



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, February 24, 1969—Thursday, April 3, 1969

RODERICK LEWIS, Q.C., Clerk of the House



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION.

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, February 24, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Monday, February 24, 1969

Fifth report, standing orders and printing committee	1459
First report, select committee on election law	1459
Borough of East York, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, first reading	1459
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, Mr. J. Renwick, first reading	1459
County of Welland, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, first reading	1460
Town of Whitby, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, first reading	1460
University of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. Peacock, first reading	1460
City of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	1460
Maimonides schools for Jewish studies, bill respecting, Mr. Singer, first reading	1460
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading	1460
Town of Mississauga, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, first reading	1460
Hydro dispute, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon	1461
Kelvinator Canada Ltd., questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Nixon	1461
Talks with Hon. Paul Hellyer on housing, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Nixon	1462
Cyanamid of Canada Ltd., questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. MacDonald	1462
Motor vehicle licences, question to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Singer	1463
Barbecued meats and poultry inspection, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Gaunt	1464
Optometric services, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Gaunt	1464
Gas fuel heaters, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Shulman	1466
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Young, Mr. B. Newman	1466
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Gaunt, agreed to	1483
On notice of motion No. 22, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Carruthers, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Carton	1483
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	1493

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from Applewood Heights Secondary School, Cooksville, and St. Jerome Separate School in Downsview; and in the west gallery from Glenview Public School in Toronto.

I would remind our visitors that any applause from the galleries is not in order. The members are glad to see you and they welcome you, and we are sure you are glad to be here or you would not be here.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Henderson, from the standing orders and printing committee, presented the committee's fifth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the corporation of the borough of East York praying that an Act may pass fixing a standard of fitness to which all non residential property shall conform; and for other purposes.

Of Harry J. Botnick, Abraham Bleeman, Yaakov S. Weinberg, Sandor Hofstedter, Wilferd Gordon, Mark A. Levy, Alex Rubin, Gedalyah Felder, Nachum L. Rabinovitch and Nota Schiller praying that an Act may pass incorporating Maimonides Schools for Jewish Studies having university powers.

Of the Corporation of the town of Whitby praying that an Act may pass permitting it to require applicants desiring the use of town streets for cable television purposes to enter into agreements with the town for the use thereof.

Of the corporation of the city of Peterborough praying that an Act may pass authorizing the corporation to enter into agreements with Border Transit Limited with respect to the operation of a bus line within the limits of the corporation.

Of the corporation of the county of Welland praying that an Act may pass permitting it to amend the agreement authorized by Chapter 182 of the Statutes of Ontario, 17 Elizabeth II, 1968.

Of the corporation of the city of Windsor praying that an Act may pass permitting the council to charge the cost of municipal drainage work against all the rateable property in the municipality; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Mississauga praying that an Act may pass permitting it to provide public transportation by agreement without the necessity of a referendum.

Of the corporation of the University of Windsor praying that an Act may pass modifying the composition and numbers of the board of governors and senate; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing a bylaw controlling the occupancy of all types of buildings; and for other purposes.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Select Committee on Election Law.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the borough of East York.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) in the absence of Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF WELLAND

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF WHITBY

Mr. Meen in the absence of Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Whitby.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the University of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MAIMONIDES SCHOOLS FOR JEWISH STUDIES

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting Maimonides schools for Jewish studies.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF MISSISSAUGA

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Mississauga.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I would like to advise the hon. members that the opening prayers today are the result of

assistance from leading clergy of several denominations and the work of the House committee. In succeeding days I shall endeavour to use certain others which have been drafted. Then I would like to have the consensus of the House as to the most appropriate form, so that it may be adopted. Everyone will have the opportunity of making his or her own decision with respect to this important part of our ceremony in the House each day.

The other day I undertook, at the request of the member for Humber (Mr. Ben), to look into the matter of questions placed on the notice paper directed to private members. The relevant part of rule 37(a) reads:

Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members relating to any bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House with which such member may be concerned.

It is, therefore, my view that such questions can be asked of private members, subject to the Speaker's ruling in each case as to whether or not it pertains to a public matter connected with the business of the House, in which the member is concerned.

With respect to private notice questions asked orally before the orders of the day, it was my understanding last session that the custom of the House is that such questions must be directed only to the ministry.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to rise on a point of privilege.

I have, on my desk today, two notices of committee meetings tomorrow; the resources and tourism committee at 10.30 o'clock and the committee on education and university affairs tomorrow at 10.45 o'clock.

Now we on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have repeatedly asked that these committees be co-ordinated, so that no two committees, as far as is possible, come on the same day at the same time.

As I am a member of both committees, interested in both subjects, I find it physically impossible to be in two places at once. I would ask that the government take some action to make sure that these committee hearings are held on different days, staggered somehow, so that members are able to attend the committees of which they are members.

Mr. Speaker: The point raised by the hon. member is a sound one and it has been raised on many occasions. I am sure the Clerk of

the Assembly and the party whips, who I believe are responsible for assisting and advising as to this, will endeavour to see if something cannot be done. I realize the situation and I think every member does; and yet there is so much to do and so little time, it seems, to do it.

I will be most pleased to endeavour to see that it is followed up.

The hon. leader of the Opposition.

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

Can the Minister report to the House on the progress of negotiations with the Canadian Union of Public Employees, CLC, Ontario Hydro Employees' Union, Local 1000?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question. The department has been providing mediation services to the parties to help them find common ground and hopefully, to settle the dispute. Meetings were held throughout last week and have been adjourned until Wednesday.

Meanwhile, the parties themselves are reviewing their positions in the light of the discussions of last week.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary question.

I might ask the Minister if he is aware that both parties have contacted their members over the last few days and the reason for my question was really to elucidate the role played by the government's mediation services.

We are to understand, then, that on Wednesday of this week, the parties will come together again. Is it the responsibility of the department, through its conciliation staff, to offer terms of a proposed settlement or simply to listen to both sides?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the meetings take a variety of forms. I think for the moment I would prefer to leave it at that.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Development how many jobs will be available in London for employees of Kelvinator when the plant closes down? What companies will be providing the work and will salaries for the new positions be competitive?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I might say to the hon. member that officers of my department have been constantly in contact with the Canadian Manpower Centre in London.

They have been advised that ample employment opportunities will be available to the employees of Kelvinator Canada Limited.

It is not possible to estimate the exact number of jobs which will be available but the industrial growth that is taking place in the London area should present more than enough work opportunities. I might say I was talking to one of my former employees and he said that his company had already hired some of the Kelvinator employees to work in its appliance plant.

On parts two and three of the question: We are unable to divulge the names, and, consequently, the wage rates of the companies which will be providing the work, but continuous contact is being maintained with the Canada Manpower Centre.

I would also say that the manpower consultive service, a branch of the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration, have made a proposal to the company and the union that a joint manpower planning committee be established, under the auspices of the manpower consultive service, to develop an orderly plan for the adjustment of the employees. So far the union has expressed willingness to participate in such a programme, but the company has not as yet given its answer.

Mr. Nixon: May I ask the Minister a supplementary question—if, in fact, he is in a position to guarantee that a like number of jobs of similar technology requirements would be made available?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am in no position to guarantee anything. It is a free society; these people can go to work in London or anywhere else.

I think I said the other day that some of these people have gone to work in another plant. The office employees are going to be maintained under a distributor set up and the Ford Motor Company of Canada, whom I contacted myself, are going to go from 1,500 to 2,700 employees around the first of May. I thought that many of these people, being UAW employees, would go to work with the Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited when that new shift begins in Talbotville.

Mr. Nixon: We have every reason to expect that there will be plenty of buoyancy as far as the job situation is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would think so—from what we see now.

Mr. Nixon: Right!

I would like to further ask the Minister of Trade and Development if he will report to the House the progress of his talks with Transport Minister Paul Hellyer over the weekend, on the subject of housing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, it is a little early to give a progress report. The Minister went back to Ottawa with a number of recommendations that I think all the Ministers attending the conference gave to him.

As I understand it, the Minister's parting remarks were that he would take these back and talk to his staff—talk to his colleagues—and see if some of these amendments could be implemented in this session of the Legislature. We agreed, as I said earlier, with many of the recommendations: I think there were 44 points. We had gone over all 44—many we agreed with; many we have recommended over the last two years. It was not new to us that the task force would make these recommendations, so we concurred with him without too much difficulty. If there was any difficulty at all, it was possibly in the holdup at the present time of public housing projects that have been up in the Minister's office since about December 19. We suggested to the Minister, with the building season upon us, that we would like to see those projects approved and down here so we can get under way.

Now I think if members reads the report they will see that somebody says public housing units should not be any more than 100 here or 100 there. Well, I think if you are going to have dispersal of public housing units in a city like Toronto, it will be a long time before we house our people. So, perhaps one of the interesting parts of the discussion was how big is large. What may be large in British Columbia or large in Kingston would not be large in the city of Toronto. So this is, I would think, the major issue at the present time, as far as the province of Ontario is concerned, is how quickly those projects that are now in Ottawa can be put through so we can get on with the job and carry on with our programme of building the units that we have scheduled for this year. Already we figure we have lost 60 days of very valuable time. I offered to go to Ottawa this morning and pick up the projects and the money at 8 o'clock. Mr. Hellyer said he would not be there at 8 o'clock; I said, "How about 8.30?" He said he would not be there at 8.30. "Well," I said, "You name the hour and I will be there."

However, all joking aside, I think Mr. Hellyer is going to expedite those projects and we should have them down here very shortly.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question, and I should say before I put the question that I saw the Minister of Trade and Development on television making this very point. As a matter of fact, I thought he made it considerably more harshly on television than he did in the Legislature, that there seemed to be some delay in approval, but the thing that surprised me—and that I would like to put to the Minister—is why he did not raise the delay in having a standard building code for this province. Surely this is a matter of some concern over which the Minister has some specific responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think the committee on standard building codes has already been set up by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: That was the one set up a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well it was set up here in the last six months or so, if I recall it. They already were working on that, but I do not think that is the problem. We are not having as much difficulty there, as we are getting sufficient funds through to complete the projects we already have on hand. I think that the building codes certainly need to be changed, but they are not the major problem. As far as I can see the major problem is perhaps the shortage of NHA money and, secondly, the length of time it takes to get these projects approved up in Ottawa after we put them through here, and I believe they are going to expedite those, as I said earlier, after discussion with the Minister on Saturday.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for York South has a question and then the hon. member for Downsview will have the floor.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour, in two parts.

1. With 25 licensed stationary engineers on strike since January 6, 1969, at the Welland plant of Cyanamid of Canada Ltd., with no qualified person to replace them, can the Minister assure the House that this

plant is operating in conformity with the regulations of The Operating Engineers Act?

2. In the Beachville plant of Cyanamid of Canada Limited, how many accidents have been reported to the workmen's compensation board since December 9, 1968? How many workmen have been retained on payroll following an accident, without reporting to the workmen's compensation board?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member for York South, it will be necessary to have an inspection made of the plant in order that I may answer the first part of the question. As soon as I receive the latest report, I will answer that portion of it.

In reference to the second part of the question concerning the Beachville plant, I am advised that 12 accidents have been reported to the workmen's compensation board since December 9, 1968. Five involved lost time and seven medical aid only. Both employers and employees are required to report all accidents under the Act to the workmen's compensation board, and hence I can only assume that this has been done. I have no knowledge of any accidents that have not been reported.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, I asked a question in connection with Cyanamid last week and I have had no reply. Is that still under study?

Hon. Mr. Bales: In that case, I will see that the report is given to the member as soon as I receive it.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has two questions.

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

1. How many complaints has his department received to date, concerning the refusal of landlords to pay to tenants the rebates provided by the provisions of The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968?

2. What has been the disposition of these complaints?

3. How many of these complaints have not yet been processed?

4. How soon is it anticipated that the balance of these complaints will be dealt with?

5. (a) Have any justices of the peace in Metropolitan Toronto or anywhere else in the province of Ontario been instructed not to accept information concerning offences alleged to have taken place under the pro-

visions of this Act unless the acceptance of such information is first approved by your department?

(b) If so, on what authority?

(c) If not, why should a Mr. Stephens of the Minister's department have so advised an inquiring solicitor on February 20, 1969?

6. (a) Is it correct that no charges can be laid alleging breaches of this Act after June 30, 1969?

(b) If so, on what basis?

(c) If not, why should a Mr. Stephens of the Minister's department have so advised an inquiring solicitor on February 20, 1969?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is a rather long involved question and I would request that it be transferred to the order paper.

Mr. Singer: Shame! I have a second question, Mr. Speaker. I am a little surprised the Minister is not on top of his department, but that is his privilege if he wants to avoid the answers to these things.

The second question is to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that the Minister's officials have stated that there are presently about one million citizens of Ontario who have not, as yet, obtained their 1969 motor vehicle registrations and, in view of the fact that after February 28, 1969 it will be an offence to drive a motor vehicle in Ontario without such registration, can the Minister advise whether instructions have been given to motor vehicle licence issuers throughout the province that they should remain open in the evenings during the week of February 23 to 28 in order to make it easier for our citizens to comply with these laws?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, our issuers have been given no special direction respecting extra night hours this week.

This hon. member's question is timely since it gives me the opportunity to repeat what I said in this House on February 17, namely that motorists are given three full months in which to obtain their new plates.

With five days to go, our latest count shows that 1,470,800 sets of the new 1969 plates have been issued as against 1,430,400 at the same time last year. There is no evidence that our facilities are inadequate to handle the remaining issue.

Mr. Singer: The Minister does not want to help the people?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We are doing a good job, a good job!

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Motorists do not have to wait till the last minute.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce has a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A question of the Minister of Health. Would the Minister inform the House as to what steps are being taken to ensure that proper inspection is given store handled barbecued meats and poultry, in view of the article in this morning's *Globe and Mail*?

I have a second question of the Minister; of you want me to put it at this point, Mr. Speaker, I will do so.

What was the cost of optometric services for the first six months, July 1968, to December 31, 1968 in Ontario; and second, did the first few months show heaviest utilization?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's first question:

Regulations to The Public Health Act lay down the procedures we follow for the safe storage and handling of such foods. The enforcement of the food premises regulation is the responsibility of the local board of health, medical officer of health and his inspectors.

This is the normal machinery for the inspection of all food cases. It is up to them to have carried out the regular inspection of places where such meat, poultry, and so on, are sold, to ensure that the regulations are being followed.

Considerable educational material concerning the handling of these meats has been presented to public health officials in this province in various public health journals.

In answer to the hon. member's second question: Cash payment by OMSIP for optometric services for the period July 1, 1968 to January 31, 1969, was \$490,972. There was a steady increase until November and a very slight decrease since then.

The answer to the second part of his question is, "no"; there was no unusually heavy utilization.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, before I ask my questions, I have a matter of privilege which I wish to raise before the orders of the day.

One of the privileges of the members of this House is to introduce public bills and we have the privilege of attempting to persuade the members of this House that our bills are in the public interest. Presumably if we do persuade those members we will have them passed, into law. If, on the other hand, we are unable to persuade the members, they will, of course, be rejected.

There are certain written rules governing the method by which such bills may be brought to a vote. The written rules in this House, sir, may be abrogated only by consent. In an earlier Legislature, it is my understanding that there was a so-called agreement which removed the system which many members complained of at that time, by which the government could call bills brought in by Opposition members at their convenience. This proved very inconvenient for many of the Opposition members who happened to be absent on the day the bills were called, by a strange coincidence.

An agreement was worked out at that time whereby regular hours were set for private members to bring in public bills and at that time the two Opposition leaders—and may I express again this was not in this Legislature—were forced to agree that they would not request a vote at that time. Let me say this was not an agreement as such. I have had an opportunity to speak to one of those leaders and he said this was literally a "take it or leave it" matter.

Now, sir, in any case this was in a previous Legislature and I certainly know that a large number of the members on this side of the House do not agree to this earlier so-called agreement.

In addition to this matter, sir, this House, in addition to written rules, works on a matter of precedent and I have had an opportunity in the last few days to go back over the precedents and I found the last precedent involved the member for St. Andrew, not the present member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman), but his predecessor, who at a certain point in the proceedings was bringing up matters which were not palatable to the Conservative majority.

A Conservative member at that time rose and moved that the question be put. This is the last precedent I have. The Speaker at the time accepted that motion, in effect silencing the Opposition and taking the vote. I think it is rather inappropriate, sir, that we do not follow precedents.

May I also say that the Speaker should only intervene in a case like that to protect the minority and in this case—this was an earlier

Speaker some years ago—he acted in effect to suppress the minority. We have a more recent incident where all members were agreed, there was no question of suppressing the minority, and the Speaker of the day followed a quite different rule.

I would like also to point out, sir that in our neighbouring province of Manitoba, which has a Conservative government, there is ample time given to Opposition members to bring in public bills. These bills are brought to a vote and if the government does not wish to carry the bill they have a majority and they vote the bill down. But they do not attempt to oppress the minority by refusing them the right to follow the rules of democracy.

Now, sir, I am not appealing the ruling of last Friday, I am quite content to let that go by, nor I am debating it. I bring this matter up, sir, because it will come before this House on a number of occasions in the future. Certainly I have been working on a lot of public bills, many of which I feel are not only for the benefit of a limited group of this province but of benefit to everyone. I think, therefore, that these bills could be agreed to by members on all sides of this House.

Many of these bills are of a completely non-controversial nature and should be passed. When any of these bills come up in the future, sir, I hope that you will follow the written rules of the House, particularly if the situation is such that all three parties have spoken in favour of such a bill, and allow the matter to come to a vote.

Mr. Speaker: I would say to the hon. member that I am not now, nor was I on Friday, unaware of the precedents that he quoted. Were the matter to come up again before this House when I was in the Chair, the ruling that I would make would be similar, allowing the members the opportunity to deal with it as they see fit.

I trust that if there is any strong feeling in that regard the hon. member would have sufficient influence with his party leader to have the matter discussed and dealt with on a friendly and amicable basis, because that is the only way that there can be any progress made with these matters in this House.

I thank the hon. member for the work he has gone to and the explanation he has given today—because I know it entailed considerable work. It is very good that he should put the energy and research that he has into introducing these bills and stimulating discussion. There is no question about it. Whether it should stimulate more than discussion or not I would not care to say, because after all the

Speaker is only human and he hopes to hold, as the member said, an even hand.

I could hope that this matter could be adjusted properly without the necessity of it being raised again as a point of privilege, a point of order, a free discussion or an appeal of the Speaker's ruling. I would strongly suggest that those concerned, take the cue and meet with me if they wish, or deal with it themselves.

The hon. member has a number of questions now, if he is prepared to put them while the Minister is still in the House.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, may I, on a point of order now, away from the point of privilege . . . I have the preliminary answer here for last Friday. When I first attempted to put this matter, you replied—I hope you are not misquoted—that you did not wish to cut off any member. Then you go on:

The member for Hamilton Mountain was next on the list. If, at that time, there is a motion to be made, that is fine. But I would not cut off discussion by members of the House. If the motion is put, that is fine, but I do think that every member should have the opportunity to be heard on this as long as there is time for him to be heard.

I then waited, sir, following your ruling, until the other members had been heard and had time to put the motion again.

I will leave it at the moment, sir. I hope some amicable way will be found to solve it without it being necessary to bring it up in the House again in this form.

I have a question for the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. In the transfer of Mr. Stanley W. from Burwash to the Sudbury Jail, did the criminal charges mentioned by the Minister on Friday refer to criminal acts committed inside Burwash?

2. How many of the 24 prisoners transferred from Burwash were transferred because of detected homosexuality?

3. Why were these prisoners not transferred to Millbrook or some other institutions capable of handling homosexuals?

4. Does the Minister think that district jails are better places to confine homosexuals?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I will take these questions as notice.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a three-part question of Minister of Health:

1. How many patients have been discharged from the Ontario Hospital School at Orillia during the past three months?

2. How many patients have been admitted to the Ontario Hospital School at Orillia during the past three months?

3. Since there are now so many empty beds at the Ontario Hospital School at Orillia, why is admittance still refused such urgent cases as Susan K., who was brought to this Legislature last December and who has been on the waiting list for over five years?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I will take the questions as notice.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transport.

1. Has the department made the study of safety factors involved in gas fuel heaters, which he promised in letters dated January 13, 1968, and April 29, 1968?

2. What were the results of that study?

3. What action has been taken?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge we have had only one complaint about gasoline fuel heaters. My department officials have established that this was apparently an isolated instance and there is no indication that a general problem exists with this equipment.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I outlined to the House some ideas which we in this group hold in respect to the establishing of regional governments in Ontario and at the time of the estimates I presume there will be more detailed discussions of the point of view which we hold.

I also pointed out our suggested plan for municipal taxation in the new regional governments and spoke on the support the province could give to these governments and suggested to this government some sources of revenue which are available today if certain tax changes take place.

Now I would like to digress from this main theme and caution the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), as he enters this next phase of municipal government in Ontario, as he faces the whole problem of setting up regional municipalities. If he is going to

succeed, Mr. Speaker, in meaningful, planning for the new regional governments, he had better do something more than he has done so far to curb the tendency of the genial Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) to fly off in all directions at once without knowing or caring what he is doing to mess up the work of his colleagues in the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, it is reliably reported around Queen's Park that on the morning of August 28 last, an explosion of mammoth proportions occurred in the office of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton). This was followed a few minutes later by a thundering crash as the Minister of Municipal Affairs went right through the ceiling of his plush quarters showering debris on a startled staff which scattered in all directions. It seems that both men had about the same time picked up a copy of the morning paper and read the account of a speech the Minister of Trade and Development made the night before at Waterloo University.

And no wonder the Treasurer, responsible as he is for regional development, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, responsible for municipal planning, reacted as they did. And I understand that mutterings came too from the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) and the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) after someone had explained to them what it all meant.

For some years now these departments have been involved in intensive studies in Waterloo county. As a matter of fact, the Waterloo area has seen over 80 studies of one kind or another all designed to find out what the future of that part of the province might be. Recently this study process has intensified. Local planning boards are busy and a regional planning board has been set up and is operating.

During the immediate past, three main studies have been going on in the Kitchener, Galt, Guelph area. I list them, because it is rather important for us to thoroughly understand just what is happening up there.

1. The area economic base study—looking into land use, population trends, employment patterns, and designed to outline population projections and land use requirements for the future.

2. The area planning and development study—designed to outline a series of alternative area development plans, evaluate their feasibility, and recommend an area plan to the respective agencies.

3. The area transportation study—to look into area transportation needs and to evolve an area transportation plan. This plan is now looking toward the MTARTS study with a view to harmonizing with it.

Several other related studies are also going on, looking at the potential water supply, the ability of area streams to handle sewage effluent, greenbelt areas, and urban renewal areas.

In addition to all this, The Department of Municipal Affairs appointed Dr. Stewart Fyfe of Queen's University to head up the Waterloo area local government review commission to make recommendations about the future form local government should take in the area. This commission held hearings, gathered together all the wisdom available, and is now writing its report.

So, for a number of years—and intensively for the past few—the local people, assisted by provincial departmental personnel and outside consultants, have been deciding where their cities should expand, what kind of housing should go where to best serve the expected population, what transportation would be needed, what parkland should be preserved, what lands should be held to serve expanding air traffic, where industry and high rise should go, and all the other facets of good regional planning.

And Dr. Fyfe was tying all this together and was ready to recommend what type of government should handle the region with some degree of efficiency and humanity.

Then, on August 27, at the housing conference at Waterloo, the Minister of Trade and Development, completely ignoring all this local and provincial study, proudly announced that he had bought land and was going to build a new city right smack in the centre of Waterloo county.

What this meant can be understood when it is realized that the land in question is completely outside the proposed Kitchener annexation area, nor is it in the Kitchener, Preston or Hespeler servicing area. The proposed use does not conform with the planning policy of Waterloo township, where it is located, nor was it considered urban land in the Kitchener-Waterloo and in the Galt-Preston traffic studies.

The fact is that the genial Minister, either in complete ignorance of the planning process, or with utter contempt for it, made his land acquisitions and announced his plans without consulting local planners, planning boards, or municipal councils. Nor did he consult his Cabinet colleagues whose depart-

ments were so deeply involved in planning the area.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): How can he do that!

Mr. Young: The Minister of Trade and Development, by his action, showed his complete indifference to all the planning going on. He set himself above the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in his "Design for Development". He overrode the Cabinet committee and the interdepartmental committee on regional government.

He ignored the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Highways, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, the Provincial Treasurer, and the Ontario Water Resources Commission. He spurned the advice of the local people living in the area and wrestling with its problems, and he took unilateral action in deciding what is best for the region and what its future ought to be.

No wonder the Minister of Municipal Affairs exploded as he did. No wonder the Provincial Treasurer nearly had apoplexy! The Cabinet meeting following the Waterloo announcement must have been a beaut! Too bad some of us had not been there to find out.

But it doesn't appear to have had any lasting effect. Dr. Fyfe was so concerned about the matter that he recalled his commission specifically to explore what impact the land acquisition and the plans of the Minister would have on the planning which had been done to date. But the Minister didn't bother to attend. That didn't do anything to help the blood pressure of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, under whose wing the Fyfe commission is operating.

Then, as if to prove that like the Bourbon kings, he learns nothing, the Minister goes merrily on deciding the future of the province. He hands out grants and loans to industry without looking to see if expansion of that industry is in harmony with good planning principles or if it will have a severe impact upon the community in which it is located.

If the Minister is going to add several hundred people to the workforce of a town, he should also look at the problems of water, sewage, housing and parks in that area. Perhaps his grants to industry ought to be matched with grants to the municipality which has to service the expanded workforce.

The statement by the Minister at Trenton last fall, coupled with his answer to a question by the hon. member for Peterborough, is typical of this Minister's contempt for the planning process.

The MTARTS study set out four alternative plans for development of the area surrounding Metropolitan Toronto. Plan one is a series of cities with open spaces between them stretching from Hamilton to Oshawa. Evidently the Minister has decided that this is the plan which is to be accepted with modifications. He has eliminated the open spaces, so abhorrent to the commercial mind fixed on land values, and has extended the plan to Cornwall with wall to wall factories along the whole complex.

But if the Minister has decided on MTARTS plan one, then where does he fit in the large scale acquisition by Revenue Properties in the Uxbridge area as announced by that firm on December 9? Private firms are planning too, as well as the genial Minister and the whole result can be a pretty thorough hodge podge if the Minister of Municipal Affairs does not move pretty quickly to some fundamental decisions in this field.

It may well be that the reason for the recent willingness of the government to act more decisively in setting up new regional governments is that they have to act now before the genial Minister of Trade and Development messes up all hopes for orderly development. He should be fired, of course, but with all the fanfare which attended his entry into the Cabinet, that course might be a bit embarrassing. So the Prime Minister seems to be trying with one hand to keep the Minister in check, while with the other he's urging the Minister of Municipal Affairs to get on speedily with the job of reorganization before too much damage is done.

But to return to the Kitchener land acquisition. I don't know how much the Cabinet knows about what happened there. I doubt if any of us except the Minister himself, know the full story. But what we do know raises some very interesting questions.

The first question is this: Why did the Minister buy the land where he did?

Already I have pointed out that this land was not in the development area of any of the surrounding towns. It was adjacent to an airport which holds 600 acres and controls another 1,000. If this land is developed, there's bound to be a repetition of what is now happening around Malton.

As a matter of fact, a company called Granite Investments acquired two farms total-

ling 284 acres in this area. When enquiries were made about development prospects here, the township concerned discouraged such development with the result that interest was turned to the north of Highway 7 in the vicinity of Maryhill, where the township gave encouragement and co-operation since this was an area which seemed ripe for the next building thrust.

It would seem, then, that the natural place for the Minister to look would be to the Maryhill environs for land acquisition since this seemed to be the direction of development. But he did not. He chose rather one of the most unlikely areas in the county. Why?

Well, it is difficult to answer that question with any degree of accuracy, but let me relate a few events which may have some bearing upon it.

Capital Building Industries Ltd. of London, Ontario, originally was in the construction business in several cities including Montreal. Its directors are mainly from London, although people from Toronto, Oakville and Windsor sit on the board. It now builds mainly in Windsor, I understand.

I mention this company only because three of its former employees played a prominent role in the land acquisition in the Waterloo area. These three—Messrs. Renaud, McDonald and Sutherland—along with a couple of others, one a contractor from Windsor, formed Renmore Developments Ltd., of Windsor, Ontario, for the purpose of purchasing, leasing, holding, renting, operating, managing, developing land and sundry other items as set forth in its application for a charter.

The company applied for incorporation on May 6, 1966. It took over the land held by Granite, which I mentioned, and bought some further acreage.

Rumour has it that the company ran into rough weather for some reason and the Windsor partner became convinced that it had no future and he got out. Shortly after he did the dawn broke in the shape of the Minister's smile. The Minister paid cash for the land held by the company. The Windsor partner was justifiably annoyed and wanted his share of the cut. He is now back as an officer of the company, according to latest reports.

But meantime something else happened which may have had some bearing on the Renmore situation. McDonald and Sutherland—maybe sensing a good thing and not wanting to share it too far—set up their own

company. It was called McDonald, Sutherland Industries Limited, 494 Queenston road, Hamilton. It was incorporated on November 30, 1967. Its officers are listed as:

President, Mr. William Joseph McDonald, 171 East avenue, Kitchener; secretary-treasurer, Kenneth Hunter Sutherland, 494 Queenston road, Hamilton; director, Audrey Katharine McDonald, 171 East avenue, Kitchener.

The first returns for the company were filed July 16, 1968. The Minister, as he informed me in the House, bought 345.8 acres of land from Renmore and 2,432 acres from McDonald, Sutherland. It would seem that Renmore faded out in the land business as McDonald, Sutherland moved in.

A couple of questions are left hanging here: Did Renmore shrewdly guess that the Minister was interested in land in this unlikely part of Waterloo county? Or having bought land in an area outside the direction of development, was Renmore rescued from financial disaster by the Minister who bought this land in an area where the township had no intention whatsoever of developing? More than this, why did the Minister buy in this particular location when land was available in the Maryhill area right in the path of logical development? In any case, Renmore got rid of its land and the new company—McDonald, Sutherland—moved in to corner the adjacent 2,400 acres and resell it to the Minister.

But there's another interesting facet to this strange deal. Renmore applied for incorporation in the name of a Windsor lawyer and what appears to be his office staff. But no returns were filed with the Provincial Secretary. The land purchases from Renmore were made on June 30 and July 10, 1968.

I checked up on Renmore and found that certain things were missing in the information and I wrote a letter to the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch), on October 29, 1968:

DEAR MR. WELCH:

I am writing you to request information in respect of Renmore Developments Ltd., Windsor, Ontario. This company was incorporated on May 6, 1966, but no returns have been filed yet, according to information from your department.

I am anxious to learn who are the present responsible parties for the corporation and hereby request that the filing of the annual return be insisted upon.

I would appreciate if you would advise me, when the information is available.

On November 7, I had a letter from the Minister to this effect:

Thank you for your letter of October 29. Our file indicates that Messrs. Bartlet, Richards, Knight and Wilson, 1002 Canada Building, Windsor, Ontario, are the solicitors of record for the company.

In August, 1967, and September, 1968, the department wrote to the company indicating the arrears of annual returns under The Corporations Information Act. I have requested an official of the companies' branch to follow this matter up and, for your information, I am enclosing herewith copies of the two most recent letters in this matter.

I might add, if the company fails to respond by filing the annual returns required, following a normal course of events cancellation proceedings will be instituted under section 326, subsection 2 of The Corporations Act.

I am appreciative of the fact that you have taken the time out to bring this matter to my attention.

(Signed)

ROBERT WELCH
Minister.

Enclosed with this were copies of letters written to Renmore Developments from the executive officer of the companies branch and the statement that returns had not been filed and the fees had not been paid for the years 1967 and 1968.

In other words, the company had not been heard from since the original application in 1966.

Then, on December 11—after I might normally have made this speech in the House, Mr. Speaker—because of other developments it was not made at that time—on December 11, 1968, I had this letter:

DEAR MR. YOUNG:

Re: Renmore Developments Ltd. from The Department of the Provincial Secretary.

In October last you wrote to the Hon. Robert Welch concerning annual returns of the above mentioned corporation. Please be advised that the corporation has now filed its 1968 annual return and this return is now available for examination in the public office of the companies' branch, room 101 in the north wing.

And inquiries there gave the following officers of the company: President, Abel E. Renaud, 2690 Askin Boulevard, Windsor; secretary-treasurer, J. William McDonald, 171 East

avenue, Kitchener; and vice-president, Patrick D'Amore, 898 Parent avenue, Windsor.

Directors on the 1968 return were the same as above.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my next question then is: Why did the Minister do business with a company which did not exist—or which refused to comply with the laws of the province? The purchases from Renmore took place in 1968, after the company had failed for two years to file its returns. Instead of doing business with the company the government would have been better advised to be prosecuting it for failing to comply with the law. If it had not been for my enquiry the chances are that Renmore would not have filed returns at all.

It all leads to the interesting query as to whether Renmore was simply set up to do business with the Minister and then disappear. Or did it have too many partners to share the spoils and so faded as the streamlined new two partner company appeared to do the lion's share of the dealing? And did the company file its returns three years late only because I raised the issue with the Provincial Secretary?

Another question is bound to arise here: why did the Minister not buy the land directly from the farmers, using an agent, thus saving a considerable amount of the taxpayers' money? Since he bought from the land companies which assembled the land, how much profit did these companies romp away with? Even if they made only \$200 an acre the profit would be \$600,000. If the spread was \$500 an acre it would be \$1.5 million.

The farmers were paid from about \$1,200 an acre to something like \$2,700, with the majority near the bottom figure. What did the Minister pay? This answer should be forthcoming, and we hope that this information will be available when his estimates come up. If he wants to table it before that, we would welcome it.

I can understand the wisdom of keeping such figures secret while negotiations for the purchase of land are going on. But now that the land assembly is complete there is no good reason for withholding such information from the Legislature. We have a right to know if public funds are properly used, or if they are going in part to enrich fast working operators who get in on the ground floor in a deal of this kind.

But there is more. At the Waterloo conference the Minister of Trade and Development said that the land in question would be

the site of Ontario's first new town. But he has already leased the land back to the farmers for five years unconditionally, and for another five years with conditions.

Is this the measure of this Minister's concern for speed in housing our people? We need homes now and we need them desperately.

Is this Cabinet policy that the very first new town in Ontario is to start in from five to ten years? Or is the Minister again setting policy with which his Cabinet colleagues disagree? How long can this Minister stay, even though he was trumpeted as the white hope of the Tory party?

In the light of these circumstances—in the light of what this Minister has done—then certainly this government should give him his walking ticket. However, having offered that bit of advice, I would simply say to the government, that he is their problem and they are going to have to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a very brief word about the event which happened last week in Metropolitan Toronto. It was decided by Metro council at that time that the Spadina Expressway should be built with priority over another expressway to the east of Metro.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And the member is opposed?

Mr. Young: I am not opposed at all, Mr. Speaker. I was delighted to see that decision. But what disappoints me most is that the decision having been made, the deadline for the finish of the Spadina Expressway is put at 1975—far, far too late.

Today I would plead with this government, and with the Minister of Highways in particular, that some plan be worked out so that the completion of the Spadina Expressway can be pushed forward by several years.

The increased assessment along that highway and the rapid transit line which we also hoped would be built immediately along with that expressway, will bring in greatly added assessment. That assessment in the long run will more than pay for the roadway. I think that this is something this government has to understand—that the Spadina Expressway and the transportation facilities for rapid transit along it is not a cost, it is an investment. And that investment will bring very great returns very quickly in increased assessment, in ease of travel, in the cutting down of frustration of the people coming from that area downtown and returning.

Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that this is the one area in Metro Toronto which is so far unserved with adequate transportation of this kind. This government should see to it that funds are made available to build that rapid transit line and build the Spadina Expressway, and to cut down the time factor dramatically, so that the development that is taking place in that very great area of Metropolitan Toronto can take place with facility. So that the people who are living and working in that area will have the same benefits that are accruing to many other residents in many other parts of Metropolitan Toronto.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge upon the Minister of Highways—and I urge upon the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman) too, that they speak to their conferees on the benches and that they get quick action on the Spadina Expressway and the rapid transit line that eventually must go into that area.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: It goes into the Minister's riding too!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We like to know where it is going before we can give them the money for it.

Mr. Singer: All they have to do is look at the plans.

An hon. member: Do not confuse him with the facts.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I know where I am going—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the reply to the Speech from the Throne, may I at the outset extend my congratulations to you in the fair manner in which you tend to your responsibilities. I would also like to congratulate the deputy speaker and chairman of the committee of the whole House on the excellent job he has done in the past and is continuing to do this year. We have a most capable deputy speaker in this Legislature.

I would also like to extend to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne my commendations on the excellent manner in which they presented their comments. We knew that they were going to present a very

one-sided point of view. However, that was their responsibility; they could have done nothing else when they had certain things pointing in their backs.

May I also extend to the new Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) my congratulations; he is a most capable man and I know he will take care of his responsibilities very ably.

I would like to start my comments by mentioning electronic voting. Mr. Speaker, I keep bringing this topic up practically every year, and I will continue to do so as long as I am given that privilege. Is it not about time that voting in this Chamber was brought into the 20th century, into the electronic age? Let us not waste our time by time-honoured, old-fashioned, archaic ways of having our names called, rising, bowing to you, Mr. Speaker, and then sitting down. Let us install push buttons on our desks with an electronic recorder on the wall and a miniature recorder for the clerk of the House so that the time consumed in voting could be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, the second topic that I wish to discuss is the topic of parity in fringe benefits. Wages and fringe benefits are two items that should be left to the discretion of the bargainer—be that bargainer a person, union or federation—and the employer to negotiate.

Both The Department of Municipal Affairs and The Department of Education have written into legislation the amount of fringe benefits that may be paid by a municipality. Today, if my power of recall is correct, a municipality may not contribute more than 66 per cent of the cost of these fringe benefits, be they medical services, Ontario hospitalization, life insurance, drug coverage, weekly indemnity benefits or any others that I may not have mentioned. Some municipalities now pay more than they are permitted to do under the present legislation. The department must be aware of this. May I, Mr. Speaker, respectfully suggest that both the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) and the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) bring in amendments to eliminate this restrictive paragraph so that employer and employee may collectively bargain as is their right.

If, in the course of their bargaining, 100 per cent of the benefits must be paid for by the municipality, then this would put the civil servant on the same basis as members of many of the unions in the automotive and allied fields. At least the civil servant would get parity of fringe benefits with his brother

member in other unions. At the same time, may I suggest that The Municipal Act be further amended to allow municipalities to extend Green Shield, prescription services, or other drug coverage, to retired employees. As the Act is now, it provides for the extension of hospital and medical services to retirees, and it would be consistent to include drug coverage. Today's retirees have made their contributions to their employer—the municipality—and worked at substantially lower salaries or wages than today's civil servants. Surely they deserve this consideration; once again, parity in fringe benefits.

In turning to minimum wages, the minimum wage rate in Ontario has been raised from \$1 per hour to \$1.30 per hour this year. In the construction trades, it went up from \$1.25 to \$1.55 per hour. The 30 cent per hour increase may seem substantial for, in the first instance, it means a 30 per cent increase in the minimum, but Mr. Speaker, the minimum, at \$1 per hour was much too low and was not realistic in the first place. The average work year, in round figures, consists of approximately 2,000 hours. This meant that an individual, were he or she to work steadily, could earn only approximately \$2,000 a year, a figure below the poverty line. This employed person this year will be able to pick up \$2,600. How anyone can keep himself, let alone a family, on such an absurdly low annual income, is unimaginable in these days of high prices.

This means that there will have to be more than one wage earner in the family. This generally means that the mother must also go out to work, and this means that the family with the larger number of children does not—or is not able to—share in our growing economy. The poor now simply become a little less poor with the increase in the minimum wage. A more realistic figure, Mr. Speaker, would be \$2 per hour. I understand the contracts for the building trades are up for renewal this year; I have it indirectly that some of the skilled trades in the building industry are asking for approximately \$7.50 per hour and six weeks vacation pay. This, Mr. Speaker, would mean an annual pay, if that person works a full year—and I do not know if he does—of about \$18,000. Compare the \$2,600 income with the \$18,000 income. Such contrast speaks for itself. Both parties must buy in the same local market. Both require housing; one just cannot make it. The earning gap keeps widening, and as it does, so do our social problems.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my thoughts towards revision of pensions. I could

go on at some length on the topic of pensions. I could read into the record the article written by Mr. Ronald Anderson, in the February 18 issue of the *Globe and Mail*, concerning the fact that the old age pensions are not keeping pace with the cost of living despite automatic indexing.

I could make mention that living costs had risen in two years by 8.5 per cent, while, in that same period, old age pensions were raised by four per cent. To maintain the purchasing power of two years ago, the pensioner would require \$113.92, rather than the \$109.20 he now receives. In other words, we have short-changed the old age pensioner by \$4.72 per month.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that the old age pension is a federal responsibility, but I bring this up to show how inflation has affected—and it looks as though it will continue to affect—all pensioners. Think of the many pensioners who at one time worked for the civil service—municipal, provincial, federal—or boards of education. Their pensions were based on the last or the best three, five, six or seven years, even the last 10 years of service. The economy has grown. Inflation has deteriorated the value of their pension just as it has that of the old age pensioner. They do not have a strong labour union to negotiate pension increases for them. They are left to the whims of the elected officials—the politicians who are always supposedly striving to keep costs down.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we can not change pension calculations of the retired, those now receiving a pension. What do you mean, we cannot? Almost every contract negotiated by the UAW—or should I say—every contract negotiated by the UAW—contains improvement factors to the pensions now received by former active UAW members. These pension increases are paid for by the public, paid for by increasing the selling price of the automobile or auto part. In other words, these pensions will continue to be increased as wage earners' incomes increase.

Mr. Speaker, why not apply that same principle to civil service pensions? Why not calculate their pensions, not on the years of service when they retired, but on the same years of service as if they were retiring from their employment each year. In other words, a person whose pension was based on the last five years of service and who retired in 1960, had his pension based on his earnings in 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959 and 1960. That person would—using the principle I suggest and having retired in 1960—have his pension based on the pay his classification would have received

in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969. Under such consideration, there would never be need for indexing, or for a cost of living increase. The pensioner would not have to worry about the ever-increasing costs. He or she would be able to live out his or her years in dignity and with peace of mind.

Such consideration would end, once and for all, the need to supplement persons receiving pension benefits. It would be a sort of a guaranteed annual income, ever increasing as wages increase, and as the economy and/or productivity improved.

Mr. Speaker, workmen's compensation board pensions and benefits should likewise be based on today's wages, not on those earned ten, 20, yes, even 30 years ago. There should be no need for periodic adjustments, as compensation payments would always be in tune with the times.

Mr. Speaker, may I turn my thoughts towards subsidized senior citizens' transportation. Too many of our senior citizens are incarcerated in their one-room boarding house, one-room flat or normal dwelling simply because they cannot afford the cost of transportation to visit either the downtown, their church, a social centre, a senior citizens' drop-in centre or their own friends in another part of the community. These citizens have asked for free transportation during the off-peak hours; they have asked for special rates. They have asked for a special consideration in this regard. However, transportation systems are having a most difficult time financially; some have hesitated to give in to these requests. In my own community, the city council has asked the Sandwich, Windsor and Amherstburg Railway to see if they would not consider providing lower rates for senior citizens during off-peak hours. However, the company turned this down stating that the loss experienced in reducing rates would not be offset by the added use of the transportation system. Yet, in Montreal on October 30, 1968, I read a press clipping which says, "Cut Fares for Elderly said Feasible."

I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of Social and Family Services, provide, as a starter, as a project, all senior citizens now receiving free OMSIP and free Ontario Hospital Services with a transportation pass, if requested, good for 100 round trips a year on the local transportation system. This would be the equivalent of two round trips per week. Coming as I do from Windsor, I would naturally wish my community to be singled out to conduct this pilot project. However, I would not be averse to leaving the selection of the community to the discretion of the hon. Minister concerned.

I know, Mr. Speaker, some may criticize me and say that carrying such a pass would be degrading and would mark the recipient of the pass. Were this so, Mr. Speaker, I would sincerely hope that the hon. Minister would consider some other method, possibly the provision of tickets that the individual may obtain from the local Department of Social and Family Services.

The Senior Citizens Association of Greater Windsor wrote me just over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to read some of the areas that today provide transportation at a special rate for senior citizens.

I am quoting from the letter sent to me by Mr. Howard E. White, of the Greater Windsor Senior Citizens Centre Association.

North Bay: They recently reduced fares as follows. There are ten rides for \$1.25 or 20 rides for \$2.25. Tickets are obtained at the city hall, showing proof of age of 60 or over. Ottawa, last summer, began a sale of eight tickets for \$1 to senior citizens. Kingston, on April 1, began to issue a pass for one year, purchased at the public utilities office for \$3.50. Hamilton and St. Catharines both reduced fares to ten cents plus a senior citizen's card. The Lakehead, Port Arthur and Fort William, reduced fares but the tickets are purchased from the welfare office because the privilege has been abused in the past. Winnipeg completed a deal last fall for reduced fares, we believe one half the normal fare. Calgary and Edmonton provide free passes between rush hours. Vancouver and Victoria are making some provision.

But they could not provide we with details.

Regina and Saskatoon have made some concessions.

But likewise they could not provide me with the details. This is a plea from the Greater Windsor Senior Citizens Centre Association for some type of consideration regarding transportation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, failing to consider the reduced rate for the senior citizens, I suggest then as a pilot project that buses owned and operated by local school boards be used to provide free transportation to senior citizens just as they do now for school children. The number of buses used would depend on the community involved in the pilot project. This transportation would have to be during off-hours—times when the buses are not being used for the transportation of school children. This could be an answer to the much needed transportation concern of the senior citizens.

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is not in the House at this time because the next 15 or 20 minutes of my comments were going to be directed to him. And this is concerning pollution. I read from an editorial dated Friday, January 24, 1969, in the *Windsor Star*, and the headline simply says, "Time to be Tough on Water Pollution".

Well, Mr. Speaker, on February 13 this year I had asked the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), what legislation the Minister was planning to regulate United States pleasure craft on Ontario waterways to prevent pollution by wastes from such pleasure craft.

The Minister gave a fairly lengthy answer. However, I will not read all of the comments he made, but simply the last paragraph. I will read my question to him and then his reply. This, by the way, is found on page 1246 of this year's edition of *Hansard*. I asked the Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the effect this may have on the tourist industry throughout the province of Ontario?

And the hon. Minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the matter of cleaning up pollution or the tourist industry, and I think anyone who wants to come in here badly enough this year with his cruiser will have a macerator chlorinator. In fact, many of them have them now in their craft.

In other words, the Minister was more concerned with eliminating pollution, rather than being worried about the tourist business.

And I was extremely pleased, Mr. Speaker, to find that the Minister has placed such high priority on the elimination of water pollution by pleasure craft over the economic concern of his own colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld)—the health of our citizenry over the tourist dollar.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the air pollution problem. Rather than to talk about it generally, I am going to be specific and I will refer to the Chrysler, Windsor foundry in the heart of my riding, Windsor-Walker-ville.

With the signing of the Auto Trade Pact, Chrysler (Canada) Limited decided to acquire the former Walker Metal foundry, as management could see the need for substantially-increased amounts of metal castings. This purchase was completed in 1964. The foundry was old then. Its production was small by today's standards. It was a real source of irritation, annoyance, discomfort and a potential health hazard to the residents in that neighbourhood prior to 1964.

As chairman of the city of Windsor smoke abatement committee for one year, in the 1950s, I can recall criticisms concerning this foundry. However, in those days the red herring used was: "Would you rather have smoke or unemployment?"

With the Chrysler take-over of the Walker Metal foundry, new, more efficient procedures were implemented. Production was substantially increased, extra shifts were taken on. It was only natural that, if there was atmospheric pollution before the Chrysler take-over, there would be an even more pronounced pollution of the air after the take-over.

The residents of the area complained and complained to the city of Windsor, whose responsibility this problem was, up until this year. They complained to the city council, they met with city council, they received a sympathetic hearing but that was all. The pollution continued.

The Chrysler people did pay heed to the residents. The building commissioner of the city or his representative did complain to Chrysler. Chrysler did start a programme to attempt to reduce emissions. But, Mr. Speaker, one only works as hard as he is pushed, be that a person or a corporation. Chrysler's claim they have spent substantial amounts of money to eliminate or to reduce the air pollutants. However, I will refer to this a little later in my remarks.

Up until The Air Pollution Control Act of 1967 was passed, the residents dealt with the city of Windsor in an attempt to get a remedy to their problem. Early in September, 1968, I was driving past the Chrysler foundry at about eight o'clock in the morning. The emissions from the foundry were so heavy and so irritating and cough-provoking that I had to close all the windows in my car and speed by.

I immediately wondered why the residents in the area did not complain. However, I contacted The Department of Health by telephone and asked for a status report concerning the Chrysler Windsor foundry. On September 27, I received the following, and this is a memorandum from The Department of Health to Mr. W. B. Drowley, chief air pollution control service from Mr. C. B. Martin, head of the approval section of the air pollution control service. The following is a status report concerning the matters requested:

Chrysler Corporation foundry, Windsor:

During the last year Chrysler Corporation has taken a large step forward in con-

trolling air pollutants from their foundry operation at Walker Metal Products in Windsor.

They have installed the very latest in modern equipment to control the iron cupola emissions. While this effort has been a major step in improving the quality of the air in the immediate neighbourhood, it has uncovered odours and some particulate whose presence were heretofore overshadowed by cupola emissions. The effect of these residual emissions has been brought to the attention of Chrysler's, and our engineers are currently working with them to minimize these effects.

This was September, 1968.

I mailed a copy of the memorandum of The Department of Health to the news media, who kindly publicized the contents. After this publicity, Mr. Harry Horton of 1951 Dakota Drive in Windsor, telephoned me. The date was October 15. Mr. Horton and I discussed the problem and at that time I told him to give me some assurance that the people were really concerned.

On Thursday, October 17, Mr. Horton telephoned me once again as I was leaving my home. On my return home, I contacted him. This was 10.30 in the evening. Within ten minutes he was in my dining room with a Mrs. Minnie Arend, and from 10.40 to 11.30 we discussed the situation. I was presented with a petition signed by 193 people in the area. And I would like to read the petition, Mr. Speaker. It is not lengthy, but it will show the extent to which the residents in the area have been attempting to have the pollution solved, all to no avail. Addressed to me, dated October 15, 1968:

DEAR SIR:

Whereas we, the undersigned, feel that with the official endorsement of air pollution control as a part of modern living we are entitled to have the provisions of by-law 32 enforced at the Chrysler Canada Limited foundry. This bylaw became effective June 30, 1967, and although further extensions were granted at Chrysler Canada Limited, the emission from the foundry has increased instead of diminished and the illegal old style cupola continues to operate.

Now this is contrary to the report submitted by Mr. Martin, head of the approval section concerning air pollution at the Chrysler Limited plant. The City of Windsor Inspector, Mr. Costello, will not accept responsibility for the enforcement, suggesting that complaints be lodged with the provincial Department of Health Toronto—

Now notice, Mr. Speaker, the enforcement was a municipal responsibility, but the municipality says it is a provincial responsibility.

Correspondence with Mr. Drowley, chief air pollution control services in Toronto, resulted in a visit to Windsor by two of his representatives to listen to complaints. The outcome of this visit is a letter from his office stating briefly that the situation is under review.

This, after all these years of reviewing. We respectfully request that you use the authority of your office to insist that air pollution control bylaw 32 be enforced at once.

And that is the completion of the comments. The balance is 193 individuals seriously concerned with the elimination of the pollution caused by the Chrysler Windsor foundry.

I was astounded. Inside of less than 24 hours 193 people were sufficiently concerned to sign their names to a petition.

On the same day—that is Friday, October 18—I had discussed this matter with a Mr. G. S. Trivett of the air pollution control service. I had also visited the city hall and discussed with Mr. Winters, of the city solicitor's office, the responsibility of the city concerning the enforcement of the air pollution bylaw.

I visited with Mayor John Wheelton in his office and discussed the city's responsibility. I also dropped in to discuss the matter with Mr. Costello, who is responsible for the enforcement of air pollution; however, Mr. Costello was not in and I had to leave without being able to discuss it with him.

On Saturday, October 19—the following day—at 11 a.m., I met with Mr. Trivett, who is from the air pollution control service of The Department of Health, and we went to Mr. Horton's home where we further discussed the situation for about one and a half hours. It was here where I suggested a public meeting at the nearby King George junior vocational school for Friday, October 25, at 8 p.m. Present, were to be representatives from the city, the province, the company, myself and the residents. There were to be no press releases, no newspaper publicity. We were interested in breaking new ground by having a fact-finding discussion.

On Monday, October 21, I asked the Windsor Board of Education for the use of the cafetorium at the King George school. I contacted—and get this, Mr. Speaker—I contacted Mr. Derek Barlow, the building commissioner of the city of Windsor, so that he

would be present. Chrysler's returned my call and I understood, in no uncertain terms, that they would be present.

On Tuesday, October 22, the use of the school was confirmed. Mr. Trivett called me back and said he would be present. I contacted Mr. Horton to tell him that everything was set for a Friday, October 25, meeting.

On Friday, October 25, something told me to contact Chrysler's. This I did at 3.30 p.m. and was told at that time that Chrysler's would not have a representative present. This is 3.30 p.m.; the meeting was scheduled for 8 o'clock.

Not one of all the parties involved received a letter, an engraved invitation, or anything like that, to be present. The invitations were verbal; a gentleman's way of doing things. I thought that I, as the elected member to the Legislature of Ontario from the Windsor-Walkerville area would act as a go-between to bring two parties together in an attempt to get dialogue between them.

This was to be an eyeball to eyeball communication. We were going to close the communications gap. We were looking to find out just what was what. The meeting did take place and 101 people by actual count were present. Of these 91 stayed for the full two hours of the meeting. It was informative, but it was all one-sided.

Questions were asked from the floor. It was brought out that the enforcing of the air pollution was the city of Windsor's responsibility up until the province set up offices in Windsor, some time in December. It was also pointed out that the Chrysler company is violating provincial regulations.

I regret very much that Chrysler did not see fit to take this opportunity to explain to the residents what they have done, what they are doing, what they plan on doing, how long it will take them to reach their goal, and even, if they wish, the financial cost of the programme. By refusing, Chrysler's has shown an arrogant, contemptuous, callous attitude toward their neighbours. Public relations wise they goofed.

This meeting was no witch hunt. It was an attempt to obtain facts and an answer for an extremely irritating problem. Chrysler's cannot hide behind the press comment that no Chrysler representative attended the meeting because the company officials said the invitation was received late Friday, on an informal basis. This statement is contrary to the facts, as on Monday, October 21, I was led to believe that a representative or representatives would be present.

Must I write to the head office of Chrysler's in Detroit? I hope Chrysler does not say, "We will close the plant if the residents keep complaining." I hope they do not resort to this type of blackmail. The day the plant becomes an economic liability to Chrysler's, it will be phased out.

I was going to read into the record the report and recommendations of the air pollution control service of The Ontario Department of Health, concerning the Chrysler Windsor foundry, but for the sake of brevity I will refrain from doing so.

Just out of curiosity's sake allow me, Mr. Speaker, to bring this to your attention.

A headline in the Windsor paper, October, 1968:

SALE PROFIT RECORDS BROKEN BY CHRYSLER

Chrysler reported net earnings of \$178.5 million, equal to \$3.83 per share of common stock, in the three quarters ending September 30. This compared with \$93.4 million, or \$2.03 per share, in the same span in 1967. These are combined figures for the Chrysler operations and include Canada's contribution, which was very substantial.

A second headline dated January 7, from the Windsor *Star*—that is January 7 of this year:

RECORD YEAR FOR CHRYSLER CANADA

Chrysler Canada has just concluded the best sales record in its history, Ron W. Todgham, president, announced this morning. A combined total of 235,724 cars and trucks were assembled by Chrysler Canada in 1968. An all time record and an increase of 16.2 per cent over the previous combined record of vehicles built a year ago.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Chrysler Corporation can put a few more of these dollars into an accelerated programme for the elimination of air pollution?

I know the foundry is now under orders from the Minister of Health to clean up this problem. I hope the Minister will keep pressing the Chrysler people, as I will him and his department.

Chrysler's have had since 1964 to solve the problem; that is now going on to six years. Does it really take that long? I do hope that the Chrysler Windsor foundry does become a good neighbour and does eliminate this health hazard and nuisance.

Anti-smoking ads on television use a slogan, "it is a matter of life and breath." Chrysler Windsor foundry, your neighbours are telling you, through me, it is a matter of life and breath with them also.

I invite the management of this plant, at a time of their choice, to meet with their neighbours and give them the whole story. I will call a meeting whenever I get the say so from Chrysler—or should I say, from you, Mr. Ron Todgham.

At the same time, I do hope that the Minister of Health, if he or someone in his department reads this comment, continues their inspection of the Ford Motor Company plant in Windsor, because substantial changes are being undertaken there. There will be a large increase in castings manufactured by the Ford Motor Company, and the air pollution problem, even today, is a vexing one. If they triple or quadruple their production, that problem may be aggravated three or four fold.

A headline on November 28, 1968, is most *à propos* of this whole discussion. It reads: "Fuses Lit, Pollution Timebomb, Blame Put on Society".

While I am discussing the pollution problem, may I ask the hon. Minister to keep a very very close eye on the city of Detroit's plan to put up an incinerator directly across from a residential section in the city of Windsor. It would leave the residents approximately one mile away from a pollution problem that could be extremely grave and serious. I hope the Minister has his representative at all of the meetings in Detroit and voices, and adds to the objections of the city of Windsor, the objections of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the topic of noise abatement, I make mention of this in my speech hoping that the hon. Ministers of Health, Transport (Mr. Haskett), and Labour (Mr. Bales), jointly or individually, have representatives attend the seminar on noise abatement to be held in Washington, D.C., this Friday. This seminar is sponsored by the National Council on Noise Abatement, a new forum for development in exchange of innovative approaches to noise control. Noise pollution is taking on an ever-increasing importance in today's environment and I think the province should have representation down there to see just in what ways we can eliminate the problem of noise pollution.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to turn to a topic concerning the restructuring of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. The combining or annexing or taking over of health services into the one structure is nothing new. OMSIP and OHS should be integrated. Now by joining federal Medicare,

I think this could be more readily accomplished.

Joining federal Medicare we could save the taxpayers of Ontario about \$170 million—that is the Ontario share of the cost of operation of Medicare. But also, joining Medicare, federal Medicare it would be, it would either enable Ontario to provide wider or broader health services or coverage, or it could lower premium payments. Or it could extend subsidies to a greater segment of our population. By having an all-inclusive health care service, only one premium payment would be required.

When that day does come, I hope the premium payments are on a monthly basis or at the most every two months, because in some instances they would be very substantial.

Knowing this government's attitude towards Medicare, I can't foresee them taking any action concerning integration. However, I would like to suggest that OMSIP and OHS be set up on a parallel basis. OMSIP pays the entire cost of services of those on low income, and gives graduated assistance to people with limited incomes.

Ontario Hospital Services should do the same. OMSIP has a three-tiered structure, has a separate fee: (1) For married couples; (2) for single people; and (3) for families. Ontario Hospital Services should do the same. It should rearrange the present single and family subscriptions and bring it into line with OMSIP.

Think of the many pensioners living on limited incomes who have to pay their own full Ontario Hospital Services premiums that could and would benefit from such a change. How can the Minister of Health reconcile his heartless attitude towards these pensioners? Have a heart!

My next topic, Mr. Speaker, concerns detention home facilities in the city of Windsor. For several years now I have asked for consideration of a juvenile detention home, in the Windsor area. Years ago it was the responsibility of the municipality to provide one.

But with the Ontario Water Resources Commission pressuring the municipality to stop dumping raw sewage into the Detroit river, and with the added financial burdens of annexation, the rising cost of education, and the limitation placed on capital works by the Ontario Municipal Board, it was just not possible for the city to undertake this added burden.

With its limited source of revenue compared with that of the province, it was only fitting and proper that the provincial government undertake the providing of a juvenile detention centre. I say to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wishart)—through you, Mr. Speaker—look our way. Look west. Look towards Windsor and its needs.

Windsor is the largest centre in Ontario without a juvenile detention home. A juvenile home is not a costly venture. In fact, it is not an expense, it is an investment—an investment in the rehabilitation of many young people. An investment in their future, a protection for the child and the public.

Today, juveniles coming before the court for various reasons require temporary confinement, both for their own protection and that of the public. Such a short period of detention while their cases are before the court, enable them to calm down and to think of their problems objectively. When a juvenile offender is judged guilty, the court has but four avenues:

1. To let the child go with a warning.
2. To put the child on probation.
3. To commit the child to the care of a society.
4. To commit the child to a training school.

To be able to make the proper decision, the court must have information as to the child's home environment, his school, his social life and its personal structure. If the child could be detained until this information was recorded, it would protect the child as well as the public. Come on, I urge the Attorney General, invest a few dollars in the youth of Windsor.

And, Mr. Speaker, separate schools; the problem of separate schools must be resolved in the not-too-distant future and I predict it will be before the next provincial election.

If you were really to put into practice the Human Rights Code, and not discriminate because of creed, and if you really believe in the proposition of the equality of educational opportunity, how can you not consider the problems and needs of separate schools?

With the advent of a more liberal approach to education, with the advent of a non-graded school, with the rapid acceptance of promotion by subjects rather than by year, how do you say where Grade 10 stops and Grade 11 begins? You just cannot.

Britain, Alberta, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island recognize and support separate schools. In Alberta, separate schools supporters can direct their education prop-

erty taxes to support their school system for grade one onward if they desire.

Mr. Speaker, section 93 of The British North America Act protects the rights of the separate schools or the Catholic schools. Either you support equality of education or opportunity from grade one onward, and that is up to and including Grade 13, or many Catholic high schools will cease to operate, and you will have to support the education of these pupils anyway. You save nothing.

In fact, the Catholic high schools today save the public school supporters millions of dollars that would have to be provided by public school supporters to house and educate the transferees from the Catholic school system.

Mr. Speaker, students of Catholic high schools have decided to present logical, neat arguments for their case rather to indulge in mass demonstrations. The students are to be commended for their restraint, but restraint can only last for a period of time, then frustration and reaction set in.

There are only a handful of universities in Ontario compared to Catholic high schools. If this limited number of universities can cause such public concern, just think of the concern the large numbers of Catholic high schools could cause.

They, however, are not interested in mass demonstrations. They are interested in logic, equality of educational opportunity. At a recent meeting held in my city, a 16-year-old—Donna Shannahan, of St. Mary's Academy—made the following comment, and I am quoting:

We are not out for more tax money. We just want the money our dads gave to be rerouted to the schools we go to.

How fitting a comment from a 16-year-old young lady.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a minute on drug prices. Some idea of how the public was gouged by price fixing, combines, restraint of trade, and so forth, was recently proved by the court case in New York when five large drug firms agreed to pay \$120 million to settle civil suits against them.

Three of the five firms had been convicted on anti-trust charges, but all five were included in the civil suit. The fact that they were willing to pay out such a large amount of money rather than allow the case to go to trial is significant, as it proves these drugs

firms' sense of guilt and shows how large their illegal operations were.

The larger Canadian firms are affiliated with those in the United States, and the extent of their imports from their parent companies must have been substantial enough to say that we in Canada, yes, we in Ontario, were taken for a ride, or should I say, given a pharmaceutical dose to tranquilize us so that we do not ask the hon. Minister of Health how such action in the United States has affected us.

