
Employment, seasonal 264, 271, 279-80, 284-5.
Employment, youth 263, 265, 280.
Family service agencies 263, 267.
Family/welfare benefits 264, 266-8, 274-5, 277.
Federal-provincial agreements 292.
Grants, day-care centres 274, 283, 288.
Grants to Indian groups 30-31.
Grants, municipal 30-31.
Grants, welfare 284-94.
Handicapped/disabled persons 267-8, 285.
Incentives, municipal employment 288.

Income supplement 270, 275, 277.
Indian bands 286.
Indian reservations 264, 274, 281, 286.
Land acquisition/assembly 282.
Land costs 294.
Legal aid/clinics 272-3.
Local initiatives programme 274.
Low-income groups 288.
Mothers, working 288.
Northern Ontario affairs 291.
Pensions, disability 267.
Project 500 263, 279-80.
Rent/rent control 270, 274, 277.
Retarded, associations for 281, 283-6, 289, 292.
Retarded, homes for 283, 289.
Retarded persons 281, 286, 289, 292.
Social/family services 31, 263, 265-8.
Social planning councils, municipal 263.
Social service costs 265.
Social workers 263, 279-80.
Tendering 274.
Unemployables 268.
Unemployment/layoffs 267, 270-1, 281.
Unemployment, seasonal 271.
Unemployment, youth 263, 280.
University, Toronto 283.

WELLS, HON. T.—*Continued*

- Wages/salaries 279.
- Welfare administrators/agencies 279.
- Welfare, municipal 266, 274-5, 277, 288, 291-2.
- Welfare programmes 31, 264-8, 271, 274-5, 277, 280-3, 288.
- Welfare recipients 264-8, 270, 272-4, 277, 280, 288.
- Welfare, regional 275.
- Winter/seasonal works 31, 263-4, 274, 278-9, 281-4, 288, 291-2.
- Wives, deserted 266, 272-3.

White, Hon. John (P.C., London South)

- Universities, de-Canadianization 95-96.
- University faculties/faculty members 95-96.
- University graduate fellowship programme 96.
- University presidents/committee 96.
- University students/graduates 95-96.

Winkler, Hon. Eric A. (P.C., Grey South)

- Employment 296.
- Federal-provincial affairs 400-4.
- Federal-provincial agreements 304.
- Hansard 27.
- Industries 397.
- Legislative procedures 173, 178, 343.
- Publications, government 27.
- Succession duties/estate tax 305, 317-9, 400-7.
- Surtax, U.S. 296.
- Tax, capital gains 318.
- Tax, corporation 294, 296-7.
- Tax, gifts 318, 400-4.
- Tax, income 177.
- Tax, income, provincial 297, 304-5, 398-9.

Worton, Harry (L., Wellington South)

- Civil servants 150.
- Conservation authorities 157.
- Contractors 151.
- Correctional institutions 150-1.
- Correctional officers 150.
- Fines/penalties 23.
- Judges, provincial/county/district 23.
- Land acquisition/assembly 157.
- Prisoners 150.
- Recreation 157.
- Reservoirs, water 157.
- Winter/seasonal works 151.

Yaremko, Hon. John (P.C., Bellwoods)

- Indian associations 175.
- Indian bands 165.
- Indian culture/history 175.
- Indian education/students 165, 175.
- Indian schools 165, 175.
- Tapes, cassettes 175.

Young, Fred (N.D.P., Yorkview)

- Beach properties/shorelines 23.
- Conservation 23.
- Ecologists/ecology 24.
- Insurance costs/premiums 48-49.
- Insurance, motor vehicle 48-49.
- Motor vehicle repairs 48-49.
- Natural resources/management 23.
- Sand/gravel 23.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCÉDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