The largest purchaser of drugs in Ontario, I would assume, would be The Ontario Department of Health. I just wonder how much of that action, that \$120 million, really should be returned to Ontario residents.

If we compare our two countries, Canada and the United States, by population, and project this comparison into the \$120 million, then ten per cent of that \$120 million represents Canada's fair share. That is, \$12 million, that Canadian subsidiaries or affiliates, should be returning to the people of Canada.

As Ontario represents one third of Canada, population wise, then \$4 million is our rightful share of this settlement. I hope that the Minister of Health, or someone in his department, looks into the rightful claim of the people of Ontario, the rightful claim that they have against the price fixing policies of these drug firms and gets back for us our share of this \$4 million.

Just to use one example of the rigging of prices and its astronomical costs in excessive price fixing, let me cite the case in point of tetracycline, produced for as little as 1.6 cents per capsule, and sold for 51 cents.

This is 33 times its cost price. Think of the many people especially senior citizens, who in many cases deprive themselves of food and nourishment because of their need for medication, being forced, yes, compelled, to pay up to 33 times the production value of medication, just so that they may be able to better enjoy the remaining days of their lives. The hon. Minister of Health, or the hon. Attorney General, or both hon. Ministers should get after these boys and get some part of our money back.

I would like to turn to the topic of rent subsidies, a topic that has been discussed in this House at times in the past. With the acute shortage of housing throughout the metropolitan areas in the province, yes, even in some smaller communities, the plight of the person with a large family, or the one on limited income, is more acute than ever.

Some are fortunate enough to get Ontario housing units, that is, some of the geared-to-income units. The Department of Trade and Development's analysis says that rent income should not go beyond 30 per cent, or, in rough figures, one-third of the total income of the family.

Social scientists say that not more than 25 per cent of one's income should be spent on housing.

Canadians pay out in rent proportionately more of their consumer expenditures than people in most countries of the world. Many, yes, far too many people pay more than 50 per cent of their total income solely for housing.

The minimum wage earner is one example. The under-employed is another. The part-time employee is a third. The limited income individual is a fourth. I would dare say that many other categories could be listed.

Those who are fortunate enough to get geared-to-income were really being subsidized. Those who were not fortunate enough, were being punished. If one fortunate group can be subsidized by living in Ontario Housing Corporation geared-to-income homes, then why should not those who are not so fortunate and who are paying a disproportionate amount of their already too meagre incomes, be likewise subsidized.

A limited income senior citizen or pensioner, for example, should not have to pay more than 25 per cent of his pension for housing. The balance of the tab should be picked up by The Department of Social and Family Services.

I am reading a headline dated May 1, 1966, from the Detroit *Free Press*, that even makes mention of rent subsidies for middle class people being predicted. I only ask this for the senior citizen, the limited income person, the pensioner.

Mr. Speaker, one of the last topics in my comments concerns housing. Now, I am reading a quote:

A major programme for providing low and moderate cost housing was forecast in Windsor Thursday night. The comprehensive programme will result from the recent establishment of the Ontario Housing Corporation which will break through the red tape that has strangled housing in the past.

Do you know who said that, Mr. Speaker? It was none other than the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) of Ontario, in Windsor on September 4, 1964. Four and a half years ago.

The problem of housing was going to be solved. Red tape was going to turn into red ribbon. Would the fact that this was just two or so weeks before a by-election have anything to do with the reason for making this statement.

To illustrate the acuteness of the situation, here is an ad, four years ago, Tuesday, May 4, 1965:

West side, near Assumption University, clean, three-bedroom brick, fireplace, basement, two-car garage, clean residential neighbourhood. \$175 monthly, payable two months in advance, \$500 deposit required.

In 1965.

Another headline reads: "House Shortage Dangerous". Another headline, "They Sit Close To The Telephone, Desperately Waiting". May 22, 1965, concerning a lady with six children attempting to get housing, sitting in the corner of a room close to the telephone just anxiously waiting for the telephone to ring.

Another headline, May 29, 1965, reads: "Lack of Housing, Number One Area Problem". The next says, "Serious Housing Shortage Windsor's Worse Problem", January 4, 1966.

Here is a letter sent to me March 17, 1966, by Mr. Wilfred Cazalais, 2665 Charles St.:

My wife and I are both on sick pensions. We are 64 years old and up to last June I was able to manage. I was paying \$40 a month rent, but my rent is now \$90 a month.

From \$40 to \$90 in one jump.

Here is another headline—I should not say headline but an advertisement in the "homes wanted" column of the Windsor *Star* Thursday, May 12, 1966:

Responsible party wants to rent 3-bedroom home. Will pay year's rent in advance.

An individual willing to pay rent for one year in advance. Surely all of these advertisements and headlines, Mr. Speaker, would indicate the acuteness of the problem. I could probably read 50 other advertisements and headlines pointing out the shortage of housing of all types in my city alone. This same situation exists in all urban areas the length and breadth of Ontario.

Speakers have given all kinds of answers to ease the shortage. In fact, there are about as many answers as there are people looking for housing. Some suggest the elimination of the five per cent sales tax; the 11 per cent federal tax; longer term low interest loans;

incentives to fix old homes; urban renewal to be used to produce a gain, not a loss of homes; a uniform building code; the province to supply services and to open up vast tracts of land; to develop a surplus of serviced land; to utilize new building methods; use new materials in construction; pre-fabricate homes; modularize homes; develop many homes; mass produce disposable homes; use the German idea developed in West Germany just recently called pre-engineered homes.

All of the suggestions take time and are not an immediate answer. Even the recommendations of the Hellyer task force report on housing and urban development will take two to five years to achieve.

Instant change is needed to provide home ownership and the technique for this is not in the report. The need for rental housing projects and public housing has also been completely overlooked. We all agree that all persons should have access to some specified, minimum, desirable standard of accommodation, and that governments should facilitate the creation and maintenance of adequate housing stock.

The time is long past that governments use home building to create jobs linking housing with unemployment. Unfortunately today, Mr. Speaker, loans to build houses do little directly to provide accommodation for low-income families. For example, in 1957, borrowers in the lowest third of the family income scale accounted for one-ninth of the national housing loans for house ownership in large urban areas. Eight out of nine houses were for the middle class and the rich.

In the address to the city council at the beginning of this year, Mayor John Wheelton of Windsor made mention that:

No new construction of low-rental family housing has been begun during the course of 1968. As a result, there is a backlog of over 1,000 applications for such housing in my community—and almost every application represents a desperate housing situation from some hard-pressed family.

Only Friday I received four different phone calls from people requesting housing assistance, and one came from a mother with four young children.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to give you a complete answer to the catastrophe, but I would like to mention, as I have for several years, part of the answer—something that may ease some of the housing problems in a very short period of time. Why not con-

sider portable houses? Not campers, not trailers, but mobile homes. These are fully equipped, fully furnished, ready-to-move-into portable homes. These are not eyesores—run-down, beat-up shacks on wheels—these are excellent prebuilt houses.

One sixth of the new homes built in the United States today are mobile or portable homes. Portable homes could become an answer to Canada's biggest problem—low-cost housing.

Experts say one of the answers to the housing shortage is to build houses in factories on efficient production lines instead of on the site. But, Mr. Speaker, this is being done today by the mobile home industry. In fact, Fleetwood Industries Incorporated, of Riverside, California, one of the largest of 200 or so mobile home builders in the United States, constructs a mobile home from start to finish in two days. California and Florida have been leaders in this field. In Michigan, a group in one local community is working secretly towards making it possible for mobile homes to be put on conventional housing sites instead of in parks. The plan is to let local contractors prepare the site and then to put the additions, like the porch and other gingerbread, on the outside of the mobile home to improve both the appearance and to help ease municipal officials' opposition to such houses.

Portable home manufacturers in the United States in 1967 produced 80 per cent of all of the single-family housing that sold for under \$12,500. All over both the United States and Canada a greater awareness of the potential of this industry in assisting to lessen a vexing problem is being more and more evident. It is estimated that by 1973 well over 500,000 mobile homes will be manufactured annually in the United States.

Prince George, which not long ago was only a small community in B.C., some 500 miles north of Vancouver, and had a population of about 13,871, in 1966 had a population of 24,471; it has 3,000 mobile homes worth well over \$50 million. The cost of these portable homes ranged from \$6,000 upward, and this is with all of the furniture and appliances in place. The units come up to 12 feet wide and 50 to 60 feet long and in area contain about 80 per cent as much space as in many small tract homes. For example a 12 by 50-foot portable home has as much floor area as a 24 by 25-foot home, and a 12 by 60-foot portable has as much as a 24 by 30-foot home.

Average retail price works out to about \$8 a square foot, roughly half of the cost

of a conventional home. One of the biggest drawbacks to the more rapid development of mobile home living in Canada and in Ontario specifically is community resistance to zoning choice property and, in some instances, just property for mobile park use. Another is the outward appearance of the homes, too often referred to as sheet-metal-sided, oversized shoe boxes.

Another is that only transients, wanderers, drifters, second-class citizens live in such accommodations. Another is that mobile-home occupiers do not pay their fair share of the educational cost burden. However, Mr. Speaker, recent studies have shown that mobile-home parks, because of the greater density of homes, have residents with fewer children and tend to produce more revenue for a community and use less of its educational and other services than a comparable sized conventional housing tract.

All the world is a stage—yes, three stages. The newly married cannot afford regular housing; their accommodation needs are minimal. The family man needs to have his roots firmly established and thus needs conventional housing. The retirees' accommodation needs, once again, are minimal. Portable housing could be an assist in the first and third stages of living. Not everyone wants to live, or can afford to live, in a rug-carpeted concrete box. Not everyone wants to live, or can afford to live, in suburbia. Not everyone wants to live, or can afford to live, in conventional housing. Portable or mobile housing can be a partial answer to that person's problem.

Mobile or portable accommodations are now used in the construction industry as engineering offices; banking institutions make use of them. In my own community, St. Clair College has two mobile units, one that acts as a guidance centre—good enough for The Department of Education, but not good enough for the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) to look into.

The Department of Tourism and Information used a mobile unit for over three years in the city of Windsor. Practically all government departments have at one time or another used them. Mobile home sites are not gypsy parks. They are not itinerant farm worker areas; they are not crowded, run-down places for the disadvantaged. The chairman of the board of the Bank of America, North America's biggest bank, a man by the name of Mr. Louis Lundborg, lives in one with his family. Mr. Al Hoyt, the vice-president of the Bank of America, lives with his wife in a mobile home—not

only on weekends but all the time. The middleclass to wealthy now seeking a second home or an alternative to apartment living are turning to mobile homes. Many of us here are looking forward to the day when we may be able to hitch a mobile home to a car and travel for months on end.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that mobile housing is the only answer to our present housing crisis, but it sure can go a long way toward reducing the crisis.

This method of housing relief would have many advantages:

One, it would enable small municipalities, especially in slow-growth areas, to attract and hold industry.

Two, it would enable municipalities to plan in a more leisurely and economic fashion instead of being stampeded into housing development.

Three, it would assure housing to persons moving from one area to another.

Four, it would be one way that a housing surplus could be provided in a community, thus easing the disastrous rent spiral.

Five, it would force owners of substandard housing to bring that housing up to an acceptable level, especially if there were large numbers of mobile homes in that community.

Six, it could be used as housing for farm labour.

Seven, when the housing crises in any municipality were overcome, these units could be transported to another problem area.

Eight, when these mobile homes have served their purpose or their master, they could be sold as summer cottages.

There are many other advantages that could be mentioned in making a case for portable housing. And I say that the hon. Minister of Trade and Development has been negligent in the responsibilities of his office by not having thoroughly looked into the place that mobile or portable housing has to play in this most serious problem Ontario has been confronted with since the days of the depression.

Mr. Speaker, it is over three years now since I first brought this to the Minister's attention. I hope when he presents his estimates, he has an answer for me. Mr. Speaker, the last topic that I would like to discuss is the one—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Would the hon. member permit me to tell him what has been happening on mobile homes?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I would be glad to hear.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have been discussing with Central Mortgage and Housing for the last two years. The difficulty is getting anybody to give a mortgage on mobile homes, including a Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation guarantee.

However, one of the discussions we had last Saturday was on how soon it could be brought about. But it has not been for any lack of pushing on our part. We have also had The Municipal Act changed here in order to accommodate mobile homes.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, may I ask the Minister then, has he gone into the United States to see how they have solved their problem?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure!

Mr. B. Newman: They did not have any problem whatsoever. Banks were more than willing to come along and provide them with the funds to enable them to get into the mobile homes financing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I say we have already had them up here, including the Bank of America, the people the member talked about. They came up here, made a presentation and we passed that on to Ottawa.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, I am glad to hear that the Minister has at least started. But, Mr. Speaker, three years for that answer—it has been way, way too long. He should have had that answer for us three years ago. In the United States they can build about 300,000 a year. Here it is one-tenth of that, 30,000. We could have accommodated 100,000 or built 100,000 mobile homes in that period of time. You see, Mr. Speaker, we still do not have homes.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Talk to Ottawa, come on now, talk to Ottawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: If we do not have homes there is no one else to blame in this House but the Minister.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): After three years he has a conversation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member should call his friends in Ottawa!

Mr. B. Newman: Well, it is a good thing the Minister has someone there to talk to.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to talk on probably the greatest fraud ever perpetrated on the people of Ontario. In fact it was Machiavellian. This was the property tax rebate. When the Prime Minister was talking on television the other day, he did not have Medicare in mind. Back in his mind was the property tax rebate and that is what he was really referring to.

Mr. Speaker, because of the time, I am going to curtail my remarks and bring one example—I would like to complete this by 5 o'clock—just one case to the attention of the House. A piece of property in my riding just changed hands during the latter part of last year.

Immediately the 10 tenants in the building had their rents raised an average of \$40 a month, in some cases a 70 per cent increase. The complex in 1969 now collects \$5,000 more rental annually than it did in 1968, yet the tax rebate by the landlord was only approximately \$500. And the alibi used? They have to give this rebate back to the individual living in the accommodation.

One of these tenants occupies 280 square feet in what is called a one-room apartment. He has his rent raised to \$85 for what he had formerly paid \$50. That is a 70 per cent increase in rental. He now pays 35 cents a square foot a month.

This would be the equivalent of a person living in a 40 by 25-foot home, paying \$350 a month for accommodations. And the alibi that the individual that owns the home always gives is: "Well, I have to give you this property tax rebate so I have to collect from you." He will give you a tax rebate of \$5 and he will increase your rent by \$10 to \$25 a month.

Mr. Speaker, the nightmares caused by this programme and the bureaucratic set-up and the added cost of operation makes this a Machiavellian scheme and also makes this one of the greatest frauds perpetrated on the people of Ontario.

The idea of assisting the municipalities and the property taxpayer in lowering his taxes is a good one, but there should be a simpler and better way. Could not an unconditional grant on a per capita basis have been implemented—one that would require the municipality to decrease its taxes by a given amount? The programme, as it is today, does not levy any restraint on municipal councils.

Mr. Speaker, I have occupied more time than I had intended to. I wish to thank the members of the House who were present even

though they may not have paid attention to what I had to say.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 22 by Mr. Gaunt.

RESOLUTION: That the Ontario government immediately include chiropractors and other paramedical groups under OMSIP.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) Resolution No. 22 standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, this is another one of the subjects which is dealt with year after year by the House because the government fails to recognize an obvious need. Mind you some progress has been made insofar as the optometrists are concerned, because eye refractions are now covered under OMSIP as of last year.

I was interested, when I asked the Minister today about the costs of this particular programme for the first six months, he indicated to me that the costs involved were some \$490,000. That is for the six-month period from July 1, 1968, until December 31, 1968.

However, in my opinion there are still a few gaps in the OMSIP programme and I wish to take up a few moments of the House, this afternoon to set out in some detail the purport of my particular resolution.

It is my feeling that a number of paramedical groups should be covered under OMSIP in some way to provide basic coverage for those who seek to, or need to, use their services. Those that come to mind immediately are chiropractors and dentists, with provision to cover drugs as well. To do otherwise is to discriminate.

Let us take a look at some of the other health schemes in other Canadian provinces in relation to paramedical coverage.

For instance, as we work from west to east, we find chiropractic coverage offered in the B.C. basic plan; chiropractic included under the Alberta health plan as an option; Saskatchewan has approved chiropractic for inclusion under its Medicare programme; and Manitoba has included chiropractic in the basic plan beginning July 1 of this year.

Then to Ontario, the so-called leader in almost everything. What do we find? Ontario has nothing in regard to chiropractic coverage. The excuse is that these things cost money and money is hard to come by these days.

Let me recite to the House some figures that were produced by an actuary in relation to the Alberta health plan for the first six months of operation—July 1, 1967 to December 31, 1967. The figures relate directly to the section called option C—chiropractic and natureopathy.

Premiums received under option C were \$368,000, based on the following rates: single, \$12 per year; family of two, \$24 per year; and family of three or more, \$36 per year.

Claims paid under option C were \$213,000, thus leaving a surplus, or credit balance, of \$155,000.

In other words, the profit to the Alberta health plan on option C for its first six months was approximately one-third of the total premiums received.

We must bear in mind two or three things in relation to the coverage provided under the Alberta health plan.

This plan, much like OMSIP, was set up to benefit particularly those in the lower income range. Insurance experience has proven that, the lower the income level, the poorer the health of the people in that income range. Consequently, there would be greater usage when the plan is confined more to the lower income brackets than would be the case if it were spread over the entire economic range of the province.

Insurance experience also has proven that usage is apt to be higher at the outset on an option service and that is why I asked the Minister today to indicate to the House whether the optometric service was heaviest in the first few months of operation. He indicated to me that there was a steady increase right up until November of last year and that it has fallen off since that time. So this would seem to bear out what I am saying.

In other words, people tend to sign up for an option—in this case option C—who normally utilize the services of chiropractors—they then rush to take advantage of the new coverage they have obtained.

Therefore, one would assume that the first six to twelve months would show a greater overall usage of the benefits under a specific option, such as option C, than would be the case when viewed over a three, five, or ten-year period.

It is an established fact, although it is disputed from time to time by the medical pro-

fession, that a patient normally only goes to one practitioner at one time. In other words, one might consider that the majority of the \$213,000 spent on chiropractic care during the six-month period is a transfer of costs from the total cost of health services during this same period.

To put it another way, the cost of medical services during this six-month period could be considered to have been lowered by most of this \$213,000. Therefore, not only did option C show a profit of \$155,000, but it also was responsible for a reduction in total claims which would have otherwise been paid out for medical services.

Let us, as a matter of interest, relate the Alberta plan and the figures I have just cited to the situation in Ontario.

In the Alberta plan, chiropractic services are provided on the basis of a charge not exceeding \$4 per visit and an amount not exceeding \$10 for X-rays for a particular disability. Naturopathic services are also provided on the basis of a charge not exceeding \$4 per visit. The combined services under option C of the plan are subject to a maximum of \$100 per plan year for all persons covered under the contract.

The cost to OMSIP, according to actuarial figures, to include this same level of coverage would be \$1.11 per month per policy holder. A policy holder is defined as a family or, based on the Alberta figures, 2.8 persons. This \$1.11 figure would likely be somewhat lower should the total policy holder enrollment currently in OMSIP take advantage of this option. Current OMSIP premiums are \$16.39 per family per month. Therefore, by adding \$1.11, it means 3 to 4 per cent on the cost of health services provided by OMSIP.

In the case of the Alberta option C benefits, it is purely and simply a case of a fund being established by approximately 40,000 people to cover chiropractic and naturopathic services, with a consequent surplus being shown.

Taking Ontario policy holders at 800,000, which was the figure a few months ago, multiplying this by twelve months and by \$1.11, we arrive at a figure of \$10,656,000. My guess is that this amount would more than cover the claims against OMSIP for chiropractic services and would, according to Alberta's experience, mean that the plan would remain in a surplus position for that service. To put it differently, the addition of chiropractic service would not cost the government any money because the additional cost would be more than made up through increased premiums.

The chiropractic profession—I am sure this holds true for other groups as well—has come a long way in improving their services to their patients the past number of years.

I also point out to the House—and I think this has been mentioned time and time again—that the chiropractors have received no government money for their new college, nor did they for their old one, but have carried on to the extent of providing a real service to the public in the health service field.

The validity of chiropractic has been reinforced by the medical profession, which is now seeking to adopt some of the practices of chiropractic, but are doing so without the benefit of the four-year course at the chiropractic college. This is the required course for anyone wishing to become a chiropractor.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I urge the government to accept this resolution. I suggest we have talked about it long enough. People are waiting for action.

An hon. member: Put the question.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, the proposal as outlined—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. member for Peterborough is next on my list.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to state immediately that, not only as a private member, but as a member of the New Democratic Party, I support this resolution placed once again by the member for Huron-Bruce. I have taken the trouble to read the debate that has gone on in this House, over the past four years I guess it is now, and during which this member has presented this particular resolution.

I have been impressed by the weight of evidence which he has placed on the record, the weight of evidence which refers to Royal commissions which have taken place, not only in this country but in other countries—in Australia, for example—the evidence which was placed before the workmen's compensation board. And, of course, today, the evidence which he has placed before us in relation to the Medicare programmes already in operation in other provinces. I think he should be congratulated. I am certain he receives the full support of this group.

I do not wish, at this time, to add any statistical evidence. Rather I wish to deal with this in a very simple—some may perhaps say simplistic—but, I hope, a very candid way, in dealing with what I would suggest are the two arguments which have been used

against the inclusion of chiropractic and other paramedical services as part of the OMSIP arrangements in this province.

I think that all the arguments boil down to these two arguments. The first argument is that there are healing arts, and there are pseudo-healing arts. It is suggested that chiropractors—and, in the past, optometrists, and certainly many of the other groups that have been mentioned during this debate—are just not quite up to being the fully accepted healing arts level which should be subsidized, or supported, by the OMSIP arrangements of this province.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a spurious argument. The chiropractors and many of these paramedical groups have raised their academic requirements. They have raised the standards of the kind of training which has been given. They have, however, been restricted—and seriously restricted—from improving themselves by the lack of coverage which has been afforded to them, particularly in this province.

I would suggest to you, sir, that the acceptance by this government of these paramedical groups as part of a total health services pyramid would enable these groups to provide the kind of services, which are desperately needed among many of the people in this province.

I suggest to you, sir, that at this time, when we are considering the various professions in this province—indeed when we are bringing bills before this Legislature to deal effectively with these professions—we should consider each of the groups as in the paramedical and medical field and bring them all up to the necessary standard to protect the public, as the McRuer report suggested. I think it is totally unacceptable to argue that these are not respectable groups providing services in this province. If this is so, then the government has another responsibility—and that is to protect the public against them.

They either have to accept them as providing a health service; or they have a responsibility to protect the people against these services.

I suggest to you, sir, that is a totally unacceptable alternative, even to this government. We know these people are providing services. We know they are alleviating sufferings. And we know as well that there are some who are under the umbrella, of certain paramedical groups, which are possibly doing some disservice to the province. It is the responsibility of this province to deal effectively with these professions. It can only

be done effectively when they are brought within the total umbrella of the health services in this province.

The second argument, sir, is I think the argument of gradualism. It is an argument which states we only have a certain amount of money to spend. We can only provide a certain amount of health services. We will begin by providing what are really "respectable" medical services and then over a period of years—perhaps five, perhaps 10, perhaps 50 years—we will bring other groups gradually under the plan.

Well I suggest to you, sir, that this is an entirely spurious argument.

I would suggest that if this session is dealing with anything, it is dealing with the all-important question of taxation. Now, there are some areas where costs rise automatically. We cannot stop the rise of cost. But I think that the taxes which the people of Ontario resent most are taxes which seem to go to a misallocation of services. Where services are being used ineffectively, inefficiently and in an extremely costly manner, it is obvious that realignment of services is necessary.

Now I think health services are a perfect example of this situation. I think that here we have a situation where the financing of health services forces people to go to highly-trained, specialized services people who are performing, in many cases, lower echelon services.

We force them to go to costly facilities in hospitals, and—as has already been stated by members of the government's side—they force people to go into hospitals at very high cost when they could easily have been looked after at much less cost and in much less-costly facilities. If we only had the wit to provide these facilities. In other words, what we are doing is charging the people of Ontario more for services simply because we have not got the wit to provide a whole pyramid of services with various levels into which these people could fit.

I know the Minister is going to say: "Well, no one is going to place a person who only needs very minimal care in a hospital." But it is the doctor's responsibility to place that person in. It is the doctor's responsibility to take that person out. But I suggest to you, that doctors are people. They realize that in many cases the person who is in the hospital at a cost of \$60 or \$70 a day has nowhere else to go. If he is not in that hospital, there is no way in which the province can support that individual.

I suggest that it is the same for a chiro-

practor, the same for all the other para-medical groups. People do not go to people who can provide less costly, lower-echelon services because they are forced to seek the services which are possibly higher priced. That is the only way they can get any support from the government of Ontario.

I suggest that this is a criminal misuse of human resources, a criminal misuse of facilities. It is the people of Ontario who are paying the taxes who are suffering—and they realize they are suffering. There are people across this province who are receiving services for which they would be very happy to pay less, but they cannot get those services unless they pay for it directly.

When this province recognizes that this is now the 20th century, that every profession, including the medical profession, including the teaching profession, is itself a pyramid rather than a single line, or rather a double line—one which is respectable and one below which is not respectable and therefore not acceptable by the government for some form of subsidization—the better off we will all be. And we will be able to make better use of our taxes, rather than continually trying to secure more taxes.

But this is not unexpected, Mr. Speaker. We saw, at the constitutional conference, the exhibition when the Prime Minister tried to use health services as a kind of a lever to get money from the federal government in place of health services. He really suggested that the people of Ontario do not want any kind of full Medicare programme. They want the OMSIP, OHS chaos we have at the present time, the Prime Minister stated.

Health services somehow are still a part of a market place. We see it as some kind of a privilege. Not a right on the part of the people of Ontario, but a privilege which is being doled out, bit by bit to the people of Ontario over the years, possibly until the next election, when a few more para-medical groups will be brought in bit by bit.

And he sees, apparently, the whole health field as fragmented rather than a team, a unit. Well Mr. Speaker this, I think, is a totally inadequate and unacceptable way to provide service for the people of this province. Not only are the people not receiving services and being deprived of services, they are being over-charged for services. Their tax money is being misallocated. In short, I do not think anyone who could look at the entire health service field in Ontario can be very proud of the way in which this province has handled its people.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Now for some soft soap!

Mr. Carruthers: The proposal, as outlined in the resolution presented by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, to extend benefits provided under the Ontario Medical Service Insurance Plan, is indeed worthy of consideration. I am sure the matter has been, and continues to be under review by the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) and his departmental officials.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the services referred to in resolution No. 22 are not at present included as benefits under OMSIP. This is not to be construed as discrimination. OMSIP is in itself an additional step forward in the provision of health services insurance for the people of this province and the plan is continually being expanded to include extended services.

At the present time OMSIP provides:

1. Physicians' services at the doctor's office, home or hospital and includes the services of specialists.

2. Certain dental services where surgery is involved and as detailed in the regulations.

3. Refractions, either by physicians or optometrists, are covered under the plan.

4. Ambulance services have recently been included.

Mr. Sargent: Same speech as he gave last year.

Mr. Carruthers: No, it is not; it is entirely different.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Yes, it is different. I read it; it is weaker.

An hon. member: He did not write it.

Mr. Carruthers: No, I did write it myself this time, friend.

It should be pointed out that the federal Medicare programme does not include any of the services referred to in the resolution. The basic federal Medicare standard simply requires that a plan approved for federal financial assistance will provide all physicians' services.

The extension of services under OMSIP is a favourable move, Mr. Speaker, that meets general approval. I want it to be known that, although I support the resolution of the hon. member, I do so with certain reservations. First, the extensions should be based on a

priority of need, availability of service and funds available. And, second, the word "immediately" should be changed to read "at the earliest practical time".

Mr. Trotter: The fullness of time.

Mr. Carruthers: After all, the government has to assume the responsibility.

In establishing priorities, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the inclusion of chiropractic services be given primary consideration, and I do so for a number of reasons.

1. Chiropractic services in general replace those provided by a physician, which at present are covered under OMSIP. The inclusion of chiropractic services in many instances would not involve new costs, but would simply be the transfer of costs from one service to another.

2. The general public is making increasing use of chiropractic services, and in many instances there is now full co-operation between physicians and chiropractors in the treatment of patients. These services should, therefore, be placed on a basis of greater equality, and in many respects are equally entitled to coverage.

3. Although chiropractic services are not included in the basic programme provided by the Alberta government, it is one of the optional benefits. As an insuring body, the Alberta Department of Health is prepared to cover these services, and it is reasonable to conclude that actually the services are part of the Alberta plan.

4. Chiropractic services are included as a benefit under the British Columbia basic programme and, although there are certain exclusions and limitations, the cost has proven to be reasonable. And the service provides an excellent model for a similar programme in Ontario.

5. It does seem rather unreasonable that the major benefits under the OMSIP programme should be limited to the services provided by physicians. An examination of the broad spectrum of paramedical services reveals the extensive use of other groups within the field. Chiropractic services in particular, because of their extensive use and their importance, should have priority.

6. What might be termed the first medical insurance provided by this government, namely workmen's compensation, does include chiropractic services in its programme. It seems logical, therefore, that in setting priorities the services of chiropractors should merit priority in extending the OMSIP programme.

The British Columbia plan shows a cost factor of 3.3 per cent for chiropractic care over a 12-month period. According to the figures made available to me through the Ontario Chiropractic Association, the total dollars paid out in British Columbia for chiropractic care over a 12-month period amount to \$388,000. British Columbia shows a total policy-holder figure of \$486,000. On an average, if these figures are correct, the cost per policy holder to the plan in British Columbia is 80 cents per year.

Applying these figures to OMSIP, which has some 800,000 policy holders, the projected cost would be 800,000 x 80 cents or \$640,000 for a 12-month period—a fairly reasonable figure when one considers the total budget of this province.

It should be pointed out, however, that the British Columbia plan is limited in that it provides for a payment of \$100 per family per year or \$50 per individual per year at \$5 per visit, and no additional fee can be charged the patient.

Even with these limitations, however, the fact remains that British Columbia has recognized the need for and the importance of including chiropractic services in a medical care programme.

In light of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I urge this government to give every consideration to include paramedical groups within OMSIP and that top priority be given to chiropractors, who should be included in the OMSIP programme at the earliest date.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I want to join in with the other members of this House who support the resolution. The unfortunate part about this is that so often, on so many occasions in so many years, this resolution has been supported by almost everyone who has ever spoken about it. But, as is so typical of the House that is dominated by a Conservative government, nothing has been done about it.

One of the major things that is wrong with our neglect of the paramedical fields is the fact that we are denying the public of Ontario freedom of choice, I know of many a Tory who likes to stand up and talk about free enterprise and the importance of freedom of choice. Slightly under two million people in the province of Ontario use chiropractic treatment. Yet they are simply cut out by this government, which has shown no interest whatsoever. I think it is about time

the government had its political vertebrae straightened and got around to treating the chiropractors as they should be treated, and that is as a very responsible profession in the province of Ontario.

One of the main reasons why the chiropractors have been kept out of the OMSIP scheme and have been kept out of the purview of the present Conservative government is simply because the college of physicians and surgeons is one of the most powerful lobbies, not only in the province of Ontario, but in the entire country. In 1950, when Mr. Justice Roach was presiding over a Royal commission investigating workmen's compensation, the college of physicians and surgeons said that the chiropractors should not be allowed to treat men who came under The Workmen's Compensation Act. Despite that Mr. Justice Roach, in his report, was most complimentary to the chiropractic profession and since that time, since 1950, literally millions of dollars have been spent and paid to the chiropractic profession to help men who have been suffering mainly from injuries to their backs.

The truth of it is that such treatments are less expensive than if they are treated by a doctor. But I use this as an example that one of our major provincial agencies, the workmen's compensation board, has been using the services of the chiropractic profession.

Well, then, why is it that slightly under two million people are denied services from this group? It seems to me unfair and it is certainly denying a freedom of choice.

Now, I have no particular axe to grind for the chiropractors. I may have been to one on one or two occasions in my life. Mainly I go to a medical doctor, and my own opinion of the medical profession in the province of Ontario as doctors is that they are probably the finest group of doctors anywhere in the world. There is no question in my mind that they are highly trained and they are good men. But when it comes to medical economics—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): They are the richest.

Mr. Trotter: When it comes to medical economics they are pre-Victorian. For us, in this House, to stand in the way of the well-being of many hundreds of thousands of people is utterly and completely wrong. The responsibility of this is with the government and, Mr. Speaker, more particularly with the Minister of Health. Why he seems to want to protect the medical profession in the economic-political area is more than I can understand. I know on one occasion, when the medical profession raised their fees without

giving the government any warning, they led our Minister of Health up the garden path. And I tell you that today they are leading all of us, including all the people in the province of Ontario, up the garden path and they are certainly not treating us in the way that we could be treated.

So I emphasize again and again, Mr. Speaker, that the medical profession is simply a lobby that is far too strong.

Now the medical profession, Mr. Speaker, tell us that they are overworked, that there are too few doctors to go around, that it is very hard to reach a doctor on the telephone. It is impossible almost to get a doctor to call at the home.

Why in the world they do not use the other services that are available, that where a chiropractor or an osteopath can be of service to a patient and especially when the patient wants his services, why should these various groups not be included in any particular scheme?

The chiropractors and the osteopaths, they are recognized by statutes of this Legislature as a profession that is considered qualified to practice and I say that they should not be discriminated against. If we recognize them as a proper paramedical group in the province of Ontario then, they should be treated fairly and they are simply not being treated fairly.

Now I know there are other groups, other than the chiropractors and the osteopaths, but certainly these are the major paramedical groups in the province—particularly the chiropractors. Bear in mind that other provinces like Saskatchewan and British Columbia and Alberta have recognized their services in their schemes, and certainly the major insurance companies have recognized their services, and for one very particular reason—it simply does not cost as much and they can do the work just as well.

As the hon. member for Huron Bruce has pointed out that despite the fact that over the years the medical profession have said that chiropractors are all wrong, now the doctors themselves are trying to learn some of the treatments that are given by the chiropractors.

So I emphasize that where the services of a chiropractor are required and it is the proper way and the patient wants those services, then their services should be used.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one further item that I would like to emphasize and this is the importance of dental health.

The argument is often put forward that if dentists were included under OMSIP there

simply would not be enough dentists in order to give the services that would be required. There is this one suggestion, however, that I would like to make. Even if the government, under OMSIP, in supplying the paramedical services, said that all children 12 and under were included at least it would be a beginning because you can give the children in their younger years good dental health throughout their life.

I would like to underline the importance of this, Mr. Speaker, because the proper dental care and the prevention of the dental decay starts in treating the young. I would hope that this government, at some future date, and believe me it is almost a dream and it is a long future date, at the speed that this government moves, but it is an idea that I put forward that I would hope that this government would certainly include dental services beginning with the children and, of course, eventually expanding that programme to cover the whole population here in the province of Ontario.

So with the other members who spoke, Mr. Speaker, I join in the forlorn hope that something will be done in the immediate future but I am quite certain of this, that these changes will come in the not too distant future, in 1971, when we have a Liberal government to do things over there.

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

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, piling forlorn hope upon forlorn hope, as it were, I want to express a dreary weariness with this repetitious ritual we go through year after year on a number of resolutions that come before the House. The refusal of the government to allow them to come to a vote is perhaps the most reprehensible feature of it because, of course, if the government permitted a vote on an issue of this kind, then the resolution would pass and willy-nilly the coverage of chiropractic care would be included in OMSIP as obviously it should be.

A number of speakers in this House have mentioned earlier in the session the feeling of irrelevance that some of them hold during the Parliamentary debates. No more, Mr. Speaker, than at this point in time is a member's irrelevance brought home to him rather poignantly in debating a resolution over which he has no control, entirely dictated by autocratic and immovable government policy.

I, as one member, register my resentment about the nature of the democratic process

which humbles private members of the Legislature in this fashion. There is no particular reason for it and if anyone takes exception to it on the government side of the House, Mr. Speaker, then simply let them put it to a vote and let us see what the gist of the House is, a pretty simple way of drawing one's conclusions.

I would like to congratulate, as with others, the member for Huron-Bruce for his relentless tenacity in bringing the resolution forward year after year. One day when it is fulfilled he will take some pride in its authorship along with the once not so bemoaned confidante of Mike Walton and others, he can share in the pleasure. When—if the member for Huron-Bruce will permit me—when his back is thrown out of joint by the NDP juggernaut in 1971, there will be many in the province who will rise to his defence not least the entire chiropractic profession and he may—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Like to hear the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) on the subject of chiropractors. Where is he this afternoon?

Mr. Lewis: The member for High Park is not present at the moment, and the member for Huron-Bruce will doubtless be immortalized in the hall of fame.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it has been demonstrated on this occasion and on previous occasions that the cost factor related to the inclusion of chiropractors is no longer a matter of anxiety or concern, that it is in fact a plus factor in the distribution of medical costs, not a negative one.

The numbers of people that would benefit has equally been demonstrated. There is an obvious social need. It is therefore very difficult even in the presence of the chief conspirator, who has just departed, to understand why it is—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That is unparliamentary!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Pretty true, though.

Mr. Lewis: Nothing unparliamentary compared to what I would like to say.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, one has to ask one's self why it is that so obvious a social need, so urgent a social issue, is not acted upon speedily in this Legislature. I want to give you what I believe to be a fairly simple

answer. All these other things having been dealt with, it is an answer which echoes other observations in this House, and I think it has to be made and made firmly, and it is a compelling and uncomplicated fact.

There is, Mr. Speaker, a medical conspiracy in the province of Ontario directed against the auxiliary medical professions, and there has been for a considerable number of years. There is an absolute refusal on the part of the medical profession to concede the viability and the legitimacy of these auxiliary healing arts. The medical profession retreats, in its own antediluvian fashion, into a kind of savage defence of what once was, deeming every other auxiliary group a sorcerer's apprentice and in the process dismembering the practice of medicine in the province; dismembering the healing arts, and throwing into disarray, not to say serious discrimination, the spectrum of medical services in the province of Ontario.

One only needs to look in the case of the chiropractor, at the evidence which is everywhere around us.

In this very Legislature where chiropractors are concerned, they are governed, not by a Chiropractic Act as in the majority of provinces in this country, but by a Drugless Practitioners Act, which immediately impugns their integrity as a healing art, which it is obviously the intention of government to do.

The college of physicians and surgeons falls over itself to construct absurd and sophistic arguments about why chiropractors should not be included, and rejects—although on the record there is no greater study—rejects the Lacroix commission in Quebec, which looked at every conceivable jurisdiction and came to the conclusion that chiropractic was a legitimate medical practice worthy of inclusion in a medical scheme.

As a matter of fact, quoting from the brief of the college of physicians and surgeons to the committee on the healing arts, they themselves describe the Lacroix commission and its intent. I would like to read it into the record, Mr. Speaker, because it could not be more aptly described:

Mr. Justice Lacroix delved thoroughly into the origin and philosophy of chiropractic, its present educational establishments in Canada and the United States, the curriculum of these schools and the educational background of their teachers.

He explored, with the assistance of competent biochemists, physiologists, and urologists, the validity of the theory of chiropractic; the deficiencies in the training

of chiropractors; and the role of manipulative therapy in the treatment of human ailments. The study ranged, not only to all parts of this continent where information could be obtained, but included visits to several European centres where manipulative therapy is practised.

Having made that statement about a report which supports the resolution put before us today, the college of physicians and surgeons then gave forth with a paragraph which I challenge anyone in this House to interpret. Since we are now speaking of professional groups, perhaps there is a legal member of the House who would explain to me the meaning of the following paragraph that came from the college of physicians and surgeons to explain their point of view.

It is submitted, with respect, that we cannot support all of the conclusions the learned justice has drawn from these facts, but the facts themselves, assembled by scientific teachers and commissioners of integrity, are beyond question and we support the validity of their conclusions.

Now, physicians, sir, have a certain casuistry of their own. It exceeds that of the mediocre minds of legislators.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It would make the lawyers blush.

Mr. Lewis: It should indeed make the lawyers blush. They might give up their professional mystique—let me read it just once again, because it is a magnificent exposé of the medical mind when dealing with chiropractic:

It is submitted, with respect, that we cannot support all of the conclusions the learned justice has drawn from these facts, but the facts themselves, assembled by scientific teachers and commissioners of integrity, are beyond question and we support the validity of their conclusions.

There is, one must admit, a certain Alice in Wonderland quality about the college of physicians and surgeons, not to mention the savage discrimination to which I alluded earlier.

Mr. Speaker, to draw this together, one should not forget that one of the doctors in this House, who now occupies the position of Minister of Health—and I make that point without any hesitation—one of the doctors in this House, was pressed about chiropractics three or four years ago. I guess it is longer than that now, it was March of 1963, when the issue became a sort of *cause célèbre*

during the Health estimates. When pressed on it by the House, he said that though he had no opposition to these various professions, he would not give them bursaries, and quoting from *Hansard*, March 4, 1963, page 1312:

the optometrists, pediatricists, hypnotists, and a whole host of other people who are practising on the fringes, or at least are impinging upon, the practice of medicine.

Now, if the House wants to understand the resistance on the part of government, then let them understand that the Minister of Health lumps chiropractors with hypnotists in the healing arts. In that way he confirms the view of the entire medical profession, or a great many within the medical profession. Indeed, he goes on to confirm it at some considerable length later on during the estimates debate.

But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we again pay the price of the Minister of Health and of the medical profession. We again pay the price for the fact that the medical profession is run as a cabal, whether it consists in the exclusion of foreign doctors from practice in this province, or whether it consists in the exclusion of chiropractors from OMSIP. It is a simple policy of exclusion and it motivates their every object.

As a final aside, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Huron-Bruce will permit me; I trust he will not mind my saying to him that there are certain pleasures in being to speak in dual directions simultaneously.

While he applauds the inclusion of chiropractors in OMSIP, the hon. Minister of Health in Ottawa has, as recently as last month, categorically rejected the inclusion of chiropractors in the national Medicare scheme in response to a question from Stanley Knowles. So that while one asks for Medicare here from the Liberal Party and asks for inclusion, the exclusion principle persists at the federal level. If the Liberal Party were not itself so out of joint, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the chiropractors' future would be better in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Gaunt: I will talk to him.

Mr. MacDonald: No more use talking to him than to the Minister of Health here.

Mr. Lewis: But in either event, Mr. Speaker, we in this House resent profoundly the autocracy and indifference of government to a very obvious social need and I suppose we will continue to persist in raising it in this Legislature until such time as the revolution dawns and the government takes action.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Armourdale.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution unequivocally—

Mr. MacDonald: We should have a vote. Everybody is in favour of it.

Mr. Carton: I, too, compliment the member for Huron-Bruce on his persistence, his continuing, well-researched and well-documented pleas on behalf of the chiropractors over the past two years. I read every word pro and con in *Hansard* yesterday on this subject and I must say that I have been impressed by most of the affirmative arguments and I am appalled by many of the negative ones.

I take issue with the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the debates on this subject have been to establish the *status quo* on the standing of chiropractors. This is in spite of general, worldwide acceptance, in spite of favourable recognition by the Royal commissions in Canada—nine of them—in spite of government acceptance in most of the provinces and in spite of acceptance here in Ontario through the workmen's compensation board, and most importantly and most emphatically, in spite of the acceptance by virtue of the personal experiences of over one and a half million people in our great province—and they are the jury in this matter.

Mr. MacDonald: How can the hon. member remain in that Party?

Mr. Carton: It is incredible and, yes, it is astounding to me that we have to spend so much time in defending their professional status. Were I a chiropractor, I would feel humiliated, ashamed and yet indignant at this necessity to prove my status in the Legislature of our own province.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us abandon once and for all these defensive arguments and let us start with the positive assertion that this Legislature needs no further debating on the merits of a chiropractor.

The next logical step, Mr. Speaker, is to look at cost. As I say, yesterday I read *Hansard* completely on this topic and nowhere have I been able to find any computation to show that this would be a significant increase. If, as its opponents say, cost is the important factor, then I would suggest it is incumbent on the opponents to explain and to document these additional costs. I, for one, am not impressed by members carelessly saying it will cost millions. I recall on a prior occasion I was damned by saying, "It will

cost millions; you will bankrupt the government," when in point of fact the government made money on that particular occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it does not faze me to slough off recommendations by the bogeyman cost, and really, if you look back in *Hansard* three years, you will see that I made a speech on taxation. It received no attention whatsoever at that time, but if you took time to read it you would find that this is what has been preached by the government leaders today. It was a good half hour on taxation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my point abundantly clear, and that is: if costs are indeed a factor—and we are all interested in costs—then we need documented proof on these, for I have read in *Hansard* some of the arguments put forth by the member for Huron-Bruce, some of them by the member for York South, and they went unchallenged.

I must confess that, at first flush, and until shown to the contrary, they appear to have made the point as far as I am concerned. So, a fatherly pat on the head or a remark by the powers that be, that he does not know what he is talking about is insufficient. Let us put our facts on the table.

I notice from the debates in *Hansard* that there is support on all sides of the House on this matter. The member for Hamilton Mountain made a very eloquent speech last year; the member for Renfrew-South; the former member for Lakeshore; and, today, the member for Durham, have all recorded their support in *Hansard*. And I am of the opinion that the majority of the members on all sides of the House are in accord with this resolution, and, Mr. Speaker, the weakness of this Legislature is that most members express their views privately.

I trust that the hon. Minister of Health will make a review of the matter, and I sincerely hope that action in the affirmative will be taken. If there are costs, I sincerely hope and trust that it would be in line with the new policy on priority spending.

In closing, just to make my point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw a picture, because one picture does more than a thousand words.

If you can let your imagination run wild for a moment—everyone in this House—you can imagine a magnificent edifice. Over the top it has "Ontario Medical Services Insurance Plan"—OMSIP—and down the road comes this man, limping with a back problem.

He walks through the door—he walks through the portals, and he finds himself in

a room. There are two doors in this room. Over the one door it says, "Injuries below the waist," and the other door says, "Injuries above the waist." So he walks through the door marked "Above the waist."

He finds himself in another room, and there are two doors. One says, "Acute" and one says "Chronic." It is acute, so he goes through that one.

Once again he finds himself in a room with two doors, and the one says, "Back injury," and the other says, "Other injury." So he goes through the door saying "Back injury."

And he finds himself once more in a room with two doors. On the one door it says, "Physicians"; on the other door it says, "Chiropractors." He goes through the door marked "Chiropractors" and he finds himself out on the street again.

I need make no further remarks, at least on that particular topic, and, with your approval, I now move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow we will go to the order paper for some legislation and continue the Throne Speech debate. I would remind the members that Thursday has been designated as the day on which the second order—the constitutional debate—will be called, and also that we are having evening sessions tomorrow and Thursday.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Has the government decided what will come up on the order paper?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, I think that we will just take anything that is ready on the order paper.

An hon. member: Including committee?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Fifth report, standing private bills committee	1498
Motion re standing health committee, Mr. Potter	1498
Federal Medicare, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon and Mr. T. P. Reid	1498
Automobile insurance, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent	1499
Nagara Parks system, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Shulman	1500
Hotel fire safety, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Deans	1500
Transfer of prisoners from Burwash, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman	1501
Ontario hospital school in Orillia, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman	1501
Proposed community pastures programme, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Farquhar	1502
Fire trucks, question to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Deans	1503
Hydro purchases, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Nixon	1504
Cyanide spillage, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Martel	1504
Dumping of hydrochloric acid, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	1504
Larder Lake and Kerr-Addison gold mines, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Jackson	1504
Fifty Point Park, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Deans	1504
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, Mr. De Monte, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Bukator	1505
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Bukator, agreed to	1531
Recess, 6 o'clock	1531

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have as our guests in the east gallery, students from Applewood Heights Secondary School in Cooksville, and, in the west gallery, students from Blessed Trinity Separate School in Willowdale and the Young Progressive Conservative group from the Lutheran University at Waterloo.

Some days ago, certain members of the House rose with enquiries concerning the powers and duties and responsibilities of committees of the House, particularly with respect to the committees' powers and procedures to pursue matters whether referred expressly to the committee by the House or not, and with respect to the summoning of witnesses to give evidence before the committee. There would appear to be little difficulty in this regard with respect to select committees, as normally the exact powers and terms of reference of such a committee are set out in a resolution to establish the committee.

Committees of the House are, of course, only emanations of the House and have only such powers and duties as are given them by the House. Their terms of reference, that is to say the matters with which they are entitled to deal, are only those which are referred to them by the House.

Standing committees are set up by an order early in the session which clearly states, and I quote from the rules:

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

Standing committees, therefore, are established only to deal with those matters referred to them by the House.

However, for the past decade or more, it has been the practice for such standing committees to institute programmes for the information or instruction of their members by hearing from departmental officials and other persons having specialized knowledge. More-

over, such committees have often heard deputations and delegations from various groups who have asked to appear before such committees.

These programmes are for the purpose of enlarging the knowledge of the members in various fields related to government and public affairs of the province. All these matters are, of course, outside the committees' strict legal functions and terms of reference, and do not entail any obligation to report thereon to the House.

Any person appearing before the committee in connection with such programme does so voluntarily on the invitation of the committee. The instigation and carrying on of such a programme does not, however, give the committee any right to initiate inquiries or investigations unless specifically ordered by the House.

With respect to the question of calling witnesses to give evidence before a standing committee, the order of the House above quoted gives the committee "power to send for persons, papers and records". This power, of course, relates strictly only to "all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House".

The procedure under this order is for the clerk of the committee to write to the witness, summoning him to appear before the committee at a stated time and, if necessary, to bring with him any documents in his possession relating to the matter with which the committee has been charged by the House.

Should the witness not reply to the invitation of the clerk to appear before the committee, the committee informs the House of the refusal or neglect, and the House may, if it sees fit, order the attendance of such witness. In this case, the Speaker is empowered by subsection 2 of section 35 to issue his warrant directed to the witness. Such warrants are only issued, however, by order of the House.

In the case of a select committee, as mentioned, which is given authority to sit in the interval between sessions, it is the practice in the order establishing the committee for the House to give Mr. Speaker blanket authority to issue his warrant or warrants for

the purpose of summoning witnesses, so that recourse may be taken to this procedure if it becomes necessary, even though the House is not sitting to make the necessary order.

I am sure that with this guidance and the assistance of the Clerk of the assembly, standing committees of the Legislature will have little difficulty in formulating and following proper practices and procedures with respect to their duties, responsibilities and powers.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's fifth report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the County of Ontario.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the County of Peel.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting McMaster University.

Mr. Speaker: Motions:

Mr. R. T. Potter moves, seconded by Mr. Belanger, that pursuant to section 35 of The Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1960, chapter 208, Dr. J. W. Mullner of the Ontario Hospital, Brockville, be ordered to attend before the standing health committee to give evidence with respect to allegations made by him concerning the staff at the hospital, and to produce all such papers and things as may be relevant thereto, and that, for this purpose, the Speaker do issue his warrant. Also, that the committee be authorized to sit while the House is sitting to hear the above-mentioned evidence, if the committee finds it necessary so to do.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he would care to comment on the story in the morning's *Toronto Daily Star* concerning the Ontario acceptance of Medicare. He responded quite vociferously to a similar comment last week. Perhaps he would indicate whether there is any veracity in this or not.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I believe the question as put to me is:

That the Prime Minister indicate that the story in the morning *Toronto Daily Star* is correct concerning Ontario acceptance of Medicare.

I would simply say that I do not choose to comment on that question. My answer to the question is no.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a question of the Premier.

An hon. member: Why does he get preference?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): In view of the statement made by the Premier in the Legislature last Wednesday that Medicare is unconstitutional, is he prepared to take this question to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I did not make such a statement about Medicare; I did not say that Medicare was unconstitutional. There is a vast difference between a bill such as that being unconstitutional. The effect of the bill is that it amounts to a federal intrusion into an area of constitutional responsibility that belongs to the province.

We have, in any event, an answer to the question. I would simply say that we have no intention of challenging the constitutionality of the bill. However, I have no hesitation in repeating what I said—that I considered it a deliberate attempt by the federal government to use a federal fiscal policy to intrude into areas that are the constitutional responsibility of the province.

I would like to add I hope the hon. members will not take the position I see some of my critics have taken that I am opposed to national Medicare, because I am not. If the hon. members will go back—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member's foggy thinking is interpreted as riding both sides of the fence. I will have an opportunity in due course, Mr. Speaker, to document my position in these matters. But if anyone is sufficiently interested—and I know the members over there probably won't be that interested—if they were to check back on various statements I have made in this House, in their hearing and on the official records of

this House, I am not opposed to national Medicare, nor am I opposed to the fullest possible health care that we can give our people. But I must say I am violently opposed to the way in which the federal government is trying to ram this down our throats.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier accept a supplementary question?

Would he not agree that this programme, according to him, is going to cost the people of Ontario around \$225 million, for which they will get no benefit? Is it not incumbent upon him to take this to the highest court in the land to save the taxpayers that money if it is unconstitutional?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I see no purpose in taking it to the highest court in the land. I do not think it is a matter that will ever be settled legally in any event.

I think it is a political matter and I do not see that there is any virtue in involving ourselves in a long course of litigation when we have some doubts as to whether we would even be successful. I cannot say that I believe this particular bill is *ultra vires* of the federal government because of the provisions of the Constitution. It is not the bill I object to; it is the intent. The purpose and the underlying philosophy.

If you want to change the Constitution, if you want to change the whole life of this country and the way we operate, there are various ways of doing it. One way is to sit down and rewrite the Constitution in terms of people and the effect that Constitution is going to have on how the people in the country live. Another way is to use fiscal leverage to change the Constitution in fact, if not in word, and thereby change how our country functions as well.

Now these are our objections; they are very simple to those who want to understand them, but I suppose if the hon. members opposite want to be apologists for their friends in Ottawa forever, you will always take this attitude.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The hon. member for Grey-Bruce will understand why I gave the floor to his colleague because it was an allied question. The hon. member for Rainy River had an allied question to the one previously asked of the Prime Minister;

that is why I gave him the floor. You now have the floor, sir.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. P. Reid: And because of a more important speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Everybody is out of step but the Prime Minister.

1. Would the Premier advise why the government will not consider forming a commission to investigate the exorbitantly high insurance rates on automobiles being charged in the province of Ontario?

2. Is the Premier aware that the Ontario rates are approximately 100 per cent more than those in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree, of course, with the basic principle inherent in this question put forward by the hon. member. I would simply say that any statistical comparison will reveal that the insurance rates in Ontario compare favourably with those really in effect any place on the continent.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): How about Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Saskatchewan does not have the same number of motor cars. They do not have the same—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member either wants an answer to the question or he does not. If he does not agree with me, he will have his opportunity to speak, but he might at least listen to what I have to say.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is rather fruitless for these interjections to be made as far as I am concerned because I cannot hear them. I am always interested in listening to any reasonable contribution the hon. members on the other side may make, but they might do it at a time when I can hear it. Then I will be able to evaluate it and see whether it is worthy of recognition and listening to.

It is really very pointless to attempt to compare insurance rates between the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Ontario. They have not the same number of automobiles, they have not the same congestion of population; they have not the same geographic conditions; they have not the same weather conditions and you can attempt to

make a point by doing this but I suggest to hon. members that it is like comparing apples and oranges, as the old expression goes; it is not valid.

If we do look at some comparative figures, the member might be interested in this. If we take, for instance, the city of Toronto, we take an owner with a three-year, no-claim record providing coverage of \$100,000 for property damage with \$100 deductible collision, \$25 deductible comprehensive (that covers fire and theft and other hazards). In 1968, this coverage would cost \$121 in Toronto; it would cost \$202 in Buffalo; it would cost \$239 in San Francisco; it would cost \$369 in Boston.

In our own country, this policy would cost \$121 in Toronto; it would cost \$211 in Montreal; it would cost \$207 in Quebec City; it would cost \$102 in Kingston—which is the best—and Peterborough; and it would cost \$108 in Winnipeg. So members can see that—

Mr. Sargent: It is \$59 in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But the member is not comparing the same thing. There is no basis of comparison in coverage nor in the method of payment. I suggest that the comparisons I am offering are much more valid in terms of a meaningful comparison than just to simply say Saskatchewan and Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When will the committee on government commissions be invited to visit the Niagara Parks system and examine the minutes, as stated by the Prime Minister in this House on May 28, 1968?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not control the affairs or the destiny of this committee, therefore I cannot answer the question.

However, the chairman of that committee informs me there has been no discussion of this matter in the deliberations of the committee. But I am assured by him that he would be quite happy to arrange a visit to the commission if the committee so requests and requires. The chairman of the commission has assured me that if the committee chooses to visit the parks commission, he will give them a proper welcome and make the minutes available to them, so as always it rests in the hands of the committee itself.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Prime Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: At the last meeting of the committee where this particular commission was present, the chairman at that time said that I could come down personally and examine the minutes. Furthermore, inasmuch as on May 28 it was apparently overruled by the Prime Minister who said this could only be done when the committee as a whole went down there; and further, inasmuch as the Prime Minister has taken this personal interest in this matter, for which I am grateful, perhaps he could intervene and see that we do actually get—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not asking a question.

Mr. Shulman: The question is: Will the Prime Minister intervene to see that we get to visit the commission and see the minutes?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not intervene in the affairs of that committee or any other committee of the House. It is set up by this House—given its being and its powers from the Legislature. If it chooses to do it, it is free to do so. If it does not choose to do so, I am not going to say that it has to.

The chairman of the committee tells me the matter has never even been discussed at this session. The member had better sort it out with him. All I am pointing out to the member is the commission is prepared to receive him and prepared to make the minutes available to the committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister:

Will the Prime Minister make the necessary policy change to transfer inspection of hotel fire safety from the liquor licence board to the fire marshal of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, no, I will not make that policy decision for this reason: The inspection staff of the liquor licence board does many things other than perform fire inspections. In other words, they inspect other matters in addition to those dealing with fire. If we were to make this change, it would be necessary to add staff to the fire marshal's office because they have not sufficient field staff to inspect all the hotels.

So the inspector for the liquor licence board, who is inspecting many other things to do with the sale of liquor in the province, does the fire inspection at the same time.

I would point out that there is very close co-operation between these inspectors and the fire marshal and we think that we have a satisfactory system of looking after these inspections.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, may I, by way of supplementary question, ask the Prime Minister if he would not agree that the present inspection by liquor licence board employees is not adequate and that it should be in the hands of those people who are trained professionally to look for the proper and immediate dangers in a structure?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not agree to that. The inspectors are trained in fire prevention just as they are trained in various other aspects of their work. It is only one part of their job.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) has a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko). He is not here. I am sorry.

The hon. Minister of Correctional Services has some answers from another day. Is the member here who posed them?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was asked some questions by the hon. member for High Park. The first part of the question was:

In the transfer of Mr. Stanley W. from Burwash to Sudbury Jail, did the criminal charges mentioned by the Minister on Friday refer to criminal acts committed inside Burwash?

The answer to that is, yes. Second part of the question:

How many of the 24 prisoners transferred from Burwash were transferred because of detected homosexuality?

The answer is, four other prisoners were transferred from Burwash to face criminal charges of a homosexual nature. The third part of the question:

Why were these prisoners not transferred to Millbrook or some other institution capable of handling homosexuals?

The answer is, it is necessary for men facing criminal charges to be held in the local jail. Question four:

Does the Minister think that district jails are better places to confine homosexuals?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we normally hold the homosexuals in Millbrook and, of course, there are exceptions such as when a man is facing a criminal charge.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday—in view of the fact that there are some criminal charges pending here it would be inadvisable to discuss this matter.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Puts the Minister in the vanguard to be—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no misunderstanding, I did not intend to ask any question, about the criminal charges. Perhaps then the Minister would accept a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to put myself in a position—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Say no, say no.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is no. I do not want to put myself in the position of making a decision as to whether what the hon. member raises is a proper subject for discussion. I am no more a lawyer than the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Far less!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health has the answer to a question. Is the member present?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for High Park asked me a question which I took as notice yesterday. The question is number 736 and since it is recorded in *Hansard* I shall not repeat it. The answers:

1. For the three months ending January 31, 1969, 34 patients have been discharged from the Ontario Hospital School at Orillia.

2. 31 patients have been admitted during the past three months.

3. On the date of enquiry there were nine vacancies in the hospital. Arrangements are made to admit patients as soon as a bed becomes available on the basis of urgency of need for institutional care.

With reference to the specific patient identified by first name and initial, I do not believe that any matters specifically pertaining to patients or any single patient should be discussed in the public record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will hear it.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister give me a private answer then as to when this family could expect to get their child admitted to the hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the hon. member is the family physician, yes. Otherwise, I do not think it is his concern unless the family specifically direct me so to do.

Mr. Shulman: I am the family physician and I am their representative in this Legislature; may I get such an answer?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As the family physician, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma has a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Order! Order!

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Does it mean that those in the Legislature who are not physicians are not subject to such information?

An hon. member: Not that information.

Mr. Lewis: Is this a little club which the Minister is setting up?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there is no club. It is traditionally accepted and I—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I put it to the hon. member himself. Does he want me discussing his, or anybody else's, family affairs and medical affairs in the House? This, in my view, sir, is confidential information and is available to those who are—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Has the hon. member for Scarborough West finished?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If a member of this House seeks information privately from the Cabinet, I think it is incumbent on the Minister to exchange that information with him.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, again I must insist that there is certain privileged information which is not the concern or the right of any member of the Legislature—

Mr. Lewis: What about admissions to government institutions?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If I have the permission of those concerned, either the patient or those acting in his behalf to give that information, then I shall give it, but I feel that I cannot give it publicly, without prior consent.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin might try again.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Would the Minister provide the House with the details of the proposed community pastures project on the Wikwemikong Indian reserve on Manitoulin Island, particularly with respect to the following information: The total amount of acreage involved; the total cost; how is this cost shared between the Indian band, ARDA and The Department of Indian Affairs; and what arrangements are made for supervisory personnel for the operation of the project?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to provide the hon. member and the House with the information which is requested in this question.

The Wikwemikong Indian reserve comprises about 100,000 acres, 10,000 of which will form a part of the community pasture. The total cost is estimated at \$30,000 with \$10,000 being provided by ARDA, which the federal and provincial governments will share in the cost, \$10,000 by The Department of Indian Affairs and \$10,000 by the local Indian band who will provide local materials and labour. It is estimated that of that \$30,000 cost, about \$15,000 will accrue to the local Indian band.

The arrangements for supervisory management of the project will rest with the Indian band itself and with the local Manitoulin island ARDA committee as well as with the local ARDA community pasture board on the island. It will be a co-ordinated project and I would assume, although I do not have the specific information at hand, that there will be someone appointed to act as a supervisor of the pasture itself.

Mr. Farquhar: May I ask a further question of the Minister? Has the Minister given any particular thought to the possibility of encouraging the Indians themselves to grow and raise more cattle to be taken care of on this pasture rather than having cattle taken care of from other parts of the island close

to the reserve? In other words, has he given thought to encouraging the Indians—in some way to raise cattle on their own, more than they are doing at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Speaker, we certainly would be very much prepared to do that and would welcome the opportunity. Quite frankly, as I mentioned in my remarks, there are at least 90,000 acres left in this reserve which is a sizable area, which could be used to vastly expand the beef cattle production of the Manitoulin islands and we would welcome any participation by the Indians along this particular line.

I would point out, sir, that in some provinces of Canada the Indian population, through its reserves, does contribute substantially to the development of the beef cattle industry and we would welcome the opportunity to participate with them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Deans: Pardon me, I could not see him.

To the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister consider changing The Highway Traffic Act to allow fire trucks to proceed through red stop lights?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is not thought that the hon. member's proposal would be in the interest of safety. Section 79 of The Highway Traffic Act now requires the driver of a motor vehicle to pull his car to the right of a road and come to a stop clear of an intersection on the approach of a fire truck sounding its siren. To do as the hon. member suggests would have the effect of removing—

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is not a suggestion or a proposal. It is a question.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would allow the Minister to complete his answer and then, if he had a point of order or a supplementary question I am sure that the floor would be his. However, it would only be a matter of courtesy to allow the Minister to answer the question in the form he wishes as the hon. member has asked in the form he wishes.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: To do as the hon. member's question suggests, would have the effect of removing from the operator of the fire

truck any responsibility for ascertaining that it is safe to proceed through the intersection against the red light.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member now wish to place any supplementary question, or any question with respect to the answer?

Mr. Deans: No, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out by way of a point of order that I was not suggesting or proposing; I was inquiring!

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order here in that matter. The hon. member has asked a question in the terms he wished and the hon. Minister has answered it. The hon. Minister is quite entitled to take what meaning he wishes out of the question, and if not correct, by supplementary question the hon. member may correct the impression.

The hon. member for Rainy River has a question of the Minister of Tourism and Information.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Tourism and Information. Who was Arnold Olsen? What department is he with? Why was a picture taken by Karsh instead of either a Tourism or Lands and Forests' photographer, which appeared in the *Saturday Review* of February 15, 1969? How much did the photograph cost? Who was responsible for the writing of the advertisement? How much did the total advertisement cost? Will the same advertisement be run again in the same magazine or any other publication? Why is he depicted wearing a Lands and Forests' uniform, and yet the public is asked to write him c/o The Department of Tourism and Information?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that that question be put on the order paper and I will have all the detailed answers to put forward in the usual way. I simply say this, though, that the answer to some of the questions of the hon. member will be found in the debates of last year at the time of my estimates, and also the year before.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management has an answer, I believe. Is the hon. member in the House?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, is it mine?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I

have the answer to question 526, asked by the leader of the Opposition. His question was:

What was the cost of purchased electrical energy to meet Hydro's load commitments during December, 1968, and January, 1969?

Answer: The cost of purchased electric energy to meet Hydro's load commitments during the month of December, 1968, was \$2,023,050.52. This includes purchases from Canadian sources. At this date, processing of costs for the month of January, 1969, has been delayed.

I also have an answer, Mr. Speaker, to question 715, asked by the hon. member for Sudbury East. His question was:

In view of the Minister's reply to the House regarding the cyanide spillage that, "the spill of cyanide was at the tailings area serving the Levack Mill of INCO and not directly to Moose Creek", how does the Minister explain the fact that men who cleaned the area of cyanide are willing to give evidence, and have in fact given evidence, that they were instructed to flush out the area through a sump and that the cyanide was flushed directly into Moose Creek?

What action does the Ontario Water Resources Commission intend to take against INCO because the company did not advise them immediately that the spillage occurred, so that tests could be taken to ensure the water was safe, or warn the people if it was dangerous?

The answer, with regard to the statement that:

Men who cleaned the area of cyanide are willing to give evidence, and have in fact given evidence that they were instructed to flush out the area through a sump, and that the cyanide was flushed directly into Moose Creek.

No one has submitted any such evidence to the Ontario Water Resources Commission. Since the spill was accidental and confined to the tailings area, and since no discernible impairment of downstream waters has been observed, no legal action is contemplated. The commission's investigation of this matter is continuing.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a supplementary?

Mr. Martel: No, I guess not, because the evidence was given, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Wentworth have a question for this Minister?

Mr. Deans: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Will the Minister investigate a report that the Steel Company of Canada dumped 150,000 gallons of hydrochloric acid into Hamilton Bay during the week of February 14?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, this matter is now under investigation. The Ontario Water Resources Commission has been in contact with the Steel Company of Canada Limited regarding the recent loss of about 150,000 gallons of hydrochloric acid to Burlington Bay. The company is being required to submit a report to the commission setting forth the details of the occurrence.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question. May I ask if the Minister will make the report available to the House?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I would doubt that very much. It is not customary to make internal reports available to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question of this Minister.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister table the Ontario Water Resources Commission report regarding Larder Lake and Kerr-Addison Gold Mines Ltd.?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the answer is, no. If the hon. member would like to come to my office I would be pleased to answer any question he might have regarding this report.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Deans: Yes, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the government abandoned its plans for development of the area of Saltfleet known as Fifty Point Park?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, the government is still prepared to acquire and develop a possible park site in this area, as soon as land acquisition at recommendable prices can be negotiated.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Before the orders of the day, may I ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food if he has an answer to my question of February 18?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will get that answer. As a matter of fact, I was asking about it today and there is a piece of correspondence that I am trying to define that I have not been able to lay my hands on, but I hope to have it for the hon. member tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment of the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to follow tradition by paying tribute to you, as the Speaker, for the manner in which you handle the affairs of this House. I think that you do a very effective job and I congratulate you on it. It is not always easy because there are differences of opinion from time to time, and one has to—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Not too far!

Mr. Gaunt: One has to view with confidence the role of the Speaker, and I am sure that all of us in this House accord you that tribute, sir.

Before I go any further, I want to say that my preliminary remarks will deal with a subject which I feel very strongly about. I have had a great deal of mail concerning this matter. It is of great concern to the municipalities across the province of Ontario, and I would just like to express my concern on their behalf in this particular area.

I am referring to the withdrawal of the ARDA grant insofar as municipal drains are concerned. This has caused a great deal of difficulty. It came very suddenly. As I understand it, the ARDA agreement was in the normal course to extend to March, 1970. Suddenly The Department of Agriculture and Food decided that in view of the federal government's withdrawal on the cost sharing programme, the province would withdraw their support as well.

This has left the municipalities in a very difficult position in connection with the drains that were actually started, where the engineers had become involved—where the petitions were in the hands of the engineers. I have had a number of examples drawn to my attention. Farmers were assessed any-

where from \$2,000 to \$7,000 for a drain going through their property and these figures were based on the fact that ARDA was going to participate.

Then suddenly the agreement was withdrawn. This means, in effect, that a farmer or person whose property is affected by a drain, and who was figuring on the ARDA agreement to pick up one-third of the cost, is now faced with an assessment of \$14,000. It was previously \$7,000. And in some cases this is perhaps more than the property itself is worth.

So this is a very important point, and I urge the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) and the Treasury Board of this province to reconsider this particular decision. I think the very least that could be done in this regard is for the department to honour in this way all the municipal schemes that were in the hands of the engineers when the ARDA withdrawal announcement was made.

I think this is the very least the department could do. They could go much further, but I recognize that one of the big problems at the moment is the fact that the province is short of money, as is the federal government, and indeed the municipal governments. Having said that, I realize that money is the problem. But perhaps, in order to accomplish what I suggested, some of the money could be taken from some other areas of the ARDA programme and applied to this area to the extent that this grant could be taken on all of the drainage schemes that were in the hands of the engineers prior to the announcement of withdrawals.

I want to make a few comments about the federal-provincial conference, and before I get into that I think we were astonished to see some of the statements that were made at that time. Ottawa has rejected Ontario's desperate demand for a bigger share of the tax revenues. It is interesting to note the change of attitude of the province in relation to the federal government. It is reflected of the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) of this province. At the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference the Premier said:

We, in Ontario, do not intend to bring in the question of the primacy of the federal government.

However, before the constitutional conference was postponed last fall, the Premier of the province said:

If co-operation and co-ordination are to work, there cannot be an assumption of

that superior power which upset the priorities and decisions of the other governments. There cannot be an automatic assumption that the federal government is the superior power and it is this unsaid assumption that leads to most of our difficulties in the field of federal-provincial relations at the present time.

The Premier, in my opinion, has always been a strong federalist. He has always been a strong centralist. He has always believed in a strong federal government—that is, until he got one, and now he does not like it, apparently. This, in my view, is a complete turn-about. I know the Prime Minister has made other statements since then which would seem to revert to his former position.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Federalism and centralism are the same thing.

Mr. Gaunt: May I make the point that the Prime Minister of the province is a strong federalist? Would that be a fairer statement? The Premier is nodding so I presume that we can go on from that assumption. He wants lots of power in Ottawa, but does that mean that he is a weak centralist?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Not necessarily, not as strong as some!

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, formerly there was a constant erosion of the federal position because of a succession of minority governments and because the provincial Premiers were a very impressive group. Now that Canada has a majority government, many of the provincial Premiers are suffering from diminished stature; many of the Premiers have changed and basically they do not represent the formidable group they once did, particularly during the Pearson years.

The Prime Minister of Canada is in a position to take on not only the separatists in Quebec, but also any provincial nationalists that happen to be around. Consequently, the pendulum is going the other way.

I am not trying to defend the federal position in regard to tax sharing. I do think that their position has to be judged against the background of the unsettled world monetary conditions which saw three major crises within the past years. The governor of the Bank of Canada put it: "You cannot take a quart out of a pint jug."

Individuals or a nation cannot continue indefinitely to spend more than they make. Having said that, it is obvious that governments can stimulate their economies by run-

ning budget deficits from time to time which, I suggest, are essential as long as they are not allowed to get out of hand.

The federal government is determined to put its own financial house in order and the province should determine to do the same thing. Surely, a provincial-federal fiscal conference should not mean that a federal government hands more money over to the provinces simply to cover up overspending and bad planning, which is the case in Ontario?

If Ontario assumes the full responsibility for hospitalization, health and welfare and the Canada Assistance Plan, as Ottawa wants, this would give Ontario, as I understand it, another 17 points of income tax which would mean that Ontario would be spending close to 50 per cent of the income tax. Under those circumstances, Ontario should have a role in determining the national income tax base and should have the right to renegotiate the tax base. No one can produce any division of tax money which will satisfy everyone. It is impossible.

Governments all like to spend money and blame taxes on someone else, yet the responsibility for raising taxes is the only real limitation on spending. I think it is about time we considered the taxpayers in the province for once. Governments are so wrapped up in the game of trying to score political points that they forget. It really does not matter whether the taxpayers pay higher taxes to Ottawa or Toronto—we are stuck either way. Yet from the taxpayer's point of view, he is interested in getting value for his dollar and keeping taxes as low as possible, bearing in mind the services which he expects and requires.

Consequently, from this point of view, he who spends, should raise, because this is the only limitation and check a taxpayer has over his government's spending. This is the fundamental crux of democracy. However, we do live in a federated country and there are over-riding fiscal responsibilities as far as the levels of government are concerned. The fact is that today all levels of government—municipal, provincial and federal—are facing equally difficult problems in trying to balance revenues against expenditures.

It is even more important today than previously that these vexing and pressing problems be hammered out in a spirit of co-operation during these rapidly changing times of escalating costs. It is imperative that there be consultation and discussion over the whole field of government expenditure so that the

greatest possible value is squeezed out of every tax dollar.

The next matter I want to touch on is essentially a federal matter, but since this happens to be the only form available to me, sir, I am going to take the opportunity to make a few observations about the personal income tax exemptions.

I presume that what I have to say in this regard will be compatible with what the Treasurer said in his Throne Speech on Monday, December 16, when he said:

We are convinced that the burden of taxation must be lifted from those families with low income, especially those on fixed incomes which have shrunk by inflation.

I have felt for some while, sir—and I have had many representations from people who have held the same view—that the basic income tax exemptions should be raised to reflect more accurately today's cost of living. Certainly the \$1,000 basic personal exemption, and the \$2,000 exemption claim for those claiming marital status, are not very realistic today.

I asked The Department of Finance in Ottawa for some information about the loss of revenue resulting from an increase in income tax exemptions. One calculation assumes that the basic personal exemption is raised to \$1,400 from \$1,000 for a single person, and to \$2,800 from \$2,000 for the individual eligible to claim married status.

A further assumption is that the existing \$300 deduction for a dependent is raised to \$400 and the \$550 deduction to \$660. If these exemptions and deductions were in effect for the 1968 taxation year, the estimated aggregate loss of (a) federal personal income tax revenue; (b) federal old age security personal income tax revenue; (c) the value of the provincial share of basic tax, would be slightly in excess of \$1 billion. Of this amount about three-quarters would represent the loss in federal revenue.

There would have to be an increase of approximately 14 per cent in tax liability for those who still would be taxable under the new exemptions, to make up the difference in lost revenue.

The loss of revenue based on a \$1,400 exemption for a single person and \$2,800 for a marital status is substantial.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is just about time the poor people in this country got a break, and they certainly have not been getting it. I think it is asinine in the extreme for a married couple 67 years of age with no income other than the old age security—both drawing the maximum—\$109.20—to have to

pay \$320.80 at the end of the year. It is playing musical chairs with the taxpayers' money and is morally wrong.

The very least that should be done is for the exemption to be raised to \$1,200 as a first step, an amount which would at least cover the amount of the old age security pension, plus the full supplement for anyone under the age of 70.

The last matter I would like to deal with is one which is causing great concern and anxiety in many parts of Ontario—regional government.

Municipal government may be on the bottom of the rung of the political ladder, but it provides the essential underpinning for much of Ontario's economic and social life. The Prime Minister said on November 28, 1968, and it is recorded in *Hansard*.

The establishment of regional government will be as major a change in our day as was The Baldwin Act of 1849 which set up the basic municipal structure we now know.

Any change of this magnitude is bound to create hardship, resentment in some cases, and out and out opposition in others. I happen to represent a rural riding which I think is essentially opposed to regional government as proposed by the government.

I suspect most, if not all, rural areas across the province are opposed to any move towards regional government, yet the report of the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts; the report of the Ontario committee on taxation; the select committee on taxation; all expressed a need for larger units of local government. This means that rural areas generally are determined to fight a rear-guard action, and this attitude is essentially different. I submit, from that of the urban counterpart.

However, I think there is basic agreement in both urban centres and rural areas that the system of municipal government has to be changed in some way in order to function effectively for the last half of the 20th century. Yet I cannot help but feel that the opposition to regional government is valid because the government seems to be preoccupied with creating larger units of administration and has not given enough study to the financing of the municipal services.

This was best put by the Ontario Economic Council in its recent report when it said:

To create a new level of government to transfer added responsibilities to it without ensuring an adequate tax base is indefensible.

Regional government will improve the current situation in the assessment and the collection

of property taxes, but the financial position of the local government will not be basically changed, and will still depend on the property tax and on financial transfers from the province.

The other point which raises fear among rural people is the fact that regional government will mean that municipal government will become very remote to the average voter and elector. The reeve or the council in any municipality across Ontario is "Mr. Fixit" to the average citizen. If this relationship is disturbed, democracy has indeed lost some of its meaning.

The government has been very dictatorial in its attitude and approach I feel. Surely we can have orderly progress without complete dictatorship. The purpose of regional government will not be achieved if the government persists in its present course of action, because one important ingredient has been left out, and that is local acceptance.

Local acceptance has to be evident if the plan is going to work. Regional government must justify its coming in the minds of the local people. Then, and only then, can it be said the Minister has fulfilled his responsibilities.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join other members who have spoken in this debate in their remarks about the responsible way you conduct your duties to this House.

May I refer briefly to remarks made here recently and found on page 156 of *Hansard*, and read into the record a report printed in the *Lindsay Post* of November 6, 1968, under the heading, "Praise Given PC Leaders," and I quote:

John Alton had words of praise for Progressive Conservative Premiers in Ontario and Canada, and the progress the party has made in the province, but he was critical Wednesday of the Liberal government in Ottawa.

He praised George Drew, Leslie Frost and John Diefenbaker as men who "gave us great government.

"Under these men we had a government serving the people," Mr. Alton told the annual meeting of the Victoria-Haliburton Progressive Conservative Association, but "I feel the government in Ottawa now has us serving them."

All three men, who were mentioned by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) on page 156 of *Hansard*, have been,

and continue to be, fine public servants. Their remarks should be heeded by everyone, not taken lightly or used in any way other than in the way they were meant, in the sincere, constructive interpretation given to the association.

Mr. Speaker, I make no excuse to this House for remarks attributed to me in quotation by the hon. member for York South. I simply state they were perhaps the most newsworthy among words given in my report to my people on that occasion in the opinion of that reporter. It is a concern of each and every member here, all the direct involvement in private or other affairs forsaken, in order to do the responsibility undertaken here.

The hon. member for York South referred to remarks made by Mr. Wilbert Worsley, reeve of Fenelon township, who expressed grave concern with the tax burden of municipalities in regard to local welfare assistance administered by the Victoria county system. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this federal-provincial-municipal programme is of concern to other members of Victoria county council and a committee was established to meet with our Minister on this very important matter at the recent meeting of the Victoria county council in session.

The *Lindsay Post* newspaper, about the same time, carried a Canadian Press article on the recent NDP leadership rivalry between the member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) and the member for York South.

Very serious charges were made by the member for Riverdale about power-broker manipulation of their party in regard to certain support and representation. The member for York South is quoted as saying the matter was one which should be discussed in private by the party, not "washed in public like linen".

Mr. Speaker, what a difference of viewpoint on how democracy should work in political parties.

Perhaps on this occasion it would be appropriate to describe the kind of liberty which our administration has sought, and continues to seek, by reading to you the simple words of a great President of the United States who believed in the kind of liberty that we believe in. The words are from the speech made by President Abraham Lincoln at the sanitary fair in Baltimore in 1864, and I ask that you good people give heed to these words, for although they are a

century old, I think you will find that they apply to 1969.

Mr. Lincoln said this:

The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty, and the American people just now are much in want of one. We all declare for liberty, but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some, the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labour, while with others, the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the product of other men's labour.

Here are two, not only different, but incompatible things called by the same name liberty, and it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible names—liberty and tyranny.

And then, Abraham Lincoln used this homely example. He said:

The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as his liberator while the wolf denounces him for the same act as the destroyer of liberty. Plainly the sheep and the wolf were not agreed upon a definition of the word liberty, and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures and all professing to love liberty. Hence we behold the process by which thousands are daily passing from under the yolk of bondage hailed by some as the advance of liberty, and bewailed by others as the destruction of all liberty.

And in closing, Mr. Lincoln said this:

Recently, as it seems, the people have been doing something to define liberty, and thanks to them that, in what they have done, the wolf's dictionary has been repudiated.

My friends, today in 1969 the people have been doing something to define liberty through this province's government, and the wolf's dictionary has again been repudiated. What Abraham Lincoln said a century ago applies today as it did then. The people, the men and women of this province, will, I think, appreciate their significance in the same measure as men and women in every part of the United States did those many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, after listening for some five years to the socialist representatives in this

House, I have come to the weary conclusion that they represent the most reactionary forces in our province. By any definition, a reactionary is assumed to be among other things a person who is reluctant to change. In my experience, the NDP members of this House are the true reactionaries. They never change. They resist change among themselves. They sit before us now, bearing the scars of their self-inflicted wounds acquired in Kitchener. Whatever progressive element there may have been among them was driven underground at that cannibalistic Kitchener festival.

No, Mr. Speaker, there is never anything fresh or constructive in the NDP's approaches to the business of government. Mind you, they do have one guiding principle, "We build ourselves up when we tear someone else down." They are the wolf who bitterly complains about the shepherd and his concern for the flock. They are indeed the party of the wolf.

Turning to the official Opposition, we find a different situation of almost extreme contrast. No sign of the wolf over there. Far from it. The Grits resemble a pet, perhaps a poodle. Though the poodle traces its ancestry back to a long line of hunting dogs, it has now fallen upon lesser ways and days. Now it is a mere lapdog, wagging its tail in happy ignorance while it awaits the whistle of its Ottawa master before performing.

Mr. Speaker, the party of the poodle and the party of the wolf deserve each other, because for 25 years the Ontario electorate has forcefully indicated that it does not deserve them. Perhaps a merger is the solution. A poodle and a wolf might give us a woodle, an animal that gnashes its teeth in complaint while it wags its tail in ignorant bliss.

It is my opinion that since yellow lines have proved successful in marking the shoulders of highways with a solid painted line, perhaps we should consider marking the centre lines in yellow paint. I believe it is much more noticeable in snow, snow storms, and fog conditions. This is my experience and perhaps should have serious consideration by our Department of Highways in Ontario.

Some of our greatest concentrated populations of this world have now found it vital to control the term of individual lifetime building use. This could be the answer to our cities' prevention of slum areas and the need of urban renewal programmes which take funds needed from other service projects.

We could set aside our historic buildings that should be retained and establish a life-time term of use on others. This would mean new buildings on our land every so often, establishing rehabilitation of our problems on a basis of planning and new concepts without crash programmes by government. Private enterprise would, and could, do the job under such a scheme of scheduled progress.

Now, may I say one or two things about our system of welfare in my locality. I believe the fears expressed to me by my people have a basis in a concern for the individuals who, for one reason or another, are accepted as meeting the requirements of our laws that govern the assistance provided. These individuals find that tax payers are, by our laws, responsible to them, but that the recipients are in only a minor way responsible to the tax payer who provides the resources for the assistance.

We have families who receive assistance from our local authorities that have had their moving charges paid by cities and agencies of government in another area who had responsibilities to that family, and discharged them simply by moving the family to our area. Often this means the new authority has neither the methods nor the opportunity to provide the rehabilitation into society for their new responsibility.

This is wrong, because often it means a family receives more in assistance than one across the street who have the tax-paying responsibility to provide for the recipients, thus too often ending incentive in society to work.

In my area, with below provincial average income and high personal home ownership, it applies a tax burden on home owners that prevents development, restricts funds, kills incentive and emphasizes a base of need for help from government.

I believe we could do much to improve our area in economic straits by providing all welfare by provincial administration and expenditure with direct relieving on a local tax base. I really believe this is the best way the province can relieve burdens at this time on local government.

Otherwise, we will, if we don't require more responsibility of those receiving welfare, create a greater load of recipients without rehabilitation into a useful position in society.

This government must design methods to provide assistance for municipalities undertaking measures of water and sewage programmes. Only so much can be afforded in many of these centres of population collection.

Places of under average income levels, with a high percentage of home ownership, cannot provide these services as we now know them.

We must have assistance and a programme of help designed at once. Average incomes per family under \$4,000 yearly cannot afford water and sewage of \$50 monthly. It should be at least assisted to a degree of approximately \$35 monthly off these charges over the 40-year period of financing.

Mr. Speaker, may I add one or two comments on Algonquin Park that can be considered in addition to those made by my colleagues of this House.

Many regional economic areas of our province need the incentive to have private interests develop winter facilities and utilize the resources available in most of our low economic problem regions. Therefore, it is, in my opinion not a priority for Algonquin to be developed into a winter recreation activity field.

Also, if we are to provide facilities of comfort for those who wish to partake of the park, we should give all encouragement to those who wish to establish outside accommodation and other facilities in order to resolve the financing problems associated with the tourist industry of this province.

A good part of this financial problem arises, and is present, a short distance outside Algonquin Park. There is a tremendous area around the boundaries of this park where operators wish to expand and enlarge their operations. They can only do so by a longer tourist season on which to apply capital costs.

In Algonquin, we also should limit concessions to some extent in that they provide only the type of articles that are after-thoughts, and in no way allow entry into the major fields of merchandising provided by private enterprise outside the park entrances who do not have captive consumers.

Why, for instance, should concessionaires advertise and keep trailers for rent in the park when we have very active trailer sales and rental agencies now over almost all Ontario?

These thoughts are a part of my wish that I never see the day when Algonquin becomes nothing more than a Coney Island type of recreation along Highway 60.

For instance, we see future proposals of snowmobile trails where presently we have 2,500 acres of cleared hydro line facility able to accommodate on a 400-ft.-wide strip 20

miles long almost all the machines on a given day we now have in Ontario. All that is needed here is to have some major land smoothing features undertaken to allow full use of this terrain, along with the presently wide-spaced towers. This is multiple use. There is no present need to develop trails in the park as I see it.

The Department of Lands and Forests is to be commended for the assistance provided to the Peterson trail committee that has done a tremendous work toward establishing a riding-walking-snowmobile facility from Muskoka through Haliburton and well into the Hastings northern region. Much better for the department to give special grants toward these economic developments than to expend finances in duplication of facilities.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I leave this thought with you, and it will be a comfortable thought. I am sure in this province where so many people need so many things, the people's government is moving forward constantly with measures to assist expanding growth. Ontario's people are making a steady upward climb in their standard of living.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Despite the government!

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Our cities are cleaning up their slums, improving their transportation. Engineers are applying the development and findings of our scientists. Our educators are exploring concepts of advanced learning so that everyone, even the disadvantaged, can develop at their best individual rate of progress.

I don't mean to imply that growth is the only game there is.

And, Mr. Speaker, in expressing, through you, my thanks for a fair hearing, may I make an observation about this House over which you guide affairs, and that is that very little change has taken place in one major field and principle from the last Parliament in that the most effective reform suggestions continue to come from my colleagues on this side of the House. I thank you very much.

Mr. D. M. DeMonte (Dovercourt): At the outset I would like to quote from a remark made by H. D. Woods, the noted industrial relations expert who is dean of the faculty of arts and sciences at McGill University. Speaking to the Canadian Chamber of Commerce manpower seminar in Calgary, he said:

Whatever you may feel about unions, collective bargaining, and therefore unionism, is a natural feature of the free enter-

prise system, and perhaps an essential feature.

I doubt if public policy makers would be wise if they attempted to replace the present system. If, under public pressure, governments in Canada introduce compulsion in settling labour and management disputes, it is not merely the industrial relations system that would be radically altered, but the enterprise system itself.

He went on to warn that the main danger now "is that an impatient public and harassed politicians will lose faith in private wisdom and replace it by public authority".

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is the essential point of this whole issue which has been brought to the fore again by the publication of the Rand report. Trade unionism is part and parcel of the free enterprise system. Therefore, unions and management must be allowed—and encouraged—to solve their differences in the free play of collective bargaining. The action must occur across the bargaining table, directly between the parties concerned.

As Liberals, we attack the central concept of the Rand report—the imposition of another tribunal in the labour-management field. This, in our submission, cannot contribute to industrial peace. This idea, incidentally, has been used in Australia and New Zealand, and has been found to be wanting. It is far too rigid to have any validity or usefulness in this province and in the Canadian industrial context. Tremendous power would be vested in a tribunal whose whole ethos is steeped in the Conservative view of life in 19th-century terms of master and servant. The proposals do not make any provision for labour representation on the tribunal, nor is there any appeal from its rulings.

Justice Rand apparently saw little usefulness in the right to picket. Again, his approach seems steeped in a conception of law which raises property above people, and the right of enjoyment of privacy over the right of freedom of association. Most picketing is peaceful, and when it is not, the violence is usually the result of the employer bringing in strike-breakers and scabs.

We believe that the police should keep order and that breaches of the peace should be prosecuted in the normal way. We therefore do not believe in *ex parte* injunctions, and support their being done away with in connection with picketing. But beyond this, as Liberals, we are disturbed by the report's appearing to give legal status to strike-breakers. This is unconscionable.

If a strike-breaker goes into a plant and gets a job, the Rand report starts to give the strike-breaker legal status in the report. To our party, to the Liberal Party, this is completely and utterly objectionable.

The report appears to want to put unions in a strait-jacket while allowing employers continued freedom to go their merry way.

The tribunal envisaged by Justice Rand would have power to impose settlements and to declare a strike illegal if it wants to. This would place the tribunal in the position of imposing an agreement upon a union and upon management, or perhaps in the position of a strike-breaker.

A very disturbing aspect of the whole report is the power given to the tribunal to ask for an order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that, because a specific industry or service is deemed essential, it must submit to arbitration. The thing in question here is: Who decides what is essential? The tribunal? Management? The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council? Who decides? This is a very wide provision that certainly cannot be allowed to stand, particularly since there is no provision of appeal from any of the decisions in the Act or from the decisions of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

The whole proposal represents an inefficient and impracticable system which, quite apart from its judicial and moral implications, is demonstrably unworkable.

The laws that we have today are, in my opinion, and the opinion of this party quite adequate to protect all parties to a dispute, provided that they act in a reasonable and prudent manner. I cannot see what purpose would be served by requiring a union to become a legal entity. Certainly this proposal, if implemented, would leave trade unions open to all kinds of lawsuits and could very well destroy trade unionism entirely.

I notice that no mention is made in the report as to who suffers and who can collect in the case of an illegal shutout. Can the union sue, then, for lost wages?

Surely the essence of this is that making a union liable to suit would in no way assist in settling any given labour dispute.

The fact that the union is a legal entity is not going to make management settle any quicker, or make unions settle any quicker. I cannot see the purpose in Mr. Justice Rand's concept of making a union a legal entity.

In summary, then, let me say that these points I have mentioned form the nub of

the Liberal caucus opposition to the Rand report, a document which we find puts the clock back many years.

In our opinion, the only way to settle labour disputes is to encourage a climate in which both labour and management can negotiate in peace and, subject to our existing laws, without infringement from outside parties. No one relishes a strike, and no one wants to see strikes going on and on. But, above all, we place above everything the continued right to free collective bargaining untrammelled by outside interference from third parties. That right seems to us as Liberals so fundamental as to transcend the inconveniences which its continuance sometimes imposes on the public. Better by far the temporary inconvenience than the permanent loss of liberty and fundamental human rights that would be implied in the acceptance of the Rand report and its translation into retrograde legislation more fitted to the Middle Ages than to today.

Today, the threat of personal oppression is being replaced by the threat of the inhuman depersonalization of industry and commerce. In this age of computers and technology, we have to start thinking again about putting people first, and this the Rand report does not do. Its legalistic approach seems devoid of all heart. It has perhaps served a useful purpose in sharpening our awareness that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. So let us keep vigilant in these matters which affect all our freedoms.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to something which has been concerning me for some time, and that is the apparent casual indifference of this government to a disease which is going to confront us more and more as tunnelling under high pressure is extended for sewers and conduits, for subways and for rapid transit. I refer to the disease known as caisson disease. In its extreme form it can be a killer.

The dramatic suspension of the operations of the Sealab following the death of an aquanaut from what was temporarily classified as cardiac arrest, but which is freely admitted, even by the doctors, to be an affliction of this new frontier of high pressure, serves as a reminder that the conditions of work are always changing and bringing with them new hazards for which enlightened approaches must be prepared.

It is part of our duty as legislators to see that laws do not lag behind the actual advance into new territory of working con-

ditions themselves. Industrial safety, like industry, cannot stand still. It is a dynamic thing, constantly changing, constantly faced by new perils and challenges. Caisson disease, while not new, is with us now and will be with us in the future to an ever-increasing extent, simply because larger numbers of workers will be expected to take this risk as part of the price of earning a livelihood in construction.

Tunnelling in caissons, Mr. Speaker, is carried out under pressure, and the air pressure in which the men work is sufficiently higher than that in the surrounding area to keep out water and to allow work to proceed expeditiously. But the human body was designed to function in an air pressure of around 17 lb. per square inch at sea level. For many of us, even a change in the weather resulting in an increase or drop of less than a pound per square inch, or a slow walk or aerial ride to the summit of a peak, can cause real discomfort. Our bodies are just not very tolerant of such changes.

Yet the men who must toil in construction under pressure must undergo compression and decompression to the point where they leave this world—this natural environment—in a very real sense, and return to it with great caution at the end of their shift. That's how it should be—a return with caution. Unfortunately, that is the element that is so often missing.

When we ask men to work under such conditions, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that their physical condition be known, and this is where we are falling short, in Ontario, of the steps taken by more forward-looking jurisdictions.

Decompression sickness proper is produced by the sudden reduction in pressure of the atmosphere, as when a diver comes up from the depths too quickly from more than 33 feet—that's the depth at which atmospheric pressure is doubled already, and that's about the limit of our freedom of movement in water—or when a flier ascends rapidly to somewhere in excess of 18,000 feet, which produces a halving of atmospheric pressure. Our jet planes are pressurized so that they don't have to take hours to reach economical working heights in the stratosphere. When that pressurization fails, passengers' blood boils, literally.

What happens in all these cases of decompression sickness, either mildly or severely, is that nitrogen bubbles are formed in body fluids and tissues faster than they can be carried by the blood to the alveolar membrane

where they are normally diffused from the body. Now it is a fairly common thing for the "partial pressure" of this dissolved nitrogen to exceed the "partial pressure" of the nitrogen in the lungs. Where things get severe is in rapid transition to circumstances of more than two atmospheres or less than half an atmosphere. That is when divers get the bends. That's decompression sickness.

Caisson disease is the chronic, cumulative form of disability that comes from working regularly under pressure, and coming out at the end of a shift each day into normal atmospheric conditions. It can cripple and it can kill.

I have literally seen men who cannot even walk with crutches, the pain is so bad. And when you get bone necrosis in the joints, the joints literally rot, I understand—the blood circulation in the joints stops and the bones literally rot. That is what I understand from a layman's point of view, and I think it is called necrosis of the bone.

It needs laws with teeth to ensure that workers who have to make their living under these very unreal conditions are adequately protected against employer exploitation due to unreasonably short decompression times being allowed in the shift—and probably, to some extent, from the men's own desire to be out and washed up, perhaps unwisely driving them to seek shorter decompression from one of their mates operating the airlock. This human factor must not be lost sight of. Whatever the pretext, adequate decompression times must be stringently enforced.

Let me take members back to November 24, and the important programme on this topic aired on W5, CTV's national public affairs programme. One of the guests on this programme was Mr. McNair, an officer in the construction safety branch of The Department of Labour, Ontario. Also on the programme was his boss, the highest civil servant in the department, Mr. T. M. Eberlee. I think he is the Deputy Minister. Now, here's what Mr. Eberlee said on that programme.

In this area we are referring to at this point, the underground regulations, the caisson regulations, we certainly have plenty of scope, and there are no restrictions on it at all.

Mr. Speaker, what an admission for the Deputy Minister to make on the air!

Then came Mr. Pike, safety director for local 183, the Labourer's Union, whose men work under these conditions. He said it was the men of his union who did all the underground work. When asked if there were any major gaps in the regulations, and was he

satisfied that enough people were available for enforcement, he replied:

Well, I am not at all satisfied, and we are not at all satisfied. First of all it is absolutely necessary that we have a more comprehensive medical examination spelled out in the tunnel regulations.

Mr. Pike went on to say that it was presently up to the project physician to determine what type of medical examination is to be given. In his own experience, he said—five years of practical experience of working in compressed air—the medical examination consists of a blood pressure check, a check on the sound of a man's heart, and a urine test.

They look in your ears and down your throat, give you a pat on the back and away you go, which takes about two minutes. They put about 35 to 40 men through a medical examination in one hour.

At this point, the interviewer interjected in the programme, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that Mr. Pike was exaggerating, and that some men had said they had had examinations lasting up to 15 minutes each.

Mr. Pike then made the telling remark that, because of the adverse publicity that had occurred in the few weeks preceding the broadcast, the men had started to get 15-minute examinations, something quite new. And the union had affidavits to this effect from men who had had the longer examinations as a result of the fuss.

However, as he pointed out, they were still the same kind of examination, just more thorough. What the union was quite rightly asking for was the x-raying of all joints: ankle, knee, hip, shoulder. The reason for this, he explained to the lay interviewer, was because it is at these points that the decompression bubbles get into the blood stream, and this is where the caisson disease gets its start.

At this point, Mr. McNair made an incredible observation. He said that The Department of Labour sought the advice of The Department of Health on the advisability of giving x-rays, and then he went on, and I quote:

I am not aware that anyone—x-rays by themselves would stop them from going into the compressed air project.

That is ungrammatical because I am reading a direct quote as he thought aloud. Then he thought some more and came up with this gem for the records:

In other words, what is the importance of x-rays? The purpose of the examination is to see if the man is fit to get into the

project, to be allowed to work in compressed air. As a suggestion that this will prevent him from having this disease, I've never seen any information, nor have I heard any suggestions.

The interviewer then pointed out the obvious fact that routinely repeated x-rays would show up developing bone necrosis, and ultimately would lead to the doctor's warning the man off the job, off that type of work entirely. Getting a woolly, non-committal reply from Mr. McNair, he turned to the Deputy Minister for some enlightenment. He did not do much better.

"Have you ever had any advice that x-rays should be made a routine matter for men working in compressed air?" the Deputy Minister was asked. He replied:

I don't believe so. I think the first advice came, as Mr. Pike said, about six weeks ago.

So The Department of Health, to which The Department of Labour was supposedly turning for advice, had obviously been remiss in this matter.

The interviewer then asked about contact with the people in San Francisco, who had recommended this kind of thing a couple of years ago, and the Deputy Minister replied:

Our doctors in The Department of Health, as I understand it, are familiar with the San Francisco project.

It is touching to realize The Department of Labour still has faith in The Department of Health. Or is it that no subject is too serious to avoid buck-passing tactics? Then he went on:

Of course, that—San Francisco—is a project under very, very elevated air pressure.

The W5 interviewer then made the obvious point that a lot of the San Francisco findings relate to men working under 35 lb. of air pressure—that is, under two atmospheres, the critical doubling of pressure where the acute form of the disease occurs in divers on return to normal atmospheric conditions—and added "You've had men in Canada certainly working under 35 and 40 lb. of pressure".

Said Mr. Eberlee:

Oh yes, that's true, that's true, but the great range of the projects in Ontario each year for the last five years, at any rate—Mr. McNair and I aren't too familiar with things prior to '63—were in much lower air pressure.

Mr. Speaker, how long does it take? More than six years of daily contact with construc-

tion for a rapidly-growing city such as Metro, with which both Mr. Eberlee and Mr. McNair must rub shoulders every day, and yet they take refuge in the fact that most of the jobs—out of a very large number—are being worked at lowish pressures. That still leaves the possibility of the chronic form of the disease unwatched. And of course, it still leaves plenty of real high-pressure jobs.

The Deputy Minister then went on to resist the idea of continuing x-rays of the bones and joints on a periodic basis, on the grounds of over-exposure to radiation, although it was said that new techniques expose only small areas. At the same time, Mr. Eberlee admitted that proof of increasing bone necrosis on the job would probably be excellent grounds for workmen's compensation, particularly if a man was ordered out of high-pressure work on these grounds.

And there, Mr. Speaker, I think we may have one clue to the reluctance of the government to get into this field in any serious way. Is it that, in the straitened financial circumstances of today, they would prefer that workmen's compensation were not saddled with what might prove to be an embarrassingly large number of claims in a wholly new category? Do they think that this would open up the proverbial can of worms?

The next speaker in the interview was a Mr. Ferici, who had suffered bone death after working in 44 lb. per square inch of pressure in Ontario. That is well over double normal atmospheric pressure; well over 2.5 times normal air pressure, in fact. In other words, every day this man was being subjected to much greater stress than Hillary on Everest, but the other way round. And instead of a leisurely month ascending through Nepal, this is a transformation that takes place, both ways, in the course of a single shift.

Unbelievably, after Mr. Ferici got the bends, he was put on workmen's compensation for two weeks, and then sent back like a kamikazi pilot, into the high-pressure tunnel! He said:

When I went back to the tunnel to start, I can't stand any more, because it was worse than before, so the doctor take me right out. He say, "You can't go any more"—air pressure—so I ask [supervisor] if he had any job for me outside, out of the pressure.

Mr. Ferici then went on to describe a typical instance of man's inhumanity to man:

Supervisor say, "We no got anything you to do", so I had to quit the job. I apply

for unemployment insurance at that time, and unemployment insurance refuse me to pay, because they not got anything to do with whatever you call, because I can't go any more in air pressure.

Surely it is part of our obligation, when we ask men to work in these literally inhuman conditions, to make sure that they not suffer financially as a result of having suffered physically on our behalf? Let us not shrug this off by saying: "That is federal." Let us admit our moral obligation, regardless of the level of government. Morality is indivisible.

We are not finished yet with this remarkable W5 programme because the representative of local 183 of the Labourer's Union, the safety director, Mr. Pike, then pointed out that although new regulations had come into effect in 1963, they were not being strictly enforced. He said:

For instance, a man is supposed to be examined and tested going on shift. This is never done. He is supposed to be examined half-way through his shift. This is never done. He is supposed to be examined at the end of his shift. This is never done.

To this, the Deputy Minister replied that the regulations place the responsibility on the doctor appointed to a project to carry out certain medical examinations. It is his responsibility as a professional man to carry out those duties. Mr. Eberlee went on to say that the department required the doctor to write a letter saying the duties he had been appointed to perform on a particular project were, in fact, those laid out in the regulations. Now, is that enforcement, I ask you, Mr. Speaker? Pressed to be more specific, Mr. Eberlee said:

They are to be placed in the medical tank by the project physician at his direction, and their reaction to exposure to the pressure is to be examined. Now there are only some nine doctors involved, so this is a very specific challenge that has been on these nine men.

Immediately, a Mr. Tully, a tunnel worker, demonstrated that enforcement is one symptom of the current malaise. He said that he had been working only under pressure for two months. He was examined the day he started, and then not under pressure, and he had not been examined since, under pressure, ever. He just got a cursory once-over before going on shift, and that in normal atmospheric conditions.

Mr. Eberlee and Mr. McNair said they wanted names and cases so that they could

follow up on the possible delinquent doctors. Mr. Pike said that he had brought all this up, admittedly in general terms, as long as 18 months ago.

Why could not the department go out and get this information? Nevertheless, having done the work himself, he produced six affidavits signed respectively by: Cully O'Donnell, John McRossen, James Sayes, William Farrow, Andy Burns and James Gallacher. These men all swore that they were not medically examined under pressure before, during, or after their first shift, working under pressure.

And then, in exasperation, Mr. Pike blew up and expostulated that it was not up to the labourers' union to enforce the regulations but to the Ontario government, and he was right. The Department of Labour, he added, was supposed to have people out on the road, watching for this kind of infringement. Surely it was enough to bring the matter to the government's attention in general terms?

But, even with the specific initiative brought forward, the Deputy Minister admitted that the department could not write stop work orders. So there was revealed a weakness in the Ontario legislation itself, quite apart from its enforcement.

Suppose, and I have heard of this, I am a solicitor and a lawyer in this city and I have had these people come to me with caisson's disease, and do you know what—in some cases the people were required to work under pressure double the time required by the Act, double the time required by the Act, without any physical examination either before, during, or after their work period.

A little later in the programme, Mr. McNair resisted attempts to approach the problem on the basis of a general survey of the under-pressure construction projects, of which it was stated there had been 45 in the past five years. His attitude was: "give me individual cases, and I will pinpoint the responsibility to a particular doctor failing to carry out his agreement and replace him with one who will enforce the regulations."

Now is that not a silly statement? Who is to enforce the regulations? Is it a doctor—do we not set down certain regulations that a doctor must follow in examining the people that work under pressure? I have here before me, Mr. Speaker, the Compressed Air Safety Orders of the state of California Department of Industrial Relations, and may I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have never seen such complete and specific orders that set

out what has to be done by the doctor, by the foreman, by the supervisor where the tanks are supposed to be; it provides for a man who works under pressure to carry a card in case he is suddenly attacked with the bends when he is out somewhere so they can rush him back to the tank and he can be depressurized.

It is a completely logical system, and under this system, Mr. Speaker, the pre-examination before they allow a person to work under pressure takes three hours. They examine the joints, they do blood tests, they do urine tests, they examine the joints under x-ray, under pressure, and the man is given a complete physical examination.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, is that there are certain diseases a person has that prevent him from working under pressure. For instance, an arthritic. It would be ridiculous for him to go under pressure because it would probably destroy his joints.

There are many people that are afflicted with certain diseases that would not normally cause any problems in normal atmospheric pressure but would cause serious problems when the men worked under pressure. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Labour or the Workmen's Compensation Board can get this report and study it and implement it.

Surely if somebody else has done the research, has had the experience, why not adopt the research and the experience and save many men from that crippling, killing disease of caisson?

Now it is quite clear that, so far as enforcement is concerned, the department is looking more and more to the avenue of complaints, apparently supported by individual affidavits. I submit that this represents a *laissez-faire* attitude, and a negative approach to the whole matter. The Department of Labour is not taking any initiatives at all in this.

Now it might be that the Workmen's Compensation Board should take issue here because they are ultimately the people that are going to pay for this. If too many men are afflicted with the disease it is going to cost them a great deal of money.

Perhaps this research and these regulations should not be in the hands of The Department of Labour, perhaps we should place it under the jurisdiction of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Perhaps only the research should be under the Workmen's Compensation Board. They are the ultimate payers, they should probably do the research,

and look into this type of legislation and see how we can adopt it.

Moving on, the regulations say that an attendant may look after more than one airlock if he may safely do so. That is the kind of woolly, subjective qualification that is wide open to abuse, and the programme showed, in fact, that it had been abused, that airlocks were often to far apart to be reached by one man in an emergency.

They say, Mr. Speaker, that the compression safety orders of the state of California set out that there be automatic devices on air locks; that there be devices on the inside and devices on the outside, so that in case of an emergency it can be controlled either automatically by the person in the air lock and by the person watching the air lock. In California the decompression system is on a tape, it is in a small computer which allows the pressure to drop at a given rate so that no man is dropped or raised up too quickly, which of course causes compression sickness.

Mr. Pike, of the union staff, himself had an eardrum ruptured in circumstances where the pressure buildup could not be stopped in time; because the attendant was out of reach of the controls. He said:

I gave the bell, the one bell to stop the compression. The lock tender was attending two locks, and before he got back to the lock that I was being compressed in, my eardrum was bursted, and as a result I lost the hearing in my right ear.

Mr. Pike said that he complained to Mr. McNair at the time, in fact they had quite an argument about what a safe distance might be. But nobody in their right mind would suggest that fifty feet apart was a working distance to be encompassed by one man, he added. At the time of his eardrum burst, both locks were in simultaneous use, with twelve men in each one, being compressed at the same time. "While he was over attending to me, there could have been an accident in the other one, another eardrum bursted", he said.

Mr. Ferici, the victim of the inhumanity earlier referred to, is now an airlock attendant, since he can no longer work inside. He gave cogent reasons in support of the common sense position that there should be one attendant for each airlock. I think that we ought to endorse this simple change in the regulations here and now, as a very first step, regardless of what comes later. I say this simple regulation ought to be published immediately.

Dr. Gamarra of the East General Hospital, Mr. Speaker, who has specialized in decompression sickness, says that a man can be exposed to compressed air for several months without showing any signs or symptoms. Then, in a moment, he might develop the tell-tale signs of the illness: the pain in the joints, the itching skin, the difficulty in breathing and the tiredness, possibly even a bleeding from the nose or ears. Furthermore, these symptoms might be delayed for as much as up to two years after a man leaves the tunnel. How, then, does a lay workman prove his case in the absence of back-up medical opinion in this new field?

This medical specialist is vociferous in his call for a complete set of X-rays before a man enters caisson work. Otherwise, there can be no basis for future comparison. The cause of new lesions cannot be pinned down. He says:

Hardly a man working under compressed air in Toronto has had previous X-rays. I don't recall anyone having been examined radiologically. This creates a problem, not only for the compensation board, but also for the worker, because there are several other factors which can resemble the same type of lesion.

Dr. Gamarra also subscribes to the view that the amount of radiation a man will experience would be minimal by taking these X-rays.

The doctor cites cases to show what happens in the case of a man who has been decompressed too quickly, as might easily happen at the end of a shift, if the supervision is lax and all are over-eager to get home. Within ten minutes after this so-called "explosive" decompression—that's the medical term, it does not mean there is a bang—the man will experience pain in his joints.

He must then move quickly to be re-compressed, and then decompressed slowly. Unfortunately, by this time he may well be on the streetcar or bus, or, as has happened right here in the city, he may be overcome while driving home in his car, while actually at the wheel. In this instance, he is obviously a severe hazard to everyone in the vicinity. In one case, a man was stricken, shot through a red light, and had to be rushed to the compression chamber by the police, who fortunately were able to understand the situation.

Other instances have found men stricken at home. Not understanding the medical

aspects of the situation, they have sought relief in hot or cold baths, which have not improved matters, and finally the police or other emergency service have been called and the affected man has been hurried to compression.

One specific worry is that obese men are apparently being allowed into this kind of work, although it is known that in the event of a decompression accident it is extremely difficult to get the nitrogen bubbles out of fatty tissue. They then cause agonizing pain because of the mechanical distention of the blood vessel walls. The nerves in these walls are sensitized to detect and react to events at a much lower threshold, so these gross shocks result in an overloading of the nervous system and most severe pain.

Dr. Gamarra has medical slides showing heart and lung sections infiltrated with nitrogen gas bubbles which have displaced the blood. They are quite shocking, and make us ask what we expect of our fellow men in pushing ahead with construction progress, towards what goal?

Furthermore, when we ask men to work in these conditions we also subject them to drill and other machine noise which, uncomfortable as it is at normal atmospheric pressure, passes the threshold of pain in the more solid medium of air compressed to two or 2½ times normal atmospheric pressure. A noise level of 120 decibels, the kind of level you get on the tarmac right behind a jet engine at an airport is common and continuous. The pain level is generally set at 115 decibels. So these men are actually working in conditions of pain for a great part of the time.

Again, the question of compensation arises, for delayed effects. Studies show that these men have a much better-than-average chance of deafness in middle age, yet how does one prove that this is compensable? No wonder that so many men leave pressurized jobs, never to return. Attempting to survey the situation, Dr. Gamarra says that he had great difficulty in locating the men, since no one will long remain on the job under such conditions. "The great majority of men are frightened—markedly frightened—by seeing their friends being hospitalized by the effects of high pressure", he says. They have started the job without any knowledge of caisson disease. They are going into a situation blind.

Dr. Gamarra believes that the 1963 regulations are good as far as they go, and recog-

nizes that work under pressure is going on all over the world. However, he lays great stress on the education of all concerned, both as to the nature and incidence of the disease, and also the enforcement of the regulations. If the foreman or safety inspector does not know the nature of the problem, then we are bound to have more cases than if there is a thorough understanding by all concerned. The doctor also believes that the regulations must be constantly updated to keep pace with our fuller understanding of the compression working situation and its effects. This is a book which must be kept open at a page marked action.

We ought to have observers over at the Bay area rapid transit operation, where the medical examination practices are so much ahead of our own, and we ought to copy all that is good from them. I notice we are trying out carpeting for the Bay area system in our TTC subway cars. I am sure that this co-operation can be even closer and more meaningful, particularly as we are faced with engineering some of our subway extension tunnels by means of these high-pressure caisson techniques.

There ought to be a booklet distributed among construction workers, through all the outlets available to us, and through the National Employment Service. This booklet, which might be called, working under compressed air conditions, would tell a man what to expect. There must be many cases where men have wrongfully been cut off from unemployment pay because they could not take this kind of work, or because the unemployment benefit officer did not appreciate the genuineness of their complaint. I think these are things that cut right through all levels of government, and we must not use this as an excuse to fob off responsibility.

Such a pamphlet would certainly tell a man how to check if he can equalize pressure. If his ears pop in the elevator, it's a sign his auditory tube is normally blocked or subject to blockage, and he ought not to be seeking that kind of work. Similarly, the man with sinus trouble, the man with recurrent toothache and cavity problems. It should also be stressed that this is no job for the older man—40 being an absolute cut-off point—and that older, fat men should stay right away from the site.

The danger of excess alcohol in this kind of living, especially in view of the temptation that comes with a higher hourly rate, should also be mentioned, since after-work beer drinking has proved a problem on the

West Coast where it has led to dehydration and heat prostration. In this job hard liquor is taboo.

The brochure would also explain, in simple terms, exactly what the symptoms were. I can see that my friends across the aisle are smiling, thinking that this would be an open door to malingering and to further compensation claims. But I say we have to do this, because it is all working the other way at the moment. Today, we can cause bone death without symptoms or pain, and we can take away that part of a man without his knowledge.

Only if the bone death occurs at the articulated joints does he feel it. On the shank, we just destroy his being silently, because the bone just rots and just goes away, and he will not even know he has a claim against society for it. Who is to say that any pay cheque is sufficient compensation for this kind of assault, for that is what it is. There has also to be an iron-clad social obligation to those who do this for us.

We must be prepared to face up to the cost of a thorough X-ray examination, running in the Bay area rapid transit operation at \$75 per man. The way BART approached this high cost is interesting. They argued that just the compensation of one aggravated pathological lesion condition would cost more than perhaps hundreds of such examinations, and so they went ahead. Perhaps if the Ontario union can get a few men to press compensation cases and break some new compensation ground, then the whole attitude of The Department of Labour will change from one of passive reaction to individual complaints, to one of aggressive involvement in the total situation.

We must have a stepped-up medical qualification for everyone working under pressure, and it must include the following, as it does at BART:

1. Identification photographs and personal data form, copy available to examining doctor;
2. Overall physical examination (as for insurance);
3. Balance, agility and co-ordination test;
4. Audiometer test (first of a continuing series to detect incipient deafness);
5. Cardiopulmonary fitness test;
6. Dorsal flexibility test;
7. Electrocardiogram;
8. Comprehensive X-rays (set of 16);
9. Chamber pressure equalization test.

We must have two or three emergency recompression chambers in the east, north and

west of Metro, with facility for oxygen inhalation while the subject is being recompressed. This flushing technique seems not to be easy here at the moment, yet we must have it as the subways expand.

Again, it is a special new expense, requiring trained doctors who can detect when the oxygen ceases its action of flushing out the nitrogen and starts to become toxic and irritating of itself. How many doctors in and around Toronto can undertake this therapy now? Certainly not enough to man these chambers round the clock, although work will go on round the clock, and off-duty people are more likely to be smitten in the night.

In San Francisco there is a charge against the contractor for the emergency therapy, and that is how it should be here. It should be built into the cost of the contract.

We have to educate contractors themselves to budget for longer and longer periods of decompression as the pressure in the caisson increases. In the really high-pressure areas of 40 or more pounds per square inch, in San Francisco, it now takes up to three hours out of every shift just to bring a man down. There's a hope that men will settle to live in the caissons for up to a week at a time, but so far no progress has been made. The men want out every day, and there's no cheap way of doing this if their health is to be preserved.

Another proposal has been advanced that men should work breathing oxygen. The disastrous Apollo fire has set back that idea, if it has not thrown it out the window entirely, and this is as it should be, since with power drills and other machinery making sparks, the possibility of catastrophe would be immeasurably increased, under these circumstances.

Nor would workmen take easily to wearing scuba-diving type mouthpieces. Furthermore, when pure oxygen is being inhaled, the muscles will not function, so the work pattern would have to be alternate periods of work, breathing ordinary air, and rest, breathing oxygen.

I make no apology for going into such detail on caisson work, because it is important that members of the Legislature be familiar with the strange new frontiers we are facing today; the working conditions that more and more people will be asked to endure. This Legislature must not always be looking backward. It must be fully conversant with today's problems and those of tomorrow. It must make laws for the future and not for the past.

As I speak, there are nine projects going on in Toronto under the conditions I have described, and I want to name them for the

record, because I intend to be asking questions before the orders of the day, on the conditions at each job, and whether the doctors are enforcing existing regulations.

I regard it as most important that the Legislature and the department be alerted to the fact that we of the Opposition are on our toes in this matter, and that we do not intend to let the subject drop with this speech. Hence, the enquiry of the Ministry I have tabled for the Order Paper today, as a beginning.

Here then, are the current jobs we are watching:

McNulty and Sons—at Bayview and Bloor; at Greenwood and South Danforth; and at Woodfield and Dundas.

First Line Contracting—at Bathurst and St. Clair; at Don Mills and York Mills.

Scott Jackson—at Hillsdale Avenue and Collin Avenue.

Sansone Construction—at Gerrard Street, off Greenwood.

Keystone Contracting—at Dundas Street West and Highway 27.

Robert McAlpine—Mount Pleasant and Mount Pleasant Avenue.

I want to serve notice upon the Minister of Labour to be ready with some specific answers, either to questions before the orders of the day, or at the time of his departmental estimates. In particular, we want to know about those affidavits, and the extent to which the complaints have been followed up. Who was responsible? If the responsibility lies with the doctors, who were they? Are they still on the job?

We certainly do not like naming Deputy Ministers or departmental heads in the Legislature, but a peculiar situation is arising these days, which others have remarked on as well as myself.

More and more, these gentlemen appear and are identified by name on television and in the press, usually in commendable response to enquiries.

I am all for the free flow of information in the frankest terms. But here is one example where the communications revolution is altering the traditional anonymity of the Deputy Minister and the public servant. Whether or not we approve of this development, we have to note it as a fact that along with this exposure comes more vulnerability for the public servant concerned.

But what I want to emphasize in all this is that, in the last analysis, it is the Minister who is responsible. That is what responsible

government is all about. And the Minister of Labour must be ready with his answers in the House, even for the commissions and omissions of those who serve him.

I have in my hand the current California legislation for caisson workers. I should like to offer it as a model. I want to see a government bill on this matter, better than the present regulations made under section 10 of The Department of Labour Act, 1960 and the 1963 amendment.

This new bill must be more specialized and based on the latest advice. I do not intend to rest, and neither do my colleagues, until we get it. And along with the new law, or even preceding it, must come enforcement by people who have been educated to an understanding of what the caisson problem is all about.

We used to be recognized in this province, in the field of workmen's compensation, as a jurisdiction which paid more attention to a humane approach, to benefitting the workman, than to the legalistic approach of the workman proving his claim.

When the State of New York did its survey, around 1956-57, they seemed to drain off the humanity from the Ontario situation and import it into the State of New York, so that our attitudes have been reversed. Now they are very humane in their approach, and we are very legalistic in our approach.

The head of the Workmen's Compensation Board has, unfortunately, taken a legalistic approach to the claims of the workmen. As far back as 1914, it was stated that this should be a workman-oriented plan, that we should assist the workman to prove his claim, not make the workman prove his own claim and set up legalistic barriers that he must hurdle in order to prove that he was injured on the job and has a right to compensation.

Today, the atmosphere is overwhelming for the ordinary claimant—I might use the word "traumatic". The claimant is sworn, having been led into the room. He is confronted by a great big panel of people. He is brought before a big table to give his evidence. Sometimes the employer is there to fight his case and everything is heard in extremely formal circumstances. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that more and more workmen have to go to free legal aid to hire lawyers to go to the Workmen's Compensation Board. This was not intended in the original legislation, not intended at all.

And I might cite, Mr. Speaker, other boards and commissions. The Immigration Appeal Board there is one hearing and one appeal;

two protecting the right of a man who might be deported.

Now, in summary, it is my submission that the whole atmosphere is one of a trial. I am quite sure that this atmosphere is far removed from the original intention of the far-sighted proponents of workmen's compensation as originally conceived.

We are sure that this province has been in the forefront of the workmen's compensation laws, but within the last three or four years, we are slowly falling behind workmen's compensation laws. We are setting up barriers, Mr. Speaker, to the right of the workman to prove his claim in the simplest and best way he knows. The workman knows how; not some lawyer, not some adviser, but the workman in his informal, simple language that he can use before some officer of the board can say, "Look, I got hurt; I cannot work because of this".

Oh no, they want reports. It is worse than an accident claim. I do many accident claims and many workmen's compensation claims, and in some cases the accident claim is easier to settle than the workmen's compensation claim.

An hon. member: Do it much faster, too.

Mr. De Monte: Sure. The original intention was that a workman who was hurt got decent compensation for his injury. It was never intended that there should be a long legalistic series of tribunals preceding an award.

In other words, a workman gets hurt, no question about it, on a certain job. He makes his formal claim; he goes to the workmen's compensation board; he is paid. Suppose this injury prevents him from working? Suppose some officer says, "Why, you are not hurt, you had better get back to work," and the man goes to work and cannot work? He has to go to the appeal tribunal, to the full board, and to whatever board they are going to dream up in the future.

Now, today, it takes six or seven months to complete the whole ritual, and there is less and less concern for how the injured workman is going to make out in the interim. He could starve or wilt away through frustration and exhaustion before anyone would lift a finger by way of an award, until the tedious pattern has been fully followed through. Prove your claim and we will pay, says the board, or you have the right to appeal to the next higher step. So the man has to go to legal aid and get a lawyer. The board sits back, smug and fat. The workman

is the all-time loser in this set-up, and it has got to be changed.

Three or four weeks ago I asked the Minister to answer certain questions. These I regarded as urgent, so I asked them before the orders of the day. The Minister decided they were technical in nature and required research, so he transferred them to the order paper, where they remain to this day, unanswered. You will find them listed as question 15 on the order paper.

Now I suspect that the real reason the Minister resorted to this delaying tactic was that he found that the questions were extremely embarrassing, and was hopeful that the act of transferring them to the order paper would somehow cause the whole thing to blow away. It has not, because I intend to bring the questions on to the plane of urgency again by reading them now:

15. Mr. De Monte—Enquiry of the Ministry—

1. (a) How many claims were appealed by claimants to the review committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968;

(b) How many claims were appealed by claimants to the appeal tribunals of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968;

(c) How many claims were appealed by claimants to the full board of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968?

2. (a) How many appeals were allowed by the review committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968;

(b) How many appeals were allowed by the appeal tribunals of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968;

(c) How many appeals were allowed by the full board of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968?

3. What is the average waiting time of the claimant to proceed through the full appeal structure of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

4. What is the percentage relationship between administrative cost and compensation paid by the Workmen's Compensation Board?

My point is that the statisticians on the workmen's compensation board staff or in The Department of Labour could quite easily have come forward with this information by now. They do not want us to know how many appeals are allowed, how many disallowed, and how long it takes for a workman to go through this procedure. With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, we should have

these answers quickly and the answers should be precise. Two or three days is ample for the research needed for an answer to current and topical questions of this kind. We are not interested in what I might call the year book approach, but rather in the *viva voce* approach, the answer as it applies today in this House.

In this instance, it is very much in line with the new star chamber atmosphere in workmen's compensation that I have alluded to this whole approach. It betrays the same mental set on the part of the Minister and his staff and those who are running things at the board these days.

There is no doubt that certain workmen may be labelled as an extortionist minority and malingerers, but the vast majority of claims are genuine. All that most people want are their just desserts. That is all. No trickery, no bamboozling, just a fair share. And most workmen are only too eager to get back to work as soon as they are able. In short, most people are decent. Let us approach the whole field on this and respect this fact.

I feel that the workmen's compensation procedure should be simple, efficient and speedy. Delay in considering claims is itself an injustice perpetrated on the weak. The workman who is unable to work in the interim is placed in a very precarious position. He is thrown on the mercy of welfare, which sometimes advances money on the likelihood of a claim being settled, and then, when the claim is settled ultimately, the money from welfare comes back from the claim.

Until we come to a guaranteed annual income concept, it is inevitable that welfare will carry a stigma. That is the result of decades of conditioning to a suggestion that the poor are shiftless. It is wrong; we know it is wrong but it is a fact that that is the current connotation of welfare, and until that image is changed, I do not think it right that that stigma should also be allowed to attach itself to legitimate claimants for workmen's compensation pending the hearing of their claims.

I am impressed by the hearing procedure and the appeal procedure in immigration cases. As I said before, it is simple, efficient and workable. I think that the workmen's compensation board officers would do well to go along and observe this simple procedure in operation and copy those aspects that apply and are appropriate. I am sure that this

would result in a speeding up of the process.

I am also concerned about the possible abuse of legal aid machinery in connection with compensation claims. It seems to me that if we go back to the original kitchen-table approach and away from the present formality that a great deal of money would be saved. I know that there are technical cases which need professionals to argue them, but surely not on the scale we have today? Let us use legal aid where it is more efficient and effective and not squander public money on cases that might well be settled by common sense.

I spoke earlier about caisson disease, and this is a perfect example of what I might call a "new frontier" disease. There will be more and more diseases as industrial expansion enters new, strange territories, using exotic processes and materials not found in nature. The only way for a board to know whether a claim is legitimate is to be aware of all these new developments, and this means an adequate research staff of people trained to read and abstract from the learned journals, and orally advise the board members where to look for specialists and authorities.

It is just not sufficient to say, as the Deputy Minister of Labour has said, "we rely on The Department of Health". The Department of Labour and the Workmen's Compensation Board should have their own research in this area. Anything less is insufficient and must inevitably lead to long delays and injustices to genuine claimants who happen to be working on the frontier of technology when they are stricken.

I am also very concerned with another development and that is the necessity for the use of the media before a fair settlement can be negotiated. The best example of someone who was all set for a raw deal concerns Mrs. Pat McMurrich, the widow of the policeman who was shot on Hamilton Mountain in a gun battle on December 22 last.

When Sgt. McMurrich was felled, initially the outlook was black, and the Workmen's Compensation Board, aside from giving out an automatic \$500 burial cheque, was by no means the inspiration and support it might have been in the circumstances. To the board, there were legal obstacles in the way of an award. It didn't matter that Jim, 11; Susan, 7; Theresa, 6; and Sandra, 3, as well as their mother, might go hungry in the interim.

What motivated the board to sit and wait was the fact that Sgt. McMurrich had not

completed his vesting period of 15 years paying in 5½ per cent of his salary to the Hamilton municipal retirement fund. He had only paid in seven years so the City of Hamilton, if the legalistic niceties of the plan were to be observed, would have to disallow the seven years at 6½ per cent of salary that the municipality had paid into the fund, and just pay the widow the few hundred dollars that would have accrued on the employee's side.

At the same time, the bureaucracy of the Canada Pension Plan was such that although there would be a retroactive payment to January 1, 1969, the first cheque would not come until March 31.

Now the board said, until all these matters are settled, we can give you no award. At least, that's what they said to begin with. And then public opinion began to build against this monstrous state of affairs, and quite suddenly the picture changed and Mrs. McMurrich was awarded \$125 a month for herself and \$50 a month each for her four children, giving a total of \$325 a month. There is also a four-week salary payment coming from the City of Hamilton, and the pension fund regulations are going to be bent to accommodate her, at least to some extent.

Mrs. McMurrich has also inherited the family home in Dundas, and a trust fund has been set up for the education of her four children, totalling over \$13,000 all from public contributions.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): \$27,000 now.

Mr. De Monte: Is it? Very good. I am glad. Now the point is this. Because of the extraordinary circumstances in which she was left a widow, the publicity and the use of the media assured her the kind of fair treatment that every widow with children should get, but doesn't. Apart from the trust fund, there was nothing extraordinary about this settlement. But she is one of the very few people who will be able to maintain her former standard of living as a result of a compensation settlement.

For the great majority of cases, which must inevitably remain anonymous because they are not news, there is a sharp drop in living standards and real hardship because of the inadequate settlements and the long delays. Only if public opinion is aroused and the workmen's compensation board has to operate in a goldfish bowl do we see the kind of settlement that ought to be the norm.

I say here and now that these dramatic drops in living standards for widows and children are immoral. They are a slur on society as a whole. We are building and breeding poverty instead of eliminating it. We have to alter our whole approach. Present awards are grossly inadequate to maintain decency and dignity for those left behind. The present delays in beginning procedures, directly contrary to section 72 of the Act, which says that a board must begin an enquiry as soon as a claim is filed, wreak havoc among the distraught families of lost workers.

I also believe that a totally disabled workman ought not to have to suffer a calamitous drop in living standards because of the inadequacy of the awards made. Who are we fooling? We are only building up another social problem that is going to have to be met through some other machinery in the long run.

We are making trouble for ourselves by being unfair to start with. Let's make the awards at the legitimate moment, when the claim is made and not years later come face to face with a welfare case, the result of injustice many years ago.

The poor workman goes out, loses an arm and gets \$66 a month. That is not even reasonable and yet we persist in carrying on this Act as it was framed about ten years ago with the new amounts, but it is not sufficient to pay a man when he loses an arm.

The man cannot get a job. He is making \$66 a month from workmen's compensation and goes out and works and because of his arm can only earn another \$20 or \$30 a week. It is not sufficient. It simply is not sufficient and we should realize the fact.

All we are doing is creating a welfare case for the future, and workmen's compensation is not welfare—it is a legitimate right that a workman obtains under The Workmen's Compensation Act for having suffered a loss to his body, to his work time and sometimes his pride.

I also want to see a review of all existing awards in the light of the inflation we have seen rampant in the last few years. All future awards and all revised awards of more than the most limited period should have an escalation clause locked in to the rise in the cost of living, so that we do not create poverty by the back door, through devaluation of our currency and the reduction in the purchasing power of awards. A man who has been

hurt at work can so easily become a second-class citizen otherwise.

The McGillivray Royal Commission was rightly critical of many aspects of Workmen's Compensation Board procedures, and we shall have the opportunity to go into greater detail when we come to debate the board's operation and estimates in due course. For the moment, let me say that the intricate procedures that have evolved in the last few years are spiralling the costs of workmen's compensation claims as more of the wrong kind of staff is hired—bureaucratic, administrative types, rather than the forward-looking research staff I have advocated earlier.

In summary then, let me just say this. Let us put the humanity back into the workmen's compensation board; let us speed up the claims procedure; let us have awards move with the cost of living; let us cut out the legalistic atmosphere, and let us have the technical knowledge to enable the board to understand the legitimacy of some of the newer claims. Let us have a system that will not breed poverty, but which will uphold decency and dignity among those afflicted and their kin.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to make a few comments about the statements made by the member for Dovercourt in regard to the workmen's compensation board.

I have to because I just cannot agree with him in two main areas. First, I hope that he does not suggest that we bring about many of the suggestions of Justice McGillivray, because most of them would be more restrictive in regards to the claimants' benefits. The other is the hon. member's condemnation of the tribunal procedure under the board. After the tribunal procedure had been instituted for a year there was a survey made by the trade union movement and the large majority of those people.

The compensation committee chairman, who was working at it regularly, felt that the tribunal stage was an improvement, that they were able to get justice that they could not find before; that it was a regulatory system where there was a recorder who took words verbatim.

They always make interpreters available for different languages, and I do not know where he received his information to base his opinions in condemning the tribunal procedures of the workmen's compensation board. I do agree with him in some areas of his concern, but I would be very weary of ask-

ing for the implementation of many of the McGillivray commission report, because they would be more restrictive upon the claimant.

Mr. Speaker, for the past few days, anticipating that I would take part in the traditional Throne Speech debate, I have wondered what could be a timely issue or issues to speak about.

Air and water pollution, land use and conservation urban renewal, the increasing urbanization of our province, adequate housing—these are all the inherent problems that reflect the kind of environment we are now living in and must live in within the future. And finding that these problems are still with us, I reflected back over the years. And my observations of progress made in this province show little, if any—at least, on the surface.

Admittedly, we have had increased economic growth, increased population growth, increased industrialization, but we still have many problems with us. The latest report of the *Ontario Economic Review*, January and February, 1969, tells us that the gross provincial product has increased by 8 per cent to \$26.9 billion from \$24.9 billion. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there will be two distinct reactions to this. Those in commerce and trade will be saying, "How can we grab a bigger piece of this pie?" Those on fixed and low incomes, the aged, the unemployed, unemployable, and those on social and family benefits are going to say, "How do we get a little bit of the pie?"

With that I reflect back to October 17, 1967, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that all the hon. members remember that date. That date reminded me of how this government will stoop to retain power after a long term in office, and that was the hoax they pulled upon the people of the province at that time by promising them a return in 1968 of the money that they had already taken away from them, without any further increase in taxes.

We all know what happened, but I think it should be put back on the record. The Ontario hospital premiums, of course, were increased by \$27 per year for a single person, and \$54 per year for a family. PSI and other private insurance plan premiums also increased. And as we understand it—and it was verified by the hon. doctor on the other side of the House—we will have a 10 per cent increase in doctors' fee effective April, 1969.

The OMSIP premiums increased by \$10.80 per year for a single person, and by \$21.60 for a couple, and \$27 for a family. We also are aware right at this particular time of the automobile licence fee increases. For a four-cylinder vehicle to the increase is \$15 to \$20.

For a six-cylinder from \$20 to \$27.50; for an eight-cylinder from \$25 to \$35. The gasoline tax increased 18 cents per gallon, and plus the 2 per cent federal tax, this is equivalent to about \$12 per year increase for the average driver. This makes the Ontario gasoline tax one of the highest in Canada, and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the 1968 property tax rebate amounted to an average of \$48 for each tenant and property owner. And this is the Hamilton average; it varied across the province. However, if we look at figures as to the number of dwellings in the province and the \$150 million that was spent, we find that it should have been closer to an average of \$78, which points out very well in effect—that there was a disproportion of distribution of that \$150 million.

This rebate was more than offset by increases when the budget was brought down during the same session. It was obvious that the government promises of no tax increases and the benefits of the property tax rebates were shortlived. The budget contained tax increases affecting the high and low income people.

And the question, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the province are going to continue to ask is, why does the government take so much out of our pockets and put so little back? Then, to add salt to the wound, following the end of the session the government committee recommended the extension of the 5 per cent sales tax on food and children's clothing.

The New Democratic Party and others across the province felt this would be an unjust tax and would more affect those on low incomes than those with the extra disposable moneys to spend. We opposed this vigorously across the province, and in face of a strong public outcry the government was forced to abandon this proposition for the time being at least.

Even with the basic shelter tax credit scheme, there is still a great need to transfer the burden of property taxation from those least able to pay to those most able to pay. For example, a family with a \$15,000 house a \$100 per week income pays about eight per cent of its income in property tax. A \$24,000 house with \$200 per week income pays only a 6 per cent tax. And that varies and reduces as the income rises with a better type of a house.

I want to assure the government, Mr. Speaker, that this party will continue to press for a prices review board to justify or stop

the ever spiralling cost of food and other commodities. It seems that the marketplace in our free enterprise society has always been where men deceive one another and demand all they can get. I strongly reject that idea and believe that a market can be made a place of fair dealing if adequate laws are made to eliminate the minority who consider it fair game to prey on their fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal to some extent with the so-called basic shelter tax credit programme. First, I want to put on record three of the many letters I received in regard to this tax rebate, and the subsequent rent increases that followed the first words that were said about the programme. I know that other members have done the same, but I think that to illustrate what I am going to say in continuation of my speech, they should be on record.

This one says:

In the month of May, 1968, my rent advanced \$5. The explanation given was the same as is recorded in the letter of November 1, which is enclosed. This now makes an increase for the last six months of \$14. My wife, who had a conversation on the phone with the owner's wife, and was informed that the apartment owners' association held a meeting and decided to increase the rents for the reason that the provincial government has placed a tax on them and this last raise is to compensate for it.

In speaking to the owner of 2205 King Street East, who does not belong to the association, he tells me he is not raising his rents until next year—1969, and only if the city taxes advance. He also informed me that his city taxes increased \$300 in 1968 and that he only increased the rent \$3 to \$5 to compensate for the increase in city taxes, which he said was sufficient to carry this.

This apartment is composed of 11 units and the apartment I am living in is 32 units, approximately three times the size. And three times \$300 is \$900 in extra taxes. The owner of this apartment collected \$1,800 in extra rent on May 1, 1968, to May 1, 1969.

To digress from the letter, Mr. Speaker, I know that the writer was contemplating the rent being collected to the middle of 1969. I quote further:

And now this latest raise of an average of \$7 a month gives him \$2,000 for the year ending November 1, 1969. I am told that if the city taxes increase next year, so

will the rents. This does not include parking of cars, which is \$3 outside and \$10 inside underground, which has no door. There are several tenants who are on fixed incomes. This looks like a squeeze play to me and I think something should be done about it.

Attached to the letter, Mr. Speaker, is one of several typewritten letters sent out to tenants from apartment owners and this is one from the Eastbury Properties Limited, 150 Bay Street South, Hamilton, Ontario.

Dear Tenant:

Due to an increase in municipal taxes and operating expenses, there will be a monthly rental increase of \$9 effective December 1, 1968.

We will continue to try to provide you with the best of services and policies to make your living accommodation pleasant and enjoyable.

Added to that letter from the same writer is:

Dear Tenant:

Our new policy will be to have private parking for all tenants with numbered parking spaces to be assigned effective December 1, 1968. Outside parking lot one-space charge will be \$3 monthly; garage parking one-space charge will be \$10 monthly.

Please make the necessary arrangements with your building superintendent as soon as possible.

Now, I understand from these particular tenants they never paid any parking fee heretofore.

The second letter I would like to put on record, Mr. Speaker, is an illustration:

Dear Sir:

I have been a tenant for four years of a small one bedroom apartment at the above address which is owned by Mr. Michael Hennaway, Eastbury Properties Limited, 150 Bay Street South, Hamilton.

On October 1, 1968, I received an increase in my rent of \$5, making a monthly rental of \$125 per month.

On November 1, 1968, another notice was received of a rental increase of \$5, stating increases were due to municipal taxes and due to the unexpected tax rebate law, this making the monthly rental \$130 per month.

I am a widow with only a pension as my income. I am amazed at these extraordinary increases that are allowed in one year. I have been informed that the tax

rebate due to each tenant was \$48, but to date no tenant in this apartment has received this rebate.

As you are MLA for our district, I think you should be informed of this situation.

Now, the third letter, Mr. Speaker, I am going to send over to the House leader after I have read it and ask him to forward it to the appropriate department head for whatever action be necessary in regards to its contents:

Dr. Mr. Gisborn:

Further to our telephone conversation of last week, the following is an outline of the circumstances regarding my attempts to obtain the tax rebate granted by the Ontario government.

I was a tenant at 110 Mary Street in Hamilton for a three-year period ending August 1, 1968. As I understood it, I am entitled to seven-twelfths of the rebate granted to this address, and that it was the responsibility of the landlord to seek me out and pass on the rebate.

Following publication in the *Hamilton Spectator* that the rebates were mailed to the property owners, I checked and found that the landlord had sold the property about September 15. I then contacted the city tax office and was informed that the rebate cheque had been forwarded to the original owner, Mr. Alfred Pasternak of 100 Inverness Court in Hamilton. By checking with the real estate agent who handled the sale and Mr. Pasternak's lawyer, I obtained his address which is 1911 Lee Street, Hollywood, Florida.

Early in December I wrote Mr. Pasternak requesting a rebate. To date I have received no reply.

On January 6, 1969, following published instructions, I contacted a Justice of the Peace at city magistrate's court to lay a charge against Mr. Pasternak. When I gave Mr. Pasternak's address the secretary called the Justice of the Peace who informed me they could not accept the charge. When I explained all the circumstances and asked for advice, his words were "You're stuck".

Mr. Pasternak held considerable property in Hamilton, all rental, and I explained the amount. It was likely \$700 to \$1,000 that was not being turned over to the tenants. I then asked if a man could take this much money, move across the line and be free from prosecution. His words were, "He has already done it". Without further discourse I left the office.

My anger is not so much at not receiving the rebate, but the dead end I reached, inability to obtain advice and the indifferent attitude of the Justice of the Peace. The situation would never arise with proper administration of this tax relief.

I would appreciate your pursuing this matter as far as possible and being advised of your findings.

Thank you,

Yours very truly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this points out the Conservative government's inability to cope with some of the serious problems facing the province of Ontario in a sound way. It was explicit in the hasty way they decided to bribe the electorate with their own money by announcing just prior to the October, 1967, election that they would implement the 1968 Smith committee's suggestion of the basic shelter tax credit scheme.

But they changed the name of the game and came up with An Act to Provide for the Reduction of Municipal Taxes on Residential Property. I guess, Mr. Speaker, this title made it more palatable to the many havers in the province who needed the rebate as much as one would need two heads.

In the debate on the bill on second reading last April, and again in committee, fears were expressed about this; about the complications of possible conflict between landlord and tenant, and the difficulties of enforcing payments through the courts. These fears have been realized without a doubt in the past few months, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if we just reflect on the amount of press that was received in regards to this programme.

I have just taken a few, maybe one out of six that appeared in the press.

Payments to tenants of shelter allowances proposed by Bales, *Globe and Mail*, January 22, 1968; Landlords warned on tax rebates. *Telegram*, April 11; Getting your Interest. *Globe and Mail*, April 2, 1968; Tax rise taken off rebate O.K., *Toronto Star*, April 21; Landlords attempting to get rebates, officials say. *Globe and Mail*, May 2, 1968; Shelter grant gives Pickering 63 headaches. *Globe and Mail*, April 20, 1968; A hundred tenants plan to sue landlords for rebates, rent increases came with rebates. Rebate deductions protest. *Toronto Star*, January 9, 1969; Late rebating landlords fined in Hamilton. *Toronto Star*, February 15, 1969.

Globe and Mail, December 18, 1968—Ontario pays Romney \$50 on his cottage.

Court is not a collection agency, Windsor judge says in rebate case.

Hold out tenants risk suit, Wishart warns. *Toronto Star*, January 18, 1969; Landlords squeeze tenants for rebate. *Toronto Star*, May 1, 1968; Tenants plan appeal to province, claim landlord withholding funds. *Globe and Mail*, January 2, 1969. And so on. Apartment tax rebate should go to tenants. *Toronto Star*, January 8, 1968.

Never have I remembered a programme of this government causing so much confusion and having so little intent and purpose in it. The utter stupidity of the scheme is beyond me, Mr. Speaker. The government goes in for blatant bribery of the electorate with their own money in the same year as they dug it out of their pockets for increased taxes and increased health premiums. The kind of increases, which, instead of leading us towards a more progressive tax system based on ability to pay, are making it more regressive.

It was reported in the press that George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, received a \$50 rebate on his cottage tax in Ontario. How many thousands of other Romneys got a share of the \$150 million, and considered it as only one more night out on the town.

I raised this point, Mr. Speaker, on a TV panel last Sunday afternoon and the hon. member for Hamilton West replied in the sense that you cannot discriminate against taxpayers.

It pointed out the philosophy of this government, that you treat everyone equal. Equal opportunity are the words they use. Now, equal opportunity, Mr. Speaker, is not available to a great segment of our society. Those on fixed incomes, the aged, the ill, the unemployable unemployed, the uneducated. They cannot take advantage of the opportunities and get their fair share in the rat race in this province. It is just not possible, and these regressive methods that the government uses are just shameful.

There has been a fraudulent smell about the scheme from the start. It was originally known as the Basic Shelter tax credit plan. A summer cottage is for pleasure and is a luxury, not for basic shelter. Thousands received the tax rebate who did not need it. Many who spend weeks in living in hotel rooms on fat expense accounts received it. Americans who own about ten per cent of the summer cottages in Ontario, and those with cottages valued at \$2,000 or less got back 100 per cent of the property tax. What

a shameful disposition of the taxpayers money in this province.

The brochure sent out across the province and signed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, states on the back of the third fold and I quote:

The system of tax reduction will transfer \$150 million to the local governments in 1968. Added to Ontario's subsidies for education, roadways, social services and other purposes, this amount increases Ontario's contribution to 48 cents out of every dollar of the expenditures of the local governments.

How come, Mr. Speaker? How do you explain that?

This money went to the owner and the tenant, not to the municipalities.

The fact is that the municipalities, already strapped for funds, were put to added expenses to administer this scheme.

For example, the borough of York claims a cost of \$67,000 according to the *Globe and Mail* of February 3, 1969. It cost the city of Hamilton \$51,012—\$30,074 lost in interest and \$20,938 for permanent and temporary help and supplies according to the *Hamilton Spectator* February 3, 1969.

We will not know what the real cost has been for some time. All of the municipalities must have had extra costs and many headaches.

According to the *Globe and Mail* of April 11, 1968, at a press conference, the Minister laid down the law that the municipalities must inform each tenant of the amount of his grant. I cannot find, Mr. Speaker, any such order in the Act or in the regulation. How was this imposed upon the municipalities?

The quick-thinking Minister stated that tenants could withhold part of their rent if they could not get their rebate, but the Attorney General said, "Now, now my boy. Do not say that or someone will get into trouble." That was squashed very quickly.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs last July estimated the cost of his department for administration of the scheme, at \$800,000. Time will only tell something closer to a realistic figure.

When we add the cost to all municipalities across the province, plus hundreds of cases taken to court, and we do not have to repeat the problem that the government's service department, established to receive complaints, ran into. I had my secretary call the officer

in charge two days ago, and I believe the answer she got back was that they had 4,000 complaints up to date.

How many have been answered and rectified? I have not the least idea. Surely there must be a more sensible way to spend \$150 million to assist those in this province who need assistance; those on low and fixed incomes caught in the ever-spiralling tax and cost of living squeeze; those on social and family benefits; those on low incomes caught in the poverty gap.

These problems are before us. Surely this government must have the knowledge to approach the problem.

If we retain the present system and I hope not, Mr. Speaker, we can estimate that the rebate will cost 10 to 15 per cent more in 1969 due to mill rate increases and additional new properties.

This could mean a cost of \$165 to \$175 million, plus \$1 million administration costs by the province and, of course, to the municipalities.

Right now we know that the city of Hamilton's budget, if not sliced drastically, will demand an 18 mill increase, nine for education and nine for municipal needs, an average cost of about \$77 per homeowner. This will mean the tax rebate will go up about only \$10.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to relate some of the alternatives I think this government, with their philosophy, might consider.

We, as the New Democratic Party, have explained at conventions and in previous presentations to this House, how we would develop a progressive tax in this province so that we do have an equitable and just distribution of income. But we are not the government, and in making suggestions we have to keep them confined to the known philosophy of the present government.

If we retain the present system, it is estimated that the rebate will cost at least ten per cent more in 1969 due to mill rate increases and the addition of new properties to the tax role. The estimated cost, of course, \$165 million plus \$1 million administration cost by the province and municipalities.

The government could convert to the income tax credit. This would require the consent of the federal government to alter tax forms and adoption of the principle of negative income tax so that refunds would go to persons whose tax liability was less than the amount of the property tax rebate, but it

is doubtful, Mr. Speaker, that consent would ever be given to this.

If we do not find a new way to develop some federal co-operativism between the Premier of this province and the Prime Minister of Canada, we are never going to get consent of a sensible programme.

This programme, of course, would also require thousands of people who do not have to submit tax returns to do so. Alternatively, the province could set up its own income tax collection system, and from what they tell me, if the government decides to do this, we may hear something about it next week in the Budget. It would take one or two years to implement it, and its implementation would run into a cost of between \$7 and \$8 million.

If the amount of the rebate continues to be tied to the mill rate, the municipalities would have just as much work as now in calculating the rebate and notifying owners, and would in addition have to apply to the income tax authorities for verification of the amounts claimed.

The income tax credit would solve the problem of rebates going to foreigners and would be limited to individuals, but it would not solve the problem of routing the rebate to tenants. Municipalities do not have sufficient data on tenants, length of tenure and forwarding addresses to either notify them of their claims or verify claims submitted by tenants to the income tax authorities. A flat rate tax credit to every householder would overcome these problems but it would bear no relation, Mr. Speaker, to property tax relief and would simply be a social credit type of hand-out which we abhor.

We could perhaps pay the present rebate only to the municipalities and we might consider two calculations (a) we could pay the same amount in 1969 as municipalities collected and disbursed under the scheme in 1968. This would be unfair, of course, to municipalities with substantial increases in mill rate or new property, as I have mentioned before. But this would save the work of recalculating the rebates. It would also freeze the province's outlay at \$150 million.

And (b) we might calculate the 1968 rebates under the present formula but pay them only to the local government and not the property owners. Or the government could use these funds to take over a greater share of education costs.

I understand that each additional point of education costs assumed by the province would cost about \$11 million, so the province

could move from the present 46 per cent to 60 per cent with the \$150 million now being spent on the rebate. The money could be distributed in an equalizing way under the present Ontario education foundation tax plan. This would be a large step towards the 80 per cent takeover of education costs which we in this party advocate.

We could also use the funds to take over all health and welfare costs, since the federal and provincial governments now pay 80 per cent of welfare payments. Of course, the province has assumed the cost of the health field—that costly portion of the health field, air pollution control. The amount needed to transfer full responsibility for these functions of the province would be less than the \$150 million available and it would be in the neighbourhood, I understand, of about \$75 million.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the provincial financial responsibility for these fields does not preclude some decentralization of decision-making in the more local administration by municipalities or regional governments with their budgets, of course, subject to provincial supervision.

We could use the funds, Mr. Speaker, to ease the transition to regional government. The entire amount could be offered as a special grant to offset the sharp tax rise in areas being amalgamated, or it could be made available to new second-tier governments on an equalization footing to keep regional mill rates uniform and at a reasonable level. Of course, this proposal would discriminate against local governments in areas not slated for regional government, at present, or amalgamations or enlargement.

The funds, of course, could also be used at the first stage in a municipal foundation plan. Since our proposed municipal foundation plan is designed to equalize the tax burden among the local governments and to provide for a gradual shift of financial load from the property tax to the broader revenue sources of the provincial government, it would seem logical to replace the cumbersome and inefficient rebate plan.

Our municipal foundation plan can be adapted to both regional governments and individual municipalities. Moreover, the amount of the province's contribution can be adjusted by varying either the standard mill rate or the standard cost in the phasing. So, it can be introduced in stages.

If the \$150 million were used for the first stage, we would be on the way to equalizing

municipal tax burdens and services instead of giving handouts to many who do not need them.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident from recent government statements that continuation of this foolish rebate system is under review by the government. Hints are being dropped that it might be replaced by an income tax credit. As long as the provincial income tax is collected by Ottawa, this would require the co-operation of the federal government and they may not be willing to go along. Moreover, a tax credit does not solve the problem of getting rebates to tenants nor to pensioners or other low income persons who do not pay income tax.

The government has already ruled out the possibility of direct payments by cheque to each person eligible on the grounds of prohibitive administrative costs.

A more sensible change would be to pay the rebates only to the municipalities and not to the owners and tenants, so that the municipalities would get some direct help in meeting their growing responsibilities. I mentioned the situation in Hamilton right now, and I expect that our newspapers will be full of the same thing, rising taxes right across the province.

Now, many will say that this would not work because the municipalities would only spend it to develop their many needed work programmes. But certainly there must be some co-operation, some understanding and some faith in the municipal politicians and leaders, that if they got grants they would be used in the proper manner, and that they would not abuse this kind of thing if it was given in good faith. They would try to keep down the tax rate.

The most useful way in which this \$150 million could be spent would be the first step toward provincial assumption of 80 per cent of the cost of education. This would do a great deal to end municipal reluctance to accept moderate price housing.

We know that in many municipalities they have shunned away from the low cost public HOME programme because this would mean larger families, larger education costs. This has been explicit in many of the briefs presented by municipalities and, of course, if you remove the high cost of education from the municipalities, they would not have this kind of restriction in mind.

Alternatively, the funds could play an important role in efforts to modernize our horse and buggy municipal system. Regional government alone will not produce more money.

As much as it is needed and as much as it will do the job has to be done in orderly planning and development in growth, it will not produce more money.

We have pressing local needs and this will not produce more money for pressing local needs nor will it succeed unless teamed with a new system of provincial equalization grants.

Our municipal foundation plan is the answer to the problem of equalizing local tax burdens and services, and can be applied to regional governments. The \$150 million for rebates, which of course may rise to \$175 million in 1969, could be a first instalment on the implementation of a municipal foundation plan.

A different approach, Mr. Speaker, would be to divert the \$150 or \$175 million to the war on poverty. This province has not even fired the first gun in that war, despite the disturbing picture of poverty in Ontario painted by the Economic Council of Canada in its latest report.

The funds would go a long way to helping our Indian population, breaking the poverty cycle for welfare families and providing more equal education opportunities throughout the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will give consideration to a new programme, a progressive programme for all the province. Many of the people in my riding remember the promises made by this government in October, 1967, that there would be no tax increase.

They ask why did they promise no tax increase and then immediately take more than \$100 from our pockets with added taxes. Then when their conscience was pricked by realization that the tax squeeze was on them they bribed the people with their own money, and came out with the basic shelter tax credit programme.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we want no more of this foolishness, no more of this misuse of the province's money. We are looking forward to a sensible, reasonable approach in the next Budget, and I hope that we do get that kind of recognition from this government.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I have several items that I would like to speak about in this House. But first of all I would like to say that nothing pleases me better than to see the Speaker sitting in his chair. He has made me feel good because I was wondering how I was going to open my discussion if the Speaker had not been there.

I sometimes think there are two types of people in this House—those who say, “If I were to say complimentary things about him, I would not be telling the whole truth,” and those who say, “If I said nasty things about him, I would be a nasty politician and I do not want to do that.”

Having said that, may I say that no one in this House has more respect for this Chair and the assembly and the people in it than I have. Every man here was elected by the constituents in his riding, every man here I believe is here conscientiously to do a good job for his riding. I respect you all, and in 10 years' time I have found that if nothing else has come of my being in the Legislature, it has given me an opportunity to meet with people from every corner of this province, who I believe are sincerely trying to do a good job for the people they represent and for the province of Ontario.

I was going to prepare my speech this evening and tell you what I thought of each department, but an individual would have to be somewhat lacking in his make-up and in his memory if he could not speak to the departments of this government without notes.

I look across the floor to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), for instance, and I think what that fine man did when he raised your licence plates by \$10. There are some who can afford it. But there are thousands who cannot.

I remember the legislation that he brought into this House when he decided that the youngsters who ride motorcycles should wear helmets. What a fine piece of legislation that was. But he did not consult the people who ride the motorcycles.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, this helmet has the tendency to deflect the sound, which makes it much more dangerous to ride a motorcycle than if the rider did not have one of those things on.

It seems to make sense to me now after these youngsters came to me with a petition and said, “We who ride the motorcycles ought to know what the dangers on the road are. And because we know, we feel the Minister should have taken it up with people who are expert in the field and said: ‘How do you think it should be designed, if you think it should be at all, and if it should, we will agree, providing you come up with a sensible kind of headgear.’”

Every individual on a motorcycle that goes by you has on a different type of headgear, and if he finds his headgear uncomfortable, it is not worn at all but attached to the seat.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): The Liberal Party again!

Mr. V. M. Singer: (Downsview): That is not what he said.

Mr. Bukator: That was an exceptionally good contribution from the minister from lord knows where—Yorkview. He has studied this thing but he too did not sit down and discuss the things with the individuals affected.

I believe that if I were riding a motorcycle, I would at least expect someone in the government to determine what type of thing would do the job of safety for us. This would have been the proper approach. Now I was asked by many of my constituents who ride motorcycles to bring this before the hon. Minister to try to tell him their side of the story because they were not afforded that opportunity. I thought that made sense to the point where I decided, “Gentlemen, you have come to me with a delegation. I will take this up with the people in authority and I will see whether they might not sit down and decide, at least, to have a transparent type.” It should be one that may be open at the back, so that they can hear the oncoming vehicle. Because they claim that with this soundproof helmet that deflects sound, they cannot hear; therefore, they are more dangerous than they would be riding the motorcycle without them.

An hon. member: The Minister should have one like that.

Mr. Bukator: That makes sense. So much so that I think maybe I should touch on another point or two. In my neighbourhood—I see the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman) looking at the clock and I was just getting wound up as I was coming to his department. I was wondering when Lincoln and Welland are going to get that lovely jail that we talked about at a lovely dinner about two years ago.

An hon. member: Give him a chance to have his supper.

Mr. Bukator: Shall I move adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: If the member has reached an appropriate point in his remarks.

Mr. Bukator moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, February 25, 1969
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 25, 1969

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Wells, Mr. Breithaupt	1535
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Reilly, agreed to	1567
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Grossman, agreed to	1567

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1969

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THONE

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is good to see you back.

I was speaking on the licence plates and helmets that are used by the people in the province who ride motorcycles. I think that many of the good citizens of this province who ride a machine of that type are often condemned because of the few in that particular group that do not behave themselves.

They get into trouble, they ride around in groups, and there was a tendency to smear every individual who owned a motorcycle. And then this government decided to protect these people against themselves, by deciding to pass a statute to protect them with a helmet. Well some of those who have to wear these helmets—because of the type of people that they are—do not need helmets. They would never hurt their heads, but there are many citizens who should have protection—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Too thick!

Mr. Bukator: As far as he is concerned, the Minister of whatever he is, should just keep his seat and keep quiet and I will tell him all about his department too. I am making the rounds. I am glad he came back again. It is nice to see him in the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He needs a little advice.

Mr. Bukator: So, getting back to the helmets. If the government would have sat down with people who know that industry, and who would have designed a unit of a type that does not act as blinkers, something with which they could hear the vehicle coming from behind, then it would have been a safety measure.

Now, why I brought this up again, Mr. Speaker, is that someone spoke to me during the dinner hour and said: "I understand you are against helmets on the riders of motorcycles."

I am not. I think a proper unit, a proper type, properly thought out, would have been

the bright thing to do and I think the right place to get that kind of information is to go to the experts, the people who ride the motorcycles. Having said that, I know a word to the wise is sufficient and I will quit there.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The member is not ahead.

Mr. Bukator: I thought I was ahead.

Mr. Nixon: Of course you are ahead.

Mr. Bukator: You will find as time goes on who is ahead because you know, Mr. Speaker, you know what defeats a government? It is not the Opposition that beats them, it is the people who have constantly, for 25 years, been kind of taken for granted by this government. They decided: "We know all and the public knows nothing." So this is what is going to defeat them.

I would think that the increase in licence plates alone—can you imagine a person owning a Volkswagen that takes up about a quarter of the road having to pay \$20 for licence plates.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Ken Bryden owned one.

Mr. Nixon: Now he has a turtle neck and sideburns.

Mr. Bukator: \$20 for a licence. Those of you on that side of the House who can afford an eight-cylinder car have to pay \$35.

Now I understand this, that the government—the Ministers—can afford the \$35, but there are many people outside of this Chamber—yes, and many here in the audience—who have eight-cylinder cars and they ought not to be paying that kind of money.

It is the cost. An old codger said to me many years ago—he was a kind of peculiar nut and this is where I get some of my ideas—he said it is not the high cost of anything, it is the high cost of mismanagement. And he hit the nail right on the head. We, the people of the province, really cannot afford you people!

An hon. member: Why is the member here then?

Mr. Bukator: We are here in the Opposition telling you of your faults on the government side of the House, and you know some of these back benchers might add something to them if they come up to date, Mr. Speaker. Having said that, I would like to get to the Minister of Correctional Institutions.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Services.

Mr. Bukator: Correctional Services.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Not much service, but a lot of correction.

Mr. Bukator: In 1950 I was honoured by the county council—I was a member of the county council at that time—to come to this fine building here, with hat in hand, to speak to the Attorney General of that day, the hon. Dana Porter, a very fine man. We decided to tell him that the cost of county buildings because of where they are situated, and the type of service that they rendered as a court house, ought not to be borne by the taxpayers of that particular area and it makes sense. I see the Attorney General is an interested and reasonable man, and he may do something about this, with his colleague sitting next to him.

We came here and said: "Mr. Porter, we do not believe that this cost should be borne by the taxpayers of the county on their local taxes, because that is not a just type of taxation on the people in that area. The province should bear the whole cost of this."

At that time, there was a peculiar formula used; 33 1/3 per cent paid by the province and 66 2/3 paid by the county. And also, if a man did go to jail and needed a toothbrush, they decided—no matter how bad you were, or whether you had any teeth at all—if you went to jail for 30 days, you had a toothbrush, toothpaste and a pillow.

Now, I am talking for an improvement over the county jail that we had at that time. So we came back from that particular meeting thinking that this Minister was an honourable and reasonable man—that he would do something for us. Well, it took many years.

Finally, this fine gentleman who represents that institution now—with a new name instead of prison and reform and many others—when he was here, I don't remember what they called that institution.

Now, Correctional Services is what we have, but the trouble is we don't have the services. I was in St. Catharines when Lincoln county and Welland county, which now will become the larger region, thinking you were going to invite me to this dinner. I did not get in on

the picture. There is a funny thing about the members of the Opposition, they are invited to eat—they are invited to be seen, but are not indeed in the picture, and are not given an opportunity to say anything because they might say something that might not be too complimentary.

However, I was pleased because now it is going to be a 50-50 cost. The province is going to pay 50 per cent Lincoln county is going to pay 25 and Welland 25. We are now moving towards the plan on which everybody shook hands. The pictures were taken and I went home and I said: "That's one gimmick I will not be able to use in the House any more, because they are going to build a new sub-unit, farm—regional detention services centre." And would the Minister of Mines and Resources believe it, that place has not been built yet. I do not think they have the land for it.

I thought maybe I would talk to him, because Hydro or the department that he represents—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator:—Hydro that he represents is going to build a \$25 million or \$30 million building at the corner of College street and University avenue here in Toronto on a lot that is not big enough to put the building on. Now, boy, that is an accomplishment!

An hon. member: How much is that going to cost?

Mr. Bukator: You know what I like about speaking in the Throne debate, you can go all over the province, talk about many issues, and you can be wrong as often as you are right, and no one can call you out of order.

An hon. member: You are right every time. You have not been wrong yet.

Mr. Bukator: Now you have not been here that long.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: However, I am an optimist. I believe that building will one day be built.

I was hoping the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be here. We hear a lot about regional government lately, so I am going to file this matter until he comes in.

An hon. member: Do not hurry back!

Mr. Bukator: I would like to speak to my friend from water resources. It is going to be

a kind of a friendly get together. But as I speak to him about some of the issues with which we have to contend, I think you would have to multiply that many times because most municipalities in the province have similar problems.

Not too long ago, the general manager came to the Falls, to the Brock Hotel, and he spoke to the industrial management group there. He went on to say that pollution is a problem that we have to contend with. Now I can paraphrase only, I do not remember his exact words, and I am sure that members would not want me to read his speech. And he feels that we, in Canada, have done much more to clean up the pollution of our waters than the United States has.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: We in Canada, have done more than they have in the United States.

Now, if you drive along our border, or if you are fortunate to have a plane—such as that of the Minister who is interjecting—to travel along our water boundary you will find in many of the areas nothing but bush. There is nobody there to pollute them for hundreds—yes, thousands—of miles, except where the international waters meet, and where there is the odd bridge. We have American and Canadian people living along these borders, and, as luck would have it, in the area where I come from, and that is between Buffalo and Niagara-on-the-Lake, on the Niagara river—

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Because of pressure!

Mr. Bukator: Not because of the pressure, but because of the common sense and reasoning of those fine people, the village of Chippawa decided to build the necessary disposal units. In the village of Chippawa where I live, they built both the primary and secondary treatment plant, long before I ever came to this particular House. Because as reeve at that particular date I thought this was the proper thing to do.

The city of Niagara Falls built a \$5 million plant, but only primary treatment. And I criticized my good friend for the great county of Welland because the city of Welland, from time to time, was saying they would do something, but they never did, until about two years ago.

Can you imagine the county seat without disposal units at an intersection of waters,

the Welland river and the Canal? My friends, you ought to have walked along those waters in the summer time, as I did. When we sat in county council, it was in terrible condition.

Finally, Ontario water resources and the city of Welland got their heads together, and they did something about it, so they tell me.

I have not been invited, by the way, my good friend for Dufferin-Wellington, to the opening of that particular plant. I doubt very much whether it is working yet. You usually invite me to all of these things, to take these bullets out of my gun. This particular spot I have not been invited to, and until I see for myself, like Thomas—I must feel the print—I do not believe.

But let me tell you the most recent bit of good political manoeuvring.

An hon. member: Oh, oh. They have got lots of it over there.

Mr. Bukator: They did come into the township of Willoughby, a township that I represent, and this gentleman and a man by the name of Moody—

An hon. member: Well, it was like Moody.

Mr. Bukator: Well, that was the gentleman who was working on a different problem altogether. I think he did a good job, much better maybe than this particular group is doing. I have a brief here on the pollution of Welland county, and the problems there for many years. I must give this committee credit, because when they invited me to that meeting a few months ago, they decided to do something about the pollution of a little place called Douglastown.

An American gentleman claimed he was not notified about the meeting. That man came across the border—and in some instances they figure they are in the wilderness and this is a good place to make money—found they decided to put the lagoon on his farm, after he decided to buy his land. He raised the roof, as I understand. He raised the roof with me I know and I understand he contacted you people also. So you are going to meet with him again.

But I say to this committee—and it will be the first time I have ever complimented them—when you get on with that job, and the sooner the better, I will be the first to say to you the same as I said to the Niagara parks commission recently. I made a statement in the Brock Hotel, and I said: “If

there are international waters that are polluted, one of the worst offenders is the Niagara parks commission themselves!"

The Table Rock House has a beautiful restaurant, and all of the sewage which runs through the NPC system runs into the Niagara River—raw—right at the foot of the Horseshoe Falls!

I was talking to the chairman—and I am sorry he is not here, he was this afternoon—and I told him when the NPC connects that to the city system, I would be the first to compliment him. The machines are working there—Mr. Chairman of water resources, vice-chairman—the machines are working there. As soon as they make that connection I will be the first to say: "Congratulations, you have finally cleaned up your mess. The government has set an example."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Was that happening when you were on that commission?

Mr. Bukator: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Why did you not say something then?

Mr. Bukator: Oh, yes. I was on that commission for six consecutive years and with some of the finest men that ever sat on a commission. We paid off a \$6 million debt while I was on the commission, from 1951 to 1956.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Better record than you have got over there.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Good leadership!

Mr. Bukator: Oh, yes. They had to bring in the Liberals to put the Conservative house right.

An hon. member: That is always the case.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Where did the member get the grants?

Mr. Bukator: Pardon?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Where did they get the grants?

Mr. Bukator: We are going to come to that. I am glad you opened up another subject, my friend.

Mr. Sopha: That commission has not worked right since George Drew fired—

Mr. Bukator: Yes! Have fun gentlemen, I am not going any place. I was told that after I have a good dinner I make a better

after dinner speaker than I do before—and boys, I have got lots of time, so have fun.

An hon. member: And with a good Speaker in the Chair we are away!

Mr. Bukator: Yes. As a matter of fact, no matter who would be sitting there now, they cannot rule you out of order when you speak on the Throne debate unless you are insulting somebody. And I have been a gentleman to this point. I have insulted no one. I am just putting the record straight.

Now, where did the money come from to clean up this mess in the parks commission? Very simple! From water rentals, away back when.

As a matter of fact, the Liberal government had something to do with that when they were in, long before 1934, as a matter of fact—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, water rentals from everywhere.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: Ah, my friend, it will take a little more than that to trap me.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where the money comes from—\$1.25 per horsepower generated is what the parks commission collects from Hydro.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): One million dollars per year.

Mr. Bukator: As a matter of fact, it was more than that. Who is that member and where does he come from?

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Right from Thunder Bay!

Mr. Bukator: Coming from Thunder Bay, that distance? I did not think he knew where Niagara Falls was, let alone who pays for the water and where it comes from. According to the way I understand it, it comes from Lake Michigan, Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair, I believe, does it not?

Mr. Stokes: It comes from Lake Nipigon and the Nipigon river.

Mr. Bukator: That is what he thinks. He had better come down and visit with me. I will show him where it comes from and where it goes, and how badly it is polluted when it gets there, and how much money this government collects and on which they do not pay taxes. How simple!

As a matter of fact, when Sir Adam Beck No. 2 was opened not too long ago, there was so much money collected by the parks commission that, finally, the silver fox, as they called him, the former Premier, said to the parks commission, "Gentlemen, you have too much money", and so \$625,000 a year of that money was diverted into the parks integration board.

And then they decided to kind of cover it up. Now it goes into the consolidated revenue fund—\$625,000! About \$800,000 is collected now and the parks commission maintains the loveliest park system that can be found anywhere in Canada. And we are proud of it and we are glad to have you come visit with us. You can relax after a gruelling few hours like you are getting here tonight. Come to the commissioners' quarters—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It certainly is gruelling!

An hon. member: Did he say drooling?

Mr. Bukator: If the member thinks this is gruelling, he is in for a pleasant surprise, because it is going to go on and on. I have heard some of his members speak here for days and say absolutely nothing. At least I base my arguments on facts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Now, where was I, was I picking on the parks commission or the Hydro?

All I can say for the parks commission—and I want to put this on the record as accurately as I know how—is that the men of that particular board are very decent citizens—good men doing a good job. And I say this, that the high cost of mismanagement has also been in that park. We have a new man there now in the name of Wilson who may put the record straight and do a good job for us. But that remains to be seen. So I am willing to wait another season to find out how this thing works out.

But, in the meantime, where the parks commission has its units of business, doing business in direct opposition to private enterprise, it ought to be taxed as you and I. Is that not right? Does that not make sense? It does not pay any taxes.

In units where it does business, such as souvenir stores and restaurants, in direct opposition to private enterprise, it is carried, in my opinion, by the city of Niagara Falls. Now, it is not because they do not have the

money; the money is there. And I say it ought to pay as any other taxpayer does. Having said that, I will leave the parks commission alone until the member for Haldimand-Norfolk returns.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, do the Treasurer. I can hardly wait.

Mr. Bukator: The Treasurer—I will come to him a little later. I wonder where he is getting his money now?

An hon. member: From Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: The Hydro has become a monster that cannot be controlled by this Legislature. It has been handled like a dictatorship would be in another country. These men have the right to run a kingdom within a country and they are not responsible to anyone.

I asked in this House, just last week, if I could not ask the vice-chairman of Hydro a question about Hydro here, and the Speaker of that day said, "Not now. You cannot ask him because you must go through a Minister". So I have to ask the second vice-chairman of Hydro the question through the Minister of Management and Resources who knows absolutely nothing about Hydro, because when the question was asked, the vice-chairman handed the—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You have got it wrong again, it is Energy and Resources.

Mr. Bukator: There is no energy there, my friend. And it would not have been too bad if you could read well—you could not even read it, and when you read it you did not know what you were reading about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: How can you? I do not recall in the ten years—as a matter of fact I may say something nice about you if I can think about it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hydro ought to be responsible to this Legislature the same as any other department of government. I think it ought to come here with the problems that it has to deal with—with its construction programme, such as The Department of Highways, and I believe that I ought to be able to question it to find out what it is doing with its money.

Now that is not asking too much. This is not being done in this House. My friends, you have had your sport, why do you not

sit back and learn something? I was just handed a sheet of paper with a lot of red figures on it, and when that is in my office, it is somebody that is in red.

We were talking about water rentals. I might say that the government, the parks commission, collected \$923,000 in water rentals last year. They can maintain their parks with that money, and they also, Mr. Speaker, can pay their taxes—at least they should.

Again, they are a commision that works under The Niagara Parks Commission Act and no one can get at them. So we have the Parks Commission water resources. At least we can take you apart once in a while. But I do believe this particular body of men means well. I will give them that much leeway, my experience of them has been good.

I would like to touch on the homes for the aged, and I am sorry that the Minister of Family Services—Family and Social Services. I have trouble with this department, they keep changing their name. We are going to Port Colborne on Friday of this week, so if you miss me, gentlemen, it is not because I want to skip school. I am going to see them open a 91-unit home for the aged, long overdue. It should have been built years ago, because surely, Mr. Speaker, it does not require too much foresight to be able to see that the population has grown and that people are living longer, and I think they ought to have homes provided for them.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Anyone who doubts it only has to look at the Liberal benches.

Mr. Bukator: Well, I am going to tell you something. I prefer some of the grey-haired men we have on our benches to some of the curly-haired ones you have on yours.

Mr. Winkler: They need a different kind of home.

Mr. Bukator: When the home for the aged in Welland was built—one of the finest in the province of Ontario—my friend from Welland, that great county, who has stepped out of the House, and I were on the sub-division of the home farm committee. What a proud day that was for me. I decided after that to go into the real estate business! We subdivided the home farm and we made a net of \$155,000 after sub-dividing this farm.

We came to this government, and we said: "We have \$155,000, now you match it dollar for dollar." And we wound up with \$310,000. And we built the first addition to that beautiful home in the county of Welland. And it

is one of the finest, and is equal to any hotel I have been in—such wonderful service. And I am sure that this Minister who just interjected, can find no better in the province.

As a matter of fact, let me tell you a little story that was most interesting to me. The young man who runs this place came to the county committee to be interviewed for the job. He was not quite 21 years of age yet, but I knew the boy. He came from my home town and, as we were interviewing these people—I know the government does the same thing—I decided that he should be the last one to speak and tell us his story.

When he was finished and had walked out of that particular meeting that evening, Mr. Nissen, now the mayor of Port Colborne, said: "He is a young boy, but he is well coached, someone told him what to say." He not only took the job, but without a doubt there is no equal in this province when it comes to maintaining and administering a business of that type. Doug Rapelje is doing an excellent job. And we have a beautiful home.

Now then, we are building and opening a 91-unit home in Port Colborne, and the Dorchester Manor in Niagara Falls has been in the process of being built. I will read the letter dated 1937 when they agreed this site should be bought.

There is a 91-unit bed to go there also; a 91-unit institution that will be part of the larger portion, and there are 300 people ready to go into a home that will house 91 when, and if, it is built.

Now, I would say to you, that this government is not sincere about housing the aged who are not being properly taken care of, because, on one hand, it is not building much-needed institutions and, on the other hand, is closing some of the homes that ought not to be closed until something better is built. So, you are kind of working at cross purposes.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with my reasoning here. I would like someone to tell me why this government cannot, tomorrow morning, go out and rent, or purchase many of the motels that are sitting idle many months of the year—buildings that have inner corridors with the finest equipment, when it comes to restaurants and fine dining rooms that could be purchased tomorrow morning. There are many of them that could be bought, and, if you don't want to buy them, rent them. You could house 300 people in that area and 1,000 throughout the province tomorrow morning.

That is too simple. That is much too simple, because many of these units have,

yes, the king-size bed with the finest of equipment, with bathrooms built right in, with adjoining units. Couples could be housed in these buildings, and they could walk in these inner corridors. They even have swimming pools. Are you interested, gentlemen, and if you are, why do you not buy, and can you tell me that it is not cheaper?

I happen to be in that type of business myself. You can easily build them for less than \$6,000 a room, complete, and you can rent them for less than \$10 a day year-round. This is no problem in my book. I would house those people immediately because they have rendered a service to this country. These old people have done a job for us. We owe them something and in their last few years on this earth, they are entitled to better quarters than those in which they have to live now.

We owe them that. We can provide it immediately and I think it makes good sense. I would like any Minister, when I get through or any other time, to tell me why this would not work. To my mind it is the answer to a very serious problem.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They are all quiet. You have got them on the fence.

Mr. Bukator: You have had representation from the city of Niagara Falls, from the sunset haven. The petition was sent to this Minister and I am sorry he is not here. I do not like to talk about a man's department when he is not here to help me, because I am sure we are all working to one end and that is to the betterment of the people of this province. No one is trying to embarrass anybody.

On June 13, 1967, they were talking about the proposed site for Niagara Falls—mind you, this is 1967: "If the site is agreeable to your committee I would be pleased to make recommendations for the approval of the hon. Minister on receipt of the legal description of the property." Not too long after that, on August 9, they agreed to an expenditure of \$38,800 to buy land. They approved of the architect's design to build this unit. The county of Welland spent \$100,000.

The government, when they were approached by a committee from the county of Welland, said: "We are sorry, but we have some kind of an austerity programme where we are spending more than we are making. We must pull in our horns quite a little bit." I said that ten years ago when I came into this House, you just cannot go on spending

\$2 million a week more than you make for ten consecutive years and stay out of trouble.

And this year they are going to spend something like \$570 million more than they have taken in, and they have never before taken in more money.

Mr. Sopha: Well, they are getting \$175 million from Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Ruston: Is that right?

Mr. Sopha: He will send a cheque.

Mr. Bukator: Should we talk about Medicare? What is to be said about Medicare after the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) himself got up in the House this afternoon and said he had nothing against it. We are going into the system. "I have never said we would not go along with it," that is what the man said, or again I paraphrase, and if he said that—that he is going on with it—then there is no problem. Everybody is in agreement.

Mr. De Monte: He said it was not pointed out.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, well.

Mr. Sopha: There it comes out—he follows that \$175 million.

Mr. Bukator: It is nice to see the doctor back. I might say this about this Minister who just came in, he is one of the few I see here every day. Have you heard about the tax rebate?

An hon. member: Try pollution.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, I can go back to that. There are many areas there that are polluted, both politically and in the water. Pollution is a problem that we have had to deal with ever since we started in politics 100 and some odd years ago.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Ever since the hon. member was born.

Mr. Bukator: That is about 100—well not quite, about 56 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member does not look it.

Mr. Bukator: Well, I will tell you why? It is this kind of work that keeps me young. Fighting constantly with this government, who will not move an inch. However, I figure that one day I will persuade you.

By the way, I am glad you are here, Mr. Minister. Bill 73 and Bill 74. Why did you not consult with these people who are so

directly involved and interested in this problem? Could you not have taken five minutes to talk to them, to the humane society, and ask them? Now you know what is going to happen, and I know we cannot talk about a bill in this House while it is pending, or going through whatever it is going through, but surely you will not mind. You, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, must do one thing—at least let that go in the committee stage and let these people make their representations to him directly. That is not asking too much.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): We never expected to do anything else.

Mr. Bukator: Is not that wonderful? This is democracy at work.

Mr. Speaker, I will get back to rent control. I received a letter from a gentleman in Hamilton, I believe—I wish I knew where to look in this mass of notes that I have.

Mr. Shulman: The member is better organized than most of us.

Mr. Bukator: Thank you. Here is a gentleman who happens to be an auditor. They are men who know what they are doing with figures, anyhow. And he happens to be a landlord also. He was approached, as everyone should be, if he is a landlord, for the rebate. Now this man wanted to be fair, apparently, from the little note I have here. Just a few lines, and I think I had better read that into the record. He said: "Fine, if you want me to give you your rebate, I will. I will do it because the law says so." But let me tell you how he put it.

Enclosed please find your provincial tax rebate for 1968. I wish to advise that, commencing January, 1969, your rent will be increased by the amount equivalent to the 1969 provincial tax rebate. However, we will not require payment until 1969.

In other words, we will apply your 1969 rebate against the rent increase so that there will be no balance owing either way.

Mr. Ruston: There he is—the Minister of Municipal Affairs has just come in.

Mr. Bukator: Well then, I can get into the file. Can you imagine that? The auditor said: If you have a rebate I will give it to you, but I will increase your rent that much, so no one will owe anybody anything. And, my friend, you the tenant will get absolutely nothing.

And that applies across the board, time and time again. This government did not accomplish what they wanted to do with that statute, and so this Minister, while he had a real hot potato in his hand at that time, gets into regional government and, heavenly days, when he gets through with that mess his hair will be as white as mine.

An hon. member: I do not think he is listening very much.

Mr. Bukator: No, I do not think he is either.

The gentleman who bought his home from Hydro—the Minister has gone and I was not through with him. I am sure he will read everything I say in *Hansard*. He is that type of fellow—he bought a house from Hydro after Hydro got through with the construction of that area. They bought many houses and built a few.

Well, this man working for Hydro bought the house and is paying them a payment, as you and I would do—a blended payment of taxes, principal and interest.

So when the time came for the rebate, he asked for it—and I wish the Minister of Municipal Affairs would listen to this because he advised me what happened—he was told by Hydro that he could not get a rebate because Hydro does not pay taxes. "You are not going to get your money because we do not pay taxes, we pay grants in lieu of taxes"—and so the vice-chairman of Hydro has said in this House, "we pay the equivalent, grants in lieu of taxes like anyone else does on our property." If they do, why did these people not get their rebate?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is a very good question.

Mr. Bukator: And you can take that same idea with the Ontario Housing Corporation if you will. There are many areas where it has houses which they rent, in which it has not yet paid the rebate.

Was my friend wrong when he said the "high cost of mismanagement?" No, he knew what he was talking about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Nice to see such a nice turnout, on both sides of the House. It encourages one.

To get into the regional government problem—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, I could talk on and on, but I like the way the auditor handled it. He says, "Fine I will give you your money and then I will raise your rent," and the tenant went without, as he always does.

This government could not see that. If it wanted to give anything it could have very well said, "Alright, half of your tax dollars is for school purposes anyhow, so we will give you a larger grant on that end. The people on fixed incomes and on pensions, the elderly people, would get a break there because they do not need the schools anymore, they have already paid the shot. We will cut their taxes down for school purposes." Again, this is much too simple.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Minister really just came in.

Mr. Bukator: Where did I put that big book?

Mr. Sopha: Well, he and the Attorney General are going to prosecute. Give him his name.

Mr. Bukator: I think my friends have them over a barrel.

An hon. member: They are coming up with something now over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I was trying to further justice, to get that fellow prosecuted.

An hon. member: I think he should lay a charge.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, I have before me a very small document that I intend to read now. This was prepared by Deacon, Arnett and Murray, a firm of architects and planning consultants here in Toronto. They were the people who helped assemble your metropolitan government.

And so the city of Niagara Falls, the township of Stamford and the village of Chippawa decided that they ought to have some information on the possibility of a merger of the three municipalities. And can you imagine, this was assembled and completed by 1958 and they found that by becoming a larger unit it would cost too much money. So the township and the city became one and the village stayed out by itself because of its tax base.

At that time at least the people of that area, Mr. Speaker, did a proper and thorough survey. I found, much to my surprise, that when regional government came into this area they decided that this particular area, including Willoughby township, would become

one city, and this government, and this Minister—who is having a lot of fun meeting with his colleagues, he does not see them very often, you will notice he is having his private conversation—

An hon. member: He is not listening.

Mr. Bukator: —they met with the mayors of Niagara Falls, Welland—a good Conservative —Port Colborne—a good Liberal—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The mayor of Port Colborne?

Mr. Bukator: A good Liberal.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, no!

Mr. Bukator: Well, I will tell you what, Mr. Nissen was a warden of Welland county on the Liberal ticket, so I do not know what his politics are.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No longer.

Mr. Bukator: And Max Chown of St. Catharines—

An hon. member: Good Liberal.

Mr. Bukator: And there we have you, three to one.

So we assembled in 1958 and we came up with the facts, the same way that this Minister and this government should have come up with the facts before they started to impose this type of government on those people without giving them the details of what it was going to cost. Nobody buys a suit of clothes without asking what it is going to cost. Yet here the Minister is eliminating 14 municipalities in one full sweep because he thinks regional government is going to be the answer to our problem in the two counties. Yet, he tells us nothing about what the cost will be or how this is going to be assembled.

I say that regional government may be the answer to the problem if our professor at Brock University is right. But I say that we ought to know what it is going to cost. The Minister agrees with me. You know, he reminds me—I am as bad as the hon. member for Grey-Bruce at this point of the game, but I must tell you—I was told the difference between rape and romance was salesmanship! This Minister is trying to sell us a bill of goods and if we do not buy it by September it is not going to be romance.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: The mayor of Niagara Falls said this, and talked about sound common sense and reasoning.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I want to go along—

Mr. Bukator: I did not think you would consider that even for a moment. Thank you very much for the compliment. I can tell you that that would be no problem. At least we would have peace among those people, and maybe I could bring them together and maybe it would be romance, but I will tell you—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You could—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There goes another Liberal seat.

Mr. Bukator: I will tell you what, I do not want the job. Let us put the record straight. I am happy where I am.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But you are willing to listen to a proposition.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, my mind is greatly relieved.

Mr. Bukator: I care not what your mind is made up of, my friend. If there was ever a Minister in this House confused, you are confused on this issue now.

They have got you walking a tight rope.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are adding to my knowledge.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, absolutely. If you would listen. This document of Deacon, Arnett and Murray could have put you on the right track at least in 1958, for that very region.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Too simple for them!

Mr. Bukator: It was no problem. We paid the experts to tell us what it was all about, and when you tell us what it is going to cost and how it is going to be assembled, believe me I may buy it myself.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What is the date of that?

Mr. Bukator: 1958; it was assembled by Deacon, Arnett and Murray, for that very region. We talked about it and we hired these men at that time because we knew something better ought to come about.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You can hardly say we were rushing then.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, you never do in this government. You never do. Talk about putting the cart before the horse, if I was a cartoonist, everytime I talked about you the horse would be behind the cart pushing it. But let me get down to the facts of this particular issue.

I believe that the people of that region, call it what you like, ought to know what it is going to cost. How you are going to assemble the different departments before you cram this down their throats? If you do the same thing with this as you did with the Ottawa Eastview Carleton bill—you did cram that down their throats and they are not happy about it, and if you want the other one, the Port Arthur and Fort William bill, they, too, are not at all pleased with you. You cannot go any place today without being booed—not cheered, jeered.

Mr. Ruston: Not number one any more.

Mr. Bukator: Surely the taxpayers of this province are entitled to the facts before they have anything like this imposed on them? If the Minister does not understand it now he never will. I do not want to object; I do not want to oppose. I only want to know what it will cost before we accept. That, in my opinion, makes sense.

I promised an hon. gentleman before dinner that I would keep the ball rolling until he came in the House. He said he would be here at about 9.30 p.m. It is nice to see the hon. Minister without Portfolio in. It was a pleasure talking to the members and I hope they got something out of it.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I think it is the first time I have taken part in a Throne Debate in this new Legislature since your election as Deputy Speaker and chairman of the committee of the whole House. I would like to offer my congratulations to you and also to the hon. Speaker of the House on his election to that position, and to commend him on the way he has been carrying on the business of this House.

I have been most interested in listening to various members on the opposite side talk about our municipal tax rebate programme. I get the impression that perhaps we should have a little adult education programme for them on how this programme works, because for a programme that has found favour with, I would say, about 95 per cent of the people of this province, they certainly do not understand it.

We have here a programme for a rebate to property tax owners that represents the first time in Canada, and perhaps in North America, that anyone has been able to get at the regressivity of the property tax. We have done it here, and it has not been done

in any other area, including the areas where they send out the \$50 cheques. It has been done at a minimum of expense, in a very economical manner.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): About \$6 million?

Hon. Mr. Wells: About \$.5 million. Now, listen, I would like to—

An hon. member: What are you defending it for?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am defending it because it has been a good thing for the people of my municipality and it has been a good thing for most of the people of your municipalities including Owen Sound and Sarnia and all the rest.

I would like to just show you the difference between how various governments can approach this problem of taxation. The government of Canada, in proclaiming that they were bringing in a just society to this country, last fall announced a social development tax in the form of a two per cent surcharge on income tax.

Very, very commendable, so they said, but what did they do in Ottawa? They brought in this two per cent surcharge, in itself a bit of a—perhaps you might say—a Machiavellian scheme also, in that it very conveniently circumvented, Mr. Speaker, any need to share any of that tax with the provinces under the normal tax arrangements in effect if they had come in and changed the general rates of income tax.

However, let that be as it may, they still, in bringing this tax in, placed a limit on the income on which it could be applied. In other words, they placed a ceiling on it. They suggested that the poor could pay it, but not the rich—they could pay at a standard amount.

Let us take a real close look at that, Mr. Speaker. What does this mean? This meant that, for a married taxpayer with two children, who is eligible for family allowances, and earns a gross income of \$3,500 the two per cent surcharge means an increase in his taxes of 15.7 per cent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Now, take a taxpayer in this province—same category, married taxpayer with two children eligible for family allowances with a gross income of \$25,000. This tax amounted to a 1.6 per cent increase in his taxes. Now, if that is not a tax that soaks the poor, I do not know what it is.

Let us contrast that; let us take a look at this—a look in the municipality of Scarborough. In Scarborough the municipal tax rebate was \$58.55 in the area in which I live. We all got it and we were all happy to get it. It was there on our tax bills and it meant that we paid that much less property tax.

Now, out in our area there lives a couple who are old age pensioners and they pay total property taxes of about \$200. They got the \$58.55 tax rebate—this meant a 29 per cent reduction in their municipal property tax.

Now, compare that with someone in our same municipality living not very far from this couple who pay \$1,500 in municipal property tax. They can afford to pay it, and they got a \$58.55 tax rebate the same as the couple in the small home with the \$200 tax and their municipal tax rebate amounted to 3½ per cent reduction in their tax.

Just contrast that with the federal legislation which soaks the poor, small-income person for 15.7 per cent and only charged 1.6 per cent for the man making \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the vast majority of the people of this province are happy with the municipal tax rebate system because it finally attacked the regressivity of the property tax. Now what are some of the alternatives that our friends across the way have come up with?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: All right, listen to this. Pay more of the school tax, you say; pay more of the school tax. That, in effect, is the same as giving more grants to the municipalities, whether it be to school boards or to municipal councils. What does that mean? Half of that money or so goes to reduce the commercial assessment—it never gets to the home owners, it does not attack the regressivity feature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, any of these other systems that have been suggested do not begin to come to grips with this regressivity feature. They would be filtered away on reducing commercial property taxes, which are not going to help the home owner. They are not going to help the home owner and I just think my friends across the way could not care less because they do not want to know about this programme.

As long as they do not want to know about it we will let them be happy. We will let

them preach programmes like the two per cent social development tax from Ottawa. I just ask you, where is the just society? Is it here in Ontario or is it in Ottawa?

I just want to say that in my own municipality of Scarborough, \$4.5 million was transferred through the municipal tax rebate and it got to people who were really happy and it helped to reduce their property taxes. And \$33.5 million came to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. If this had been paid in grants to any of the municipal councils, it would not have reduced property taxes by \$58, I can tell you that. The people of Scarborough are very happy with the municipal tax rebate.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They are not happy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They are just as happy as the people of Downsview are with their member.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is very happy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The next time the supporters of the member for Downsview hold a meeting in a telephone booth, invite me along.

Mr. Speaker, I just conclude by saying, or reiterating, that I think that this municipal tax rebate system has been much maligned. It has probably been maligned because we attempted to do something with an area that most other jurisdictions did not even have the guts to attack and that is to try and pass something on to the tenants—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): And the Minister fouled it up.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We did not foul it up. There is about one and a half or one per cent of the people in this province who are making all the complaints.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: For a variety of reasons—and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the staff which the Minister of Municipal Affairs has in his department has handled most of these in a very excellent manner and obtained a lot of the rebates.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, we will be living with this and I think it is a good programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to change to another subject, I would like to—

Mr. Singer: The Minister had better. That one was not so good.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh, we will leave it to the people of Ontario and the people of our constituencies to decide whether this was good or not. I am sure they will see where the just society is.

I would like to turn to another subject, Mr. Speaker, and bring this House up to date on the action that this government has been taking in regard to the report of the select committee on youth.

As you know, this committee was appointed in May, 1964, and was re-appointed in 1965 and 1966. After a total of 162 days of meetings and visits and after receiving and considering 698 briefs, the committee tabled in the Legislature its final report in March, 1967.

The report contains a total of 276 recommendations dealing with the special needs of youth and the steps that can be taken to ensure a wider participation by youth in the life of their community and this province.

The major subject headings of the report give a good indication of the scope of the committee's interest and study: organization within the government, education, health, welfare, recreation, employment, sports, guidance and counselling, cultural arts, physical fitness and delinquency.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, that under the able chairmanship of the member for Kingston and the Islands, the youth committee was able to produce a report that is thought to be the most intensive focus on youth ever undertaken in this province.

As I mentioned, the work of the committee continued over a period of nearly three years. One result of this was that a number of recommendations that were formulated in the minds of the members, as the committee meetings went on, our deliberations, many of these had already been acted upon by the time the report was completed. I think this gives a very positive and good indication of the fact that when people set their minds to a common set of problems they often come to similar conclusions. The action taken on these problems by the government, both before the completion of the report and since its release, give a clear demonstration of the seriousness and depth of the government's concern for the young people of this province.

Before dealing in greater detail with the government programmes concerning youth, I would like to tell hon. members about the way the select committee's report has been handled by the government.

The first step was the establishment of a Cabinet committee to analyze the report. Each recommendation was assessed and discussed in relation to the rest of the report and the work of the departments most directly concerned.

It was immediately apparent that a number of recommendations are restatements of suggestions made elsewhere in the report, some, as I have mentioned had already been acted upon and still others did not call for any action by this government but were directed to other bodies and agencies.

Each of the remaining recommendations in the report was referred for comment to the departments which would be involved in its implementation or affected by it. The departmental replies and suggestions were then discussed to see which recommendations could be implemented. Mr. Speaker, as a result of this review, work is going forward in a number of areas in keeping with our priorities and budgetary constraints.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose today to try to review all the programmes of the government that affect our youth or go over each recommendation of the select committee and outline the government's position or the action taken.

Not only would that take more of the time of this House than I would expect or ask, but it would lead on into a discussion of the details of some departmental programmes that would be much better left to my colleagues who are responsible for the programmes and these, of course, can be discussed fully during the estimates of the various departments. I would, however, like to mention what has been done in some areas that will, I think, be of general interest to all.

It is, of course, very obvious from information in the select committee's report and many other sources that the composition of the total population of this province is becoming increasingly younger. In 1961, 45 per cent of the population in Ontario was under 25; by 1971, over 50 per cent of our province's population will be under 25 years of age. What this means is that now, more than ever, young people—our youth—are going to have to play a greater role in the total life of their community and their province and this country.

Indeed, I find from personal talks with the young people I know, that they want to accept this responsibility; they want to become involved. This has been the underlying basis of many of the actions that have been taken in respect to the recommendations of the select committee on youth.

The government was impressed with the reasoning of the select committee that there was a lack of any formal structure for co-ordinating the work of the various departments of government concerned with youth. A number of the recommendations of the select committee were designed to overcome this problem, recognizing that the informal channels of communication are not always sufficient to provide the desired amount of co-ordination.

In addition, the government recognized that our services in regard to youth are so important that there would be an advantage to having a body that could meet at regular intervals to discuss youth matters specifically and co-ordinate the total approach of the government.

Accordingly, the Prime Minister has established an interdepartmental committee on youth, made up of representatives of a number of departments whose programmes directly affect the young people of this province. With the exception of myself, as chairman of the committee and a member of the Prime Minister's staff who acts as secretary, all the members of this interdepartmental committee are drawn from the operating branches of the various departments of government.

This means that the members have intimate knowledge and day to day experience with the programme and with the problems of our young people. The advantages of this choice of membership have been readily apparent at our meetings that have been held to date already.

Although the committee is still very new, it has already been of considerable value as a vehicle for communication and a sounding board for ideas and problems brought forward by the individual members and it shows great promise of bringing about a greater degree of co-ordination among the various departments.

I am sure, sir, that this committee will prove its worth and will fulfill the expectation of the select committee.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What is the average age?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The average age of the members on the committee? I am afraid I cannot answer that now, but there are many young people, or people who, I would say, would be in their 30s or 40s.

Mr. Singer: Does the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps) sit on that committee?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, he does not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wells: As I said, Mr. Speaker, this committee, although it is very new, is a group that has been a valuable vehicle for communicating. It will be a sounding board for many new ideas and problems brought forward by the members from the various departments.

Another action step of great significance is the formation of the youth and recreation branch. Announced last June 1 by the Minister of Education in this House, it was formed by consolidating, within The Department of Education, the youth branch and the community programmes section.

This amalgamation, as hon. members will appreciate, is very much in keeping with the spirit and thinking underlying the recommendations of the select committee. The effect of this reorganization has been to mobilize the established and effective staff and field organization of the community programme section and the research facilities of the youth branch to serve the young people of this province. As a result, the thinking and policies regarding youth programmes now have a decentralized organization through which their implementation is greatly facilitated. Another beneficial effect is to ensure that our extensive recreation programmes fully serve the needs of young people. This aspect is particularly important in view of the need seen by the select committee for greater emphasis in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say here that as a member of this select committee on youth I travelled to all these other provinces in Canada and saw the organizations that they have. And in my own mind I am convinced that our youth and recreation branch, as it now stands organized, and as it will develop, is the equal or better of any department of youth in any other government in this country.

Mr. Singer: Does the member for Kingston and the Islands share that view?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am sure he would, Mr. Speaker, if he comes up and sees the functions of the youth and recreation branch. The facilities and the staff that are there, I would say, are the equal of any complete department of government in any other province where it might be in operation.

I would like to spend a few moments outlining some of the activities that the youth and recreation branch is currently engaged in and which have a direct relationship to the report of the select committee. This new branch now provides a focus for the escalation of present programmes for youth and for the introduction of new programmes as they may become necessary.

One of the most important projects now being undertaken is the formation of a provincial youth council along the lines so strongly suggested by the select committee.

Initially, this council will be composed of one young person under 25 years of age from each of the 19 areas of the province, presently covered by the field staff of the youth and recreation branch. The primary function of this council will be one of involvement. It will assist and advise the branch on the programmes and services required by the young people of the province so that these programmes and services will be appropriate, meaningful and timely.

The provincial youth council will meet at different times with the interdepartmental committee on youth to discuss common concerns of youth and to resolve these concerns through face-to-face dialogue. We feel that this will be extremely useful to both groups and will involve young people under 25 years of age in a meaningful way with the government of this province. The inaugural meeting of the provincial youth council will be held in April.

While the initial appointment of this council will be the responsibility of the youth and recreation branch through their field staff, long range plans call for the establishment of local community and regional youth councils. The regional councils would be composed of representatives from the local community youth councils and each regional council, in turn, would select its representative to the Provincial Council. One can appreciate, therefore, that on a long-range basis, grass roots involvement and development is assured.

I want to comment on the function of the local community youth councils for a minute and these are in operation in at least half a dozen or more communities in this province already. We hear from every side about the

“generation gap” and the “alienation of youth.” In an experiment done last summer, the youth and recreation branch sent 35 university and college young people into the communities of this province to determine the concerns of youth and to ascertain their needs.

Significant documentation of the results of this study have now been made. In brief, the study showed that youth, generally, have ideas, attitudes and opinions about their communities that require consideration. One of the identified problems the study emphasized is that there is no organized way in which the concerns and needs of youth can be articulated to the decision-makers in the community. Youth are anxious to become involved in community life and not in a superficial way. They have ideas for community development and betterment they have opinions on the need for youth programmes and services and they are interested in being given responsibility for implementing these ideas and suggestions.

The survey showed that youth wants to become involved in helping make decisions that affect them and in developing programmes planned for them. They are receptive to adult guidance, direction and expertise but they want a part in the decision-making process, if for no other reason than to eliminate that long-held feeling that they are simply carrying out some other person's orders. Local youth councils will give our youth this sort of involvement.

It should be noted that these youth councils, as they develop, should reflect all youth in the community—the radical, the reactionary and those “in between.” The youth councils can co-ordinate the existing community activities of youth, develop programmes for youth, provide services to youth and share with others in the community the concerns of youth.

The survey programme conducted by the youth and recreation branch—and this is the branch that is helping to form these youth councils in communities across this province—was called “Ontario Youth in Action” and will be continued again this summer in communities not reached last year—and I emphasize again, last year Ontario Youth in Action went into 35 communities, many of them with populations of 15,000 and less.

Mr. Speaker, automation, and in general the cybernetic revolution, is increasing the amount of leisure time available to an increasing number of people in this province. Research studies clearly show that this leisure

time will continue to increase as the automated potential is harnessed. The youth and recreation branch will, therefore, have an ever-increasing role to play in providing advice, resources and programmes to meet these demands—not only for youth but for all our people. Through the work of the branch, the citizens of the community become involved in making decisions about their leisure and in taking action to provide leisure programmes and services.

On January 1, 1969, the field staff or extension staff as it is called, of the youth and recreation branch joined the regional offices of The Department of Education.

This means that the field man of the youth and recreation branch is now housed in the offices and works out of the local regional offices of The Department of Education.

In addition to their ongoing responsibilities for community development, these consultants of the youth and recreation branch will use their expertise to help advise and make their advice available to boards of education on such diverse subjects as the optimum community use of schools, leadership training courses for teachers of adult avocational programmes, the development of continuing education programmes offered by boards and by community colleges, and resources of the branch will be available for leisure-oriented subjects within the school programme.

To meet the ever-increasing demand for leadership for recreation programmes, an Ontario recreation society is in the planning stages. This society will include all professional recreationists, both in public and private practice of their profession and who have responsibility for the development of leisure programmes across this province. Not only will the society provide training opportunities for its membership, but it will encourage co-operation between recreation agencies at the local level so that maximum opportunities for the creative use of leisure will be available to the citizens of this province.

One of the recommendations in the report of the select committee on youth stated the need for research into recreation and youth programmes. The Ontario recreation research committee has now been established to provide this function. It is chaired by Dr. Roby Kidd. Initially, the committee will consolidate the existing research and then will identify areas in which research is required so that appropriate agencies and institutions can become involved in determining the answers to the many pressing questions of the day related to youth and to recreation.

The information collecting and distributing services of the youth and recreation branch is now well advanced. This very important resource centre will loan material to any community organization and will provide information to them on successful programmes and activities in any jurisdiction where they may want to initiate new services or expand their present services. They are sending out newsletters and information sheets and bulletins to bring details of successful recreation and youth programmes to a wide readership of interested and concerned people in this province.

I want to identify one particular programme for the members today because of the involvement of youth in this particular study. About one year ago, a group of young people in the Newcastle area suggested, through their English teacher, that a series of dramatic productions might be developed during the summer. From this idea was born the Great Pine Ridge festival of the arts with headquarters at the Massey Building in Newcastle, Ontario. The primary programme offered was a series of three high quality dramatic productions which alternated for six nights a week for a period of five weeks. Somewhere close to 10,000 people came to see the productions. I explain this programme in some detail because it was a programme by youth for youth.

Over 150 young people were involved in all aspects of the productions from actors to ushers, from stage hands to ticket sellers and from make-up artists to lighting technicians. Thus throughout the summer these young people were part of a new programme in Ontario, a cultural activity in which their creative talents were used and developed and from which a greater appreciation of the theatre emerged. It is expected that this programme will continue again this summer in an expanded form and we are hopeful that through the youth and recreation branch and with the help of this branch it may be the forerunner of an Ontario youth theatre programme.

While it is recognized that "recreation" is more than sports and includes social, cultural and intellectual activities as well, one cannot overestimate the value of fitness and amateur sport programmes. The federal government has established a "task force" to look into this whole area from the federal viewpoint. Here in Ontario, the problems and needs were identified at the Ontario sports conference held last November 1, 2 and 3, in Scarborough.

This conference brought together two representatives from each of 56 of Ontario's

sports governing bodies, as well as physical education specialists and representatives of associations concerned with amateur sport programmes. The conference was planned on a discussion group format in which the participants analyzed the following four subjects: leadership and coaching; programmes and facilities; administration and communication; and the government's role.

Following these discussions priorities for action were established by the delegates. The following significant action was recommended at the conference for implementation by the youth and recreation branch.

The first was the development of a provincial sports council which is now going ahead and which is representative of all amateur sport groups in the province. Its purpose will be to provide mutual assistance and development. The council will provide the opportunity for the sports groups to share concerns, solve mutual problems and chart a common course of action to develop greater participation in sports programmes and to improve the quality of performance and leadership.

Second, one of the significant concerns was the development of local sports councils in every community to ensure co-ordination between sports groups, hockey, baseball, and so on, and to prevent overlapping in the individual communities.

The third concern was the development of community and regional competitions in non-team sports such as swimming and track and field and eventually the development of an Ontario junior olympic programme. I think we recognize that the main emphasis in sports today, and certainly, I feel this should be at the mass participation level where anyone of any age has the opportunity to take part for the recreational satisfaction that participation in the sport of his choice brings. But having said this, Mr. Speaker, we must also recognize that opportunities for the attainment of excellence of individual performance must also be provided for those who have the ability and desire to achieve this excellence and we hope that an Ontario olympic programme will help in some small way to serve this need.

Many other equally important recommendations were identified at this sports conference.

The Ontario sports conference was actually the first time in the history of the province that Ontario's sports governing bodies have met together and discussed mutual problems and this is very significant. Through this conference and through the development of the

Ontario sports councils, I am sure that we will see a considerable expansion of fitness and amateur sports programmes in this province for our young people and indeed for people of all ages.

Now to turn to another area of the select committee on youth and the recommendations contained in the report. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that today, there are many who tend to isolate our schools from the community, to built chain-link fences around them and lock them up at 5.00 o'clock in the evening. Occasionally a gym, an auditorium or, if the community is lucky, a swimming pool, is open to the public.

A few youth groups can be allowed to use the building regularly but, unfortunately, all too rarely is an integrated attempt made to use the whole school plant as a community facility. This should not be and I am equally certain that it is not what the majority of our citizens intend be done. At the conference on leisure called by my colleague, the Minister of Education in November, 1966, the hon. Minister said:

Co-operation between the school and recreation authorities in a community needs to be continuous so that the best and most dynamic programme of recreation and continuing education is available to the citizens. All publicly-owned buildings must be used for programme development. Facilities are of little consequence unless they are used to the maximum.

Here tonight, I would like to re-state this again and say that we believe that there must be maximum community use of school facilities in this province for the benefit of all the citizens of the community.

Under our existing legislation, this means that there must be a high degree of co-operation and co-ordination in both the planning of facilities and in their utilization between the school boards and the municipal recreation departments. Without this any real community school programme will fall flat.

In 1964, a committee was set up in The Department of Education to study community activities in school buildings. This committee studied this problem from two different approaches: (1) The use of existing facilities by community agencies and (2) the provision of community facilities as part of a school complex. In the course of their studies, Mr. Speaker, the committee came up with a list of what they called "barriers" to community use of schools.

The list is as follows and I can certainly attest to the relevancy of this list, based on

my experience as chairman of the Scarborough board of education, and this is the list of things that they said prevented full community use of schools:

The grant structure; liability, in the case of an accident; high rental fees caused by union agreements; the difficulty of disciplining adult groups; the ban on smoking; interference with books, blackboards and cupboards; equipment not returned to its proper place; maintenance and operational control.

When we look at this list, however, we see that these are really not major barriers to community use of the school facility. Certainly, I agree, that is what some people think, but these are not really barriers to the community use of school facilities. They are merely administrative and mechanical matters that can be annoying from time to time but that can really be resolved in a rational and easy way with the kind of co-operation and co-ordination which I say must exist.

One of the important recommendations of the youth committee was as follows:

When new schools are designed, their recreation and leisure time facilities should be planned jointly with community recreation authorities in order that such facilities will be easily available for both school and public recreation purposes.

This recommendation again suggests a high degree of co-operation and co-ordination between on one hand school boards and on the other municipal recreation authorities. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that this kind of co-ordination does exist in communities in this province and exists to a high degree and great things have been done in the development of the community school concept.

We are hopeful that this ideal state will be reached in most of the other areas and communities of this province—particularly as the new county boards become fully operational. Certainly it can be done on a voluntary basis without government interference. It is being done now in communities and we hope that it will be extended to most of the communities in this province. From a recreational point of view and from the point of view of continuing education, and adult education if you will, the community use of schools and of other public facilities is essential if the recreational needs and total education needs of our youth and indeed of the public are to be met and if we are to avoid needless and unnecessary duplication.

Sir, I know hon. members will realize that a large number of the recommendations of the select committee on youth pertain to the

activities of other departments, perhaps most of them to The Department of Education. For a moment I am just going to give a brief summary of some of the actions taken and as I said all of these can be dealt with in a much fuller manner when the estimates of these various departments come up.

The curriculum branch in The Department of Education now provides a series of courses throughout many grades on the use and effects of tobacco, alcohol and drugs and is currently working on improved courses in these areas and in family life. Great strides have been made in improved training for guidance teachers, particularly at eight Ontario centres. The department is in full agreement with the select committee's recommendations about upgrading the training of elementary school teachers and has introduced steps to achieve this end. Extensive changes have been made in the grant structure for capital construction, many of them in line with the committee's recommendations.

Legislation is now in effect to bring—and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I guess already has brought—most of the schools for retarded children under the regular grant structure and incorporated them in the local boards of education, and the new county boards. This, of course, was a step that was recommended by the select committee on youth and which has been acted upon. A number of correspondence courses are now available in braille for blind students.

There is, of course, much in the select committee's report about community colleges and, as the members all know, there are now 19 colleges of applied arts and technology in operation. They provide two and three year courses as well as evening courses and they offer diplomas to students who graduate from them.

Students taking some three year courses receive credit for entrance into second year of university in a related course.

Seven colleges of applied arts and technology are now offering two year programmes for recreation leadership and beginning this fall two Ontario universities offer programmes in recreation.

The certification of full time recreation staff is being provided for and the standardization of the qualifications of part time and voluntary recreation leaders is now being undertaken by the youth and recreation branch through the provincial leadership development programme. A formal structure is now in operation to ensure the close co-ordination of the departments whose programmes relate to apprenticeship training.

That is, between The Department of Education, Department of Labour and Department of Correctional Services.

The province is now using all the money available to it through the federal-provincial physical fitness agreements. An escalated programme has been introduced to give courses for sports leadership personnel interested in such fields as coaching, refereeing, teaching of sports skills and administrations. An increasing number of sports groups are now using the facilities on Lake Couchiching for athletic training, coaches' training, executive member training and for competitive purposes.

The Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker, maintains a constant liaison with employers and management of major trades to determine where new apprenticeship programmes might most beneficially be introduced. This department also works in close conjunction with The Department of Education to ensure that apprenticeship training and other vocational training is as effective and beneficial for the students as possible.

A statistical and research branch was established in the Labour Department in 1965 and it operates under terms of reference encompassing those recommended by the select committee.

In The Department of Correctional Services a large number of the research projects suggested by the select committee have been undertaken. By arrangement with the centre of criminology at the University of Ottawa, studies concerning the Ontario training centres are being undertaken. The trades and training programme of The Department of Correctional Services has always been designed to assist the inmates and their rehabilitation upon release. Very close co-operation is maintained, Mr. Speaker, with The Department of Labour and The Department of Education, as I said earlier, to assure that the training programmes in all our institutions particularly those where young people are concerned is as effective as possible.

The Attorney General's department, along with other representatives of course, Mr. Speaker, has been participating in federal-provincial discussions over the last year and a half, concerning the age for juveniles. This question is, of course, one that has very great implications for many areas of government, particularly our correctional system and discussions on this matter are still continuing.

As funds become available, the Attorney General's department is proceeding with a programme whereby fulltime judges will be

available for family and juvenile court work. A number of the select committee recommendations involved, of course, Mr. Speaker, attitudes and approach to the treatment of juveniles who are brought to court. Although they are not of a nature where specific action could be taken, the Attorney General's department is in broad agreement with these overall policies and is doing its utmost to ensure their implementation where possible. The recommendation that youth bureaus be established in police departments has been commended to the Ontario police commission for their study and this type of programme is being proceeded with of course, in some of our urban police departments.

A large number of recommendations of the select committee fall under the purview of The Department of Health, and many of these have already been implemented.

The services provided by mental health clinics throughout the province are fully available to our young people and in most instances an excellent relationship exists between these institutions and the schools, whereby referrals can be made with great ease. The clinics supplement the guidance services of course, Mr. Speaker, available within the school system.

Grant programmes for the training of such clinical personnel, psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers have been undertaken for some time by the Department. In recognition of the need for research regarding the manpower needs in the fields of social work, psychology and psychiatry, there has been established, within the Ontario council of health, a manpower committee which is directing its energy to this very pressing problem.

Extensive use is now being made of local mental health services in assisting the courts. The Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation has, for some time, had a programme of research to determine the effects of alcohol on the social and economic welfare of youths.

Under The Rehabilitation Services Act, both capital and operating grants are now available for sheltered workshops of the type recommended by the select committee on youth.

The Department of Transport tells us that driver instruction courses are now being given in about 300 of our high schools throughout the province. It is hoped that, in due course, such training will be available in all our secondary schools. I am sure that the hon. members are aware of the action that was taken by The Department of Transport in

making crash helmets mandatory for motor cyclists in accord with the recommendations of the select committee on youth.

Finally, as the hon. members will recall, legislation was introduced in the last session—and it is certainly not one of the more important recommendations of the report, in fact perhaps one of the least important—but anyway, it also has been implemented. That is the recommendation calling for the removal of the age restriction in regard to playing billiards, in public billiard halls. That has been done.

Mr. Speaker, although the list of actions taken by a number of government departments that I have just given is fairly long, it is, of course, in no way exhaustive in terms of the study and implementation that has gone on by the departments of this government of the report of the select committee on youth.

As a former member of that committee, I can only say tonight how pleased I am to have been able to bring to the hon. members this brief summary—a summary which, surely, must be an indication of the stress that this government puts on the needs of youth, an indication of the involvement of our youth, and our desire as a government to help them take their place and play their part with us as partners in the full development of the life of the community of this province and of this great country.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and enter this Throne Debate. First, sir, I would like to congratulate you on your continuing function as Speaker of this House.

I note that on occasion members are wont to start a comment they might make by saying: "In my time in this House, such-and-so has happened". Well, sir, a third of the members can, I think, with good reason say that in our time in this House you, as Speaker, have proven to be most competent, most fair and indeed, most efficient.

And so I would also add my appreciation to the comments that have been made with respect to the continuing appointment of the hon. member for Waterloo South as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the whole House.

In the operations of the estimates committee, and of the dealing with the estimates in our last session, he was most efficient in his work and, sir, we presume that once again the estimates of the various departments will be handled with efficiency and dispatch by him when the time comes for that order of business to be with us.

I would this evening, sir, like to preface my comments with a discussion of some of the problems which face the citizens of Kitchener with respect to their urban renewal programmes. As members of this House are well aware, in many of the cities of our province there are requirements for substantial programmes of urban renewal.

At the present time we have a project to the value of some \$16 million which has been developed over a period of years. We had, of course, the difficulty of facing the proposal made by the federal government with respect to a holdover of all types of urban renewal programmes as the federal housing study continued and as we faced the various problems of finances at the federal level of government. And there was, sir, some presumption that we might lose several large projects in our city. However, fortunately, that presumption seems to have been surpassed.

The federal Minister of Transport, the Hon. Paul Hellyer, has expressed interest in meeting with the city officials in Kitchener. We certainly hope that the proposals that have been made for urban renewal have not met any firm cut-off, but rather only a deferment as the housing requirements and urban requirements generally across our nation have themselves been sorted out in various priorities.

In Kitchener, five years of work have now gone into the programmes of urban renewal which were first begun in 1963. And I would say to you, sir, that in this approach to the problem which we have, the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been most helpful in attempting to ensure that we are able to resolve our problems. In a letter which went out generally over his signature on December 16 last, he said as follows:

It is my full intention to attempt to be involved in any change in policy developed, and to bring the province's point of view fully to the attention of the federal government before any change is made.

In the interim, I would suggest that each municipality examine its current position in urban renewal to determine whether it should continue as previously scheduled, or defer further action until a new policy is announced or the previous policy confirmed.

And I think, sir, that the comments of the Minister have in this area been most sound. We are certainly prepared to continue with the scheme of urban renewal and we are most pleased to see that the provincial authorities have approved a commitment of 25 per cent of the projects' costs, or some \$4 million. We

now require approval from the Ontario Municipal Board and then as well, hopefully, approval from the federal authorities so that the additional 50 per cent of the costs may be obtained.

We are quite prepared to continue with our commitment of 25 per cent of the costs. We intend to pay our share and we certainly appreciate the Minister's approval and assistance in encouraging the provincial authorities to pay the \$4 million to which they have committed themselves.

Now, of course, as a result of the waiting which we are presently undergoing, there have been some comments to the effect that we may be losing certain kinds of redevelopment projects within our city; these certain projects which could cost our city missed opportunities or possibly even threaten the collapse of the present urban renewal scheme. However, I believe that such is not going to be the case. After five years of detailed studies and planning, the programme which has been developed so far should certainly receive the approval of the federal authorities. Normally, of course, the 50 per cent grant given at this level is almost automatic once provincial approval has been given.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Is it five years? I told Mr. Hellyer on Saturday you had been waiting four years.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Oh, the Minister is just a name dropper.

Mr. Breithaupt: I thank the hon. Minister. In fact, the original project was first conceived in 1963. Our city planner, Mr. William E. Thomson, has, of course, referred to the situation and the problem which we might face because of the change in interest in the development in the downtown area. Several developers are certainly waiting in the wings to deal with certain urban renewal problems and I note with great interest that two major projects have been announced in the last week. These are two large hotel developments, which will certainly go a long way to assist in the future development and redevelopment of the city.

Mr. Speaker, I was most interested in listening to the comments of the hon. member for Yorkview yesterday, as he referred to the land development project in the Kitchener area. As hon. members are well aware, the Ontario Housing Corporation has taken options on approximately 3,000 acres of land between the boundaries of Kitchener, Hespeler and Guelph, and the intention has been expressed that a new city will be developed in this area. No prices have been

given to us as to the assembly cost of these lands, but it is estimated that an average price might well be about \$2,000 an acre, or an approximate total cost of some \$6 million.

Mr. Sopha: Eighty per cent paid by taxpayers.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now, sir, I think it is important to us, as we look into the views which we should have in attempting to develop an efficient control of our financial expenditures with this province, to review the comments of Mr. Roy P. Drachman, who is the second vice president of the United States Urban Land Institute. Mr. Drachman is of the opinion that holding land in advance of large-scale community developments has been the nemesis of a number of ambitious and highly desirable projects for many years. In his opinion, we must have a commitment financially so, as when land may double in price every six years, we justify the holding of it.

Many developments of any size, of course, will have to be properly land planned, and this is especially true of the new towns and the large-scale housing projects. Proper designation and location of commercial areas, school and church sites, other community facilities and various residential types are very important financially to any large project. Only proper land planning can achieve the sorts of things which we wish to achieve.

I would, sir, refer you to several of the conclusions which Mr. Drachman made in a recent article, and they are as follows:

To summarize; developers of new towns can solve their land problems by first associating themselves with strong financial institutions which provide them with the necessary staying power to carry the project through the formulative period, into the phase when the cash flow begins in a substantial stream. Carrying costs such as interest and taxes can be added to the principal of the loan from financial institutions.

Secondly, following a plan for "new town" development using land for the development which will produce enough income from such lower uses as agriculture, mining, gravel operation, timbering or oil production, so the burden of carrying such land does not fall on the residential or industrial developer.

Thirdly, employing assistance from a federal government programme of long term low interest for the assemblage of large land parcels, with a portion of the increase in value to be paid to the govern-

ment later in addition to the interest and principal repayments.

All of the foregoing comments confirm what the dean of twentieth century real estate developers, whom Mr. Drachman refers to as Mr. J. C. Nichols of Kansas City, says:

I remember well hearing him say that he had learned the hard way during the early '30s that he could not own all the land adjacent to his developments.

Since that time, his company has followed the policy of buying land to meet current needs, even if it meant paying considerably higher prices for it.

He has learned that he could better afford to pay more for land that he could put to immediate use than he could to buy it for less and hold it for several years.

Perhaps this is the answer that most community developers must come to.

Well, we are at the situation, sir, where land is now being held, and indeed, withheld from the market, in Waterloo county, to an extent where additional areas of land are having their prices inflated whether or not value is there.

We have seen two examples of this same approach within Ontario. The first one is in Scarborough's new town. And during the time that this new project was announced in Waterloo county, there were several articles in our local paper dealing with the situation in Scarborough and in the second area of development, namely, Saltfleet township.

This first area in Scarborough is known at least, locally within that area, as "the Malvern mystery." These are lands which were purchased in 1953 by a federal-provincial partnership long before the advent of the Ontario Housing Corporation.

The provincial government promised to have some 9,000 families living there by 1964. Unfortunately, there is not a home there as yet. We are now told that by 1970, next year, there will be, at long last, some development in this area.

But if this development does come to the fore, it will seemingly be in spite of the lack of co-operation which has existed between this government, through the Minister in charge of the Ontario Housing Corporation, and through the municipal authorities of the borough of Scarborough.

Supposedly the Ontario Housing Corporation has hired a staff of planners to design this project, but according to the mayor of the borough, Mr. Albert Campbell, they have

not seen any of the proposals that have come to the fore as yet.

When they come in with their plans, the planning department of the borough will, of course, have to look at them, and consider them to some extent.

During the last provincial election campaign, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development said that the Ontario Housing Corporation would be prepared to begin offering lots to the public in 1969. But, of course, at that point no mention was made of the \$2.5 million in services which Scarborough would normally have to pay before the development could proceed.

And it is indeed on the costs of these services that the whole project is now hanging—services that will have to be provided before the land can be effectively used, services which the borough cannot afford, and, apparently, services which the provincial government is not prepared to provide.

Now we are told that the project is suddenly ripe for development, and the Minister said that the first step would be a meeting with the Scarborough department heads to establish certain basic land use guidelines.

This may well be the case, and it may well be that the Malvern project will fit into the plans for the development of the borough of Scarborough. But it has taken 15 years. During that time the land has been tied up, and it may well be that the cost of maintaining this type of development will have seriously interfered with the market for lands, and also with the future development within this area.

The second area, of course, is that in Saltfleet township. And once again, the problem resolves itself along the lines of payment for services. Again, the Ontario Housing Corporation developed a project to assemble land for some \$3 million during 1967, but the site at the present time is not serviced either by water or by sewers.

The services that Saltfleet township does have below Hamilton Mountain, I am informed, are purchased under agreement from Hamilton. And the city of Hamilton is, of course, the only municipality capable of servicing the area.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): When did they get the agreement? They have not got the agreement for Saltfleet, as far as I know.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not for the servicing, no. Well, I would be quite happy to put the question as to when this servicing agreement

will in fact be developed, and possibly we will hear from the Minister to some extent as he attempts to put this project into fruition once the land has been assembled.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Wait until the developer snaps his fingers.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, if the first buildings are going to be put up without the servicing agreement, they may well be in some difficulty.

Well, sir, I put it to you that the two projects here are facing the same problems as the project within Waterloo county. One of these examples that I might put to you is a development which was to have taken place for the creation of a joint industrial park with the city of Kitchener and the township of Waterloo within the county of Waterloo.

Efforts were made on both sides of these two municipal organizations to develop an industrial area across the Grand river into a certain acreage, some 8,000 acres that were to have been annexed by the city of Kitchener. But this annexation has since been held up pending the result of the local government review within our county.

Land prices, of course, have soared in this area. As the Ontario Housing Corporation has developed its project, so the owners of every other acre of land in the adjacent area have expected that the same prices would be given for the land no matter what its use would be. The end result of the purchase of this land has been that this industrial park will not be proceeded with.

The Ontario Housing Corporation has had to bear some of the blame and, indeed, the major part of the blame for the inflated land values that have resulted from this hastily announced and surprisingly-quickly-conceived project. It is a project which created headlines at the time, but I am quite certain has created serious problems within this administration, problems that the member for Yorkview referred to, dealing with the lack of communication and the lack of common planning, and problems which I shall not repeat at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the problems of land development, we also have problems in our area concerning the obtaining of sufficient water so that the municipal growth within our country may continue at the same pace that it has so far.

For those members who are not familiar with our area, there are five possible sources for water development. First of all a pipeline from Lake Erie. Secondly, a pipeline

from Georgian Bay, which is used in conjunction with the Grand river. Thirdly, a direct pipeline from Georgian Bay. Fourth, a pipeline from Lake Huron, Fifth, a pipeline from Lake Ontario.

We are suddenly faced in Waterloo county with the requirement for a study to be performed as to the comparative costs for the provision of water to our municipal areas. The water commission of the city of Kitchener, and Waterloo public utilities commission, have agreed to hire an engineering firm so that a detailed cost study of potential water resources and sources can be conducted.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario Water Resources Commission is most capable to conduct this kind of study. Certainly the decision which has been made by the Ontario Water Resources Commission has been one given without the full facts that we believe we are entitled to have.

Our authorities have been told by the commission that the costs on some of these possible sources are prohibitive, but no one has come up with a positive figure. Certainly the elected, or appointed, officials within our county cannot take an intelligent stand on these problems, they cannot know what sort of decisions they have to make, unless the costs of these various projects are clearly set out.

We, at the present time, have had recommended to us a pipeline situation from either Lake Ontario or Lake Erie. However, the local authorities who are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that our citizens have sufficient water resources available to them, are not satisfied with this programme. The possibilities of the Grand river as a source of water supply should not be dismissed lightly.

Similarly, there is a great feeling that with the sewers developing down to the Lake Erie area, it seems rather curious that we should pump the water, once it reaches the lake, back to our communities as drinking water. Now this, of course, is an oversimplification, but the point is surely that the cost structure of these various projects should be known to us before we are forced to make any decision.

The Ontario Water Resources Commission has seemingly not been prepared to allow a full and free flow of information between itself and the local bodies to which I have referred. The commission has evidently made up its mind that either Lake Erie or Lake Ontario should be the future supply sources for this area. They are not prepared to dis-

cuss the alternatives. Now I am sure they must have been following some sort of advice from the engineering staff they have. I am told that they have some 300 engineers on their staff.

I should think that it would not take that number of engineers to create a craft that would go to the moon, much less solve the water resources problem within Ontario. Lake Erie, as a source of water, alarms many who are aware of its degree of pollution.

Either Lake Huron or Georgian Bay may well be more preferable to the persons within our area. Indeed, as I have said, there are some who believe that a redevelopment of the Grand River itself, with the proper results from conservation programmes, and, to a degree, supplemented with Georgian Bay water, is a source of adequate potential for the growth which we may well expect. We have had a somewhat highhanded way from the Ontario Water Resources Commission of trying to settle this kind of question at its Toronto headquarters, certainly leaving many local doubts unanswered. The result of not answering these doubts has caused some resentment and finally, of course, this independent study decision, the cost of which will have to be borne by the municipalities.

Now I think, sir, that the Ontario Water Resources Commission must have its entire role reviewed. Energy and Resources Management and the OWRC involvement, and the interest of the Highways Department, as well as in the development of programmes of growth within our area, have to be conveyed to Queen's Park in the first instance through some forms of channels of communication and leadership, which apparently do not now exist.

I recall on the select committee on taxation this summer, my colleagues were dealing with the development of an increased staff, a small staff, but one which could deal in depth with the problems of redevelopment within the province which might be directly under the control of the Premier's office.

Now, if this staff were provided, we, of course, would presume that the water resources commission would be reorganized so that it would be selling its services wholesale to the regional government or borough utility commissions. The implication of the proposals are that the regional governments would be financing their water and sewage services in the same way that municipalities are doing now, but the implication given through the Minister of Municipal Affairs does not appear to be satisfactory.

I suggest that the services provided by the OWRC are not something that can be localized. They indeed depend on drainage areas, which may, or may not, be otherwise ideal regions for government. Of course they usually will not be, since other considerations will predominate over the drainage patterns, I am certain, for the development of viable, economic regional growth within the province.

The Ontario Water Resources Commission, I suggest, should become an operation like Ontario Hydro, financed with provincial backing, as a provincial body, not restricted by local government limitations.

With our community we have difficulties in the development of housing projects, certainly for the lower income groups. Not only in Kitchener, but I am certain within the downtown areas of other cities across our province, the prospect of owning one's own home becomes less and less a possibility. Indeed, dark days may well loom for the persons who wish to break out of a rental accommodation situation, either by apartments or by living in converted portions of homes, unless additional funds can be provided through federal or provincial sources.

We now have a commitment from the Ontario Housing Corporation which will build some 250 units within this year and this, of course, will lease to some extent the need for those requiring rent-geared-to-income accommodation. There is, of course, no problem for those who can afford homes at the \$25,000 level and above and, indeed, there is seldom a problem in this area.

There is always an available market, providing that the down payments can be scraped up. The real problem, of course, lies for those who wish to obtain homes say in the \$16,000 to \$20,000 bracket, and the high interest rates which now exist are not helping them.

The costs continue to rise for housing and there are, of course, some provincial regulations, to which I would like to refer, which assist these increases. Let me, sir, refer you to a recent problem in the housing field which our builders have had to face, as sales tax was to be applied to prefabricated structures but not applied if those same items were framed or were built on the building site.

I would like to review with you a letter which Mr. Russell Howald sent to The Department of Revenue on October 2 last and the reply which he got on October 10.

Mr. Howald had written as president of the Kitchener-Waterloo House Builders Asso-

ciation to Mr. G. W. Prowse, the district director of The Department of Revenue in Kitchener. This letter was in turn answered by Mr. Stewart Garland, the director of the retail sales tax branch on October 10, last.

The first question that Mr. Howald asked was:

Will the sales tax still be applicable if the builder stops his in-shop fabricating operations and builds the component such as walls and trusses at the housing site, and will the builder still be required to obtain a retail sales tax license?

Mr. Prowse in his reply said that if the builder did stop he would not be regarded as a manufacturer and under those circumstances he would not be required to obtain a retail sales tax license.

The second question raised was:

If the builder continues to fabricate in his own shop, does the sales tax apply to the labour used in erecting these components at the house site as well as to the labour involved in making the components at the shop?

This was answered in that the sales tax would not apply to labour erecting the items at the housing site if the builder continued to fabricate in his own shop.

The third question put was:

If the builders using these in-shop methods have already paid sales tax on materials used since the components made in the shop would be liable for sales tax, would the material used for in-shop fabricating qualify for sales tax exemption on the basis that double taxation would apply?

The answer was that the builders using these methods would be required to obtain a vendor's permit and would be thus enabled to purchase all materials and equipment used exempt from tax so that double taxation would be avoided.

Now, the final question referred to the fact that the letter was dated September 30, 1968, and that the tax would apply from October 1, 1968, which would, of course, leave many members of the association in the position of having contracts signed and commitments made on the basis of components which had been built and which were not taxable.

The question dealt with who in fact would absorb this additional amount of money and the answer was that if the contracts were signed, or some other firm price commitments had been entered into, prior to the date of notification, they would be

exempted from sales tax and the manufactured cost of any shop-manufactured components of such contracts. However, tax would have to be calculated and applied correctly on all contracts entered into thereafter.

Well, Mr. Howald then went on to review the general structure of prices and problems facing the house building industry, and suggested that the benefit of in-shop fabricating of various component parts was an excellent way of maintaining a high level in employment and of allowing stock of items to be manufactured at times of inclement weather and especially throughout the winter months. This would, of course, lower the general cost of many items and it would be a benefit both to the home builder and to the purchaser of the home who eventually must pay the price for all of these items and must pay, of course, all the total taxes which are shifted along to him in the purchase price of the home.

In addition, overtime work and payments which are also added to the overall cost of the homes could be kept to the minimum and the waste which would be occasioned on the site, as one or two items are made, would also be kept to a minimum if items were prefabricated from the builder's own shop. As well, there would be additional costs for bookkeeping and other supervisory services which would also have to be passed on to the person who buys the house.

Mr. Garland replied that he was of the opinion that the different tax treatment of in-shop and on-site fabrications contributed to greater overall equity in that the economies and benefits resulting from in-shop fabrication more than offset any additional tax which might be involved.

He then went on to state that this was not a recent ruling and in fact had come from a revision of the Retail Sales Tax on April 30, 1963. Apparently, the Act was changed at that time to supposedly ensure comparable equity as between the contractor who might buy some prefabricated items from a lumber building supply dealer and thereby have to pay the full tax on the purchase price, and the contractor on the other side who might, himself, prefabricate and assemble such sections at his own shop.

The latter contractor is required to pay tax on his manufactured cost just as the lumber dealer would collect tax if he sold component parts to another builder and the difference between the taxes paid and required to be paid if he had purchased the prefabricated sections is, of course, much

closer than it would be if the tax was not collected at all from the house builder who prefabricates in his own shop.

As the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record* reported, in an editorial on October 7, 1968:

It is supposed to be government policy to cut housing costs. Cutting costs is what the builders are trying to do when they do some prefabricating. Then the government moves into penalize them for trying to follow government policy. No one should have to pay a sales tax for moving his own work from one work place to another.

And it is with this editorial comment that the Liberal party is in accord. On October 11th, the leader of the Opposition and leader of the Liberal party in Ontario, sent out a news release for what he called a "priority task for Mr. White". In this release he referred, of course, to our new Minister of Provincial Revenue who had, at that time, just been appointed.

In our leader's view, the situation shows that the new Minister of Revenue must get down immediately to the business of running the province's tax system on socially equitable and progressive lines. I, as the Opposition critic of this Department, share this view. It is apparent that the present tax system is going completely against the ready provision of homes for the people of this province. The imposition of this kind of a tax and the collection of it from house builders is only a nuisance to the house builder and a cost which, of course, will be fully passed on to the consumer who buys the home.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: And drop the 11 per cent?

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Go to your Liberal friends.

Mr. Breithaupt: The regulations now show that sales tax is imposed on house components such as windows and kitchen units which are assembled efficiently in factories and workshops and brought to the building site in prefabricated form. In order to qualify for tax exemption, Mr. Speaker, they have made into a kind of stone age manner of construction the approach for development of these component parts. The parts must be created on the site themselves because only in this way can they be said to be regarded as real property.

In this day and age, of course, this kind of an approach to taxation is nonsense. We have called upon the hon. Minister, as one

of the first things he does in his department, to resolve this problem.

Of course, it should be stressed that the civil servants of the Revenue Department are correctly interpreting the policy with which they have to work. There is no evidence of double taxation. The research which has been done does not suggest that there is any discrimination in our area with respect to other areas. Rather that a late audit of this situation only brought this matter to light when the tax really should have been added since April of 1963.

The criticism which the Liberal Party makes, and which I make, against the operation of the department is that it is up to the Minister to change this point of view and to change the rules in this area so that house building can be encouraged and this intermediate stage of taxation avoided. To do otherwise, is to penalize the efficient house builders who are attempting to spread employment throughout the year and fabricate items with as little waste as possible and with the best efficiency in which they can operate.

This whole approach should be encouraged so as to lower, as far as possible, the general overall cost of house building. I certainly look forward to having the Minister change these regulations so that house builders in our area and throughout the rest of the province can pass on these definite savings to the eventual purchaser of the home.

Mr. Speaker, within our province there have been many persons involved recently in discussions dealing with the problems of pollution. We have had, of course, the report brought in to this House concerning the situation with the Electric Reduction Company at Port Maitland. This report and the public enquiry into this problem of pollution may well prove to be a milestone as it sets out the approach which this government has taken to attempt to resolve these problems.

There seems to be much difficulty within this government as it attempts to decide just who is responsible for what. One of the prime causes of confusion and concern to the residents of the polluted area, for example, was a 1965 analysis by the Ontario Water Resources Commission of water samples, which showed a high fluoride content. This was sent to the local medical officer of health but the environmental health branch of the provincial Department of Health did not seem to get it.

At one time or another the commission

found six departments of government, plus assorted divisions and agencies, were involved in the Port Maitland problem. The health of the fertilizer plant workers was the responsibility of the Labour Department while they were in the plant and of the Health Department while they were at home. The main plant came under The Department of Health and an associated operation a few hundred yards away was considered a metallurgical plant and came under The Department of Mines. No wonder the problems of pollution face difficulty and indeed well nigh impossibility of solution. We talk of pollution but who in fact really does anything about it?

A recent book by Professor J. H. Dales of the University of Toronto is entitled "Pollution, Property and Prices". And Professor Dales points out that pollution is a human problem and not a natural one. He says that pollution is a problem for much the same reason, and efforts to solve the problem are frustrated because pollution, like the weather, is one of those problems that being everybody's business ends up as being nobody's business.

There is, however, this difference between the weather and pollution. Pollution has become an acute problem because of the ways humans exercise their property rights.

And the whole approach to pollution, if we intend to resolve the problems which now face us, must be an approach which will resolve the problems by looking at them as a collective problem. They must be solved collectively and not through the approach of choosing individual scapegoats who will take the blame for this small area or that small area.

If everyone can be made to be involved in settling everybody's business, which pollution is, instead of waiting for a democratic government to establish a bureaucracy in order to settle it, we shall be that much better off.

There are, of course, various effects that face us, not only in the damage that is done to our persons, to our animals and to our property by pollution. Indeed, within this province as it develops even further, damage results to the various forms of recreation that we face.

Professor Norman Pearson is an associate professor in the department of geography, and chairman for the centre for resources development at the University of Guelph. In a paper which he delivered to the Ontario pollution control conference in Toronto, December 5, 1967, he set out briefly some of the

problems which we have to face in the pollution area and some of the solutions which he sees available to us. He said:

The mega problem of pollution as it affects recreation is already complicated enough without worsening it by actions which can only be called shortsighted, if we want to be charitable, and stupid, if we want to be blunt. It is stupid to let septic tanks be built on totally unsuitable soils, or cottages to be built on very small lots when any competent engineer can forecast what will happen. It is evident that if we cannot bring ourselves to prevent the wholly obvious, then the more complex problems which need research and action will only be compounded and will worsen. We could, in fact, begin to ameliorate the most evident effects of pollution affecting that kind of recreation by having sensible building and zoning regulations and by enforcing them. In just the same way we could insist on suppressors for automobiles and begin to ease the decay of city environments. This would begin to take some of the pressures off the recreational areas.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that earlier in the session I had asked certain questions with respect to development in the Niagara region concerning, especially, the ownership of the public beaches on the Lake Erie shoreline. I referred at that time to studies completed by Professor John N. Jackson, head of the geography department at Brock University, which were done at the request of the Niagara regional development council. These studies concluded that the beaches were public now.

I think, sir, it is important for us to spend just a moment to review some of the comments which were made concerning the development of this recreational area. This area was a playground for persons in southern Ontario 50 years ago, but has now been dealt a series of almost mortal blows by those who have wasted these resources. With luck and a lot of money and better management than we have seen so far, we may be able to reverse this problem. I sincerely hope we can.

But the matter of owning these beaches in Ontario has been dealt with at some length and I certainly invite the study of the hon. members to the July 1968 issue of the *Ontario Naturalist* and to an article written by Professor Jackson. This deals with what he believes to be the effective rules that concern the ownership of these beaches.

His conclusions and recommendations are there for the hon. members to look at and I will not add them to the record of the House at this time. But he does say this:

In encouraging the greater use of land for outdoor recreation, many difficult problems will arise, particularly in the more densely settled regions such as along the Lake Erie shore. It is important in this provision to provide not only for the recreation but also to protect the legitimate rights of the neighbouring landowners.

A code of recreational law and behaviour should be concerned with both aspects and a certain amount of research and experimentation to help in devising better and fairer arrangements will be necessary.

We, sir, have managed to pollute many areas within our province. One of them happens to be the northerly shores of the Lakes Erie and Ontario. I certainly hope that this government will give more study than it has to date to attempt to resolve these problems while they are still soluble.

I would like to refer, sir, to an anniversary which took place within Kitchener in this last year. It was the twentieth anniversary of a programme which had its development in Kitchener-Waterloo collegiate. This programme dealt with proper classroom and vehicle training for student drivers within our community.

The establishment of the first driver instruction course in Canada took place in Kitchener in October of 1948. At that point, some 8,000 schools were giving driver instruction in the United States but this programme had not as yet been developed to any extent within Canada. And I would, sir, like to praise a number of men who were instrumental in developing this programme which has now spread throughout the province and, indeed to other provinces within Canada as the hon. Minister of Transport can well attest.

The strongest supporter, of course, was Mr. Arthur Sandrock, former head of the Ontario Motor League and a past president of the Waterloo County Automobile Club. As a resident of Kitchener, a city which we have always considered to be a pioneer area in many fields within our province, Mr. Sandrock was instrumental in developing the initiative which got this programme under way.

Those of you who have seen the November, 1968 issue of "Ontario Traffic Safety" might well be interested in the picture that appears on the last page of that item. Very fortunately for us, the seven men who were instrumental in the developing of this programme were there, present and well, to see the results of their handiwork on this twentieth anniversary. We were joined by the Minister, who graced

the gathering and brought the greetings of the government, which were much appreciated by those who received them.

The first driving instructor, Mr. Joseph St. Amand; the co-ordinator of the first driver instruction course, Mr. Gordon House; the high school board member whom Mr. Sandrock encouraged to get involved, Mr. Max Euler; Mr. Sandrock to whom I have referred; Mr. Walter Ziegler, the former principal of the Kitchener-Waterloo collegiate and vocational school; Mr. Vince Scherer, who was the representative for the automobile company that donated the first car; and the present police chief, Mr. Wilfred Henrich, who was formerly a traffic sergeant and instrumental in the development of this course.

And it may well be of interest to the members of this House that of the nine students who graduated from this course 20 years ago, a check by The Ontario Department of Transport was able to locate seven of them as residents of this province. Every one of these graduates had a perfect driving record, so the programme must be of some merit.

This programme which has now spread to some 350, or two-thirds of the high schools within Ontario, is a programme of which we are very proud. I was most pleased to see these men be present because this instruction has become accepted and developed within the province.

Mr. Speaker, last year an important new educational report was published in Ontario and it is now being widely read and discussed. It has the title "Living and Learning." Now you have all heard of it, of course, as members of this House, but the title, I suggest, can also be applied to the present financial situation in which we are living. The more the people of Ontario live within the shadow of the present administration, the more they learn what it is costing to do so. We are now beginning to appreciate the price that we have to pay for the flagrant bad management of the province's affairs we believe we have seen, especially over these last few years of the quarter century that the Conservatives have been in power.

Now, in what attempts to be a last fling, we are witnessing the development of regional government programmes within the province. These programmes have been referred to by hon. members of this House in the Niagara region and the Halton-Peel region, and, of course, we are faced with the same sort of programme development within Waterloo county.

There is much uncertainty as we approach the day when the report will be presented to the citizens of our area by Professor Stewart Fyfe, of Queen's University. There is much uncertainty that we are now facing, as various city projects are being postponed or defrayed against the day when this report may be forthcoming.

Now it would appear that the report which we had hoped for this year, in fact, will not be received so that it can be implemented much before 1971. The delay has upset our local officials and people who have been involved in attempts to live with the growth that is facing us in Waterloo county.

Despite the promises that we had received to the contrary, we, I am afraid, will have to forget regional government in our area, at least until 1971. There are problems which result from this kind of a delay and I might, Mr. Speaker, just briefly refer to a few.

We have the problems of our registry office situation where the building is inadequate for the amount of business that has to be transacted. The grand jury recently has been told that, even with three extra microfilm machines, it will take some 22 years to catch up on the backlog of work which has to be done in that office.

We have, of course, the problem common to many other counties within Ontario—that of a jail that has existed since some years before Confederation. The 35 ancient county jails which we have in Ontario are slated, no doubt, for replacement eventually. That replacement, of course, will have to be something that will have to wait until we are in some scheme of regional government.

The longer we have to wait for regional government, the more problems we have of creating good forms of detentional centres that will replace these ancient dungeons that dot our landscape.

We have problems, of course, with increases in crime because the police forces within our area have not as yet had the ability to fully integrate themselves. Again we are waiting until regional government may set up new patterns of growth for the future, and the kind of boundaries which we face in our county set out nine separate municipal police forces.

It is very difficult to decide who should go where on what emergency. While the departments do attempt to co-operate, again the fact that regional government has been delayed adds a certain burden to the authorities within the county. This same burden

we have, as a final example, in the kind of traffic problems which we are facing in the downtown areas of Kitchener.

Again we expect an approximate ten per cent increase in this kind of traffic in 1969. While we now have a new expressway which is under construction, the problems which will result from its being available may well be more impressive than the problems which could otherwise be solved.

But we have, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that our regional government study has not been made available to us, attempted to co-operate as fully as we can with the development of regional government. Our new county school board has been well organized and I should refer to its newly-elected chairman, Mr. John Darling.

The trustees of these new county school boards are facing different kinds of problems. They will certainly no longer be administering schools, but they will be involved in the planning and establishing of policy and will be available to provide additional educational services for the children within our county.

They have a difficult job, a job which they did not seek initially, a job which was imposed upon them, but a job which I believe they have grown into and a job which they are prepared to deal with. The same situation exists with the development of health services as we approach the situation of regional government.

We have now a project for the development of a boys' village within our area, a centre that will deal with making home-life facilities available to adolescent boys, and one which we hope will be the most progressive in Canada. We hope that this year will see the start of this project; a project which will accept boys from 12 to 18 years of age, and perhaps outside this range if necessary.

It will be more of a permanent home for them, not just a place for them to stay. This kind of a project, which is being developed through several officers in the Kitchener-Waterloo social planning council, is something which again will benefit through the final and eventual implementation of regional government.

As well, we have a new development for health and psychiatric care, a development which will co-ordinate the services for children in the schools within the county.

We have a recent announcement as to the development locally of the Addiction Research Foundation for alcoholism and

drugs, which will set up an intensified alcoholism and drug dependence programme within our metropolitan area.

These sort of projects show the growth and the pattern of development which Waterloo county is facing, patterns which have been referred to by the hon. member for Waterloo North — when he spoke — patterns which are becoming increasingly involved, and patterns which will have to be developed rapidly if we are able at all to keep a balance of control over the forms of growth within our province.

Mr. Speaker, politics like many other human activities, involves an interaction of myths and realities. The clash of opinions among parties and governments, pressure groups, and the public, is the democratic method of flushing out the realities from the myths. The system works well most of the time.

Human prejudices, biases, and lack of knowledge, indeed, the impossibility of determining truths or actions that are right for all time, makes the system imperfect. But since parliamentary democracy is the best device which so far we have discovered to handle people's affairs for the common good, I certainly make no apology for talking about some of these myths as seen by one practising provincial politician.

In Ontario and throughout Canada, a series of myths has hampered all of us in conducting ourselves so as not to demand more than we can produce. One myth is that inflation does not really hurt anybody, since a little extra pressure of demand and resources acts as a stimulant to business. It has taken some time for the so-called man on the street to recognize what inflation can do to his standard of living, to his ability to borrow funds to build a house, and to his willingness to invest his savings in a profitable way.

I hope that this myth has been largely destroyed, but one still hears echoes of it from those who claim that inflation is the price which we have to and should pay for employment. I believe that we cannot for long sustain high levels of employment in an inflationary environment.

The second myth with which we have to live is one which has arisen out of the destruction of an ancient view of economics. It took many years in the recent past to convince the citizens, not only in Canada, but in the rest of the western nations of the world, that deficit financing was not immoral — indeed, that this kind of financing could prove highly

beneficial when a great deal of economic slack exists in the country.

However, as a concept that was fathered by that great economist, John Maynard Keynes, began to be understood, balancing the economy rather than balancing any one annual budget became more and more fashionable, and for good reason. However, once the myth of the eternally balanced budget was destroyed, many people also seemed to have forgotten the lesson that balancing the economy must frequently imply balancing the budget, or even running a surplus during some periods of excessive pressure.

Those of us who, in today's conditions, talk of the necessity of the balanced budget, are attacked by some of being totally ignorant of modern economics. I, however, suggest to you strongly that it is these critics who are fighting the last war, and in my view it is they who are losing it.

I know that if Keynes was still alive today he would endorse any positive approaches that exist for balancing budgets in Canada today.

The third myth has been that we could somehow, all of us, get more out of the economy than we were putting into it by way of production. We have all read articles and arguments about how beneficial it would be to have incomes rise substantially in excess of productivity, so that in some mysterious manner we could all become rich.

This is a myth which responsible economists and politicians are still fighting against, and one would hope that useful instruments will eventually be devised to cope with this particular problem. Essentially it must well be the role of the federal government to re-establish an environment in which price levels will generally remain stable, employment remains high, productivity increases steadily and people are induced to save and channel their savings into productive investment.

This is what we should look for as well in our provincial economy, and this is what the government of the province of Ontario must achieve in its own budgetary, economic and financial policies.

In these areas, the provincial government must follow the approach of the federal government as it attempts to bring under better control its own expenditures.

Over the past year or so, provincial expenditures have been one factor pushing up the level of demand within our economy. In addition, of course, this government must endeavour to bring about an improvement in

the climate of the market for capital securities of the province.

The federal government has attempted to make some improvement in the control of its own expenditures. It may be noted in the area of university and post-secondary education, as well as in a number of welfare fields, there have been a number of cost-sharing agreements.

It may further be noted that the cost of these programmes, administered by the provinces, but paid for in part by the federal government, have risen considerably beyond early forecasts. As a result, expenditures at the federal and provincial levels have consistently increased so that year after year, deficits have developed in current financing, in spite of the pronouncements of the federal finance ministers and provincial treasurers, that their own budgets would be placed in balance.

The present federal Minister of Finance stated that he is determined over the next fiscal year to bring federal expenditures under better control. It seems that there is a credibility gap between the annual proposals of persons of authority, regarding our economy on the one hand and the actual results on the other.

This gap cannot certainly be allowed to remain. It seems apparent, however, that only performance and careful scrutiny of expenditures on behalf of both federal and provincial authorities can make it disappear.

While 1968 was certainly a good year for the economy of Ontario and of Canada, our general expansion continued without significant interruption, and the demand for Canadian goods and services has been firm, with our exports substantially increased.

The monetary policies being followed by the Bank of Canada are motivated by the objectives which are designed to strike at inflation and to overcome those financial difficulties which will exist until the expectations of inflation are broken. Now that a year has passed since the provincial election of 1967, we, in Ontario, are down to the rock bottom problems of how to run this province within the bounds that reasonable taxation affords.

As the official Opposition, we Liberals say that the Conservative government of Queen's Park, the government of this House, which has been in office for a quarter of a century, has become moribund and is now incapable of running Ontario efficiently.

Some of our best evidence comes from the Cabinet Ministers themselves. Particularly the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), the

hon. member for Huron, and the new Minister of Revenue (Mr. White), the hon. member for London South.

New taxes, of course, are something that will be distasteful to all of us, but they are the situation that appears to be inevitable because the Treasurer seems to have regarded the Revenue post as an excuse for his own relaxing a little in the surveillance of the expense side of the ledger. In this connection, borrowing is no substitute for good house-keeping.

Today's voters are, apparently, more sophisticated and more wise to the world than those who returned the previous administration to power only some 18 months ago. Such is the accelerated pace of living that they now have only—with the reality of the lunar mission, perhaps, as the trigger—awakened to a world of high-rise buildings, urban problems, endless noise, housing and transportation difficulties, bureaucracy at every turn, a polluted environment of air and water, and that hopeless feeling that goes by the name of alienation.

Certainly it took the astronauts to bring home the idea of the "the spaceship Earth." This is a planet of quite limited size, and we are eating away at its thin armour of atmosphere through poor conservation practices and using up its irreplaceable defences against the hostile universe.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested to have the comments of the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wells), concerning the basic shelter exemption grant programme in this province. The plan was accepted by the Conservative Party within this province as it approached the most recent election, along with the other item that was pulled out of the Smith committee report, namely that of the taking over of the total cost of the administration of justice.

Both these ideas were pulled like plums out of a pudding, and the rebates, of course, in cost, will probably have reached the sum of \$150 million in cost this year. This is certainly an expensive, wasteful and inaccurate method of giving civic taxpayers some assistance from the cost of education and other burdens upon them.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Their thumbs are still stuck in the plums.

Mr. Breithaupt: If the Minister without Portfolio equates his task to being the Minister of nothing, then I assure him that his comments with respect to the presumed success of this programme means that he is

continuing to be the Minister of nothing, who is going nowhere.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That is very uncharacteristic of the hon. member.

Mr. Breithaupt: The approach given by the present government has been to back into any attempts at reform within this system, something like the butcher backing into the meat grinder and getting a little behind in his work.

And this whole situation has developed consistently to the point in which we now find ourselves. The Minister of Municipal Affairs seems to recognize now that a direct grant to the municipalities is a much better way of handling provincial assistance to civic taxpayers. He, of course, has to accept the fact that every taxpayer does not then share in the largesse of the provincial government.

However, this is more than balanced by the view of any intelligent person that the taxpayers are no longer prepared to be bribed with their own money, that they realize that they are only receiving in repayments moneys which have been taken from them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not seem to recall the hon. member voting against this legislation.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to accept a little reform when we cannot get a lot.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You should not have voted for it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are in favour of any reform we can get, whether it is well conducted or not.

Mr. Speaker, during the last provincial election campaign we were assured by the leader of the government that his party had authored in Ontario the kind of prosperity that had not been seen since the golden days of Rome.

Nothing much has happened to change anything and yet we are now faced with the contradictory comments that we have heard from time to time with respect to the financial crisis, of a sort that even Aristotle Onassis would not figure was small change. It certainly came on very swiftly.

The little stopover in Frankfurt that the Provincial Treasurer and his friends made has given us some temporary relief, at a price—a loan in Deutschmarks, of course, at

six and a half per cent, unless the mark is revalued.

If it is, then calculating the true rate of interest will be quite an exercise. Interest compound on interest by the time it is paid off. This, of course, if only the first of any future borrowing that we are now told of which will have to be dealt with by someone; if not the members of this House, by their children and their grandchildren.

And, this, of course, is the government that is not prepared to take away \$175 million available under the federal Medicare programme on one hand, and yet is prepared to throw away \$150 million on the basic shelter exemption. No wonder we are in trouble.

It makes one wonder, Mr. Speaker, as to the activities of the economists employed by the Treasury at Queen's Park. Apparently they can tell you what will happen next week, and next month, and next year, and then they can explain afterwards why it did not happen that way at all.

The hon. Premier and the Provincial Treasurer have been attempting to condition Ontario residents for likely tax increases, in order to offset the province's worsening expenditure revenue gap. They have, as well, been conditioning the public to blame the federal authorities when these increases are upon us. I would certainly make it clear to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are not intent—in spite of what the Treasury benches may think—on bailing out our federal colleagues, the present government or the present Cabinet.

We are not apologists for the activities of Mr. Benson or of his colleagues in the Cabinet. We certainly did not visit Ottawa as a group to receive any instructions, in spite of what was said, but rather to attempt in a spirit of co-operation to explain our points of view and our ultimate responsibilities to the people of this province.

We believe that both the provincial and federal governments have been too rigid in their approach to financial matters. We believe that Ontario should demand a greater role with the federal government in attempting to determine the income tax base, rather than simply arguing about increasing the tax points which provinces receive in rebates from Ottawa.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the present administration is always prepared to accept the credit. They are always prepared to take any advantage they can from programmes which have been developed and to take any benefit which

has been bestowed upon them by the people of Ontario.

I suggest to you, sir, that it is difficult to come up with a programme of taxation which is going to be satisfactory. In spite of the fact that various economic outlooks have been made, we, of course, well realize that none of the outlooks or none of the predictions which have been given to us may at all be accurate because of a variety of reasons.

No one knows better than those who make the forecasts annually just how audacious they really are since they presume predictability that is simply non-existent.

So many organizations or individuals crank numbers into budgets and forecasts each year. But the laws of probability ensure that a few will correctly predict a peak and a trough a year ahead.

However, economic literature is conspicuously lacking in examples of any one or any organization that has demonstrated consistent ability to predict one turn of the cycle six months ahead, not to mention the turn ahead following that.

There are simply too many factors which are involved in the domestic market.

In the Christmas letter of the chairman of the Ontario Economic Council, Mr. W. H. Cranston quoted a recent issue of *The Wall Street Journal* as follows:

After all, a lot of people enjoy being frightened. Some people like to go to horror movies and some people hire economists. What is the use of keeping an economist around if he cannot scare you?

Well, it would certainly seem, Mr. Speaker, that the economists hired by The Department of Treasury and at work at other civil service posts across our province are certainly earning their salaries. They are, without question, causing the Provincial Treasurer to remain white-lipped and trembling if no one else, and I suggest they are scaring all of us more often than we would like to believe.

I would refer briefly, sir, to the recommendations of the report of the economic council which called for government reform within this province only in this past month. The concept of regional government, we are told, should be expanded to include consideration of the reform of the total system of government in Ontario. We are further told that the basic operating principles should be that insofar as possible, the elector is able to assign responsibility for provision of services to a specific level of government and that he is

capable of understanding the real cost of each service as well as the direct and indirect benefits received.

The recommendations of this report deserve careful study by all of the members of this House, because unless we get a viable form of economic reform within this province, we will only be continuing to compound our problems. As Plato says in *The Republic*:

The just man sets his house in order, gaining the mastery over himself; and becoming on good terms with himself through discipline, he joins in harmony those different elements; and binding all these elements he moulds the many within him into one, temperate and harmonious. In this spirit he lives, whether he is money making or attending to the wants of his body, whether he is engaged in politics or on business transactions of his own, throughout he considers and calls just and beautiful, all conduct which pursues and helps to create this attitude of mind.

Mr. Speaker, if we are able to develop our own economy and our own approach to the future of Ontario by following these rules set out for us thousands of years ago, then we can approach through responsible reform, a just society in Ontario.

Mr. Reilly moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the Throne debate and other matters on the order paper.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the House leader whether the Ontario College of Arts bill will be likely to come up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am afraid I could not give you that information. I would doubt it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): But you do intend to do bills?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If there is time after we have completed the Throne debate speakers.

Interjections by hon. members.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.00 o'clock, p.m.

Wednesday, February 25, 1969



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Safety regulations concerning snowmobiles, question to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Haggerty	1571
High school teacher shortage, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Pitman	1571
Grants to Ontario universities, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid	1573
Brock University, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman and Mr. T. Reid	1574
Foreign students at medical institutions, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Haggerty	1575
ETV, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid	1575
County school boards, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman and Mr. Burr	1576
Humane society, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Deans	1576
Sewage treatment plants, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	1576
Community colleges, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Martel	1577
Federation of agriculture, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Gaunt	1577
General Welfare Assistance Act, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Makarchuk	1577
Death of William Frederick Ambling, questions to Mr. Yarenko, Mr. Braithwaite	1578
Students' administrative council, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. Lewis	1579
Mining properties, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Stokes	1579
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Edighoffer, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Braithwaite, Mr. Haggerty	1581
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Haggerty, agreed to	1608
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	1608

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have a great many visitors. In the Speaker's gallery, we have members of the Queen Victoria Rebekah Lodge No. 225, from Ridgeway; in the east gallery, students from the Western Technical and Commercial School in Toronto, and from the York Humber High School in Toronto; in the west gallery, students from St. Clair Junior High School, in Toronto; and members of the field services branch of The Department of Social and Family Services. And in both galleries, we have students from Applewood Heights Secondary School in Cooksville. Later this afternoon, the students from McKay Senior Public School in Port Colborne will be with us.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have questions for the Minister of Trade and the Minister of Education. Neither of those gentlemen are with us as yet, but perhaps the question period might proceed.

Mr. Speaker: If the question period extends until their arrival I will be delighted to put the questions. The hon. member for York South, I think, is in the same position—his Ministers are also absent.

The hon. member for Welland South, though, has a question of the Minister of Transport if he wishes to place it.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transport. As a result of the statement by E. M. Taylor, manager of the outdoor recreation department of the Ontario Safety League, in this month's issue of the Ontario Safety League report, that 21 deaths this winter involved snowmobiles, what action

is the Minister now prepared to take to revise the safety regulations concerning snowmobiles on public thoroughfares in the province?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, our staff is under direction to carry on a continuous and detailed examination of the operation of the Motorized Snow Vehicles Act for a full season, and in light of that experience, to review the legislation to ascertain if practical improvements can be made. It is felt that a full year's operation is desirable before changes are contemplated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition might now place his question.

Mr. Nixon: Some questions for the Minister of Education, notice of which has been given to him several days ago. The first one: Does the Minister agree with the statement of the Etobicoke secondary school supervisor, Jack Baker, that Ontario will have a shortage of 2,000 high school teachers this year? Secondly, would the Minister approve of municipal summer training courses, as suggested by Mr. Baker, and last, when will the department's expansion plan compensate for this continuing shortage?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the member for Peterborough has a shorter, but very similiar question. If he would like to place that, I will answer both at the same time.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister agree that there will be a shortage of some 2,000 qualified secondary school teachers during the coming year? What steps does the Minister intend to take to alleviate that shortage?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Put a teachers' college in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Sudbury East has a partial answer, in his view at least, Mr. Speaker. Dealing with the leader of the Opposition's question—and I think contained in that, will be an answer for the member for Peterborough—I have to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I really do not know the basis for Mr. Baker's estimate. Mr.

Baker of course is associated with one large board here in the Metro area, and I think he is perhaps basing his estimate on the situation that it anticipates.

Mr. Nixon: What is your guess?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do not know yet. We do know this though—there has been an increase of some 77 per cent in the full year enrolment in the colleges of education, from 1,195 to 2,116 in 1968-69, so that there will be an increase in the full time personnel available from this particular source.

From the summer course—and I will have to refer back to the statement I believe I made here in the House some months ago—there will be mature students who will provide another group available to begin teaching in September 1969. This is estimated at roughly 600, although it is difficult at this time to know whether it will be 590 or 610, but it will be in the neighbourhood of 600.

The discontinuance of the former summer school programme is where we will have the difficulty this year and, I would think, for another two or three years. It comes about because the former summer school programme was terminated at the request of the Ontario Teachers' Federation, the other professional groups, the superintendents, and the directors.

In all of these discussions, Mr. Speaker, it was made abundantly clear by the department that there would be this shortage of personnel and it was acknowledged there would be. There was an indication that the profession itself would make a very real effort to take up the slack, because of the elimination of the summer course programme. In my view they are prepared to do this.

At the same time, I think one must expect that there will be, during this transition period, a shortage of teachers. There is no question about it. We cannot determine—and will not be able to for perhaps another two or three months—the extent of this shortage.

I also am somewhat interested in the second part of the leader of the Opposition's question—Mr. Baker's reference, if you like. This is very important to the local board putting on a summer course.

Some of the boards have done this. We do not discourage it. I expect there will be more this coming summer. But, as I understand it, these summer courses really are to assist the teachers who are moving in more than likely, on letters of permission in September, 1969.

The point that I made and I make it again today, and I will continue to make it, is that they should not hold out hope to these teachers that because there may be a two, or three, or four week summer course offered by the local municipality, that this will in any way be the foot in the door to reintroduce the summer course two years from now. I think, Mr. Speaker, it must be made abundantly clear that this decision must stand if we are to maintain the validity of what we are attempting to do.

So that, as far as we are concerned, as a department, the question of a municipal course to assist teachers to move in this September on letters of permission is fine. But it should not be held out as the beginnings of another build-up for another summer course programme. I am sure the members opposite would agree with this.

I think it should also be pointed out, looking to the future, Mr. Speaker, that McArthur College, at Queens, is now in operation and we are in the process of developing a new college of education at the University of Ottawa. Perhaps sometime in the not too distant future I will have some reference to, shall we say, the northern part of the province of Ontario. It is also our intention to expand the facilities in the Metropolitan area and perhaps in some other locations as well.

As the greater numbers moving through the universities reach the graduating year, we think there will be more candidates available for the teaching profession. We have seen this in the teachers' colleges this year, where the enrolment last September increased to 9,300 from 6,700 in the previous year. In other words, we have reached a point at the elementary level—and I think one must recognize it will not be necessarily a permanent situation—where we have really a very good supply of elementary school teachers.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, one must recognize, as I said at the outset, that when the decision was made to terminate the summer course programme, all of those involved knew there would be a shortage of teachers. Frankly, I think it will last for a two-, three- or perhaps a four-year period.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question; I am attempting to find from the Minister some means of estimating how large this shortage might be.

I would ask the Minister if, in fact, he does not know how many students will be requiring instruction in September? He can surely read the 20 pages of advertisements

for teachers in the morning *Globe and Mail* on the first day of advertising—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The—

Mr. Nixon: —but I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if in fact he could not give the House now an estimate of how short the teacher supply would be for this coming September?

Now, he has referred to letters of permission. It appears that looming on the horizon is going to be the requirement to issue many hundreds of letters of permission, and that the municipalities are given the—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister will now answer the question which was asked?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the leader of the Opposition an accurate estimate as to how many letters of permission there will be.

There are several hundred teachers now in the secondary school system, as the hon. member knows I am sure, who are teaching on letters of permission. We anticipate this number will be extended this year, because of the change in policy.

We think that Mr. Baker's estimate of 2,000 is too high. You cannot determine these from the numerous ads that appear in the paper and will appear over the next few weeks. We know, with great respect, Mr. Speaker, it is not quite as simple as that. I should hope that, Mr. Speaker, we might give the hon. member more specific, detailed information but I think it will be another two months before we are in a position to do this.

As I have pointed out, the municipalities, or local school boards, are not obliged to provide upgrading courses at all. They will provide, perhaps, some form of indoctrination or familiarization course for those who will be moving in on letters of permission. Nothing wrong with this, as long as it is not held out that this is a foot in the door towards another summer course programme.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me. Could not the department give a better indoctrination course for those who are going to be granted letters of permission without opening the door to the possibility of the reintroduction of the full-fledged summer course, ending in a certificate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, we think that a number of the boards are in a

position to offer this type of instruction, this type of programme, really on a much better basis than the department.

Mr. Nixon: What about the ones who are not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has a supplementary question.

Mr. Pitman: In view of the possibility of this great shortage, would the Minister not consider the possibility of relaxing some of the maturity regulations or allowing certain categories to enter the summer course? Thereby, you will at least have people there who have taken training before letters of permission. As it happens a great many of those with letters of permission will have no training whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course this was considered at the time the decision was made to terminate the summer course. If we now tend to back away from that position, to make exceptions, and to establish other routes, and so on, we will never reach the point which we are all trying to achieve—and that is for most students to have a full year of teacher education before they move into the secondary school system.

Obviously the suggestion by the member for Peterborough was considered, and considered in some depth. But then you defeat the purpose of what we are attempting to achieve.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition has a further question.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister of Education support the Brock University experimental programme which admits students without grade 13 after a post-grade 12 summer course? If so, why is he withholding \$120,000 from Brock University that should go to support the institution?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that is directly related to this. May I also place it?

Mr. Speaker: That might be sound; the hon. member might do so.

Mr. T. Reid: The question is in three parts, Mr. Speaker.

a) What is the Minister's policy concerning provincial government grants to Ontario universities for students who have been duly admitted by these universities from grade 12 in Ontario secondary schools?

b) Are such first-year university students eligible for the Ontario student award programme?

c) Is the Minister in favour of the abolition of grade 13 as recommended by the Hall-Dennis report?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Peterborough has really a very similar question, so once again we will try to deal with them all at the same time.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision that Brock University will not be given grants under the formula to support the attendance of 59 students who did not attain grade 13 standards, would the Minister indicate:

1. Whether any grants were given to support their attendance at the summer session?
2. Whether students admitted to the spring semester at Guelph are supported under the formula financing?
3. When will the 59 Brock students be acceptable under the formula financing system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, may I trace very briefly the principle upon which the committee on university affairs—and as a result, the department and the government—operates. That is that the province, in respect to these situations, does not determine new programmes that are introduced by the universities.

This is their decision, but whether or not they will receive public support for these programmes is a matter of concern to the government. Through the committee on university affairs we receive recommendations as to what programmes should have public support.

I should point out that this was made clear in letters to Dr. Gibson on September 5, 1968; to Dr. Mayer on September 23, 1968, and it was suggested to Brock University that they bring this to the committee on university affairs in the hearings in November and December. This was not done. It was made clear that the committee and the government were not going to pay grants to grade 12 students who were admitted into university on some form of experimental programme or otherwise.

This decision was based on a very simple principle—and that is that there are adequate student places in grade 13, there are adequate teachers, and it would not be appropriate to have further funds allocated to some universities to provide an educational experience that is available to students in the secondary school system, and this—

Mr. Nixon: Not on an experimental basis.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Whether it is experimental or not the same applies—one university could move to the entrance requirements say for grade 12 in total, not restricting it to a select number of students.

I should also point out—I am not sure where the figures come from but if one is referring to the news report and if it is 59 students as suggested in the questions—our calculation is really that this would account for a \$57,230 grant, not \$120,000. I think the figures themselves were out of line somewhat. But I think, Mr. Speaker, there is really a fairly fundamental principle involved here and that is: to what extent public support should be available for courses that are being suggested by some institutions where a comparable course is available in some other institution receiving public money? Where do you draw the line?

I do not want to call upon, shall we say, a comparison or a parallel that was used by the former Minister of Education in the province of Nova Scotia, who has since moved on to a very important position in the political life of this country, but I think he made a speech once saying, and it is relevant, that if a university—and he was not referring to any particular university—wishes to put on a course in Egyptology, be my guest, but at the same time you cannot anticipate that there will necessarily be public funds to support it.

Mr. Nixon: You are paying for one in astrology.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is paying for itself. I thought I pointed that out. It is a dividend producing course. This is the point. This information was made known to Brock University and we are not saying they should not do it, it is up to them. All we are saying is, there are not public funds for this type of course and, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very valid position to maintain.

Now, dealing with two or three of the other questions: Are such first year university students eligible for the Ontario Student Awards programme? The answer is yes, they are.

Are students admitted to the spring semester at the University of Guelph supported under the formula financing? Yes they are, when they come in under the semester basis. They have been into grade 13 up until April and then move into the universities. This was recognized—not only recognized, it was encouraged—by the committee

on university affairs as perhaps one valid way of getting greater utilization out of capital plant at that particular institution. Thus they come within the formula calculations.

The third part of the question from the member for Peterborough I cannot answer. When will the 59 Brock students be accepted under the formula financing system? If he means as part of this programme, they will obviously be accepted next year in the allocations; no question about this. When they get into the second year of the programme at Brock they then become part of the total formula financing arrangement.

In respect to the third part of the question asked by the member for Scarborough East, really I think this is a question that we should discuss at much greater length during the estimates. You cannot give a yes or no. I think there are a lot of things that need to be said on this particular part and I am sure he will understand if I suggest we discuss this at some length during the estimates.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a supplementary question: In view of the Minister's remarks that Brock University would not be receiving these grants and the reason he gave for that, would the Minister say therefore that the government and himself in particular are directly interfering with the admission policy and the curriculum policies of the university?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I thought I made this abundantly clear. We are not saying to Brock University "You may not do this". If this is their desire, they can do so and they are doing so—but they will have to finance this in some other fashion. That is all there is to it.

Mr. Pitman: Really this is not a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, but I think the first question—the Minister may have answered it but I am not sure—whether these students receive any grants as part-time students or on any other basis for their attendance during that summer session?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Pitman: None for the programme at all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, none at all, not on this type of programme—at least, Brock University does not receive any support under the formula for this type of course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South has a question?

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. How many foreign students are at medical institutions studying for doctorates this year? Does the Minister have projected figures for 1969 and 1970? What will be the minimum requirements for entrance to medical school in September of 1969?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer all three together. We do not have, in the department, the birthplace of students who are attending our universities in this province. I cannot tell the hon. member how many foreign students—whether they come from outside the province or outside the country—are attending the medical faculties at universities of Ontario.

As a result I have no projected figure for him for 1969 or 1970. We do not determine the place of origin of the students in our institutions of higher learning.

I should also point out with respect to the third part of the question—and I am sure the member for Scarborough East would support this—we do not determine, of course, the admission standards for the medical faculties at universities; they vary from one university to another to some degree. It should be pointed out, however, that the requirements are such, with the numbers of students who wish to enter the faculties of medicine, that the majority of students who do enter, probably enter with marks that are in excess of the minimum requirement established by the universities for admission to those courses.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for Scarborough East, since this is members' day, would finish his questions.

Mr. T. Reid: A question to the Minister of Education: Since a superior type of information retrieval ETV for schools and institutions has now become practical in Metro, will the Minister make initial comments as follows?

a. Does the Minister recognize that early action would secure the lower ten channels on the 27-channel cable, and thus result in large savings in that standard ETV receivers could be used?

b. Are we to accept the Bell cable monopoly as a fact of life, or will the government challenge it in the courts?

c. Recognizing that channel 19 would serve adult and community needs better, but that the closed-circuit retrieval system is better for school and instructional uses, how does the Minister propose to proceed?

d. Recognizing that the limited federal communications effort is now being channelled in directions other than ETV, what are seen as the provincial ETV prior calls on the taxpayers' dollar?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I informed the hon. member a few minutes ago by telephone, this is a fairly detailed answer. There is a fair amount of technical information that I think should be made available and I hope to have this in the next day or so.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Peterborough would complete his questions also.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is one more question: Has the Minister decided against the provision of transfer review boards within the county boards' jurisdictions, as reported in the press?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I did not see a report of this in the press. Obviously we are at a point where a decision will have to be made and I shall have a statement for the House within the week or ten days, I would think.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Education: Does the Minister intend to sit idly by while new top administrative posts proliferate under the new county school boards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I like to think that the department never sits idly by. Our efforts may be misdirected on occasion. I would say this, that in our survey to date, there is only one top administrative post within the county unit—that is the director of education.

So there cannot be a proliferation of the top post itself. Below the director our information so far would indicate that if one totalled those who are already part of the municipal organization—if there happened to be one within the country area—plus the personnel who were available from the department, our former inspectors, programme consultants, and so on, there is really a very minor variation.

Some cases would be perhaps ten per cent less, some perhaps ten per cent more, but very close to the total number that were involved in the educational administration whether from the local municipal inspectorate, or from the department itself.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary question. Am I correct in assuming that the Minister is discouraging any proliferation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like, I will send him two addresses I have made; one to—I forget the name of the first organization—the other to the trustees' council. Do not read it all; there are about three relevant paragraphs on this matter where I have suggested very strongly that there not be a proliferation, as you call it, of administrative positions; that there not be an overload of supervision, etc. We have put it all, I hope, in sort of black and white so they will understand. I will send it to the hon. member.

Mr. Burr: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure which volume.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Will the Minister assure the House that an opportunity will be afforded to the humane society to voice its objections to Bill 73, prior to second reading?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): The normal custom of the House is to have a bill dealt with in principle, Mr. Speaker, on second reading, and then refer it to committee. It is our intent to proceed that way with this bill.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, may I enquire whether or not the Minister intends to invite the humane society and representatives of the various clinics using these animals to appear before the committee?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the standing committee on agriculture and food is always open to anyone to come and make representations. I would suppose that anyone who wants to oppose the bill, as the hon. member suggests, is just as welcome as those who will come and support it.

Mr. Deans: To the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Will the Minister advise the House whether he will consider an amendment to The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, empowering the commission to subpoena witnesses for hearings regarding sewage treatment plants under Section 32, or 32(a) of the Act?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Water Resources Commission does not propose any such amendment to the Act, as it has not experienced any difficulty in obtaining witnesses in connection with hearings on sewage treatment plants.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East has a question of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Martel: Question of the Minister of Education:

What action does the Minister intend to take with respect to the turmoil, firings and unrest amongst staff members of some community colleges in Ontario? And, does the Minister agree with the Civil Service Association of Ontario that much of the difficulty in the colleges arises (a) from the fact that local boards of governors are attempting to establish complete autonomy, and (b) from the direct influence exercised by local boards of governors over local faculty associations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member would indicate for me those community colleges where he suggests there is great turmoil amongst the faculty I would be quite prepared to take a look. We do not know of any great turmoil amongst the faculties of the community colleges, and I have been to several in recent months.

If he is prepared to do this, I am prepared to find out for him any information I can.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to a question that was asked of me some time ago, and which I took as notice, from the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt).

Mr. Speaker: What is the number?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. 674.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That question asked of me reads:

Will the Minister of Agriculture and Food table correspondence with the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, as follows: a letter of August 27, 1967, recommending Mr. George Closser, M.A., economist, a farmer with experience in preparing reports, to chair the inquiry into the pollution of air, soil and water in the townships of Dunn, Moulton, and Sherbrooke in Haldimand county?

Mr. Speaker, I received no such letter from the federation of agriculture. I received a

letter which simply brought this gentleman's name to our attention as one proposed by the federation of agriculture as a member of the committee.

There was no indication or suggestion that this man be named chairman of the committee. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the reply which I made to the federation of agriculture—I have a copy of it right here; I simply acknowledged their letter, and said as follows:

I regret that Mr. Klosler is not known to me personally. However, I am sure that, judging from his special qualifications, his appointment should warrant special consideration.

And I let it go at that. Now that recommendation was passed on.

The reference that is made by the hon. member is to the date, August 24. Indeed, on that date the Cabinet did give approval to the appointment of Dr. Hall as chairman of the committee, and the establishment of the committee. But the members of the committee were not appointed until a later date, when there had been contacts made with those who would serve on the committee.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, am I to take it from the Minister's reply that the federation of agriculture did not send him a letter requesting that this man be given consideration?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As chairman?

Mr. Gaunt: As chairman, but as a member of the inquiry committee.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I acknowledged that. I said they did send me a letter, but not asking that he be made chairman, only that he be considered as an appointee to the committee. This is all. There is quite a difference.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brantford has a question from the other day.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Does the Minister intend to approve, under Section 5 (1) of The General Welfare Assistance Act, the appointment of former Victoria county warden, Everett Cameron, as social investigator for the county, bearing in mind Mr. Cameron's references to welfare recipients, referring to them as nothing more than "bums", and "leeches on society", as reported in a news story in the *Telegram* on February 22?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I must say that references such as mentioned in connection with persons in need of assistance are reprehensible.

While The General Welfare Assistance Act only permits me to rule on the appointment of general welfare administrators, and not at the level referred to, I am sure no administrator would be willing to engage any person on his staff which does not meet requirements. I am, however, looking into the situation, and if it has any validity I will consult with county authorities on the matter.

Mr. Makarchuk: By way of a supplementary, could you indicate to the House when we would have a reply on this—when your investigation would be completed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I asked that the matter be checked into on receipt of the question yesterday, and those consultations are going on at the moment, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I wonder if I may have the privilege of answering question No. 669, placed by the hon. member for Etobicoke. He asked the question as follows:

In view of the recommendations of the coroner's jury investigating the death of five-month-old William Frederick Ambling, (a) is the Minister prepared to introduce legislation to allow for protection of children of mentally ill parents, and (b) to establish a central communication system where all welfare agencies would provide information on their services?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is as follows. Children in need of protection for any reason, including problems relating to mental health, are covered in the present Child Welfare Act, under part 2 of the Act. This deals with the protection and care of neglected children and defines a child in need of protection.

One of the definitions of a child in need is, I quote:

A child with a person in whose charge he is cannot, by reason of disease, or infirmity, or misfortune, or incompetence, or imprisonment, or any combination thereof, care properly for him.

As for the second part of the question: a central communications system is not as simple a method as it would first appear to be.

I am told that a social service index, which attempted to perform this task, existed in the

city of Toronto for more than 20 years. It was supported by both the city and the United Appeal but it was abandoned several years ago for a combination of reasons. Paramount among them was the reluctance of various agencies—doctors, psychiatrists and social workers and others—to violate the confidences of their clients.

This question of professional ethics and the civil rights of the clients would still persist and cause concern. An example of the questions which bother them is whether it would be ethical to have the name of an unmarried mother in a central file long after she has repaired any damage to her life caused by this one mistake.

The same could hold true of a man or woman with a criminal record. Professionals questioned whether this information should be made available to organizations which happened to become involved with them for completely unrelated reasons, when they have otherwise rehabilitated themselves.

I am told one of the reasons for the setting up of the index in the first place was the fact that policies of various organizations working in this area in the early days were often unclear and there was a possibility of duplication. But as government, both municipal and provincial, became more involved in various programmes, legislation removed a great deal of this duplication by setting down the responsibilities and fields of activity different groups should concern themselves with. This made it more obvious to those in the field, which organizations had the facilities to deal with a particular case and as a result the index was not used.

Apparently, the workers preferred direct contact with the organization involved and considered the index an unnecessary extra piece of machinery which slowed down the handling of a situation.

I might add that where it is merely a case of providing a member of the public with information on the programmes of different agencies, the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto already operates such a service. I am told that they deal with many requests for information each year. Metropolitan Toronto welfare offices also maintain a 24-hour information service.

I would also like to stress that there is a complete willingness on behalf of those in my department to deal with requests for assistance. I would conclude by saying that we are always concerned with communications and continuously impress on those in

the field, the need to keep each other informed in order to provide the most enlightened help possible.

In the case under discussion I would suggest the evidence reveals communications did exist. Everyone who needed to be alerted to the situation were notified.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to send me a copy of that statement?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a question.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A question for the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker: Would the Minister indicate to the House the reason for refusing a grant of incorporation to the Students' Administrative Council of the University of Toronto, and the argument which underlies that reason?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised to get this question, because this application is pending within the department. There is some correspondence going on now with the solicitors for the applicants over one of the clauses in the application. As far as I am concerned, this application is proceeding in the regular way. So I really do not see what more I can say at the moment.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I will re-direct my question toward the particular clause on another day.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions of the Minister of Mines:

Will the department undertake to make a comprehensive survey of the Geraldton, Nakina, Beardmore areas in an effort to ascertain the mining potential in these areas?

Will pressure be put on mining companies, such as Anaconda, to develop known ore reserves rather than have them lay idle?

Should mining properties that are not developed within a reasonable period of time revert to the Crown?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, due to my own absence from my office, I just received this question as I came into the House. All three questions in general relate to future government policy or suggestions relating to government policy,

so I can only say that at the proper time and in the proper place government policy will be made known to the members. But in respect to his particular reference to the Anaconda Ore Company Limited and what we hope to be a very large potential development in that area, I can only say that it is certainly not the desire either of the company or of the government that this particular property should lay idle very much longer, as he puts it. I, myself, have been travelling around the continent and speaking to the actual principals concerned with the company and we are attempting to bring all the pressures to bear that we can upon them.

At this particular time, due to certain doubts that exist in the minds of people in other countries respecting Canadian tax policy and even provincial policy, respecting resources in this province, that particular company is having a very hard time obtaining the large mass of capital financing that would be required to develop that particular development.

But we are attempting to assist. We are attempting to make known the needs of that particular company and I have hopes, that before long something will come out of it. But at the moment there is simply no hope due to the doubtful atmosphere that does exist, especially in respect of the federal government's attitude regarding the recommendations in the Carter report, which I think the hon. gentleman and his colleagues support.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Do not let them blackmail you.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Sure.

Mr. Stokes: With reference to the first part of the question, I understand from the circulars that come out from your office that detailed surveys are being made of most parts of Ontario. Will the Minister indicate or take on a commitment to have a detailed survey of the areas that I have mentioned? It seems that they have been neglected.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can discuss this perhaps a little bit more fully during the estimates when the policy respecting this re-surveying of the geological areas can be more fully discussed. But the whole of the province has already been covered by geological surveying and mapping and it is quite true that in some areas we

are going back and doing a more intensified re-survey. But the specific areas will have to await the Budget, to be presented next Tuesday, and the discussion of the estimates in this House. We need the money.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wonder if I might raise a point of order. I had hoped to do it before the Prime Minister left but perhaps I can present it to you now and through you, to the assistant House leader.

It is in reference to standing committees and membership thereof. There is no particular problem for a member in deciding what standing committee he wants to sit on, or for his caucus making the kind of division in assignments, with most committees because they focus on one department or perhaps two departments. However, with one of the committees—namely the committee on government commissions—it literally spans the whole gamut of government departments—commissions that may relate to various government departments—and therefore you find that when a certain commission comes up the members who are most interested in it are not on that committee for those particular meetings.

I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether the government would give consideration to an alternative which I think would be feasible and would meet this particular need, namely that each party should have "x" number of members and that the membership might change from meeting to meeting depending on which commission comes up, because of the particular interests and work and preparation that has been done by members?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Surely they have to choose in advance which of them is to create the main disturbance.

Mr. MacDonald: Well I think that is irrelevant, that interjection from the minister of obstruction.

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear any interjection but I heard the leader of the Opposition. Does he wish to speak to it?

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find the proposal a very good one. We have been concerned with the same problem, settling it this way; realizing that any member of this House might attend any committee meeting, take part in the questioning but be excluded from the vote. Now since the committee on commissions does not normally find itself in

division it has not been a problem to such an extent in the past. But it would be a very worthwhile solution to the situation which might come up at any time and certainly we would support the proposal that has been put forward.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, if I might speak for a moment, we tried on Monday to have questions from the members of the Legislature but we ran out of time. An hour and a half does not seem to be enough time to hold these meetings and to give everyone a chance to speak, and I think the members of the committee should be considered first, and this is what we tried to do. Several members wanted to speak from the Legislature who were not on the committee, and I ran out of time and was not able to include them at that particular time, but I think we should consider a longer time in order that we could accommodate all the members who wish to speak.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition has raised the point, and the hon. member for Simcoe Centre who is chairman of the committee this year, has commented on it, and I think something more should be said. It is true that there has been an acknowledged practice that any member of the House can go to any committee and have voice but not vote.

Mr. Nixon: Is that not in the rules?

Mr. MacDonald: It may well be in the rules, but the procedure that has been adopted—and I am not saying this critically—is that the regular members of the committee have the first say and time runs out and therefore those members of the House who may be most knowledgeable and most interested in the particular committee which is before the standing committee on government commissions at any given time, literally do not get a chance to participate at all, so that the spirit of the rule, so to speak, does not get implemented.

So I revert to my original proposal. It seems to me that—in our instance, for example, I think we are entitled to four or five members—what difference would it make if in any given meeting the names of the four or five members—it would be the original names or any substitute that might be made—were handed to the secretary of the committee? I think it would give an opportunity for all members to participate in the hearings of commissions with which they are normally interested, studying, working, and speaking in this House when the estimates come up.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It might help the hon. member with his deplorable attendance record too.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House leader wish to speak to this matter?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, just to speak to the point of order, I would be very happy to undertake to bring this to the attention of the Prime Minister and I am sure that he, in his anxiety to assist in the efficient operation of these standing committees, will perhaps want to meet with the other two leaders and discuss some procedures along this line.

Mr. Speaker: I would think that the leaders of the two parties might keep that in mind when today's meeting is reconvened.

Mr. MacDonald: When is that meeting to be reconvened?

Mr. Speaker: I have had no message except the one you received today. I am sorry, but that is all.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to take part in the Throne debate in this, the second session of the twenty-eighth Parliament. I would like, of course, to once again add my word of congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, and also to the deputy Speaker. In my judgment you, sirs, are fulfilling your duties in this House in a most purposeful way.

Now while on the subject of worthwhile contributions, I must make a comment about our leader, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). I feel, Mr. Speaker, that he is, without a doubt, making an outstanding contribution to the operation of the affairs of the province in a constructive manner. I know that in the not too distant future, the Nixon name will be better known, because on the North American continent, the people will hear and read about both President Nixon and Premier Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I must be very blunt. Perth is the constituency the Premier (Mr.

Robarts) has forgotten. There can surely be no more representative cross section in all Ontario of those sterling qualities which have made Ontario great, but the Robarts' government has a failing memory. The Premier himself, and his Ministers, conveniently forget that here, in the rich heartland of the province, lies the source of much work and wealth.

It is from Perth that fathers have raised families who have gone to the big cities and the industrial centres to make Ontario what it is today. Yet as I said in my Throne Speech last year, it is fair to call Perth the neglected county. So I want to once again, if I may, to advertise to the government the pride that is in Perth.

Perth is noted for its well organized farms which are diversified in their production. We have one of the most active county milk committees in the province and we have the largest number of milking cows in any county of Ontario. Thanks to the Stratford industrial commission and municipality representatives who have all been alert to every practical possibility, we also have a well diversified industrial base in Perth.

One of the largest tourist attractions in Ontario is, of course, the Stratford Shakespearean festival, the happy result of early collaboration between Tom Patterson and local authorities, who quickly appreciated the depth of his vision and co-operated with him to the full.

Today, all Ontario can see the result of that effort and the tourist dollars benefit not only Stratford, not only Perth county, but every stopping place on the journey to and from the place of pilgrimage. I hope that is not too strong a phrase.

Now it is right and proper that the tourists who contribute so much to the income, not only of Perth county, but all along the way, should be well served. A recent survey showed that 91 per cent of these tourists used passenger automobiles, so that while rail and rapid transit systems are appropriate for metropolitan areas, we still have to rely on cars, and that means on highways, for our activities and our prosperity.

We have tourist traffic, normal local traffic, farm traffic, and industrial traffic, all seeking better roads. I am glad the good roads convention is still in session. I would like the good people who came to Toronto expecting to hear from the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) that they were at last being considered, to note that I share their concern at the tone of the Minister's remarks at the Royal York Hotel yesterday. This showed, if

anything can, that the Tories are at the end of their tether; the last bend in the long Tory road is approaching; their horses are weary.

"Take a short term view" said the Minister, "do not plan too far ahead". Now what kind of talk is this? It is the talk of a government on the way out. "Afraid to look ahead" the Minister cried, "nothing else will have any chance of approval in the present economic situation". I wonder if he has read the Smith report? Does he not know where to put money by way of investment? The trouble with this government is that it cannot see where money is doing good and where it is being wasted. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, Perth needs a better link with Highway 401 to survive and thrive. Such a link was foreshadowed in last year's departmental estimates, but nothing has happened in the past year. There has been no start on project 190-63-3, the clearing project for a link with the Kitchener-Waterloo Expressway. No wonder I say that we are forgotten in our part of Ontario.

I would like to remind the government of another promise, the promise of relocating the Stratford teachers' college in Perth county. The present college, built in 1908, is presently overtaxed with students, and the atmosphere is not conducive to the modern approach to teaching and learning, as expressed in the Hall-Dennis report.

This building echoes the old approach. No wonder the teachers cannot appreciate what the new report is getting at if they are trained in the atmosphere of Charles Dickens. A new college is needed in our area. So that teachers will remain in their own community as long as they realize that Perth has everything to make the Hall-Dennis way of education come true.

It is the best natural learning laboratory in Ontario, and if I were a teacher, and had fully grasped what the report was getting at in terms of a discovery approach and experience learning, then I certainly would want to be leading this kind of learning adventure in one of Perth's schools, rather than moving away to the cities to be swamped.

However, the lead for this has got to come in a modern teachers' college. The land has been purchased, now the building must begin. We have over 400 future teachers enrolled this year, and there could be many more, given this initiative. We are extremely well equipped to deal with a greater student body, since many homes take in tourists during the summer, and student-teachers during term, and

we have more accommodation available for expansion. This means that costs can be concentrated on the learning areas rather than on dormitory accommodation in new student residences.

Mr. Speaker, I am blessed with constituents who are not easily fooled by high-pressure sales and advertising agency techniques. They see through the sham and the smoke screen very quickly.

I have a very good example of this skepticism at work. I sent out a questionnaire at the end of 1968 to my Perth constituents. And of those returning the form, 82 per cent answered with a resounding "no," to the question of whether or not the province should collect its own income tax. They just could not see the sense in setting up double collection machinery, double bureaucracy, just so that the Premier and the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), could stand on a higher pedestal.

In letters that came with their replies, they indicated that we, as taxpayers, cannot afford to set up more departments and that rather, than standing on a pedestal, the Premier and the Treasurer would be standing on the shoulders of the people. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Perth have 20-20 vision.

Also, 91 per cent of the returns called for meetings between municipal representatives and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), face-to-face before further steps are taken to implement regional government. I know that my colleague from Welland is going to develop this idea further, so I will not belabour it, except to underline that the feeling is pretty general, that the Minister is riding roughshod over the locally-elected representatives of the people, and that sooner or later, there will be a back-lash that will topple this government from power.

As one man put it, Darcy may win the Tory leadership, but he will never be Premier of Ontario."

Another group of letters accompanying the returned questionnaires had as a common theme—the fact that the writers knew little or nothing about regional government, as is envisaged by Queen's Park. They could not believe that a scheme could be pushed through in any area with so little information about what it would cost, and who would pay.

One man asked: "Will it consolidate and not multiply?" And another asked: "Is the county school board experience any guide with officials being paid 5 or 6 times the average per capita income for the area? How is this justified?"

One correspondent asked me especially to condemn the "Darcy-knows-best" attitude.

That would force regional government upon an unwilling electorate. I am pleased to place this catch phrase on the record.

It sums everything up so neatly—all the frustrations of those who have to deal with this Minister—"Darcy knows best." It means the exact opposite of democracy. If the government would come out with a really sensible master plan for regional government in each area, then John Q. Public would know how to weigh it in the balance. He would know what was going on. Now, he knows nothing, nothing at all.

Even though I come from a predominantly rural area, my filing cabinet still smoulders with letters condemning the basic shelter grants. Most people felt it was unnecessary, to say the least.

A resolution was sent from Perth county council to other county councils right across the province. The resolution asked that the Minister be petitioned to repeal the Act, and it has found favour with over half of those replying; and the replies are still coming in.

I think the opinion of Perth county council should carry some weight here, particularly with the Treasurer. I would remind him that Perth, has handled its finances so well that it has had no debenture debts in the last 20 years.

An editorial dated December 12, 1968, in the Stratford *Beacon-Herald* is headed: "Ontario Heads For Trouble." It comes from a paper—similar to most others—which in the past has looked with some favour on the activities of the Robarts government, but now it is beginning to be highly critical of the present administration.

The government should take measures to get a grip on its expenditures—

It says:

—instead of behaving like an administration on the verge of defeat and desperately scattering grants which it must first collect from the taxpayers.

So everyone is now beginning to see that this government is bribing the people with their own money. Next week, the Budget will tell the tale.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the young people who are contributing so much to Ontario these days. I hold no brief for violence of extremism. I think that only a very few are making a lot of noise. But I do know that a great many moderate young people are very disturbed that they do not have an effective way of helping shape the future.

They feel cut off from the main stream of power, which they sense is directing them without a full appreciation of what today's life is all about. They want to be part of the democratic process, and for them essentially, this means to right to vote at 18.

They point out that increased educational opportunity and a better chance to grasp world affairs through radio and TV means that they are probably as ready at 18 as their elders were at 21.

Now, I know that some members are opposed to lowering the voting age to 18, and some want to see it brought about. But all of the people I talked to are honest about it. So it was with shock and dismay that I read the remark of the Premier as reported in the London *Free Press* on Feb. 4, 1969.

I said then to myself, just as on the subject of Medicare, "Is he really speaking for anyone but himself? Has he lost all touch with the people's feelings on this, and with the rank and file of his own caucus and party?" What he said is this:

A reduction in voting age may follow a full-scale reorganization of the Conservative Party to increase its appeal to youth.

What cynicism that statement carries! The Premier does not care a hoot for the people any more. He is doing too much damage for his successor to repair, and at least two of his three possible heirs are also doing considerable damage on their own.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about the brainwash Budget. Let me advise the Treasurer to move into Medicare on the strength of the following London *Free Press* comment. It is always best to take criticism from the home team, so here is what the London *Free Press* says about Medicare; February 24, 1969:

In spite of the fuss over Medicare, it might be pointed out that British Columbia and Saskatchewan were the first two provinces to come into the national scheme. It apparently has not been an insuperable financial burden on them.

Need I say more, Mr. Speaker? I think not. It is pretty obvious that in spite of all the noise, the Treasurer has come to grips with reality and decided to go into the scheme as the Liberals have been telling him to do for two years.

He stayed out for the wrong reasons and now he feels he is going in under duress. What he really means is loss of face. Well,

the voters have a very kind way with bruised egos, they are very ready to forgive. Fortunately, they are also equally ready to forget. They will forgive you now and forget you at the polls.

And that is what will happen to this government in 1971 as regional government problems, county school board problems, the memory of the basic shelter exemption fiasco, the memory of the delayed entry into Medicare, all add up to a rejection of the Robarts government at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, we are out to win in '71 and when that happens Perth will take a rightful place in the scheme of things in Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in your presence, sir, distinguishing the chair as you do in your subsidiary, but nonetheless important post.

I appreciate the opportunity to enter the Throne Debate and the flexibility which has characterized the arrangements which were made by the various Whips. I appreciate the opportunity to reflect, perhaps in brief—since the burden of my remarks are better saved for the constitutional debate tomorrow—upon certain legislative aspects of the functioning of this House and of its direction. "This House"—this Romanesque mausoleum, in order to make the comparison with the "neo-Gothic monstrosity," as Westminster was once called.

There comes a time, I think, Mr. Speaker, to appraise or re-appraise the legislative processes under Tory rule. I make that point because I think it is an important distinction to draw, in order to recognize that social change can be effected in a very considerable variety of ways. Many of them are outside the Legislature, in legitimate areas, in the present, I think, justified preoccupation with extra-parliamentary vehicles and other forms of direct action. But in the process of recognizing the legitimacy of those avenues it is important to take a pretty hard-headed look at the functioning of the legislative process and the disabilities—and they are indeed disabilities—under which a great many members of this House—perhaps the majority of members of this House—function within a Tory framework.

I suppose then, Mr. Speaker, that for a socialist that brings the additional dilemma of working in a—without meaning it in a perjorative sense—in a capitalist framework. In the very considerable rigidity to which the members opposite adhere, none more firmly

and more vigorously than the new Minister of Revenue—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Are these the reasons why the member is never in his place?

Mr. Lewis:—whose ascension to a Cabinet post may perhaps be justified when he winds up this debate. It has not yet been justified, but doubtless will be.

There are, Mr. Speaker, moments of intense discomfort for some—I know it is true for myself—regarding the relevance of what is done, not so much in terms of the social philosophy—I do not think any of us in this party ever had any qualms on that score—but certainly in the context of how one effects social change. The very great limitation; the recognition that one should not or would not wish to spend one's life tampering at the periphery forever of social issues. That is not radicalism, Mr. Speaker, that is playing the game in a Conservative government and in a Conservative dominated Legislature.

Radicalism which effects real social change is usually a tough and pretty unpopular set of propositions. It is disconcerting for a member like myself to accept the irony that certain propositions are viewed as contentious in many levels of government—some that I would not have viewed as contentious at all. It seems ironic that amendments to the Criminal Code in Ottawa, halting and unprogressive as they are, should be considered by so many in this country as disputatious and terribly radical in their implication.

It is perhaps, at least for me, ironic that the student unrest should evoke such a backlash from so many respectable elements in society, if one puts it that way. Not so much the student unrest that results in what occurred in Sir George Williams, because everyone in his right mind deploras that kind of extremity to which some people feel compelled to be driven on occasion. But certainly in this province, as, interestingly the Minister of Education and University Affairs (Mr. Davis) seems to realize, there has been no particular demonstration of extremity which would merit from some individuals, some papers, some political parties, that kind of backlash response.

One is sad, Mr. Speaker, that in this society it is still difficult to talk about the public ownership of urban land as a response to altering the housing crisis, something that the federal Liberals eschew and the Ontario Housing Corporation eschews. It is a pity, I suppose, when one has a debate on Indians

in this Legislature, that some remarks however well-meant in themselves, from the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) show such an incredible gap in comprehension of what the problem consists. Despite that, when another member in this Legislature puts the proposition that the only way one solves the question around Indians is to grant full power and financial rights to the Indians themselves to solve it—even that raises eyebrows and brings questions and impugns motives. For a great many I would have thought it would seem to be a patently obvious kind of proposition.

But, again, we work under a Tory aegis where even the most hesitant twitches in the direction of social progress are characterized by great anxiety. That makes the position of some in the Legislature, sometimes this party, ever more vigorously expressed, ever more militant.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, I object to the Legislature itself, because it is far too often a sort of fossilized relic of club-like debate, always reverting to parliamentary language—let us not be real in the expression of our discontents, but let us couch them in parliamentary language, so often contrived—

Hon. Mr. White: Everybody is out of step but the member.

Mr. Lewis: —so often artificial and very often predetermined, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, even the fourth estate—one marvels at their capacity for self-flagellation in covering some of the Legislature, time and time again, although they, too, obviously, have felt a certain discontent—would be wise to look to the quality of what is reported about the Legislature, however much the Legislature may not measure up to what their expectations pose.

We have become, I suspect, in some ways computerized automata enacting this drama. You have a lot of Pavlovian hoots, Mr. Speaker; desk thumping; rally 'round the flag boys; 117 mature adults in the ritual emasculation of the parliamentary process.

And that happens all too frequently in this legislative chamber.

Again I suggest to you, sir, that it is very much a product of the way in which a Conservative government looks at this Chamber, and at the workings of the process. So much that is trivial predominates; so much that is destructive irritates, eating away at the relevance and the enthusiasm of the democratic assembly.

And, like those of a great many members in this House, these are not in any sense distinctly personal views. There are many who would support aspects of this kind of criticism.

So I repudiate all the petty, unconscionable obstacles which demean private members and the Legislature they serve, because it need not be.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that government rests upon consent, but we do not consent to be governed. We grow up in a world in which we are governed, and it is intolerable that the governors should suffer such frustrations and indignities as is placed upon them by the malfunctioning of the parliamentary process.

There are a great many areas, and some of them have been alluded to far more eloquently—no question in my mind—than I can bring to bear at this point, but I want to repeat some of them. I reject the condition of indemnities, and of expenses, and of working conditions, and of research facilities in this Legislature for the vast majority of members. I echo with all the strength at my command the statement before the orders of the day which the member for Sudbury made some little time ago.

I ask why, Mr. Speaker. I ask the government, I ask the Ministers now occupying the front benches—why, why it is necessary for members to occupy more than an individual job on a full time basis with a budget of \$2 billion to be considered? I ask why it is necessary for members to petition leaders of their parties—it is true of the government party—about the state of indemnities and expenses? I ask why, Mr. Speaker, members of this House have contemplated resignation, because they cannot survive the economic straits to which they are subjected—of maintaining homes in two cities?

I ask why members from all over the province, particularly those in the north, are restricted to 15 round trips throughout the entire legislative year, when it is fairly obvious even to the most modest of minds that there are at least 52 weeks, and that members like to maintain that number of contacts with their constituencies?

I ask why, Mr. Speaker, members of this Legislature have to submit to the most degrading spectacle of public life, which is to set their own level of indemnity and expenses and why the Prime Minister, with even an ounce of maturity and intelligence, cannot establish the independent commission which has been talked about in order that that

invidious role to which members are subject be removed from this House; so that there is some kind of comparable financial equivalent to all those areas of private service, civil service and public service at which level, salaries, expenses and travelling, and all the other accoutrements of legislative life, can be set?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has said that he will not permit a question.

Mr. Lewis: Not because I could not deal with it, but the member follows this debate and, therefore, can obviously intervene appropriately. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, why only an individual secretary is granted sometimes to three, four or five members of the Legislature—or seven? I want to know why members are unnecessarily trapped in the vortex of constituency work without the kind of assistance they require in order to serve their constituents?

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, really you have such a difficult time.

Mr. Lewis: I want to know why—

An hon. member: He has forgotten his origins already.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I would not engender plans in the hon. member opposite. There are other emotions that I would hope to reach. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, why there is such a paucity of research facilities for the members in this House? What kind of contempt does this government hold for the backbenchers of this House that they view the services as so dispensable, so inconsequential, so that even the most minimal of research and secretarial facilities are not provided in order to do the kind of work which has to be done?

Hon. Mr. White: How would the hon. member know?

Mr. Lewis: I want to know, Mr. Speaker, why the derogatory parsimony that so characterizes the government in all of this, even the lack of private offices, as the description of the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) indicated—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): How would the hon. member know? He has the worst attendance record of anybody in the House. The NDP ran their last provincial campaign from their third floor suite of offices in this building.

Mr. Lewis: If one wants to talk about campaigning from private offices, then we will get to one of the Ministers without Portfolio in time, but I will stick with my text for the moment.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do members have to be subjected to such undignified and humiliating cubicles, if such they are called?

I recall a quote from one of the members from the British House of Commons, who, in describing his facilities, back in 1950, and I trust they have improved, said:

I have now in addition to my locker, a little desk, with another seven members in a room the size of the average dining room in the average council house. The room is ideal for a suicide. If I could squeeze out of the window I could throw myself, and sometimes feel like doing so, into the Thames. The room is wholly inadequate for an effective member.

I do not commend the analogy to any members of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I do point out that other jurisdictions, having suffered the same ignominy, 18 or 19 years ago, have taken steps to alter it, and I think it would be well within the government's command to take steps to alter the condition of private members, Opposition and government, in the present Legislature.

The regal majesty with which the Ministers of the Crown, and the Deputy Ministers and the senior civil servants, comport themselves, looking in a "prince and the pauper" fashion upon this two-nation theory in the Legislature.

The simple matter is, Mr. Speaker, that one need not suffer this perpetual humiliation, this inability to function. I would like to ask the Prime Minister, or any other member of the Cabinet, at some time to explain what twisted, detached, mocking view of a member's work and contribution this government has, that in the matters of indemnities, and salaries, and round trips, and research facilities, and secretaries, and office accommodation and all the paraphernalia of a good functioning member of the assembly, they are willing to rest in totally discriminatory and unworthy circumstances.

If they really want to raise the calibre of the legislative assembly, Mr. Speaker, as has

been expressed from Conservative ranks, then there are ways to do it.

Even in the narrow, functional definition of this Legislature, to scrutinize, to publicize, to criticize, as well as to support the government and to pass legislation—even in that narrow functional definition, our roles are very circumscribed.

Then too, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask about the question period in this House, because all of these aspects add together to emasculate the effectiveness of members; an inflexible, sterile, shadow-boxing process, the Opposition either playing the role of straight man to the government monolith, or stand-up comic as the court jester to the establishment.

And the Minister either takes as notice, or the Minister refuses to answer a supplementary, or the Minister puts the question on the order paper, confining himself to those which are most felicitous in reply. And Mr. Speaker, in the role of schoolmaster, he vetoes material—our own board of censors—to assure that nothing controversial or argumentative disturbs the diffusing of cut and thrust which would otherwise be desirable in this Legislature, in what could well be, before the orders of the day, the most productive part of the legislative session.

Now, what a commentary on the Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Speaker. I feel for the Cabinet Ministers; the position in which they are thus placed. Trembling and ashen in their offices till noon, waiting for that final phone call about a question, and then a high level conference with all the appropriate civil servants, and a number of written drafts until finally the ultimate vehicle is inscribed on the answer form. Then there is a rehearsal of voice inflection, and dramatic pause before one of the mirrors in the Ministerial offices, and then, Mr. Speaker, with the help of a parliamentary assistant, there is a dry run of all possible supplementaries and finally, shifting through the shadows, the Minister returns to the House to face the ugly rabble opposite.

Hon. Mr. White: We are terrified of the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it is in fact, for the government, an appropriate kind of analogy. Although this government suffers irrationality and inconsistency with ease, I would not have thought they would suffer indignity with so much apparent comfort. Why no spontaneity in the question period? What is wrong with these Ministers of the Crown? Is the Prime Minister suggesting

that the entire Cabinet is without wit, is without grasp, is without policy?

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two who have a sort of marginal grasp of their department, but this is the stuff of politics and we would deal with it.

What does it do to the House in the most important hour of the day, and to the level of debate, and to the freedom and directness of exchange in the democratic process generally? Again, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker; it is an abuse of the system and a rejuvenation lies in store when the change comes. But at the moment, fear and timidity prevail and the Premier defends those who cannot defend themselves. But one would hope that that might, in fact, be altered.

Mr. Speaker, there is, too, the current practice of private members' hours; the so-called gentleman's agreement—not akin to the film of that name—where the coercive apparatus of the state in the Prime Minister's office, delivered to the Opposition parties an ultimatum which said, in effect, "If you want to have private members' hours at all, there will be no votes. If you insist on votes, no private members' hours!"

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, that description is certainly not what happened when the arrangement was agreed to.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It certainly is!

Hon. Mr. White: Absolutely incorrect. It was pointed out sir, it was pointed out—no—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. Perhaps the House would permit the hon. Minister to state his point of order.

Hon. Mr. White: Well the point of order—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: The point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker is trying to determine whether or not he does have a point of order and I could not hear him.

Hon. Mr. White: The hon. member has misled this House, deliberately or accidentally, which is directly contrary of the rules. The facts, as his own leader and Whip will confirm, were that it was pointed out in a series of meetings several years ago that most private members' public bills and resolutions are of a nature that make it impossible for

other members of the House to vote against them. The solution of some Parliaments, including Ottawa, is for that order to be talked out and therefore, the members are not embarrassed—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is not a point of order at all.

Hon. Mr. White: —are not embarrassed, not having to vote against it—let me finish please. We have the alternative between talking out the measure for the hour or to adopt an alternative method which was to adjourn the debate and—

An hon. member: It is a speech.

Hon. Mr. White: —and on those occasions, where possible, to handle two or more orders during the course of the private members' period—

Mr. Singer: Completely out of order.

Hon. Mr. White: The second method was decided upon because it is more efficient and because it keeps the debate more interesting. There was no forcing involved at all, and the contention from the NDP now that that agreement of four or five years' standing—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. White: —that it was forced is a complete and deliberate untruth.

Mr. MacDonald: I rise on the point of order. I happen to be a part of those decisions and it was clearly indicated when the Opposition sought to have a vote accorded, that if they wanted to have the regularized private members' hours it would be without a vote.

Mr. Singer: Or else they would not have—

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, it was a gentlemen's agreement and we had to accept it.

Hon. Mr. White: All right, quite right—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order!

Hon. Mr. White: —right, the private members, the members of this Legislature cannot be forced into voting against the pious platitudes contained—

Mr. MacDonald: They do it in Manitoba all the time.

Hon. Mr. White: —contained on Opposition members' public orders.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. White: The choice was whether to talk them out or adjourn the debate without—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will you not—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, will you not let me speak to this point of order that has been going on for ten minutes?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I should like to deal with the matter brought up by the hon. Minister. In my view the hon. member of the New Democratic Party who was speaking did not suggest anything different than has been mentioned by the hon. Minister from London South and the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party. I do not think there is any point of order at all. The hon. member for Scarborough West may continue.

Mr. Lewis: That being the case—

Hon. Mr. White: Why did you wait five years?

Mr. Lewis: Well, frankly, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: We have complained every time we met.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, your antennae, your perception, being dead on, the fact that London South agrees wholeheartedly, I will remind him just once again to what it was he agreed. The Prime Minister, and his party, said to the Opposition in categorical terms, using the big stick as they were powerful enough to do at the time but could no longer do, either you allow it to go through without vote or you do not have private members' resolutions in this House at all.

Hon. Mr. White: That is not true!

Mr. Lewis: That is the way in which it took place and with that trembling affliction that is characteristic of Tories when they are in a difficult kind of battle.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Completely untrue.

Hon. Mr. White: Why is your leader still not complaining?

Mr. MacDonald: We have complained at every meeting.

Interjections by hon. members:

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order please. Perhaps the hon. member may be permitted to continue his speech.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member is enjoying this, Mr. Speaker. The government as usual, terrified by a grain of incipient autonomy that might appear occasionally in the ranks, then confined the bills to two hours a week, to two hours a week so that they could effectively, in terms of time, also emasculate the contributions of back bench members in this Legislature. No suggestion as to why we should not have a full day. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Revenue was so persuasive before, I am almost inclined to let him speak again.

Why not extend the session if necessary to accommodate private members' contributions, Mr. Speaker, and why not vote on those contributions? Are there such—

Hon. Mr. White: Why do you not attend this House if you want to make a contribution?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Because he does not make the money you make.

Mr. Lewis: Are there such fratricidal splits in the Tory party, Mr. Speaker?

An hon. member: He would have a nervous breakdown if he was here much more often.

Mr. Lewis: Is there such total fragmentation of the Tory party that the Prime Minister cannot risk a vote? And wherein lies this fear of autonomy, this necessity to whip every single Tory member into line, however modest or minor the issue? Why invoke such ferocious party discipline? What are the Conservatives afraid of? Would there be a back bench revolt? Is that what is in fact being said? Has the Tory party perhaps a left wing or a right wing or even a middle?

Is that what the Prime Minister is concerned about; that they should retreat from the proposition of a vote on whether or not you lower the voting age to 18 years old—everyone in the House supported it from all parties, on the inclusion of chiropractors in OMSIP, when all parties supported it—on the inclusion of nursing home care in OHSC when all parties supported it? Why can the government not, via the private members' contributions—some of them from their own members—give support?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Can you imagine that back row in revolt?

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): That is why we are here.

Mr. Lewis: Now, Mr. Speaker, the members, I suggest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it is true, it is true. The Minister of Finance is right. The government is of one opinion, never more than a sole opinion, on any single issue, unlike Opposition members and some back bench members who take private members' contributions seriously, who invest them with a good deal of time.

In addition to which, Mr. Speaker, the written rules permit it, so it is not only a flagrant disregard for the rights of members but it is an equally flagrant violation of the rules. And it is a real abuse of the private member, it delimits the exercise of independence, it reinforces a jaundiced view of the inconsequentiality of much of what is presented here when that in fact need not be the case. It is an obvious area which needs real reform. But then, Mr. Speaker, one could go on at a great many aspects of this but I shall choose only one or two others.

It is necessary to reject the committee system because there is nothing quite so fraudulent in this Legislature as the committee system under the aegis of a Tory mentality. So you have a public accounts committee which, when times are fortuitous, might review the estimates of three or four out of twenty departments in a year, and then, more than a year out of date.

You have government commissions which subject the individual corporations to scrutiny for all of an hour and twenty minutes, unless they can somehow be held over for another session. All the rest, with the exception of friendly field trips, as was true yesterday in the committee on education to ETV, simply exists to act as ciphers in the rubber stamping of legislation which comes through this House and goes to committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Tories have done to the committee process in this legislative assembly is the final perversion of the democratic process, because with the committee system lies in considerable measure the answer to our problems.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. White: Once again the hon. member is misleading the House and with

your permission, sir, I will describe in some detail the improvements that have been made during my ten years' experience to strengthen the select and standing committee system around here.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, surely you will allow me to make a comment on the point of order that has been raised. I think it is generally accepted—you are not going to permit it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition wishes to speak to the point of order? I was just going to rule there was no point of order, but if the hon. leader of the Opposition makes one—

Mr. Nixon: My own point of order is that we cannot suffer the continuing intrusion of the counter arguments from the Minister across the way. He has no point of order and he has to get up on his feet whenever he disagrees and I would submit to you, sir, on a point of order that he should be restrained.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. It seems to me that any hon. member may rise at any time when he feels he has a point of order. The Speaker or the Chairman has the responsibility of determining whether or not, in fact, it is a point of order.

The hon. member for Scarborough West did not indicate in the remarks he had made that there was anything upon which a point of order could be raised. I think the hon. member for Scarborough West should be permitted to continue without any further points of order in this respect.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): It is a typical example of how the government treats parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Lewis: Precisely.

Mr. Sopha: I will be right back.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am going to mark time until the member for Sudbury returns.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: I am enjoying it, Mr. Speaker. I am not routed by the counter arguments, counter productive as they are, and I must state to the House with absolutely explicit

validity that it is a quintessential corruption of the whole committee process what the Tories have done to the committee system.

The last refuge of much of the usefulness of the private member in this House has been excised from effective exploitation. Constantly the government finds other recourse to do further damage.

It is a very, very unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, that we then have to fall back purely on the legislative apparatus as such, because, of course, the fact of the matter is that there are committee systems in other parts of the world, as in other Legislatures—other Tory Legislatures, like that of Manitoba—where they vote on all private members' bills and resolutions. There are other Legislatures and jurisdictions in the world, Mr. Speaker, where committees are at the very heart, the very centre of the process.

In the United Kingdom some of the standing committees—many of them for an explicit, though emergency purpose—have served very useful functions in giving individual members a new adrenalin in terms of the job they are about to perform.

Even the American congressional committees, some of which we deplore, have had enormously useful functions in the subpoenaing of people and opening the subject to the public—whether it was Kefauver's committee on drug costs, or the committee on price fixing, or on foreign relations, or on car safety, or, indeed, on crime.

It is a simple matter, Mr. Speaker, that when you destroy the work of a committee by having it deal purely with legislation which is already a *fait accompli*, or the taking of field trips, or the submission of briefs, then you denude the committee structure of any consequential contribution.

Now the revelations that would come from a worthwhile committee system would revolutionize the policy of this government. In fact, the reason the committee system is so fiercely resisted is because the government would, in fact, fall, if there were reasonable committees.

Can you imagine what would happen to this government if there were committees which could bring witnesses from all walks of life as well as civil servants to discuss areas like urban renewal, or rent structure, or what happens in our mental hospitals, or the auto trade agreement, or farm income, or drug prices, or teacher education, or sources of election funds, or the facilities for children in the province, or any of these areas?

Mr. Speaker, we would have one *cause célèbre* after another until this shaking and tottering edifice would tumble into the ground once and for all, because you cannot withstand a conscious, relentless type of public scrutiny. In order to avoid it, one resorts to a modest palliative, a pleasant little format, which encourages everyone to a fairly non-descript behaviour.

What we would do, Mr. Speaker, is to focus dramatically many times in explosive ways, but at least in useful public ways, the major, social issues of this province which cannot effectively be discussed in this House for reasons I will allude to in a moment.

As it is now, our committee system is in some ways too embarrassing to keep alive. Compassion dictates a quick and painless end. The world would survive its passing, Mr. Speaker. I realize that the members of the Legislature will see its continuance in the hope that it alters, but there will be few protest demonstrations in the event of its demise.

Of course, this extends, Mr. Speaker—as all members know—to the autocratic and unregulated boards and commissions, and commissions in which this government indulges; the use of regulations, tremendously important and significant regulations, which impringe directly on the lives—economic, social and cultural—of individuals across the province, but never come before the House for scrutiny, and are never given so much as a passing nod by the members as a whole, which regulations frequently alter the substantive content of the legislation itself in the process of their enactment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the impotence, the sheer impotence, of committee scrutiny means that much legislation, particularly in the financial areas of this Legislature, is simply a matter of accomplished fact usurping the privileges of the members, rendering them appendages to a machine that seems to be irreversible.

And the Minister of Finance is, perhaps more than any, responsible for what has happened to this Legislature. I suppose it is a cry in Legislatures in many other jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is that in our capacity to scrutinize the finances of the province, and the expenditure of public funds, we have been more severely restricted than in any other area.

The budget dictates taxes, as it probably will next Tuesday, before any of the bills are submitted to this House for discussion. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, of participating in a detailed discussion of financial expenditures in the current terms in this Legislature—none at all, none at all.

The material that we got in the public accounts committee is almost two years old. The government makes liberal use of the financial warrant. The Minister of University Affairs and Education—I see him fleetingly under the gallery—wants to increase the money spent on the Centennial Centre for Science and Technology 5, 6 or 10-fold. He simply signed some financial warrants.

If the Minister of Trade and Development wants to hand out EIO loans indiscriminately to companies whose objects are to destroy the economic fibre of this province, then signs the financial warrants and exceeds the amount of money which is allocated for the expenditures, there is absolutely no way of controlling, no way of discerning, no way of scrupulously examining the current financial expenditure in this Legislature.

It is inaccessible, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes it is so complex, but we necessarily resort to the broader issue, missing the fine details. I don't know an occasion in this House when an estimate had actually been altered in a fundamental way. I know that the last occasion was our great Westminster protest in the year 1919, when a second bathroom for the Lord Chancellor was at this point excised from the budget.

But since that time, and in this Legislature, there has not been a noticeable alteration of the materials which are given to us. Behind every estimate debate is the resonance of many sleeping dogs, Mr. Speaker, whose activities we cannot discern or have access to.

Indeed, animal husbandry is not a bad analogy, Mr. Speaker. We are so enmeshed and ill-informed that we cannot get at the contents. The procedures themselves fail to grip the subject matter. I am reminded of a little limerick that I came across and I quote what is wrong with Parliament:

The bits and the reins are very well looked after and the stable door is double locked but no one looks inside. You praise the firm restraint with which they work. I am with you there, of course, they use the snaffle and the curb all right, but where is the bloody horse?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the "bloody horse," has escaped through the cavernous gap provided by that charade behind which Ministers and deputy Ministers, sitting as lackeys and sycophants in front of them, go through the various estimate procedures.

And the financial affairs of this province fall into the breach. Whether we will see the redemption of television by virtue of the

performances of the Provincial Treasurer is something that only time will tell.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this House has largely lost control over the expenditures of money, and one can think of few other rationales which could justify a legislative assembly—that, too, is worthy of total restructuring. There is little meeting of minds on issues and that includes the question of bills. Indeed there are many bodies that wonder whether the government, as a government, should continue to try to legislate at all; whether there should not be some kind of devolution of power, which vests a great deal more strength in those who ultimately make the decisions, which at least would be a more legitimate way of running the government.

The vote on most bills, on all bills, is predictable; the divisions are predictable; a good whip knows what lies in store on any issue; the persuasive arguments are seldom trotted out any longer because who is one persuading? They are not levelled at their opponents. A few eccentrics continue to revel in the world of ideas but mostly one talks to the public. I suppose that is why we are going to have television debate, so that one can get over the masquerade and communicate directly with those whom one hopes to impress.

Finally then, to the demagogic process to influence the electorate deeply. Olis pointed this out in his book and suggested that it would be simpler and certainly more economical if a flock of tame sheep kept conveniently at hand were guided through division lobbies, then appropriate numbers have an agreed time. And that view, I may say, is concurred in by less spectacular observers of the various legislative scenes, among them McKenzie and Bulmer-Thomas.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, this is what has happened. If I may revert to Richard Crossman, the good British Labour Party political analyst, the executive and the Legislature, the government and the Parliament, are a constitutional façade; in reality, the party alone exercises power, and the dictates of this Legislature are put by the Conservative Party, modestly supported by the Cabinet—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: —and laid down in an enviable pattern, Mr. Speaker, by the Prime Minister himself.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the Prime Minister exercises considerable power indeed, a kind of constitutional dictatorship. The Prime Minister of this Legislature is not loath to exercise that power; he supports Churchillian doctrine—"all I wanted was compliance in my wishes after reasonable discussion"—and that is basically the motto under which the current Prime Minister exercises power.

He leaves his impression on all government policy; he whips his Cabinet into line; he removes some of them retroactively when it is required—the first essential of the Prime Minister is to be a good butcher—I think that was a Gladstone comment in the days of yore; and I think this Prime Minister, as charming and ingenious as he is on occasion, has recognized that there is a hierarchy in the parliamentary system in the province of Ontario, and it consists of the Tory Party with a Cabinet shakily at the top, presided over by the Prime Minister himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to put it to you that it is no accident that there is much disenchantment abroad when one looks at the way in which this Legislature approaches its functions. Perhaps I can add, two very brief asides to all of this, because I think they need to be said. Quite apart from deterioration of the role and participation and usefulness of the contribution the government permits members to make, this could be a most excellent Legislature if the government would permit certain areas to be exploited and expanded. And let no one be concerned about its possibility, only the limitations under the present regime.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are some forces even beyond the government's control, and they must be alluded to in any reflection on the nature of the legislative process. The civil servant, of course, dictates more of what occasions the interests of this House, than do the members or the Cabinet Ministers themselves.

We all submit to that happy technocracy; we give in. We submit in a supine way; I suppose there are no other responses to the technocracy. And, of course, the decisions which are made, as other members have pointed out, by corporate institutions based outside this Legislature, with inanimate resources, but governing, none the less, the animated behaviour of people all over this province.

And more and more, the Legislature becomes an obedient echo, Mr. Speaker, to the designs of others. Let us have no self-deception here. Any Cabinet Minister who

thinks that he acts with independent power and autonomy in the face of many of the corporate decisions, is acting in total self-delusion. The Minister of Mines above all.

If Texas Gulf Sulphur says to the Minister of Mines, "I will not build, or we will not build our smelter," the Minister of Mines salutes, bows and scrapes, humbles himself, prostrates himself, occupies an obsequious posture and runs snivelling off to the Cabinet room.

Well, the fact of the matter is—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I don't prostrate myself before anyone! The hon. member's hypothesis is completely wrong.

Mr. Lewis: Well, if that is the hypothesis, I would hate to hear the conclusion. Only, Mr. Speaker, by placing pretty fierce limits on all these incidental forces, and I think we will come to that as the Legislature continues through the rest of this session, only by placing pretty fierce limits—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Why does he not ask his colleagues in the NDP about their conflict of interest?

Mr. Lewis: No, no, I do not want to. Can the Minister of Mines subside for just a moment into his usual tranquility, sir, and I will continue. Mr. Speaker, I look round me and I take pride in what I see. I even take pride in what I do not see. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has about it certain elements of poignancy; the Cabinet acting as a dreary chorus to handle the continuity between the decisions imposed from outside. Until this Cabinet stops its complicity in accepting outside dictation on the Legislature on bill after bill, on policy after policy, on issue after issue, by even one of the examples such as the one which I gave, then of course we will have no useful parliamentary function again under Tory aegis. But those days have their withering away like other states do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the alienation itself in the body politic about the behaviour of government and about the abuse of the Legislature by government, expresses itself in alternative routes. Some say—I do not—that the Legislature itself is a withering process. I would think that the Legislature might conceivably be rejuvenated, but not when the individual members of the House, in Opposition and government, are subject to such gross indignity and such obvious inequality as they are on a variety of fronts; not so long as debate is structured and regi-

mented; not so long as forces from outside dictate the context of this Legislature.

I am not suggesting a Guy Fawkes solution, but I am suggesting a pretty radical overhaul. And it is a real challenge to penetrate the cynicism of this government, Mr. Speaker, and the apathy of this government. I want to suggest to you that it can be done. The Minister of Mines is a great devotee of Winnie the Pooh and A. A. Milne, and I want to read a little quote from A. A. Milne:

Here is Edward Bear coming downstairs now, bump, bump, bump on the back of his head behind Christopher Robin. It is, as far as he knows the only way of coming downstairs, but sometimes he feels there really is another way, if only he could stop bumping for a moment and think of it. And then he feels that perhaps there is not another way.

Now the purpose, Mr. Speaker, is to suggest that there are other ways, that it is inherent in a parliamentary apparatus run by a Tory party, that they are in collusion with it, they are defeated by it. Not a conscious plot, it is just a willingness to watch the assembly emasculated and trifled with by forces which they do not appear to wish to resist.

There is the ultimate authority, if I may be forgiven an excess of quotations, of Bernard Crick, who wrote his little study on the reform of Parliament, and said in the process:

But governments have grown to feel that they are neither representative, nor in any real sense themselves members of Parliament, but simply remote and all-powerful trustees for the electorate, only answerable to anyone at general elections. Indicative of the Tory party, the prejudice grows that proceedings in Parliament are a waste of ministerial time.

There are a great many Ministers who treat this Legislature with considerable indifference.

It is this prejudice which has to be met. Party leaders talk of Parliamentary reform only when they face the facts of life as an Opposition. The ministerial mind is not much moved by demonstrations that there is public disquiet with Parliament. For the ministry shares this view, indeed is in part responsible for it.

And the critiques continues.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, to wind it up, reflecting soberly, one learns the limitations of this assembly and one deals with them, but as on all issues of social policy, so on Parliamentary policy it becomes necessary to deal with them by bringing the government down. There

seems no other conceivable alternative. And then it is necessary to reconstitute the Parliamentary protest. And if you will, a totally radical overhaul, some of which I have alluded to this afternoon.

The reforms have to be sweeping, not just in terms of times on speeches, and rules and a few of the obeisances to efficiency in administration, but root and branch so you destroy the endemic power structures which in their terms undermine the Parliamentary process. And then you make Parliament a flamboyant vehicle, Mr. Speaker, for the democratic process and for the exercise of that process, rather than an encrusted kind of forum to be used and abused at whim by the servants in the Treasury Board, servants of dubious power.

And in this caucus, Mr. Speaker, we see that reassertion of the legislative autonomy of private members. Of the dignity which might be afforded the nature of debates, of the re-analysis of those things which are relevant, rather than the preoccupation with those things which are irrelevant, by a return to things which are substantial and qualitatively important rather than constantly denegrating that which is of significance.

I notice, because I think it is the appropriate way to end, Mr. Speaker, the quote from de Tocqueville:

It is both necessary and desirable that the government of a democratic people should be both active and powerful, and our object should not be to render it weak, or indolent, but solely to prevent it from abusing its aptitude and strength.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining this Throne Debate. I would like to take a moment to say that having watched the Speaker handle ministerial statements I feel that, at long last, the Opposition has been getting very fair treatment. I commend the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker on the way that the affairs of this House are running, and I feel that we in the Opposition—although we may not always feel that way—we are happy to have the Speaker and Deputy Speaker that we do have.

Before embarking on the main part of my speech, I want to begin on a personal, and perhaps a very sensitive note. However, this is something that has to be said, and, for reasons which will emerge as I make this remark, I am in a unique position in this House to make it. I refer to the criteria by which Queen's Counsel are appointed. Traditionally, the title QC is recognized by the public as a reward for service to profession and com-

munity, and a recognition of skill in the calling.

Service to community is underlined by the mandate of the electorate, when a lawyer also holds public office. I am proud to have the provincial welfare of some 60,000 constituents in my trust. I like to think that I serve the people of Etobicoke, in my own way and at my own level, as well as Edward Brooke serves in the U.S. Senate, as well as Ralph Bunche served in the United Nations and as well as Lincoln Alexander serves in our own House of Commons.

I am glad to see that the Smith Committee has recommended the abolition of the poll tax, and that the government has acted upon this recommendation. I am glad that literacy and property ownership do not give the advantage to some that they once did in the franchise. In fact, the electors are perhaps more fairly dealt with today than those in whom they have placed their trust. Often as I sit here in this House and hear the talk about the people of northern Ontario, the Indians, the Franco-Ontarians, sooner or later someone asks: "What do these people want?" That question, Mr. Speaker, is the cry of bigotry and ignorance. It is a question asked out of a vacuum and into the void. The very act of asking the question marks the man who asks it.

In asking for fairness and equity in the apportionment of recognition and honour, I hope that these few words will mark the end of the age of the subtle silence, the covert rejection. I know the Premier to be a fair-minded man, and I am sorry he is not in his seat at this moment, Mr. Speaker, and I end this heartfelt paragraph with my own question to him: What are the rules of the game?

You know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) quite often refers to "the rules of the game". We sit here and we sometimes see different rules applied at different times to different circumstances. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, just what are the rules of the game when this Cabinet meets and discussion takes place as to who shall be and who shall not be appointed as a QC? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, are these rules changed from time to time to keep some member of the Cabinet, or some other member of this House, happy?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Such as whom?

Mr. Braithwaite: I bring this matter up only—the Minister will get his chance—Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter up only because I feel that it is something that has

to be said. I hope I do not have to refer to it again.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Detail it now.

Mr. Braithwaite: The Minister will have his opportunity to speak later.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Who is the member talking about?

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, we have heard wide-ranging and high-flown topics in the Throne debate this year, but I want to bring the debate right back to earth and localize it in Etobicoke—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is chicken. That is just chicken.

Mr. Braithwaite: —because I believe this particular debate should serve the purpose of a member constituency.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This is absentee member's day.

Mr. Braithwaite: It is too bad we do not have the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) here. He might have a few quotations on these interruptions. He might be able to pinpoint the reason for them.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Why can the hon. member not pinpoint the reasons himself?

Mr. Braithwaite: In bringing to the attention of the government some of the matters which are engaging—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Who is the member talking about?

Mr. Braithwaite: —a member's electors as they go about their daily business in this increasingly complex world.

One of the things I am going to talk about is solid waste disposal, and why we can no longer allow this to go unplanned. I am particularly critical of sanitary landfill projects. In my view, Metro garbage should be burnt and the steam sold; the latest apparatus should be installed for this purpose all over the greater Metro area—equipment should be purchased that will not pollute the air, because the stack gases will be scrubbed and filtered of fly-ash and noxious components.

Garbage disposal methods should be moved into the 21st century, and I am convinced that, more than anything, this represents an attitude of mind on the part of the people who must make these decisions. I am told that the whole tone of the garbage disposal

approach centres on the personal views of Ross Clark, Metro commissioner of public works, and that he is against incineration. However, we cannot allow matters to rest like this. Mr. Speaker, let me take the members of this House back a couple of years to the beginning of the present crisis—and crisis, let me assure the House, is not too strong a word for the landfill chaos we now face.

The long hot summer of 1967 has come and gone, and Metropolitan Toronto has won its case at the Ontario Municipal Board, and is now proceeding to dump garbage in the north of Etobicoke and in southern Vaughan township and is laying up trouble for the future.

It is worthwhile reviewing the history of what may well become a nightmare in the future, Mr. Speaker. Metro notified Vaughan township on October 27, 1966, that it was making an application under the provisions of Bill 81 to use the 150-acre Thackeray site and a small portion of north Rexdale in the vicinity of Steeles Avenue, for land-fill operations. Originally, there was no objection to this proposal from Vaughan, even though the land had a high potential value, due to its proximity to Etobicoke. However, Metro then requested that 600 acres immediately north—known as the North Thackeray site—be incorporated in the request, and Vaughan township objected. I might add, I appeared before the OMB on July 24, 1967, during its hearings, to object on behalf of the constituents whom I represent in this Legislature.

My objections were concerned with considerations of traffic, pollution, expansion, displacement of homeowners, pollution of water resources at the headwaters of the Humber, destruction of recreation areas, the proximity of the proposed site to residential Etobicoke and to Woodbridge and the availability of alternative sites or techniques of garbage disposal.

But the case of Metro found favour in the eyes of the Ontario Municipal Board because of the urgent need for more dumping areas and so disposal trucks are now rumbling along Albion road and up Kipling avenue, creating a serious hazard for children in Etobicoke in the daytime, distressing noise, and dust all around the clock. When the summer of 1969 rolls around, there will be added the problem of odour.

Mr. Speaker, a major hazard in all this is that of methane gas seepage. This is a real danger since the gas is odourless and heavier than air, and seeps into basements where it

forms pools of explosive gas as it mixes with air. The result is an explosion, often claimed to be of unknown origin, or mistakenly blamed on natural gas. In fact, the gas already causing trouble is the product of earlier attempts to bury garbage and cover up the traces. Methane is the will-o'-the-wisp gas, the jack-o'-lantern gas, and it moves mysteriously in the ground.

What is about to compound the problem is the proposal to build several high-rise apartments, five or six units, 5,000 suites in all, housing some ten to fifteen thousand people, within a year or so on 100 acres which lie east of Kipling, north of Finch, south of Steeles, and directly south of where the dumping is now taking place. This proposal was approved at the Etobicoke council meeting of Monday, February 24, 1969.

Now I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to these plans, as I feel these units will be of assistance in easing the desperate housing shortage we have here in Metro. Yet the experience of the events at Edenbridge drive in Etobicoke ought to be enough to give pause to all who are contemplating amplifying this nuisance and danger connected with methane gas, as Metro continues to do. At the Edenbridge site, none of the three municipal authorities involved can decide what to do about the gas problem, although engineers say the problem of continuing gas generation underground could last for 100 years.

The Metro Toronto and Region Conservation Authority has refused to pay the costs of getting rid of the gas. They own the site, but say they did not do the dumping or create the problem. The Metro parks department, as agent for the authority, shares this view. Etobicoke says: We sold the conservation authority the site for a dollar, and with that goes all the liabilities as well as the benefits. The big liability, of course, is that Etobicoke dumped its garbage on the site some ten years ago. So who is responsible?

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that the methane travels underground mainly in winter under the frozen layer of ground which effectively seals off all escape holes. It seeks out underground hollows and porous ground in attempting to reach the atmosphere and often the most effective ducts are service trenches of all kinds, carrying pipes, cables, conduits, and what have you. Branches of these conduits run to neighbourhood basements, carrying water, gas, electricity, telephone service, even cable television, and carrying away waste water and sewage.

Mr. William Swan, Etobicoke's borough engineer, by continuous testing and other means, is trying to minimize the danger, but, under these conditions, it is very much present and very real. For example, in the basement of one Anthony Abela, of 236 Edenbridge drive in Etobicoke, the saturation level of methane stood at 30 per cent on Wednesday, February 5, 1969. The house was one of the many built in the immediate vicinity of the landfill development located at Edenbridge and Scarlett road, in Etobicoke.

Meanwhile, this winter, as every winter, work crews are drilling escape holes so that the gas may vent through the frozen topsoil. In 1963, the construction of a \$20,000 gas interceptor trench was authorized by the Etobicoke works committee and by the board of control. However, it was turned down by full council, which had referred the matter already to the conservation authority.

The authority advised the council that it had no funds for the project and that the gas was generated by Etobicoke's garbage. It limited its liability to an offer to donate easements for an interceptor trench. Metro parks department washed its hands of the whole mess. Then Etobicoke went to both bodies calling for a subsidy for the interceptor trench construction, and there the matter, Mr. Speaker, today sits, unresolved.

The procedural wrangle is stymied, but the gas is still being generated, relentlessly, and so it will be with the much graver problem that will arise on the new land fill site unless action is taken in advance of construction. The plan must recognize the reality of the situation.

And this brings me to my point, the point of my raising this matter here in the Legislature—this is a problem for regional government, and for inter-regional planning, and it underlines the Liberal approach to the problems of regional government in the areas immediately surrounding Metropolitan Toronto, which we are holding up to view as a special case.

This is the reason why our municipal affairs critic, the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good), in outlining the Liberal caucus position on regional government in his statement of Thursday, February 6, made quite clear our desire for a supra-regional, or joint planning authority for the special area from Oakville to Lake Simcoe to Cobourg.

Incidentally, it is useful to compare the Minister's statements on regional government, both inside the Legislature and, increasingly,

and with increasing exasperation, outside this House; with the Liberal position and the NDP position.

It is an interesting evening's homework, and it demonstrates that the Liberals are the only ones who have thought regional government right through to its detailed implications in matters such as garbage disposal. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to look at the Minister's statement on garbage disposal and ask him how it would work in the specific case I am outlining now.

He could not possibly have an answer at this stage, and that, surely, is the test. It demonstrates the unreality of his force-feeding in the absence of a master plan for Ontario. He cracks the whip, but the cart is empty.

Whenever I look at the Humber, that once-clear river where children used to swim and one could go fishing, two things come to mind. A plan for Ontario and fully thought-through regional government would have kept the Humber pure. And the second thought that comes to mind is that seepage from this large dump at the head waters of the Humber will pollute it even worse, if we continue to bury garbage rather than burn it.

We have to move eastward, to the Don Valley Parkway, on the east side, just before the Don Mills Road interchange, to see what so-called sanitary landfill is really like. A century from now, the earth there will stop bubbling.

Engineers say it will be over 500 years before all the gas pockets are out of the earth, which at the moment has the texture of an Aero chocolate bar. Inspecting that particular site in October, 1966, the late controller Herbert Orloff and city streets commissioner Harold Atyeo expressed themselves as disgusted with the way the sanitary landfill operation was working out in practice, and put forward a strong plea that all garbage be burned.

However, as of January 1, 1967, Metro took over responsibility for garbage disposal, and the "expansion of incineration" idea died, as so many good ideas die at Queen and Bay. Mr. Atyeo's comment that allowing sanitary landfill is like allowing a city-dweller to build a privy in his backyard, has more force today than ever.

We are setting up these communal privies with their methane gas, rather than incinerating garbage, and we are making a great deal of trouble for ourselves. At the moment, Toronto burns garbage at four sites: Don Valley, Wellington Street, Commissioners

Street and Symes Road. This approach must now become total, and the latest model incinerators must be used, so that all ash and noxious gases are scrubbed out of the exhaust.

It can be done, Mr. Speaker. Forest Hill operates an incinerator with a water-wash smoke filtration process right in the middle of a residential area, and there are no complaints, after eleven years of continuous operation.

The impression one gains is that Metro works commissioner Ross Clark had his mind set against incineration and blocked all attempts to employ this method, rather than landfill. If this is not so, I apologize to the gentleman, but that is the general impression I get in talking at length to people about why this approach was never pushed with vigour at Metro.

Meanwhile, out in Scarborough, a works crew makes its morning coffee on a flame from a methane gas seepage!

Mr. Speaker, let me look back again briefly to that infamous Ontario municipal board decision of two years ago. I predicted the traffic problem of the Steeles and Kipling landfill site and my forecast of massive congestion is coming true. I predicted the increased pollution of the Humber River, and this, too, is happening. I speculated on the loss of recreation lands close by Metro high-density areas, and this has been borne out.

I commented on the great potential loss for development purposes of rolling ravine type lots, and now Vaughan township recognizes that it has, indeed lost valuable assessment to Metro, for which it has not been adequately compensated.

I protested the removal of some twenty families by expropriation of their homes, and I painted a picture of the typical homeowner at the Thackeray site, who had fled the noise of Metro for the peace of what was formerly a haven.

As he looked out on the river, the woods, the farmland, the wildlife, he wondered about the mentality of Metro officials who would erase all this beauty to make room for a garbage dump. I remember, Mr. Speaker, saying: "It is wanton destruction, and I sincerely hope this board will not allow it to occur".

But, in its wisdom, the Ontario municipal board did allow it to occur, which leaves us where we are today, with garbage beginning to pile up, and the summer ahead. The underground water and the proximity of the river will cause the production of methane gas on a scale quite unlike anything we have

seen in this end of Metro, and at least as bad as the Don Valley Parkway situation.

In the summer, the gas will bubble up and be dispersed in the atmosphere, but in the winter it will creep underground towards the new construction and homes south of Steeles Ave. in Etobicoke that the *Globe and Mail* has so proudly announced only this week. And there we will be, with a neatly-predicted hazard all built in.

Do we ever walk into these things with our eyes open! At least, some of us have our eyes open. It is a pity that others are so shortsighted when it comes to the future. They certainly need guidance about the consequences of their actions. We have only one atmosphere protecting us on this earth from all the hostile elements of the universe. We are poisoning it. We have only so much renewable water. We are getting to the point where we are polluting it faster than the sun can recycle it. We are killing ourselves off, Mr. Speaker.

And so I want to join the swelling chorus of my colleagues who are calling for widespread pollution control of air and water, and a consolidation of all effort under one Minister, at the same time as the government brings forward a master plan for Ontario.

Pollution is no respecter of boundaries, nor does it recognize tiers of jurisdiction. We have to have similar flexibility in the way we deal with the problem. It makes me sick to see the Ministers on the government benches passing the buck from one to another while the situation worsens. This cannot go on. Time is running out on us.

Now let me turn to another aspect of human welfare, which I think the government, through the Ontario Housing Corporation, ought to be doing more about. I refer to the provision of space and accommodation for thrift stores, manned by volunteers, in public housing projects. In the case of the Thistleton development, I think that we should now be considering thrift stores and other social services in the context of a balanced community.

Thistleton has over-reached itself, and the provision of human amenities has not kept pace with the raw provision of shelter. Now we have to turn shelter into community. We must work toward total integration so that no one need be ashamed to live in an Ontario Housing development.

Let me tell you first of the Rexdale experience with a thrift store, and then go on

to tie this in to the larger picture of the greater Rexdale community.

It took the churches and other interested groups almost a year to obtain permission from Ontario Housing for the setting up of a thrift store in Braeburn Woods in the Braeburn Woods housing development in Rexdale.

They are able to use what was the caretaker's hallway, and a very, very, small utility room for a thrift store, which is now open.

I am told by the Rev. Bruce Roberts and Mr. Reynolds, and other members of the Rexdale ecumenical social action group that the Braeburn Woods thrift store is a huge success, although the quarters are very cramped.

The service rendered has been of particular use to the residents of the housing project of Braeburn Woods. People are flocking there. It is open one day a week.

Material is supplied by churches, interested groups, and housing agencies. Most of it is used clothing and shoes. It is sorted and the various items are sold very reasonably. For example, a pair of pants might go for 25c.

All proceeds are used to purchase new children's underclothing, which is either sold or given away in needy cases. It should be pointed out that because of the shortage of space, no adult clothing can be handled, although there is a definite need for good, used, adult clothing within the programme.

Now how does this activity fit into the larger community picture? Assuming that the noise from the airport is going to increase in North Rexdale, it is possible that the existing 279 HOME lots will remain unsold. I want to use this land to develop the North Rexdale area into a true community, not just a housing site.

This land on the west side of Martingrove Road and Thistleton, which the *Telegram* tells us will be withdrawn from the HOME market, can now be used to give vital living room. The OHA is always saying: "We have the space in our public housing for shelter, but we do not have the space for social facilities."

Well, now they have the space, since the potential noise has made the area undesirable for residence, but not untenable as a place to enrich life with nursing centres, properly-insulated community halls, facilities for social services and the like.

The social need is so great in North Rexdale that social workers do not advertise their

facilities. They let people find out. Let's dilute this high-density housing pressure by ventilating actual shelter with social facilities and service centres to fulfil human needs.

This brings me back to the thrift store concept, and in particular the enterprise of Rexdale ecumenical social action. I want Ontario Housing to donate one house in the Thistle-town development as a thrift store and warehouse for this deserving group, which does not give clothing away, but which sells it for a nominal amount, so that people's pride is not bruised by charity.

The real need is right in the Thistle-town project and there is no reason why we could not set up a store there given OHA co-operation in the matter of accommodation.

Of course, I do not want the services to stop with the thrift store concept, valuable though this is. Just having to pay a small amount for an item does a great deal for a person's pride and self-respect. No value is attached to outright gifts, but great value can accrue where this symbolic sharing takes place. And of course, the money goes to purchase baby things and other necessities.

There is no profit and no overhead in a thrift store. But there are other services, too, that might be accommodated in a settlement house of the kind I have in mind. I am thinking particularly of budget counselling, showing people how to stay out of the clutches of the finance companies, help in coping with their new environment, family counselling, children's aid workers, and so on.

This elementary instruction is still very much needed on an individual basis in Thistle-town in particular.

I think, too, we might lick the hole-and-corner approach to welfare information by being straightforward about what is available to indigent and needy persons. This is best done by individual counselling in conditions of privacy. The approach ought to be: you have the need. What can we do to help you?

I want to bring up the question of stoves and refrigerators, and their availability in low-income housing. People who move out of apartments into row housing find that these necessities are missing. Because this kind of move is nearly always made in a climate of crisis or emergency, the lack of stove and 'fridge can be serious and traumatic, particularly if it is a week-end evening move and the family has young children.

Now there is a depot where the OHA keeps these things, but they will not say where it is. There is an extraordinary run-around which the unfortunate people are subject to. It's

apparently all part of the cat-and-mouse game that some welfare types get a kick out of in their dealings with other human beings. It's a kind of sadism, I suppose, kicking the underdog, giving him a hard time.

In this vein, some bureaucrat has devised this circuitous scheme. First, the intended recipient of a stove and 'fridge has to go to the Salvation Army or to some other service organization which then tells him to send a letter to the member of the Legislature. The member must then write to the Ontario Housing, who will eventually write back, saying they will provide a stove and 'fridge, renting them for a dollar a month each.

About twice a month I get letters from people who have had to move in quickly, sometimes on Saturday to take advantage of a vacancy in public housing, and who have found on arrival in row housing from an apartment that they have neither stove nor 'fridge.

They have children. They have nowhere to cook a meal. They have to go down to the St. Vincent de Paul Society or some other kind person and borrow a hotplate. It's all terribly degrading, and what it does for the self-respect of those involved is hard to imagine.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pause for a moment here and read into the record a few letters from some of these unfortunate people to make my point. The first letter I have is from a man on Orpington Crescent. In part he says:

I have just moved into the above address which is owned by Ontario Housing. These units are not equipped with any appliances. I have got a stove and washer which was very difficult for me as I am on welfare.

I borrowed a refrigerator from a friend. The difficulty with this appliance is that the freezer space was not made for meat. I have to buy my meat daily and this is a most expensive way to buy. I would therefore like to know if it is possible for Ontario Housing to supply this one appliance that I so desperately need?

And another letter, Mr. Speaker:

I am writing in regard to a fridge. We are unable to get one. It takes all the money my husband makes to pay the rent, hydro, some food, and very little clothes.

His take-home pay is approximately \$105 to \$110 a week. We pay \$143 a month for rent. It costs us about \$45 to \$50 a week for groceries and there is not that much. The fridge we have is years old. There is a small freezer in the middle. Any meat we might have usually starts to taste bad, or go bad in about three or four days.

I understand Ontario Housing has to supply one for a family—if they are unable to get one—for a dollar a month. Please answer and let me know.

This letter, Mr. Speaker, is from a lady on Mount Olive Drive in Rexdale.

My last letter, Mr. Speaker, is from a lady who lives on Jameson Crescent, right in the middle of the Thistle town project and she says:

Dear Sir:

I have just spoken to Father — and he told me to write to you and tell you that he told me to do so. I am in bad need of a fridge and electric range. My husband is not working and we are on welfare at the present and we have four children. I find it hard enough to keep enough food in the house, for now I am losing quite an amount since my fridge gave out.

My stove has one burner left working and no oven working, which means I cannot bake or make bread for my family anymore.

We had a man in to see how much it would cost to get them both working and he said it would cost quite an amount and that they were both too old and worn out to bother being fixed and we don't have any money to pay to get them fixed.

So father told me to write to you and you would be able to get me a fridge and stove. I pray to God that you can help us for I don't know of anyone else to turn to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I make is, why should the member have to involve himself in this circuitous way of doing things? Why should the member become a party to dragging people down from dignity to abject supplication? Why does the government allow this to happen? I will tell you why—it does not care.

The settlement centre approach would mean there would be someone on duty round the clock and the stove and fridge would be forthcoming without all this fuss. Better still, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why they just could not simply supply a stove and fridge for this row of houses just the same as an apartment or any apartment rented these days is supplied.

My file is full of individual cases. Some of them are heartrending. Most of them show just how soulless bureaucracy can be. As with the thrift store, on which I have met with the Minister several times, nothing has been done to lift the people up. I am told that these matters are passed down the line by the

Minister of Trade and Development, and by his deputy, until they reach a level in the hierarchy where the public servant can legitimately turn round and say: "In this matter I do not have the authority to act."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the final refinement in the buck-passing technique of which this government is master.

I cannot end without pointing out the need for balanced growth, and the relating of available school capacity to the provision of new shelter. Co-ordination between different levels of government is essential here. The Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) must know what is going on, his architects must be aware. All of which brings us back to that basic Liberal plank—a plan for Ontario. It is missing, and, Mr. Speaker, do we feel it!

Ontario needs a Nixon government now. We might have to wait until 1971, but as sure as I am standing here, we will have one.

Now, let me say a few words on the subject of rent control. My remarks conform with the statements of my leader, made on November 22, 1968, on the subject.

The government's bungling of the basic shelter exemption has resulted in large and unwarranted rent increases in the private sector, whenever the vacancy rate has dropped to about 1.5 per cent of accommodation, and it is clear that there are local urban areas in Ontario where a free market in housing no longer exists. True, this may only be a temporary phenomenon. Yet it is heartening to note that newspaper advertisements are inducing tenants to sign up for certain luxury—and I emphasize that, Mr. Speaker—apartment developments by offering a month's free rent and other blandishments, so it is clear that the supply of luxury apartments, at least, has pushed the market to its limit and therefore prices could be backtracking somewhat.

However, there are still areas in Metro, and Etobicoke is one of them, where more modest types of apartments are yielding returns to their owners of a magnitude that suggest the famine is not over. In other words, Mr. Speaker, some landlords are gouging their tenants. This continuing crisis has occurred through the present government's failure to provide serviced land in a planned fashion; adequate rapid transit to relieve "close-in" urban pressures; a proper balance of industrial and residential growth; and sufficient subsidized housing in the proper density and dispersion, through OHA.

And so the middle income groups are forced to raise families in apartments while yearning for detached homes of their own

and the way of life that home ownership will bring. At the same time, recent increases have forced hundreds to move around, looking for still cheaper accommodation than that they have recently occupied.

In these exceptional, and I re-emphasize, government-created, circumstances, the time has come for a rent control statute which will allow those municipalities where the local conditions demand it, to constitute rent control boards for a limited period of time and subject to the regular renewal of the over-riding statute by the Legislature. These boards must have the power to take measures appropriate to their areas of jurisdiction. In this way, local initiative, know-how and ingenuity will be applied to the pressing urgency of putting a roof over people's heads.

You know, Mr. Speaker, tenants should have some place to go for help, some place to get back their security deposits. There should be no need for tenants' strikes, as we have right here in Metro now.

Once more it is appropriate to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that rent control applied in Ontario until 1953, when the housing emergency was considered over. Thanks to Conservative maladministration, we are once more in such an emergency.

However, in the Liberal view, rent control is a temporary palliative to a crisis created by the Robarts government. If it must remain in operation for an extended period, it will be a constant condemnation of the failure of Conservative policies in the shelter field—a constant goad to destroy the complacency that still insists that all is well.

Will the government settle for less? We shall see. It is clear that this issue can no longer be avoided, as we enter the 17th month of the final mandate of the Robarts administration.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that in the first session, when I was first elected, and for several years after, I remember distinctly when the member for Grey-Bruce and others on this side, would twit the government. The government would be so secure. They would laugh and say, "There is not a chance, nothing to worry about."

But you know, the odd time, Mr. Speaker, we find that the member for Grey-Bruce, in particular, lands one of his haymakers. I notice that the government does not laugh so loud: I notice that there is quiet over there sometimes. I truly believe that they have come to fear some of these questions that the member for Grey-Bruce, and the member for

Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) and others have been asking.

In my view, Mr. Speaker—there is no need for us here to trumpet it—this government is going to fall and it is going to fall of its own volition. It is going to fall because of its own sins of omission—not by anything that it has done, but by what it has not done. I am not going to go into all of the various things that I feel this government should do and ought to have done.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Go ahead.

Mr. Braithwaite: I will let the hon. member do that.

But what I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that it will not be long. I do not care if the government calls a snap election in 1969, or a snap election in 1970. It does not matter who gets into the hockey finals. It does not matter a darn who wins the Grey cup.

In 1971, if the election is called, Robert Nixon will be the next Premier of this province. We will be sitting on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question please?

Mr. Braithwaite: The debate is over. The Minister will have his opportunity.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It is in relation to the hon. member's charges of discrimination—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please!

The hon. member has indicated he will not permit a question.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well then on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I hope I am mistaken, but it appeared to me that there was an innuendo or an impression, deliberately left by the hon. member, in relation to the appointment of Queen's Counsel in the New Year's list and that, somehow or other, the appointment of QCs on that New Year's list, sir, bears some relation to discrimination in respect of one's colour or one's race. I would like to have the hon. member document this, Mr. Speaker, one way or the other, or to indicate to me that I am wrong in my impression of what he indicated.

Mr. Speaker: I must say, that as far as I can determine there is no point of order. Actually, the hon. member who was speaking made certain remarks which were his opinions, his views of the situation.

I do not see that there is any point of order. It was simply his opinion.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: With all due respect, sir. I am a member of the executive council of the province of Ontario and this is a serious matter.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): The Minister does not act it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am a member of the executive council which approved certain names, sir, at the beginning of this year for the appointment, within its discretion, of certain people within this province to be Queen's Counsel and to hold that title thereafter.

Within my ears this afternoon it appeared to me that a member of this House attempted to leave the impression that certain factors relating to one's race and one's colour came in into discussion relating to those matters. I am asking the hon. member right now if this was the intent of his remark, because, sir, it bears very much on my own feelings and my own reputation.

Mr. Speaker: Well it seems to me that for this properly to be a point of order, something must be out of order. Now—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If this reflects upon one's own integrity and one's own reputation, sir, it affects me and I have certainly the right to bring that before this House as a matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the hon. Minister, with great respect, simply rose on what he called a point of order—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: A point of privilege, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw that innuendo.

An hon. member: No!

Mr. Speaker: I just say that I did not happen to be in the Chair when the alleged remark was made and, even though I was not in the Chair, the allegation made by the hon. Minister did not seem to me to be a point of order.

Now, if the hon. member made any such allegation to which the hon. Minister has taken offence, perhaps he would like to comment upon it at this time. I take it that the hon. Minister is rising on a point of personal privilege?

An hon. member: One or the other.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member for Etobicoke care to comment upon—

An hon. member: No!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The hon. member's actions today are despicable!

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, *Hansard* will record what I have said.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I think the records will indicate what the hon. member said in the absence of myself. At the moment I am not in a real position to indicate what he did say, therefore if there is some point of privilege, it may be raised again, I would think, another time.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker I rise with pleasure at the opportunity to speak on the Throne debate today. I commend you, Mr. Speaker, and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker on the manner in which you administer your responsibilities.

I would agree that you have treated all 117 members in a fair, just manner. I would also like to commend the Speaker for providing much better facilities for the page boys, for this is long overdue, and I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) on his appointment. What his position is, is one of question.

The people of this province, as well as the government, know that they are in a financial nightmare, travelling to many countries, trying to raise enough money to keep their heads above water. For surely, this government is sinking.

Mr. Speaker, some nine months ago, questions were raised by myself and other members on this side of the House as to what position and action were to be taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) as to the question of ownership of the lake shores and the right of access to the beaches in the Welland South riding.

The Minister's replies are noted on page 4721 in the Legislature debate of June 19, 1968, and I quote:

The departmental study of between the 1400 and 1500 township plots and some 76 townships fronting the Great Lakes had been completed. A legal opinion is presently being prepared by our department on the extent of the beachland in these townships which may be in public ownership. The wording used in the grants from the Crown for these lots varies in terminology. And may I say that some of these grants are quite old; some are over 100 years old and they vary considerably.

Approximately 40 per cent of the lots were granted by reference to the lot concessions only and about 25 per cent were granted on the basis of description of land, including the lot and concession number, but in addition, they described the exterior boundary of lots as along such line as the water's edge, the lake, the shore, the bank, and the high water mark in the front. The remaining 35 per cent of the lots were described by various combinations of the above.

Until this date, Mr. Speaker, nothing has come forth on the decision of the government itself, as to what action is being taken. The arrangements are now being made, sir, to have a hearing of a court case before Osgoode Hall. As a layman, I would presume that the application is similar to a quit claim deed. And that the province would be relinquishing all the rights or claims to the property involved.

I know that Mr. T. Laine from The Attorney General's Department is gathering all possible information from area residents of Bertie township to show proof that the area residents used the lakeshore and beaches previous to the American ownership of the property and control of the lake. This is not a new problem for it has existed some 24 years, and beyond that, perhaps when many properties along the lake were first sold in the early 1900's to the Americans.

Many of the lakefront property owners have tried in many conceivable ways to obtain possession and control of the beaches along the shore of Lake Erie. Application before the court today still remains the same as of the past with Walker, Stockton, Stockton and Letenworth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report this on the record. This goes back to 1945, and pertains to a bylaw in the county of Welland—bylaw number 1538, a bylaw to confirm bylaw No. 1385, 1944, the corporation of the township of Bertie passed October 18, 1944, for stopping a part of the road allowance and highway as described in the said bylaw:

A bylaw number 1385 in the municipal corporation of Bertie township passed by the said township on the 18th of October, providing the stopping up of that part of road allowance and highway between lots 16 and 17, broken front concession, Lake Erie in the said township, and more particularly described as set out in the said bylaw, a duplicate of the original of which is hereunto annexed. And the same is hereby confirmed and enacted this 18th day of January, 1945 by the warden of the county of that time, Mr. I. E. Michener, in the county of Welland.

This brings up the same question today as to what action today that is going to be taking place at this court hearing. The reason of the closing of this road at that time, Mr. Speaker, was that the Americans, the property owners of that area at that time, had built houses upon a road allowance; even at that time they had tried to obtain possession of every access to the lakes. The council at that time became aware of such a situation and made an agreement with the property owners of that time that they would deed that part of the road allowance to them for the part of land they owned next to it. That conveyance of land, the transfer of land—even at that time they tried to obtain ownership.

I have a letter here from residents in the township of Bertie, and this again is one of the questions that the staff of the Attorney General is enquiring about throughout the area. It is asking for help to fight the case before the courts. And it is as follows:

Mr. Haggerty, M.P.P., R.R. 1, Sherston, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Haggerty:

In reply to your request regarding Lake Erie beach information of the past years, I can recall about 1905 when the farmers took their sheep out to the lake to clean the wool before shearing them, and the cattle out to water them during the dry weather.

Before houses were built along the lake front the township roads were supposed to have access to the lakes and rivers. Many years, I have teamed gravel and sand for houses being built along the lakefront, and in the park and our own homes. I have cleaned driftwood, seaweed, algae for years. I have ploughed beaches, levelled sand, and cut down small poplar trees and brush that had grown wild for the American people. Later they put up fences on the beach, and even out in the water several feet to keep people off the beaches in front of their houses, which was torn down by others on many occasions.

I think what the writer is trying to inform me is that in many cases fences have been put up; signs have been put up and they have been removed for the past 50 years.

I teamed for the Furry Company at Erie Beach when they built their big dock, hauling sand and gravel almost 60 years ago. About 50 years ago, I worked for Mr. Dan Good when he built his dock to the left of the Crescent Road, hauling gravel again to the big dock. Later, three or four

teams were hauling gravel for their own use about 55 years ago, from the Rosehill area which we were arrested for hauling gravel at the time. Mr. Hersey was reeve of Bertie. As "private beach" was painted on one of the many big stones in the area, we settled out of court for a fine of \$7.00 each.

About 15 years ago when I worked for the former lawyer, Mr. Flynn, on the lake-front at Crescent, he told me that the Crescent Beach association got the best lawyer in Canada to do their legal work in securing water lots and deeds.

And I might confirm this. I have been told on many occasions that there are certain lawyers in that vicinity of Bertie township that have all the power and connections to get anything they want from this government.

Fences were put up by someone blocking off the Crescent Road entrance to the lake, causing a lot of trouble and inconvenience a few years ago, stopping me from working on the beach. Guards or police have patrolled the lake front for years to keep people off the beaches. Whoever pay them I do not know. Things have surely changed in the last 40 years, as Americans want to take over everything beyond their own lot, and surely receive help from someone in authority of our country.

Sincerely yours,

Albert Bonner.

And one would raise the question today, why this certain group of people are taking such a court action? Perhaps it is for greed, perhaps it is for concern, and perhaps there is a possibility of a quarter mile, or a half mile of beach that is public land. And I go back to September 1964, and this is always known in my area as the Battle of Ridgeway and the Beaches.

Ridgeway: In the face of strong protest from ratepayers, Bertie township council last night tabled for a further study of a by-law authorizing sale of another unopened road allowance in return for 100 feet of beach adjoining another 66 foot public beach.

The controversial proposal which would deed the Central Avenue road allowance running down to Lake Erie to three United States residents with summer homes in the area has been the subject of recurrent protests, picketing, and hot exchanges in council since it was first suggested by council early in July. The three property owners have agreed to pay full costs of expropriat-

ing 100 feet of beach adjoining the Bernard Road allowance. Three petitions presented to council last night listed nearly 1,200 names of Bertie township residents who protested the sale of Central Avenue.

The most forceful opposition, however, was the submission of a Welland solicitor, S. S. MacInnes, QC, who argued that far from trading 66 feet of inaccessible beach for 100 feet of beach readily available, the by-law, in fact, robbed the township residents of over 2,000 feet of public beach. Mr. MacInnes appeared on behalf of three property owners whose land adjoined Central Avenue and who claimed that their lands would be adversely affected by the sale of the road allowance, and on behalf of several ratepayers associations.

The search of deeds. The solicitor explained that the search of the original Crown patents granted for lot 16, 240 acres east of Central Avenue in 1798, and for lot 17, 330 acres west of Central Avenue in 1802, showed that the measurements were taken from the Crown surveyed post. He told council that he had discussed this with the surveyor general, and others who agreed that the only logical place for the survey post was the edge of vegetation or high water mark.

A further Crown patent granted in 1891 gave John McLeod the water rights for the west half of lot 17, Mr. MacInnes pointed out, leaving all the beach, some 2,040 feet of it, as Crown land.

Mr. MacInnes agreed with Councillor Wilfred Cook when he noted that the law had ruled that for Lake Erie, the wording "banks and shores" referred to the actual water's edge. He went on to explain that in this case no reference was made to a bank or shore, but only to a Crown survey post.

Mr. MacInnes said that in view of the fact that over 2,000 feet of public beach existed at the end of Central Avenue, it was not surprising that the three property owners were prepared to write almost a blank cheque to get the road allowance closed for all time. The solicitor suggested to the council that in view of this information, they would be justified in withdrawing their by-laws.

"Ratepayers do not become disturbed unnecessarily," he said. "It would be almost impossible to replace this amount of beach," he added.

And as I have said, Mr. Speaker, the same property owners some 20 years ago, and again

today, are still trying to obtain ownership of the beach rights to this area.

The *Welland Tribune* of February 19, 1969, supports Bertie on the beach issue. Welland county council has thrown its support behind Bertie township in protest of transfer of lakefront property. The township is protesting the transferral of any Lake Erie beach property from Crown lands to private ownership, through quit claim deeds.

When one questions the methods of the department that is handling this matter, one can only go back to the Niagara River and some of the early deeds of that time—the early settlers from Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Dutch United Empire Loyalists first settled in this area.

The deeds at that time of the Niagara River only went to the bank of the river. Sixty-six feet was left open for a military road. We come to the question of the old fort at Fort Erie, which has been an old fort for a number of years, one of the original French forts in this area. We find that along the lakeshore, and maps will tell you that there is a road there. What the road is I do not know, but I can tell you that in many cases sitting on local council, Bertie township, we have had solicitors come in to our council meetings, and ask council to give a quit claim deed to this land along this lakeshore.

Now, there must be some question of ownership, whether the municipality owns it or the Crown owns it, when many lawyers and solicitors would come in for their clients and ask for a quit claim deed because there is a question of a road.

Back in the early stages of Crystal Beach, when it was first incorporated as a village and as a park, going back to the horse and buggy days and the trains, the trains used to travel from Buffalo to the area of Point Albino. From there, they used to be transferred by bus down the Point Albino road and along the shores of Lake Erie to Crystal Beach. We can go back further than this—I do not have the attention of the Minister of Lands and Forests yet; I hope I am getting through to him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister of Lands and Forests, did the member say?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes. Many years ago, there used to be a grist mill built upon the shores of Lake Erie within this vicinity of Central Avenue where farmers at that time years ago used to travel the lakeshore by horseback,

by horse and buggy, to take their grain to have it ground for flour. There is still a landmark there yet from this old windmill. So once again I bring to the attention of this House that this was public land; for years ago settlers used to travel this lake shore, it was the only way they could travel because there were no roads in the area.

There was some question about the Crystal Beach company when they built their amusement park, I understand there is supposed to be a tunnel underneath there that is supposed to be kept open for the purpose of the public, a thoroughfare for the public to have use and access to the lakefront.

Now, this government for 24 years has sat idle. This question has been raised, protests have taken place in the past four or five years, protests to bring to the attention of this government that action is needed now.

For if this land is ever lost, precedent will be set that all the land along the lakeshore will go to a certain few property owners along the shore. And in many cases these are Americans. This land is part of our Canadian heritage and some place along the line we, as members of this House, must decide to say that this is Crown land, that this is public land.

The Act was repealed in 1951 because of the pressure on the government from certain riparian property owners and interests and because of the difficulties of surveying in certain instances. But the appeal and definition of the high-water mark, which existed from 1940 to 1951, is removed completely, and there is a return to The Beds of Navigable Waters Act.

Resumption for the purpose of the administration is that the riparian rights of lots extends to the property boundary to the water. The Department of Lands and Forests on many occasions would like to assume that the high-water mark, which has been established under the departmental survey instructions, is a permanent immovable boundary. Again, the question is, upon whose instructions? Whose instructions?

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a very important matter to me, not only to me but Canadians here today, to our Canadian heritage. And I plead to the Minister of Lands and Forests, to the Prime Minister of this province, let us get this matter settled, let us put it back into Crown land and let us give it back to the public where it belongs.

An hon. member: What is the member doing about it?

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see I do raise some interest from the NDP party over here. I have been carrying on this battle for a number of years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Haggerty: Just a minute now. You know I was born and raised on a farm and one of the first things my dad told me was: "Son, I am going to buy you an animal, a donkey. I want you to look after this animal. Take the very best care of it. Every day I want you to go out to take care of this animal, feed it, water it and clean the stable out. Son, this is only a donkey, this is an animal, but it has human values too. Whatever you do, make sure that that barn door is closed at night."

So one night I was not paying attention, just like the member is here right now and I left the barn door open. The next day I walked out to the barn and the donkey was gone.

Sure enough, we went out looking for the donkey and we found it down the road. It had been hit by an automobile. It was too sad the animal was dead, but my father said, "Son, let that be a lesson to you; that animal, that donkey, or that jackass, is going to haunt you the rest of your life." And sure enough he is sitting over there right now.

But to go back to this matter of beaches, I have sat on local councils for the last ten or 12 years—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): We can still hear him braying; they are still braying over there.

Mr. Haggerty: That is right. I have sat on councils the last 10 or 12 years and I have fought this battle at that level.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): That is socialism, watch out.

Mr. Haggerty: I have never seen an NDP nor anybody else come into this picture until they thought they were on the gravy train and this is what you are hoping for.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Haggerty: Well, Mr. Speaker, now that we have got off that subject, it is my

duty to pick up the loose ends that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) has left hanging all over the province in the matter of regional government implementation.

To begin at the beginning, the Minister has not defined regional government; it seems to be all things to all men, and to mean something different to each person with whom I talk. For some it is a vast type of government, for others a neat way of consolidating local districts into a two tier arrangement something like our present counties with a little different name. In between, all the shades of opinion into what regional government should be and no guidance at all from Queen's Park to shed some light on the darkness. Consequently a lot of money is going to be wasted in just getting to first base.

In a sense Welland county is a regional government already appropriate to its functions and I think that those who wish to change and enlarge it have the duty to demonstrate to the people of the area just to what advantage further consolidation might be. When the Minister takes the initiative, as he did coming down to Niagara-on-the-Lake and laying down the law, then it is incumbent upon him to spell out all the details of what an essential and an alternative proposal to one that is already in existence and working. The incumbent administration had the mandate of the people and this gives them the advantage over all challengers who must prove to the people that they can do better. What the Minister is doing is not offering any kind of proof that his enlarged domain will be workable and efficient. Rather he is waving his big stick. This not good enough.

Quite frankly, Welland is not Metro Toronto and we can afford to move with less haste than might be the case of the big city. Niagara Falls, Welland, Port Colborne and Welland county, already share certain services and one could see the trend toward larger units of administration. For example, the homes for the aged, the children's aid society, the hospitals, the suburban roads, the county roads, Brock University, the county health unit, and the adult centre for retarded children, mutual fire aid services, welfare and the conservation authority. This seems to work well and most of my constituents do not want change just for the sake of change.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs' principles of reorganization are by no means consistent

with the thinking of the Minister of Education, who on April 3, 1968, on page 1599 of *Hansard*, said with regard to the Mayo report proposal for regional boards of education for the entire peninsula:

When you look at the Mayo report, it does not talk about one county, it talks about a Metro board with almost absolute control of finance, determining the educational programme of the two counties. Of the two counties. Surely what we are suggesting is more responsive to the needs of the people in that part of the province of Ontario, than the recommendations of the Mayo report. I do not think that there is any question about it, Mr. Speaker.

Sure, some of the situations continue to exist in boroughs. They have certain responsibilities, but the fiscal or financial control lies, as I read the report at least, in the hands of the Metro board. This control of both counties involves education situations as well, and I think that the approach that we are taking—and I say this most sincerely with respect to the Niagara Peninsula—really is more responsive to the needs of the people within those communities. It is not perfect, I can see that, but I think, Mr. Speaker, it probably will serve the needs better than the recommendations of the Mayo committee report.

What the Minister is saying is that a region must justify its own size and function in terms of citizens involved in the special circumstances of obtaining the particular locality.

Now let me read from the *Globe and Mail* on August 8, 1968, in view of the very interesting person, someone who was pushed around by the land consolidation plans of the Minister of Trade and Development, acting in isolation from the report that was being prepared for the Kitchener-Waterloo area. No wonder this gentleman threw up his hands and went back to teaching at Kingston for the balance of the academic year. I refer, of course, to Doctor Fyfe. Here is what the *Globe and Mail* says:

Kingston: Another important voice has been added to the chorus of academics and planners who disapprove of the suggestions on regional government made by the Ontario committee on taxation.

"The reasons they give in the Smith report for regional government are pretty flimsy," Stewart Fyfe said yesterday, following a hearing of the Legislature's select committee that is studying the report.

Mr. Fyfe is a professor at Queens University local government institute and has been appointed by the province as the commissioner of the Waterloo area local government review. His report is expected this fall.

Certainly there should be enlargement in municipal areas, Mr. Fyfe said. But it

should be done for different reasons than those expressed in the Smith report and should be done according to a different set of criteria. The report says that the Smith committee found it necessary to consider regional government for four reasons, most of which dealt with financial problems. They were that regional government:

1. Would provide a more efficient system of raising tax revenue;
2. Is the only means by which equitable tax treatment can be ensured;
3. Would give municipalities greater scope in developing non-property sources of tax revenue;
4. Is at the heart of the debate over municipal reforms, which it calls "the greatest ferment, both practical and theoretical, in the recent history of local government in Ontario."

Mr. Fyfe's immediate reply to the initial question on regional government was: "What is regional government?"

His reaction was similar to that of a large number of academics, including Norman Pearson, chairman of the Centre for Resources Development at Guelph University.

In a variety of speeches since the publication of the report last fall, Mr. Pearson has condemned both it and the government for failing to define what is meant by regional government.

Today, the Minister has not defined that. Under The Municipal Act, cities can pass annual by-laws to keep from payment of taxes those taxpayers who are now benefiting from inter-city services—for example in recently annexed fringes without enjoyment of those services. The Minister has been silent on the division of similar benefits to the rural taxpayers coming under regional government. Are we going to end up paying for city skating rinks and municipal bowling alleys and whatever use there is of them?

There are many questions that arise here, Mr. Speaker. In the counties of Lincoln and Welland, the cities of Niagara Falls, Port Colborne, Welland, and St. Catharines, the debenture debt is some \$80 million. One could almost say, accepting this report of the Minister's, are we going to saddle the smaller municipalities with city debts?

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): No.

Mr. Haggerty: Who said that? Oh—this is the first reply we got from the member for St. Catharines.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: You are away out in left field.

Mr. Haggerty: Away out in left field, eh? He was just telling me the other day—he said regional government will work but you have to give it 15 or 20 years and then it will even things out.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: It will serve everybody better.

Mr. Haggerty: In 15 or 20 years everybody will be in the poorhouse on welfare.

Mr. Haggerty moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, February 27, 1969
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Presenting reports, Mr. MacNaughton and Mr. Welch	1611
Sixth report, standing private bills committee	1611
Committee on French-language schools, statement by Mr. Davis	1611
Toronto committee on school construction, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	1611
Ontario savings office, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Nixon	1612
Kelvinator Canada Ltd., questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Nixon and Mr. MacDonald ...	1613
Education administrative centres, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. MacDonald	1613
Pelee Island transportation, questions to Mr. Gomme, Mr. MacDonald	1613
Welding shop facilities at Brampton, statement by Mr. Grossman	1614
Kelvinator Canada Ltd., question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Stokes	1615
Tenants' organizations, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Stokes	1615
Children with emotional and mental disorders, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Burr ...	1615
Sale and distribution of hearing aids, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Trotter	1615
Gas pricing in Ontario, question to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Martel	1616
Credit unions and housing, question to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Peacock	1616
Sexual deviation, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis	1616
Tax on services, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Pilkey	1617
Smith committee report, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Pilkey	1617
Recall of General Motors cars, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Young	1617
Ford layoffs in Windsor, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Pilkey	1617
Saltfleet sewage and water facilities, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Deans	1618
HOME programme, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Jackson	1618
Peche Island auction, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Burr	1619
Exclusion of press from Hamilton trial, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Lawlor ...	1619
QEW construction in Saltfleet, questions to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Deans	1619
New Lakehead city, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Knight	1619
Constitution debate, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	1622
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	1649
Recess, 6 o'clock	1649

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have as our guests, in the Speaker's gallery, members of the Windsor-Walkerville Liberal Ladies Association from Windsor. In the east gallery, again from Windsor, are students from Bellewood public school and from Prince of Wales public school in Hamilton; in the west gallery, are students from King Edward public school, Toronto, and in both galleries, students from Applewood Heights secondary school in Cooksville.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) presented the 19th annual report of the Ontario Racing Commission.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) presented the following reports:

1. The 1968 annual report of The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Public Records and Archives.

2. The annual report of the office of the Registrar General for the year ending December 31, 1968.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East) from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's sixth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported:

Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): **Mr. Speaker,** I indicated some weeks ago to the members of the House that when we received the report of the committee on French-language schools in the province I would make it available to all members. It might be somewhat relevant for some of the discussions this afternoon and evening.

This committee was named in November 1967, **Mr. Speaker,** and its first task was to

prepare legislation for the establishment of French-language secondary schools. Similar legislation was also prepared for French-language elementary schools. The members will recall that it was in the latter part of May last year that I presented this legislation and it was approved by this House on July 3.

I think, **Mr. Speaker,** one can clearly state that the legislation presented then and referred to in this report, perhaps provides some example for other jurisdictions as it relates to this particular situation.

Since last spring, the committee has been considering other matters such as courses of study, teacher training, educational television, financing and structures at the departmental, regional and local levels. These subjects are discussed in this final report as is the legislation itself.

In the weeks to come, **Mr. Speaker,** I would hope that all members in the House would have some observations to make on these particular recommendations, which are presently under study by the department. I should also like to take this opportunity to express, on behalf of the government and all members, our appreciation to the committee, which did such an outstanding job in the preparation of this report.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): **Mr. Speaker,** I have a question of the Minister of Education. What plans does The Department of Education have to put the findings of the special Toronto committee on school construction into application across Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: **Mr. Speaker,** the SEF programme, as I guess it is called, was brought about really with some co-operation from The Department of Education. The Department has made a financial contribution to this study, and the officials of the department have been in constant touch with those responsible.

Mr. Nixon: A minimal contribution!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, it all depends on what the leader of the Opposition means by minimal, it was not—

Mr. Nixon: In the estimates last year, it did not amount to much.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was not as much as those contributed, I believe, by the Ford foundation or the experimental laboratories in New York, but nonetheless it was a contribution from the government. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we made a contribution. I shall leave it up to the leader of the Opposition to determine whether it was relevant, significant or not. And, Mr. Speaker, the officials of the department, as I say, are in very close touch with the Metropolitan Toronto school board group who are working with this, and as the results come in from the actual practical implementation of this we shall assess these to see if they can have some province-wide application.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he believes, since Metro Toronto has estimated it will save the cost of one full \$4 million school in the application of its plans, that it would have immediate application for what we want to do across the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to provide the member with a copy of the report if he has not read it. It obviously, I think, relates to the number of schools being built in any geographical location, and the availability of the components. It is a modular type of construction as I am sure he is well aware.

I will leave it for him to assess whether there should not be some practical, should we say, application here in the Metro area to see whether it can be done before isolated school construction begins in other areas of the province. If it can, we are delighted. But at the same time, I think he must realize there has to be a certain amount of further information before this can be determined.

Mr. Nixon: I might just point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have had a policy of wait and see in this matter for some years.

Mr. Speaker: Order! order!

Mr. Nixon: To the Minister of Revenue: Are there any compelling reasons why the Queen's Park branch of the Ontario savings office cannot open at an earlier time on

government pay days? How many additional staff members are required in that branch for the operation to be run at maximum efficiency? To what extent are Ontario savings office branches in Metropolitan Toronto understaffed at present? How many additional employees were hired following the last job recruitment programme by the Ontario savings office in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): The reasons, and my hon. friend can tell me whether they are compelling or not, are that in the interest of maximizing efficiency and economy, in this as in other branches of government, we have established a staff limit which provides good service nearly all of the time. Of course, we can increase the level of service by engaging more people but I question if the additional cost warrants this change, having in mind that a rush comes on for very short periods during the day, and more particularly, a couple of days a month.

In assessing this, Mr. Speaker, we have to attempt to maximize the efficiency, not only internally so far as the branch is concerned, but externally, so far as lost time for other civil servants is concerned. If I thought that the external diseconomies exceeded the internal economies, I would be very glad to consider an increase of the staff of that branch, but I have no reason at the moment to think so.

Mr. Nixon: I find that compelling.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh yes. Now, point two: An increase of three or four employees would reduce these delays but it would not eliminate them because there does come this sudden surge for a very restricted time, and so there would be some delays even with an increase in staff. Point three: At the present time we are five under complement for all the Metropolitan Toronto branches. In answer to point four: None. Recruitment has been designed to fill vacancies as they develop. There have been three employees hired since the last newspaper advertisement on January 7, this year.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Minister would be prepared to answer this question as a supplementary question, but has he abandoned the thought that there might be a sub-branch opened in this building for the convenience of those working here?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I am most reluctant to do that although I recognize

that, having moved the branch across the street, there may be some slight inconvenience.

I myself over the years have simply written a cheque and given it to one of the attendants, or sent one of the pages for it. I expect Mr. Speaker would permit this practice to continue, so that the hon. members here would not be inconvenienced in any way. I think that would be a suitable solution if Mr. Speaker were to agree.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition has a further question from the other day of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Nixon: It was two days ago I guess. I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker, the following questions.

1. Will the Minister give further information on the part played by his department in assisting the relocation of the workers displaced by the closing of Kelvinator in London?

2. When did the Minister contact the London Manpower authorities with regard to the placement of Kelvinator employees?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party has a similar question for us; perhaps I can hear about them?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Yes, I have a question for the peregrinating Minister. The Minister stated yesterday that officers of his department have been in constant contact with the Canada Manpower Centre. What is his explanation of the statement of C. L. Wallbridge, in the *London Free Press*, February 25, that neither the Minister nor any member of his departmental staff has been in touch with the manpower centre during the past three weeks?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer for what the *London Free Press* has to say except to give you the facts as I have them. Officers of my department have been in touch with the manpower centre in London twice during the last three weeks. The first contact on the matter of Kelvinator Canada Ltd. was made on February 10, 1969. They were then informed that the manpower centre would register workers who would fill in the unemployment insurance forms.

On February 24, 1969, my department was informed by Mr. A. Bates, a centre official,

that work opportunities would be available to the displaced Kelvinator employees with certain companies expanding in the London area.

We were also informed on February 24, 1969, that Mr. R. E. Blois, an official of manpower consultative service, a branch of The Department of Manpower and Immigration, Ontario region, Toronto Dominion Centre, had made a proposal to the company and the union for the establishment of a joint manpower planning committee to develop a plan for the adjustment of employees.

He stated that the union had expressed their willingness to participate in such a programme, but the company as of that date had not given an answer. It seems that the statement of Mr. C. L. Wallbridge in the *London Free Press*, dated February 25, 1969, must be the result of some misunderstanding.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for York South have a further question of the Minister of Highways?

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Education:

1. Are the education administrative centres, planned for the Toronto area boroughs in this year's capital budget of the Metropolitan Toronto School Board, eligible for provincial grants?

2. If so, is the Minister taking any steps to prevent unnecessary duplication of costly facilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no grant payable on these administrative facilities.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has a question of February 20, of the Minister of Highways which has not been asked, with respect to Pelee Island and Hovercraft.

Mr. MacDonald: I think I asked that question.

Mr. Speaker: This was supplementary to the original question, I believe, which was answered. This was put in the next day, I believe.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, my question to the Minister of Highways. I am informed by municipal officials on Pelee Island that no feasibility study has been made by the federal government on the use of Hovercraft to meet the all-year transport needs of the island. The federal authorities have now indicated their

willingness to sit down with the province and discuss the whole problem. Two questions:

1. How does the Minister reconcile his earlier answer with this information?

2. Why is the province unwilling to sit down with the federal authorities and discuss the transportation needs of an island which is indisputably part of the province of Ontario?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, approximately two years ago, I spoke with the then Minister of Transport, Mr. J. W. Pickersgill, who advised me that officials of his department had considered the matter of Hovercraft generally, and in particular as a possible means of transportation to Pelee Island. My statement in the House on February 18 was based on that conversation.

The officials of The Ontario Department of Highways have investigated the possibility of utilizing this type of transportation generally and, when requested by the residents of Pelee Island, the feasibility of such a service between the mainland and the island.

We find, at least at its present state of development, the Hovercraft is not an economic solution to this particular transportation problem.

Question two is answered already.

In answer to the third question: We are, of course, willing at any time to discuss the technical aspects of transportation to Pelee Island with the federal authorities. But I point out for the information of the hon. member that the matter of subsidizing transportation to this island has been traditionally the responsibility of the government of Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: Like the Indians, you have sloughed it off.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Correctional Services has advised me that he has a statement which may also be an answer.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have an announcement which I am sure will be of interest to all hon. members.

Arrangements have been completed by The Department of Correctional Services, The Department of Education, and Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology, for part-time use by Sheridan College students of the vocational welding shop facilities at the Ontario Training Centre in Brampton.

This centre provides full time academic

and vocational training for young offenders in an open setting. On Monday, March 3, 1969, a number of Sheridan students will begin attending evening classes at the centre in phases of welding related to highway bridge construction. The actual title of the course is Highway Structure Erectors. This course has been set up by Sheridan College in co-operation with The Ontario Department of Labour and the Ontario Roadbuilders Association.

Mr. Speaker, while this particular project may, of itself, appear to be small, it has very wide and important implications. The multiple use of existing facilities is in keeping with the Ontario government's desire to assure the widest possible use of available facilities. Obviously such usage is in the interests of the taxpayer because it avoids costly duplication of facilities and additional expenditures for equipment. This type of programme also helps to expand community involvement with our correctional system.

It is hoped that, when enabling legislation is approved by the federal government, The Department of Correctional Services will be able to arrange for similar sharing of Sheridan College facilities by the young men from our training centre. As hon. members will recall, a pilot project was launched last September in which young men from the training centres attended classes at a local high school during the day and returned to the centre at night. We feel, sir, that these are progressive steps and would hope similar projects can be initiated in the near future at other institutions, where feasible.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister, by way of clarification. Would the Minister say why he is waiting for Ottawa to fund the reciprocity part of the programme by which the offenders will make use of the college's facilities?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we have not at present the legal right to permit these students out of our institutions. We have an arrangement presently whereby we can do it by agreement with the federal parole board. It is a clumsy arrangement and we have asked the federal government to provide for this in the new amendments to the Criminal Code presently before the House of Commons which, I understand, received second reading yesterday. Just as soon as it gets final approval and becomes law, that portion of our Correctional Services Act which applies to

this particular programme, will come into effect.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has two questions placed by the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey) to the Prime Minister. Perhaps he would ask them?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes.

1. Is the Prime Minister scheduled to meet with the mayor of London and other city officials regarding the Kelvinator layoff, and has the Prime Minister offered any provincial assistance to alleviate this situation?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I sent a wire to the mayor of London last week when I learned he had established a sub-committee of the city council to deal with this matter and together with the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), and the Minister of Revenue, I will be meeting with the mayor tomorrow afternoon. Of course we have not examined the problem yet so I am in no position to answer the second part of the question.

Mr. Stokes: The second question, Mr. Speaker, of the Prime Minister: Would the Prime Minister consider enacting legislation on behalf of tenants similar to The Labour Relations Act enabling tenants to be organized and certified and giving them bargaining powers?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, we have given no consideration to that particular line of action and we have no legislation in view that would accomplish the ends the hon. member mentions, although tenants are free to associate themselves if they so wish to deal with it, as long as they do not do it for some illegal purpose, and get themselves drawn into a conspiracy. They are completely free to band together to take what action they may wish as a group in regards to their landlords.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has a question of the Minister of Health, from the other day?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A question of the Minister of Health: Is the Minister giving favourable consideration to the request of the Windsor and Essex county council for exceptional children that modern facilities be provided locally for children with emotional and mental disorders?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are. This question was answered on February 4, Question No. 490.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale has a question of this Minister.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, as follows: Are regulations in effect to govern the sale and distribution of hearing aids? If not, why not? If not, when?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No. We ran into some legal difficulties, Mr. Speaker, and find that an amendment to the Act would be necessary. Rather than do that, the matter will be covered under The Health Protection Act, which will be presented to the Legislature at this session. The regulations will be ready and will then go into effect as soon as the bill gets Royal assent.

Mr. Trotter: May I ask a supplementary question? I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, why has it taken two and a half years? We were promised this about two and a half years ago.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the amendment was made a year ago but we found, as I stated, that we did not have the legal right to do what we had intended to do.

Mr. Speaker: I am advised that the ministry is now ready with answers to questions directed to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. There is a question from the member for Windsor West and one from the member for Sudbury East. Perhaps they would place them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague, the hon. Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the questions might be placed first. They have not been asked.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The Minister is not tuned in—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying hard.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Minister take his seat until the member asks the question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East might please place his question.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I do not have my question with me. It was so long in coming I just ignored to bring it down with me.

An hon. member: It was not important anyway, was it?

Mr. Martel: I thought it was.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: It was February 7; you can see why it was so long in arriving.

A question to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: At a meeting between the Minister's department and Superior Auto Association approximately two years ago, Superior Auto Association was told that within two weeks of the date of the meeting they would be advised as to whether or not an investigation in gas pricing in Ontario would be held. To date they have not been advised. Why the delay? Has a decision been made to hold an investigation into the pricing practices of the major oil companies?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that continuing dialogue has taken place and is taking place between The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs and any groups, such as Superior Auto Association, who have a vested interest in gasoline price and policies. Preliminary studies indicate that an investigation into present practices of major oil companies is not warranted at this time.

Mr. Martel: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would appreciate that I am not in a position to answer a supplementary question for the department involved.

Mr. Martel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Might I enquire of the Minister if he has also the answer to question 775? Perhaps the hon. member for Windsor West would then place his question?

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is: Will the Minister give consideration to amending The Ontario Credit Union Act in this session to permit the Ontario Credit Union League to sponsor and construct co-operative and limited-dividend housing, without awaiting the report of the select committee on company law?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the implications of a proposal parallel to that which has been suggested in the hon. member's question are currently being studied by The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs staff. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I am also informed, that existing legislation covers the contingency raised.

For this purpose, I would refer the hon. member to section 35(1)(b) of The Credit Unions Act which states, and I quote:

The funds of a credit union may be invested in any investment where such investment is approved by a resolution passed by a two-thirds majority of those present at a meeting of the members called for the purpose. But in no case shall a resolution under this clause affect more than ten per cent of the share capital and deposits of the credit union and in no case shall the aggregate of all investments of the credit union under this clause exceed 25 per cent of its share capital and deposits.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a question which has been directed to this Minister.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): For the Minister of Correctional Services, Mr. Speaker: In light of the Minister's answers to the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) about the laying of charges against men allegedly involved in homosexual activities in the correction system, is it the department's policy that treatment for sexual deviation consists of criminal prosecution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, "no". The hon. member is probably confused as to the source of the laying of the criminal charges in these cases. The charges were laid by the police and, of course, it is our duty to assure the appearance in court of the accused to face those charges.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate again to say, no, but for the same reason as I gave to the hon. member for High Park, I do not want to get involved in something which may be *sub judice*. There are certain—

Mr. MacDonald: Would you listen to the question?

Mr. Lewis: This is purely a matter of clarification, Mr. Speaker. May I ask it? The Minister can then choose to consider it if he wishes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has stated that he would not answer. So far as Mr. Speaker is concerned it can be asked.

Mr. Lewis: What I wanted to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, was whether the charge arose from incidents which occurred within

the Minister's correctional services institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Fine.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa has a question of the Treasurer which the member for Thunder Bay will place.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Does the Treasurer anticipate the inclusion in the retail sales tax, a tax on services, as reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* of February 25? Is the Treasurer aware of the position taken by the select committee on taxation: "We caution the Legislature against the wholesale adoption of the list provided in the Smith committee report"?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, my answer to part one of the question, in reply to the hon. member and indeed, to all members, is that his question and associated questions will be answered in this Legislature on March 4.

The answer to part two of the question is, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview has a question of the Minister of Transport.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): The question is this, Mr. Speaker, in three parts:

1. What were the specific defects which caused the recent recall of General Motors cars?

2. Is the Minister satisfied that all defective cars in Ontario will be recalled for checking?

3. Will the Minister call officials of General Motors before the standing committee on highways and transport to establish whether the defects were caused by faulty engineering, careless construction, or some other factor?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, General Motors service inspection programme announced yesterday, involved two groups of cars. The first group numbered about 135,000. These were vehicles equipped with a quadra-jet carburettor having a cam device that, on fracturing, could enable a displaced portion to jam the throttle barrel and hold the valve in a partly open position. There are two cases reported in Canada in which the cam device was found to be cracked.

The second group involved some 400,000 vehicles and related to the exhaust line assembly and mounting. In these cars, if the exhaust line had been moved substantially from its original design position or had deteriorated, it could affect a nearby body plug that, on failure, would permit the intraining of exhaust fumes into the vehicle body.

In reply to the second part: yes, I am satisfied that the procedures now being followed by General Motors Corporation in recalls is thorough and that endeavour will be made to reach every last vehicle owner in Ontario.

The answer to part three is: I think this is the prerogative of the chairman of the standing committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development on behalf of the member for Oshawa.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Minister aware that 350 Ford workers were laid off from the Windsor plant with an additional 450 workers to be laid off some time this year, and that the UAW has made representations to Ford Motor Company to have laid-off workers transferred to the Talbotville plant?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation at the Windsor plant of Ford Motor Company of Canada. The operations at this plant are being changed from the manufacture of transmissions and chassis to the production of engines. In the process, 322 workers were laidoff in November last year, and an additional 430 employees are due to be laidoff next month. Since some of the workers laidoff in November have already been recalled or placed elsewhere, there will be a total of about 700 workers on layoff by the end of March this year. About half of these 700 men will receive supplementary unemployment benefits under the collective agreement between the company and the United Auto Workers.

The company hopes that a majority of the laidoff workers will be recalled by the end of the year. In the meantime on the union's representations, the company is exploring possibilities of transferring the laidoff workers to its Talbotville plant. Canada Manpower Centre at Windsor is working closely with the company on the transfer, placement, relocation, retraining and other matters affecting the employees.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of this Minister?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Trade and Development: Have arrangements been made to provide sewage and water facilities for the Saltfleet Mountain Housing Development? If so, what are they? If not, when will they be completed and with whom?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, the land-use plan of our holdings in Saltfleet is well underway in co-operation with the township of Saltfleet, the township of Binbrook, the city of Hamilton and the county of Wentworth.

The provision of sewage and water facilities will depend upon agreements between the township of Saltfleet and the city of Hamilton. The proposed agreements are currently before the Hamilton board of control. As soon as these agreements are executed, Ontario Housing Corporation will then negotiate a subdivider's agreement with the municipalities involved.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question of this Minister from the other day?

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Trade and Development: When will the Minister answer the question regarding the HOME programme which I asked on December 9, 1968, *Hansard* page 461?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give the hon. member some information on this. I do not think it will be as much as I would like to give him but there are certain things that I cannot discuss at the present time.

However, in March, 1967, I was pleased to announce an extension to the HOME plan: the development of lots on a leasehold basis as a means of reducing downpayments for families in Ontario who wish to build their own homes. In answer to an enquiry I indicated it was our intention to assemble some 600,000 lots within one year.

In January last year, at the opening of a prefabricated HOME plan in Woodstock, I again repeated that the Ontario Housing Corporation had plans for putting some 6,000 HOME lots on the market in 30 communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Housing Corporation, I believe, is making good progress towards achieving this objective. By November 1968, as the member for Timis-

kaming has mentioned, 3,316 lots were offered to potential home owners and this figure increased to 3,374 at the year's end. During the same time land was developed to provide 5,896 housing units. Sale of these lots is to be announced as soon as details of final registrations, zoning changes and title transfers are completed. I anticipate this should take place over the next few months.

Land for an additional 8,000 dwelling units in municipalities is in the active planning stage and should be ready when it can be registered and serviced. This will mean that we are now operating in 36 municipalities and we are investigating in a further 14 communities. I believe our progress is very much in line with the plans as we announced them.

Mr. Speaker, I might add a word here about projections of the kind I have just made. Any members who are knowledgeable in land development will know that forecasting the actual time it takes to transform raw land into lots for sale is indeed a very difficult occupation. For example, the proposed expansion of the Toronto International Airport caused us to defer some developments pending clarification of matters pertaining to noise levels in that area. Other aspects of the development, such as negotiations of subdivision agreements with the municipalities concerned, planning considerations and even certain title matters, all may present intangible considerations. Although unforeseen originally, these may have the effect of postponing developments well beyond the anticipated completion date.

Whenever I have replied to a question concerning our future housing programme, I have done so in good faith and have endeavoured, to the best of my ability, to provide useful information for the hon. members. If, for unforeseen reasons, these forecasts do not meet our projections, I can assure the hon. members it is not for want of trying on the part of OHC or myself, it is always my intention to answer the members' questions as accurately as I can forecast with the information available at the time. However, OHC has no more privileges than any other developer. If a municipality or an individual interferes or delays their plans, we have to keep trying and dispose of these difficulties with, I hope, patience and understanding of the other man's position.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has a question of the Attorney General.

Mr. Burr: Will the Attorney General take whatever steps are necessary to protect the interests of the city of Windsor, the Windsor utilities commission, and those citizens who have had to place liens against the Sirrah Company which is now planning to put Peche Island up for auction in Detroit on May 27?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, all I know of this matter is what I have read in the newspapers, and it would appear to be entirely a civil matter. I know of no law or statute which would enable the Attorney General to interfere in such matters or take any part. The question indicates that liens have been filed against the property. If this is so the property could not be disposed of without disposition of those lien claims.

I would expect that, as I feel certain this is a civil matter, the parties will consult their own solicitors and obtain advice. It is not a field in which the Attorney General can, I think, interfere.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary question: Is there any danger that at this auction in New York an American purchaser or an American company might acquire the property without discharging the liens in full?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this verges very close to asking for legal opinion. While I am quite glad to do the best I can, I would suggest, of course, that the parties get legal advice from their own solicitors. If liens have been registered, as the question indicates, and the proper action is taken to follow them up and they are pursued to proof of the claim and to judgement, then whoever acquires the property would take it subject to those claims, properly proven and recorded. That is the protection for the individual.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary: Would the Minister mean at full value, necessarily?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I cannot guarantee that the property would be sufficient in any event to satisfy all the claims. No one could do that. It may be worth ten times the claims against it or it may be worth less than the amount.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Attorney General:

Can the Attorney General advise the House why the presiding judge excluded the press and radio media from a recent three-day hearing in Hamilton concerning five men

jointly charged with capital murder? Does such action by the presiding judge not interfere with the freedom of press media?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, section 451, subsection J, of the Criminal Code provides that a judge, or a justice, presiding at a preliminary enquiry, may exclude the public from the hearing if he feels it to be in the interests of justice to do so, or in the interests of the public. He may exclude the public and I would take it that includes the press. The question asks why. I do not know why; I have not discussed it with anyone concerned with the hearing. But I would take it that the justice decided that it was in the interests of the administration of justice and in the interest of the public in the particular function he was carrying out, and under that section he exercised his discretion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Deans: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Highways:

Have all the negotiations and/or expropriations been completed for accesses and overpasses presently being constructed on the Queen Elizabeth Way in Saltfleet?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the hon. member is referring to DHO contract 68-05, which covers that portion of the Queen Elizabeth Way between Lake Street east to the Glover Road. This contract is under way and all property acquisitions have been completed with the exception of 11, and negotiations are continuing with the owners of these properties.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur has a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Will the Minister reconsider the matter of a plebiscite on a proposed incorporation of a new Lakehead city, in view of the following recent developments: Unions representing over 6,000 men have passed resolutions requesting a vote. The mayor of Fort William, Ernest Reid, representing 49,000 citizens, has changed his earlier position and now demands a vote. The distinguished MP for Fort William, Hubert Badanai, has stated publicly he will ask the Premier to intercede on behalf of the people for a vote. Reeve Tom Tronson and his council of Neebing

have launched a hue and cry for a vote. Both Lakehead newspapers have demanded a vote, in editorials. A petition now being circulated has been signed by more than 10,000 Lakehead taxpayers requesting a vote.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The hon. member is not asking a question now. He is either stating a fact, if it is a fact, or it is a preamble.

Mr. Knight: I have said "the following", Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That is quite out of order. The Speaker was not in his office this morning unfortunately. He must take responsibility for it, but he was not there this morning, and consequently the whole of the question after the word "developments" is out of order. Now, if the hon. member wishes to place his question again and stop at the word "developments", then I would agree that the question is in order.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I find this extremely embarrassing. Perhaps I should make it a point of personal privilege. In due respect, I took the time to submit this question early enough today so that it would be checked by your office. It was returned to me with the idea that it was all right. And now my entire question, my manner of asking it, my purpose for asking it, has been completely—

Mr. Speaker: Undoubtedly, because the purpose in asking it and the question in its entirety is out of order, and unquestionably so. Therefore, the member's purpose has been frustrated—

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knight: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. leader and the hon. member will wait until I have finished, please. Actually, I have no fault to find with the members of my staff who passed this question through, because we have been in the habit of allowing these. I have now looked over the question, and I find that it becomes not a question, not a statement of fact, but a debate, an argument. Therefore, I would suggest that the only part of the question that is in order is as follows:

Will the Minister reconsider the matter of a plebiscite on the proposed incorporation of a new Lakehead city in view of recent developments?

If that were asked then I think there is no question that it is in order. Now, I will be glad to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition who has a point.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept your ruling. I would just draw to your attention that it is often the prerogative of government Ministers in giving background information that substantiates the importance of the question being asked.

I submit to you, sir, that the list of pieces of information that have been presented before us by the hon. member for Port Arthur now does just that and, in fact, would put the answer that is presented by the Minister in a context that is much more meaningful than the restrictions than you are placing on it.

Mr. Speaker: One of the unfortunate things, of course, as the hon. leader of the Opposition will realize, is once we depart from the written rules, which we have done in order to have this question period, then we are always in the position where neither the member asking the question, nor Mr. Speaker, knows whether the question as worded is in order or not and certainly the rules as laid down, the rules of the House, would not allow such a question. In my own personal opinion, the question would be sufficient leaving out "following" after the word "development."

The hon. member has now read all his question except the last three parts; I would think that any publicity which he wished to obtain he has now obtained, and I would think that—

Mr. Nixon: I do not think that is required.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the hon. member said that this was destroying his purpose and, if his purpose is to obtain information, then he asked the hon. Minister a question. It is the hon. Minister's prerogative then to answer the question, if that is all the question is for.

If the question is for some other purpose—whether I have misinterpreted it or not—then, of course, I could understand why it was so worded. If it is to obtain information, then it is a perfectly good question, it has been asked, and the Minister can reply.

Now I was about to say that he probably has obtained the purpose of his question, but since it did go through my office and since he has been able to ask the greater part of it, I would have no objection to the hon. member completing his question. But if so, and there are any outcries from the hon. member for Fort William, I would suspect that we might have another problem on our hands. I will leave that to the House when the time comes, because I

can see quotations here from the constituency of another hon. member; therefore, I anticipate we would have some difficulty.

Mr. Nixon: There are no rules.

Mr. Speaker: We have customs. We have customs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! We have customs which have broadened and in some cases supplanted our rules, and they work very well. Therefore, I would suggest that if the hon. member wishes to complete his question, he has the permission of the Chair to do so and I would ask that he be allowed to complete it.

Mr. Nixon: Well, with great respect, sir, if you will permit me on a point of order: I would submit to the Speaker, and as I say with great respect, that it is hardly incumbent upon him to comment on the motives that may be in the mind of the hon. member when he puts his question. I think surely it is incumbent upon us all to accept the fact that the question is put for information and I hope that we can proceed to that point soon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. leader is quite correct. I apologize and withdraw any remarks which I may have made that may seem offensive to the hon. member or his leader. I suspect, though, that the reaction would indicate that the ordinary person's reading of this would indicate that it was not a request for information or it would have stopped at the word "developments". That would have been my ruling if I had dealt with it carefully in view of the rules.

Now I have suggested that the House might have allowed the hon. member to proceed to read his question and then we will deal with what arises out of it in due course. Perhaps the hon. member would wish to go on. He had finished number four, I think, when the outcry arose.

Mr. Knight: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I accept the apology. We were up to number six, Mr. Speaker.

6. A petition now being circulated has been signed by more than 10,000 Lakehead taxpayers requesting a vote—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I will have to go on the record as objecting to this. This is where the business of this House breaks down; the member is

being permitted to do something when he is out of order, and if we are to conduct a question period in this fashion, I would suggest to you that we will destroy its effect.

Now here we are at half past three and we have spent ten or 15 minutes wrangling over a procedural matter when I think we all know what the rule and the custom is. If there is a question it should be asked and answered; speeches are not allowed during the putting of a question.

Mr. Nixon: Again, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

We are quite prepared on this side to abide by your ruling, which was that the question be truncated after the word "developments". I am sure my colleague from Port Arthur will accept that as long as the hon. Minister is prepared to give us a reasonable answer—a thoughtful, reasonable answer.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister, then, would take the question as ending at "developments" and answer it. The hon. member for Port Arthur has a point of order.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the point of order of the hon. Premier, I sat here and waited for almost an hour listening to questions from other members of this House; I did not complain about their questions. The other point, Mr. Speaker, is that you yourself had this question in hand for 45 minutes before I began reading it.

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately Mr. Speaker has other things to do, when he reaches the Chair and the House opens, than to check over the questions. I have already admitted that it was Mr. Speaker's difficulty today in not being in his office that caused this problem now instead of earlier, but I suspect that we would have had the same discussion in any event if I had ruled the question as out of order prior to its being put in the House. So it is just as well that it should have been dealt with on the floor of the House.

With respect to the hon. member's point of personal privilege—it was not a point of order—as to his waiting. He will realize, of course, that business in the House must be conducted in an orderly manner, and on Tuesdays and Thursdays I have been taking the course that we should ask them of the ministries in the order of seniority; it has worked very well. The hon. member happened to ask his question of one of the less senior members of the ministry, and therefore, he was obliged to wait until we reached that point in the proceedings.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister answered "no" as far as I can understand.

Mr. Lewis: What is the meaning of less senior?

Mr. Speaker: That is good parliamentary language; less senior in order of appointment. Has the hon. member for Fort William a point of order?

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): As all these questions were directed to Fort William, I would like to inform the member for Port Arthur that Port Arthur voted for amalgamation—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Jessiman: The Liberal associations voted for amalgamation—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will take his seat when the Speaker is on his feet. The hon. member for Fort William is quite out of order and I anticipated that this would arise from this.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, consideration of the propositions of the government of Ontario submitted to the continuing committee of officials on the Constitution as of December 1968, sessional paper number 83.

CONSTITUTION DEBATE

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this order was put on the order paper so that we might have an opportunity to discuss the events of two weeks ago, the last federal-provincial constitutional conference. In opening the debate, I would like to make what may prove to be some rather extended remarks about that conference.

The members will recall that it is the third constitutional conference of the last 18 months. In November 1967, we in Ontario were privileged to play host to the Premiers of the other provinces, together with some observers from the federal government, where we initiated this debate and discussion about constitutional matters in our country.

This was followed by a conference in February 1968, which in turn was followed by this conference of February 1969. The question most often asked me since those days of two weeks ago is,

in fact, what did we accomplish? I think if anyone expects us to rewrite the Constitution of this country in a relatively short time they are bound to have some feelings of disappointment at what was accomplished at this conference. On the other hand, if you look at it in the proper context and as the third in a series of conferences in which we are laying the groundwork for amendments should they be necessary—to our constitution, I think we can all take heart that we did have some really quite extensive success in this conference. It was another step towards the development of some new kind of federalism in Canada. I think the atmosphere that came out of the conference was good. The discussion took place in an atmosphere of desire for co-operation—certainly wide participation by everyone there—and the real difficulty, of course, when you start out to do such a thing as amending a constitution, is to find the means whereby you are going to do it.

We started a year ago in February in Ottawa from what might be termed a standing start, and certain mechanics were developed, which I will speak about as I go along, and this conference two weeks ago was nothing but a continuation of that process.

We might take a look at the machinery we have established during the last year. At the conference in February 1968, I would say the greatest accomplishment was that the conference took place and that there was an agreement among those present that the task which the conference set itself was meaningful and one that was accepted by all the participants.

The next thing we had to do at that meeting was, as I say, to devise the technical and mechanical means by which we would achieve our end. A continuing committee of officials on the Constitution was created and, of course, the first task that committee was given, when the leaders of the various governments broke up, was to devise a suitable method of tackling the whole question of constitutional review. After a good deal of discussion among themselves, those officials from all governments in Canada, and I came to the conclusion that the proposition method which I have mentioned before in this House would be perhaps a good place to start.

The propositions forming the basis of this debate this afternoon are those submitted by the government of Ontario to the continuing committee of officials. I can only repeat what I said here when I tabled those propositions:

They do not necessarily represent the government's position at this stage of the game when the debate and the dialogue are just commencing. It would be extremely difficult, I think, to take a firm position because inevitably our thoughts in connection with constitutional change are bound to be altered by the ideas and the arguments put forth by various other people who are participating in the conference and in the whole process. I think the idea of the proposition basically is to stimulate discussion, to get out on the table various matters that might be considered. Some, of course, will be of much more importance to certain people than others, but nonetheless they will stimulate discussion, they will stimulate free expression of views and ideas about those matters that might be changed either slightly or completely, or those matters in our present constitution that might simply be left alone.

So, as the propositions were received, the committee was able to take them as submitted. It divided them into groups so that they could carry on a general discussion on such topics as the object of a constitutional review, why we are conducting it; the objective of Confederation; what we are after in our federated system of government, and what are the basic principles of our confederation; what about the position of the official languages in Canada; what about the very important matter of fundamental human rights; the Constitution of the central government; the Constitution of the provincial government; there was some preliminary discussion concerning the judicial system and also that very important matter, the distribution of powers.

We as a government will have a good deal to say as time goes on on this subject. So, this was the point at which we had arrived just prior to the meeting two weeks ago. During the past year I would say very valuable groundwork was laid by that continuing committee of officials. The initial stage of what might be termed a broad analysis of the problem had been completed and we are now moving ahead into the areas that are going to require much deeper study, and a much greater examination in very fine detail. So, at this last conference and for the purpose of moving the whole process along, there were several committees of Ministers established, and I will deal with what has been referred to these as I go through my impressions of what we were able to do at this last conference.

I would point out to you that the estab-

lishment of the ministerial committee does not in any way detract from the function of the continuing committee of officials. Those men will continue their studies and the work they have begun. On the other hand, there was the feeling by some of the provincial leaders at any rate that we should not leave too much of this detailed work to non-elected officials. In other words, the actual work that is being done should be undertaken to the greatest possible degree by those who represent our people directly. We accept that point of view, we think there is a place for both, and I agree personally with the idea. I like the idea of the ministerial committees in order that we may have a close scrutiny on a continuing base. In other words, if we meet only once, twice or three times a year and receive reports only from officials, it does seem to me that we do not have the close contact we want with the development, or the ideas for change that are bound to be brought forward.

I might table the agenda, I do not know whether the agenda for this conference has ever been made an official document of this House.

From the agenda it will be seen just how complex some of these things are. It started with opening statements. I might say that it was suggested that in future conferences, we might dispose of those opening statements. I do not know whether I necessarily agree with that or not, it all depends how frequent are the meetings. If you are meeting with frequency, yes, I would say, dispose of them. If not, there is a time when one likes an opportunity to present the broad picture of what one is thinking.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry, I did not get that comment from the hon. member.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not entirely agree. You can see, Mr. Speaker, why we should have a debate. Obviously there is a wide range of opinion on how these conferences should be conducted.

In any event I would say this, if we are to meet with any degree of frequency I would dispense with the opening statement. I have gone to so many of these conferences. I remember days when the opening statements were supposed to be restricted and secret until delivered, and yet they all went out the back door on Sunday night if the conference opened on Monday. It became

pretty farcical. I must say that is precisely why I wanted the conference to be opened to television and the press and radio, because over the years, the control of the release of information has been one of the great games of federal-provincial conferences, which really had nothing to do with the conference itself—just one-upmanship at its worst, as far as I am concerned. If you move in the cameras, the press and the radio microphones, then you remove all necessity for this eternal desire to get one step ahead of your colleagues at the conference.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The Prime Minister might do that for the Legislature on a permanent basis.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not think we have much trouble, Mr. Speaker, on that subject in this House.

But in any event, I will not go through this, other than to mention just one or two other things. The objects of Confederation are basic principles; official languages; fundamental rights; distribution of powers including constitutional aspects, taxation and spending powers; reform of institutions linked with federalism—that includes the Supreme Court and the Senate; regional disparities, amending procedures and provisional arrangements; and mechanism of federal-provincial relationships.

When you read that list and you consider that this is a three-day conference, you can well understand that it became very, very difficult to do anything that might be termed meaningful as far as depth of approach to any one subject was concerned. That, I think, basically is the reason why the conference turned to the method of establishing ministerial committees to deal with these matters in some depth.

I have mentioned the fact that it was open to the public through television. I was very interested in the coverage we got and the people who were interested enough to watch and take some interest. After all, the people who watched on television are the people who are going to be ultimately affected by whatever we do or whatever we do not do, for our errors of commission or omission. I was delighted that so many people were interested and did watch what was going on and took advantage of the opportunity to make up their own minds as to what they think the direction of their country should be.

I think one of the interesting things in the days leading up to the conference was the obvious difference in approach of various

parts of the country. In certain parts of Canada it seemed the important item was such matters as linguistic rights, fundamental rights, the Bill of Rights, the formalities, perhaps, if I might put it that way, of our constitution. Other parts of the country wanted to deal with economic disparities and various economic matters.

Our approach as a province was simply that we had to discuss constitutional matters, linguistic matters, fiscal and monetary matters simultaneously, if we were ever to achieve the objective we were after. We take the position that it is impossible to separate these matters out and to deal with them individually and apart from one another. Basically, we must decide what Canada really means to us, what we want it to be. If we are to make changes, we must have an objective in mind as to what the result of the changes we make, will be.

I think we all agree that we are looking for a stronger Canada but the particulars of how that is to be brought about and what it is, in fact, to be is not exactly clear and I would suggest to the hon. members that there is a wide variance of opinion in our country and I think this was made obvious at this conference.

I would just say in regard to this, that despite the fact that there are so many conflicting points of view, the one course of action it seems to me that is not open to us is to do nothing. Even though it may appear difficult and even though we are unable to get agreement, that is no reason for us to overlook some of the difficulties in the country. We must respond to the tasks that lie ahead of us.

These are really our great national priorities today; where we are going fiscally and economically, linguistic rights across the country and constitutional change. These are the major national problems facing the country today and they must be faced and they must be treated and solved together, they cannot be separated and dealt with, apart from one another.

I think too we must recognize—and I think this also was borne out by the conference—that constitutional change is a matter that has to be dealt with in a very deliberate and thoughtful manner. You must be able to assess the ultimate effect of everything you do before you do it. It is not something you can rush into lightly because the side effects are many and varied and often not all completely thought about. It is not a question of simply tampering with our constitution, we must make changes that will

stand the tests of time. At the same time, while it is necessary to proceed with some deliberation, I would suggest the one thing we cannot do, is to take forever.

There are elements in our country that are looking for change, they are looking for redress from what they consider to be wrongs done them over the years. You just simply cannot temporize with that either and take an undue length of time to recognize, to meet and to cure these things.

Perhaps too, it is important that our people should understand that as we enter this second century of our life as a country, we are prepared, that the leaders of the governments, the leaders of the parties in the governments are prepared to meet these problems and take them on regardless of their difficulty.

I think we will need a very high degree of political skill and political sense, if we are to achieve our ends, because we are embarking upon the age-old political problem of squaring the circle or reconciling the irreconcilable points of view, and this, of course, does require a reasonably delicate touch.

We feel that such changes as we make may, very well be made and may be easier to make, particularly in the constitutional field, if we can do it against the background of security for our people. That is why we advocate that some of the immediate problems must be dealt with as well as some of the long-range problems.

I would suggest to the hon. members that a man who cannot get proper housing for his wife and his children has very little interest at this stage of the game in what might happen to the Supreme Court of Canada or what the representation in the Senate may be.

On the other hand, if we do meet the immediate problems that face our country, then against that background we will produce an atmosphere and a climate in which we will be able to attack these other very delicate questions and come up with the proper answers.

So, this is the approach that we took, Mr. Speaker, as a government. Some of these matters that are on the agenda were put there at our request. In the beginning we really were not going to discuss anything concerning taxation, spending powers, things of that nature, but we asked for it. Some other provinces did as well, of course. Thus we were able to deal with all these things together.

Now, what really are we after, to get at this objective? I think the basic question in its

most simple form is, "what kind of federalism do we want in this country. What kind of a federal system do we want?" This is the basic question to which we are addressing ourselves.

In commenting specifically on this point, I would like to mention three of the subjects which were raised at the conference; the first concerns the distribution of powers and fiscal responsibility; the second concerns fundamental rights and the third concerns the place of the two languages in Canada.

If we look back to the beginning, I think we all realize why the Fathers of Confederation chose the federal system as opposed to the unitary system. It is based on the physical size of the country, on the enormous regional differences there are which must be recognized; widely varying local traditions and interests across Canada; the country itself and its people does not lend itself to the unitary form of government, even though perhaps that is the most efficient.

I suppose, the most efficient government in the world is a dictatorship where eventually all decisions reach one spot and then you can get decisions in a hurry. But that is not what we want. Federalism is not the easiest form of government to devise, from an operational point of view, and I think we are all aware of this when we just watch what happens in our country, a federal country.

However, I think we all agree that federalism is indisputably the only type of political organization that would be acceptable to the people of this country, so, if you make that basic premise you move on from there inevitably to the point of what type of federalism it is that we want.

I would say, at the outset, any country that is organized federally must decide what powers, or perhaps a better term would be responsibilities, are to be allocated to the central government, and to the regional governments which make up the federation.

In addition, there are mutual responsibilities which do not necessarily belong to one area of government or the other, and which must be shared, or, in terms of the constitutional lawyer, those powers that are concurrent.

In 1867 this country was put together at a time of national crisis. It was a threat from outside the country that made the Fathers of Confederation gather together to create one unit which would be strong enough to stand external pressure. Of course those pressures came from the United States, the civil war was just completed, and there were various rumblings going on. If you read the press

of those days it is interesting to see how great the threat was as reported in the local press, not only from a straight military point of view but also from an economic point of view.

Therefore, the existence of the country itself was threatened from outside and the federation was formed in order to resist those threats. But it is interesting to see, even though those stresses were there, that they still decided in their wisdom to have a federated form of government which recognized the regional differences in the country.

Now, today, we are not subjected to the same external strains as were our forefathers. We have other problems, and I think that in this change of circumstance lie some of the problems that we face in Canada today. We do not have the external pressures upon us that existed a hundred years ago. We are, perhaps, much more secure as a unified nation or country now. I have made it a standard rule not to use that word, nation. It has been so widely misunderstood in this country in the last few years. In any event, we do rightly, of course, worry about preserving our country. But it seems to me that the great problem we face today and that we must look at in thinking where our country is going and what it will become, is what we are able to do to build a better society within the country. This is our endeavour now, this is the root objective of our federalism—to create a better society, a better place for people to live.

Essentially, this shift in emphasis from national preservation to the development of, and the improvement in the quality of our own lives and the lives of our people, is really at the root of some of our problems. It makes it easier for me, at least, to understand some of the things that are going on in the country when I think in these terms.

When we look at The British North America Act we must be driven to the point of view that the Fathers of Confederation showed very great foresight in their division of powers and responsibilities between the various levels of government. These responsibilities are still with us; they have not changed.

What has changed in this period of time, and what our forefathers could not possibly anticipate, is the weight of responsibilities and the priorities of these responsibilities. So, what we must do at the present time is to recognize and respect the existing constitutional obligations we have. We must make sure that each government has sufficient

money to meet the constitutional responsibility it has to its own people, and to get on with the job of living and running the country.

We have to make this present Constitution work in order that we may have time to change it if we think it must be changed. Therefore, we cannot cast aside the difficulties that are presently arising in the interpretation of our Constitution simply because there is some form of change in the air.

The hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), who is not in the House, yesterday made some comments in the Throne Debate concerning my own approach to federalism. I can only say that I personally am absolutely certain that Canada cannot survive her function without a very strong central government. I am also equally certain that the country cannot survive without strong and vigorous provincial governments which recognize the wide diversity of life and economic circumstance and tradition in our country.

We must divide our powers so that both governments can know what their responsibilities are, and discharge them, and any effective distribution of powers must take into account several other particular points. I have about six of them here which I would like to deal with.

I think powers must be allocated according to the functional criterion that the government most capable of doing the job efficiently should have the responsibility. Now that is a broad statement and, of course, there might be certain times when it would not be 100 per cent applicable, but as a basic principle I think it is sound.

Secondly, I think we must respect in our country the regional differences and the regional preferences. We suffer from an enormous amount of geography in Canada. We have great regional differences, and as we allocate power between the various levels of government we must take into account that there are real variations in structure. There are real variations in need from one part of the country to another, and I would suggest that unilaterally imposed take it or leave it attitudes, will never be successful in Canada.

Thirdly, when delineating responsibilities I think we must be careful not to give too much weight to some vague, but perhaps appealing, activities of a national nature, such as scientific research, and defence, at the expense of what may appear to be more pedestrian but, nevertheless, very important matters, such as social services and the relief of poverty.

In other words, we must keep our eyes on the bread and butter issues as well as cloud nine, if I can put it that way. We must ensure that we do permit funds to be available to each order of government so that it may carry out its responsibility. This has been a point I have been stating for some considerable time; I think it is worth talking about.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): About the only one the Premier talked about in Ottawa as far as I can discern.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, if that is all the hon. member discerned he was not watching very carefully.

Mr. Sopha: The Premier talked about money for three days.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Then you did not hear. As I go along, I will repeat for you exactly the position we took on fundamental rights and a whole series of things. The Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) will speak on it later and I am quite sure the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) will also have something to say.

Mr. Sopha: The Toronto *Daily Star* called you a money grubber.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The Toronto *Daily Star* has called me quite a few things in a period of years, and maybe it will again. But they are entitled to their opinion, just as you are.

Now, I would like to expand on this fourth point. You can use these terms, "money grubbers", and you can push off to one side one of the most important factors for the change in this country today by trying to sweep this point under the rug. I claim that by the use of fiscal spending power you can do more to change the face of this country—what it is like, how it will function. You can do more with that weapon than you will ever do by sitting down, writing words on a piece of paper and enshrining them in a constitution.

It is the practical aspect of constitution-changing, that is what fiscal spending power is. That is why we think it is very fundamental, that this particular point should not be downgraded by calling it money grubbing, making it not very respectable as a part of the debate on what is happening to our country. I would just reiterate that in our opinion it is one of the most important weapons that can be used. I will not use the word weapons, I will use the word instrument. It is one of the most important instru-

ments that can be used in changing our country from what it is to what somebody else might want it to be. And I think we all want to be in on those discussions, and we want it aired fully so that at least we understand and know what is happening.

Mr. Sopha: Are you mostly nettled by the fact that you have to pay your own bills for a change?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I am not in the least bit nettled, by that or anything else. In any event, I will go on to point out that we must also bear in mind that there is only one taxpayer. If you want a grade nine statement, it is that statement of, "Well, you go and raise your money and I will go and raise mine." That has got to be the most puerile thing I have ever heard.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We will see what kind of puerile response we get on March 4 with the Budget.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, wait for it. It will be here on Tuesday.

Mr. Sopha: You are going to grab \$175 million—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Wait for it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): The hon. member would not want us to money grub, would he?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Despite the efforts to reduce this very important matter to something that should not even be talked about, we feel it is very necessary that we match revenues with responsibilities. If you want one level of government and if it wants all the revenues maybe it should take over all the services in certain areas.

But I do not think that in 1969 we can go along any longer saying, you operate behind your brick wall and I will operate behind my brick wall, but we will both get our hands into the same pockets for revenue," because I do not think the people of this country, as taxpayers, will put up with it and this is the point we make.

Mr. Nixon: There is a \$700 million hole in the brick wall—that is what is coming to the government from Ottawa this year.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What is the \$700 million?

Mr. Sopha: That is what you get every year.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, all right, if you want to discuss that, I know one province getting—about 22 per cent of the revenue this province spends comes from Ottawa. Another province derives 62 per cent of its revenue from the federal government.

Mr. Nixon: And unfortunately a higher tax rate—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is all right. The hon. leader of the Opposition raised the point about the \$700 million—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting if we put the \$700 million that comes back to Ontario up against what the taxpayers of Ontario pay into Ottawa. Then—

Mr. Nixon: The Prime Minister is disclaiming his responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not disclaiming any responsibilities. I am just not allowing this red herring to be thrown into this debate. The leader of the Opposition is going to say \$700 million—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The Prime Minister should not forget that he is a Canadian first.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, being a Canadian first does not mean that I was not elected by the people of Ontario to look after them, and I propose to do that. We will discharge our responsibilities as Canadians—

Mr. Sopha: So will we.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and we will also discharge our responsibilities to the people who put us here.

Mr. Sopha: So will we, to 60 per cent of the electorate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that a great deal of the trouble we have had and the difficulties we have been in during the last few years have been caused by disparities in the distribution of taxing powers. Personally, I do not think that the spending responsibilities, the distribution of powers in The British North America Act of 1867, require any very large change. I think that we could live very nicely with it. There are charges, of course, and there are positions other parts of the country take, but by and

large we have not any great quarrel with the distribution of powers in The British North America Act.

But we do say that those responsibilities that are given to us—whether you are responsible for governing this province or whether we are, it matters not—whoever does it has to have the sinews of war. He has to have the muscle to carry out the responsibilities he is given under the Constitution. And if you have any hope of ever getting across on this side of the House, I should think you would join us in this argument so that you would be in a position to run the show properly when you got here.

Mr. Nixon: We make our own decisions in our party.

An hon. member: They do not care; they will never be here.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In any event I am rather interested in this subject and we will go on—if the leader of the Opposition just will not mention any more \$700 million figures we will not maybe have as many diversions, but since we are—

Mr. Sopha: Next Tuesday it will be \$875 million.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They are very impatient, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Treasurer's Budget, but in the fullness of time we will lay the affairs of the Treasury before this House.

Since World War II there have been several devices developed to distribute tax revenue. The bulk of the revenue being distributed comes from personal income tax. We have developed a very complex system of equalization payments to which Ontario, I might say, has always subscribed. Equalization payments simply mean that you collect from the wealthier provinces and you distribute it to the less wealthy provinces in order that you may have some standard across our country. Of course, this is absolutely necessary if to be a Canadian is to have meaning, regardless of what part of the country you inhabit. We have always agreed with this. We do not agree with some of the forms that equalization takes. We think equalization should be all in a lump sum so we all know what we are doing and so we will not get into some of the anomalies of equalization or paying, for instance, to national averages where you have high-cost provinces and low-cost provinces, and one province may be making money on a plan where it is costing another province. Those

sort of things we do not agree with. That is built-in equalization in certain plans; but the principle of equalization we have always supported and always agreed with.

Shared cost programmes, conditional grants, block grants—all these methods of distributing tax have been developed since World War II. All of them, I might say, include a high element of federal control, and they are very, very difficult for provinces to resist. In the first place, the province's residents have supplied the money that is being distributed and therefore there is a pressure as the Opposition is trying to exert on this government today, to go into the programme whether you want it or not because your residents are paying for it and therefore, you had better get in and get your money back.

Now this is not really a very rational basis on which to go into a programme.

An hon. member: Not a good way to run—

Mr. Sopha: It is certainly not a reflection—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Pardon?

Mr. Sopha: It is certainly not a reflection of our views.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member keeps talking about this \$175 million. We will hear what he has to say in the Budget debate.

Mr. Sopha: Will the Prime Minister wait?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, I will be here. I will be here. And I will do my best to listen. But as I say, these programmes are very hard for the provinces to resist because if you refuse to participate in the programme you may be denying and refusing the benefits which you are in fact paying for. So with pressures like that you may take on a programme that you really do not believe is the proper one for you or your people. But you take it on because—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Against one's better judgment.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Against one's better judgment.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): The Prime Minister might as well tell us why—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: However, the other point is this—

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the Prime Minister not announce the introduction of Medicare?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just a minute. I am speaking theoretically. The Budget will

come. I am giving the background of why this government took the positions it did at the federal-provincial conference. We wanted a debate about that conference and I am trying to play my small and insignificant part in that debate. If one accepts all these programmes without reservation when they are offered by the federal government, of course, it leads to complete disruption of provincial planning and it leads to complete disruption of the provincial priority setting. Because always you have to put up so much of the money in order to share in what the federal government offers. Then if you haven't sufficient revenue to do everything you have to establish a priority according to someone else's dictate—and not your own. You have to stop going ahead on one programme in order to take advantage of another when it might not be what you wanted to do at all.

This has been referred to in some circles as Ottawa using its spending power to buy jurisdiction. It buys its way into the area of constitutional jurisdiction that is not, that does not, belong to them. This approach I am mentioning, and this sort of provincial financial relationship conflicts with the principle I tried to enunciate, that revenue should match standing responsibilities. Then we would reach the position where a government would be completely responsible for what it did because it would be its own decision and nobody else's. Some of our decisions really are not ours at all. The principle I am expounding—namely revenues corresponding to responsibilities—implies in the federal system, a degree of equality and partnership, but when you get into the other aspect of shared-cost programmes, you get into really a master-servant relationship and you destroy the partnership which must be the true estimate of a proper federal system.

I think that we all agree that the federal government should have as one of its powers, the right to raise money across the province and then across the country and then to distribute that unconditionally in order to equalize living conditions and opportunities and the standard of living across the country. I think that we would agree too, that the position taken by the federal government presently that well established shared programmes which had been established in the field of provincial jurisdiction, perhaps should be turned over to the provinces and phased out. We would put a condition on that, of course. We would want to know when they are phased out that we have tax sources to support them, and not what is considered to

be adequate. We do not want the federal government to phase out just to get rid of the responsibility of the programme and to build up a little surplus so it can start another one.

If the federal government is to phase out of these shared cost programmes, well, we will agree with this if they are mature programmes and have been built up to the point where they are functioning properly. But we want to see the tax or see what will come with them as well. Then, of course, if we look into the future, I hope that we will never have the creation of any more tax sharing, cost sharing, shared cost programmes unless there is clear agreement and clear consultation—and by consultation I do not mean a visit where you are told what is going to happen. I mean consultation in the pure sense of the word where you state your objections, which can vary from region to region, from province to province, and where you reach a mutually, agreeable position even though it may require some compromise on both sides.

Much of our consultations in the past—and I throw no stone today when I merely state it as fact—have not been, in fact, consultations at all. It has been a question of this is what we are going to do, take or leave it, and because you happen to meet in the same room that is termed a consultation.

Now, in the past, I think I have advocated at some provincial conferences that I would like to see the shared cost programmes replaced by block grants. That is, a grant which would be limited to a certain function such as health. Whether you spend it on medical education, whether it is spent on medical services, whether it is spent on hospitalization or hospital construction, would be up to the individual government concerned, as long as it was spent in the area of health.

Now it seems to me that with a block grant, the federal government might achieve its national purpose and yet would allow sufficient freedom within the individual provinces to meet the varying conditions that exist in each province, and between provinces. But more recently I have sort of given up the block grant concept. I think we must go to the tax source or base, because when times get a little tough and there is financial stringency it is too easy with a block grant programme to simply say, "Well, we will cut the grants back 25 per cent for this year to meet our immediate needs or commitments or difficulties." Then, of course, who-

ever is responsible for administering the programme has to deal with that situation. Such has happened to this province on several occasions in recent years.

It would not happen if we had a tax source given and allotted to us at the same time we were asked to accept the responsibilities of the programmes. I am just giving some of my own experiences in these matters, but I would say that what we need to do is work out a means of distributing our tax revenues in line with our responsibilities. Now, what the final answer to this would be, of course, I do not know. I think it will be thrashed out in these conferences as we go on. I hope I make my point that it is not money grubbing to discuss these matters, it simply is not money grubbing; I think it hits the heart and core of our federal system. It is not the only thing in our federal system, of course; there are all the institutions we choose to deal with.

So these matters were widely discussed, I thought, at that conference. The consensus we came to on the distribution of powers—and this was a consensus subscribed to by all the participating governments in the conference—and if you will excuse me I will read this:

The conference recognizes as a matter of priority the study of the distribution of powers, in particular the taxing and spending powers, and directs the continuing committee of officials to give immediate attention to this aspect of the constitution.

So you see, it may be money grubbing to some, but at the conference it was taken to be a constitutional matter. To continue:

The Constitutional conference, recognizing the urgency of the matter, agrees that the tax structure committee should be convened for the purpose of examining and reporting at the earliest opportunity to first Ministers on (1) the occupancy of available tax fields by each of the provincial governments and the government of Canada, and (2) federal-provincial shared cost programme arrangements. To this end, the tax structure committee would consider the aggregate of government expenditures and their rate of growth, the tax sources available for financing these expenditures, and the potential of the total tax system, level of borrowing by governments and its effect upon the Canadian economy.

You see we cannot operate in a vacuum any more. We must tie all these functions together and the balance of fiscal responsibilities and

resources within each of the provinces and the government of Canada.

So, to return to a discussion of the basic prerequisite for a functional federalism, there is a fifth point I would like to make, and it is simply this: While discussing fiscal matters, the government must retain the power and the responsibility to operate an effective economic stabilization policy in the country and it must have the power to combat the very serious regional disparities that exist in Canada. Regardless of what we do in these areas of division of tax revenue, the federal government must have the motive and the power to deal with the overall financial and fiscal position of the country.

It is very interesting to note that, in November, 1967, and at both conferences in Ottawa, there are certain areas of the country that place regional disparity as the number one problem, as far as they are concerned, in any discussion of constitutional problems. It is a very understandable point of view, with which I might say I am in complete—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, you mean that fat sow?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It did not bother me. I know Mr. Smallwood quite well. He invited me to go fishing in Newfoundland last summer and I accepted his invitation. He is a very colourful man. I might have been able to say that Newfoundland lives rather high off that fat sow, but I did not think that it was quite the proper thing to say at that conference. But that did not bother me, I assure you, Mr. Speaker. I do not think Mr. Smallwood meant it to bother me either.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Is the Premier not gradually whittling away the powers of the federal government in overall control?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we are going to get into a debate across the floor of this House, but I would be delighted to hear the hon. member's comments in this regard as this debate develops. I do not think we are whittling away at the powers of the federal government in any way, shape or form. We are asking for a degree of co-operation. We only hope that we will get it so that we will not be forced to take certain courses of action

that might not just be what we would want them to be.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the Premier want a plenary transfer of these tax sources?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, as I say, this is a very intriguing matter for discussion and it will require the ingenuity of man to find an answer, but I think we have the ingenuity. Certainly if you go back and look at personal income tax, of course, you know this—the original Income Tax Act was called the War Income Tax Act, and that was taken from the provinces in order to finance World War I. But it was never given back when the war ended, and it developed to where it is today.

The whole field of succession duties was a purely provincial jurisdiction until World War II, and it was taken over by the federal government to finance World War II. But World War II ended and we never got that back either. So, while there has been whittling one way, there has been lots of whittling the other way, and all we are suggesting—

Mr. Sopha: If there is World War III, we are finished.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, that could be, but all I am saying is that it is time in 1969 that we sat down and started to sort some of these things out, and I do not think it will be too difficult.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That is a reasonable approach.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Thank you very much. I have been trying to get this point across to some of your confreres in another place for some considerable length of time, but I am told, "Go away and raise your own taxes, regardless of what we may do between us to the poor benighted taxpayer of Canada."

That is a position we do not accept. We are looking for this opportunity to sit down together, line up our responsibilities, put a price tag on them, and then line up some sources of revenue that are reasonable to approach the whole question of borrowing on a combination basis.

After all, when we get a few more regional governments set up in Ontario and we start to add together what they will be doing in the money markets, what we are doing in the money markets, and what the Hydro is doing in the money markets, it will be impossible to run Canada in an orderly fashion unless this is all co-ordinated. I think this lies ahead of us. September 1,

1969, is bound to come, and I think that this situation will come upon us and we are trying to anticipate these things.

I suppose everyone has forgotten the numbers of these points—I am just reaching six. I am just finishing up number five, but I would like to make my fifth point very clear: that we do recognize the responsibilities that the federal government has, and I say that whatever arrangements we make must not impinge upon their power to do these national things.

It is a very fine line that will have to be drawn, because we all know, in this House particularly, what the requirements of our cities are going to be in the years that lie ahead. A new and very expensive element is coming up very quickly in this whole equation and it has got to be fitted in here some place, and it will be.

The sixth point that I would make in dealing with distribution of powers and concomitant allocation of resources, is the very rapid rate of change in the world in which we live today. I think whatever we do we must build into it a very high degree of flexibility and not try too hard to have everything 100 per cent perfect before we do it. Who knows what this country will be like 10 or 15 years from now and what changes will be required, so we need that degree of flexibility.

I think this will involve some constitutional change which will permit the delegation of powers back and forth between governments. There is a whole area of constitutional change here which is really quite fascinating to think about. For instance, it may be that the province of Ontario would want to have its own securities commission. It may be that three other provinces some place might be very willing to delegate this situation to some arm of the federal government simply as a matter of administrative efficiency.

Once again this has to come to a recognition of regional disparity, and not only regional disparity, but regional difference—the fact that all areas of the country cannot be treated the same way. If we are to have a flexible system of functioning I think that we need some by which through agreements the powers can be exchanged and delegated. There was a certain amount of this built into the Fulton-Favreau formula, if you recall that ill-fated document.

These are just some of the matters that we think will come up for discussion in the future in this area of constitutional change. I might say that we think the federal gov-

ernment in a very broad way should have responsibility for national defence, tariffs, monetary policy, fiscal policy; it must ensure free market for all the factors of production, airlines, communication, railways, national transportation, which affect the whole country, external affairs, with some arrangement made to protect those areas that are the constitutional responsibility of the provinces. I do not think there is any great difficulty, at least from our point of view, in separating these powers out on this basis.

We think, too, that the provincial government should retain their traditional responsibilities for economic growth and for the growth of social capital, if I can put it that way—highways, education, health, resource development, and language and culture insofar as these matters affect the residents of the province. This is a very brief sketch of distribution of powers. It will be clear and it will never be completely applicable in a simple way for all purposes. Nonetheless, it seems to me that there is lots of scope for us to solve some of our problems in this area.

Mr. Lawlor: Where does the Premier place social security?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Social security?

Mr. Sopha: Social legislation.

Mr. MacDonald: What the Prime Minister said is, the *status quo* is acceptable and therefore nothing need be transferred to the federal government—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I said in the beginning that I was not really looking for any enormous changes. We feel confident to deal with some of these matters as long as we can match up the necessary revenues to discharge the responsibility. We are not looking for change just for the sake of change. I do not want to rewrite the constitution just because it happens to be the exercise of the day. If these things have worked well over the years why would we not leave them as they are?

In any event there are the grey areas of concurrent authority; that is, where there is overlapping of authority between the two levels of government. I think we should try not to create any more of these than are necessary. We recognize that some are, of course, necessary in the functioning of a federal system, but we do think, too, you can use certain techniques to ensure that the exercise of power in this area is not too irritating one way or the other when you are both exercising a concurrent authority.

I might say in that regard that the whole question of Medicare is one of these areas that has caused this government a good deal of concern, and I want to make a few remarks about Medicare. I presented to the Prime Minister of Canada during the course of this constitutional conference a request that this province be provided the fiscal equivalent.

Mr. Nixon: I think it was a demand.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, a demand or a request, I was—

Mr. Sopha: You called it a formal demand.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: A formal demand? I said that very deliberately because I thought perhaps a formal demand would bring a formal answer.

Mr. Sopha: I had my eyes glued to the television.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will see as we go along how much the member saw and heard. On behalf of the people of this province, I did make a formal demand or request. I might say that I was not speaking from a text, so perhaps some of my phrases were a little more colourful than they might have been if I had sat down and written them all out in dull, grey English. But in any event, I seemed to get my point across, which was really the object of the exercise.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The Premier thinks it is a fraud, eh?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think I could demonstrate. I do not think the plan itself is a fraud, but I think the way it is being imposed on the people, it could very well be. Otherwise I would not have said it. And I will go ahead and develop this and you may agree or disagree, as you see fit. I know you will in any event.

This is the type of thing that we hope will not happen again, but we are presently contributing in this province to this plan. In some of the matters I pointed out, the pressures are at work, because our people are paying for something they are not getting, or that they are not sharing in. And I asked for the fiscal equivalent and I made a formal demand. I believe I got my answer in a press conference out in the hall. I do not think I really accept that as a formal answer to a formal demand, or a formal request. However, I will pursue that as time goes on. But we would like to think that we would

be able to get the money that is being taken from Ontario residents to finance this plan—and let us be very clear about this, there is no national Medicare plan, there is no federal Medicare plan, there is just an arrangement whereby “if you do it our way, we will pay for half of it on a nationally equated cost basis”.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The Liberals never did intend to provide us with a health insurance plan.

Mr. Nixon: Very much like the hospital plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am talking about Medicare at the moment. In any event, on we go. We think that we would like to get these funds that are being taken from the people in this province to deal with some of the matters we think have priority. I am thinking in terms of such things as housing; I am thinking in terms of education; there is a whole host of matters that we think have priority as far as this province is concerned. My reason in asking for the fiscal equivalent was to get those funds so that we could use them for the benefit of the people of this province. I felt I was discharging my constitutional responsibilities as the leader of the government of this province in making this demand and I do not at all apologize for having done it. I did it on behalf of the people of this province. I think we could take this money and put it to good use, I think we could do a lot of things for a lot of our people who are quite happy with the *status quo* as far as medical care is concerned.

Now, I will set forth as briefly as I can the views of the government about the federal Medicare plan as it has come to be called. I do not think it is a plan. I would like to talk about some of the costs and why we have not rushed wildly into embracing the propositions that the federal government has made. There is one aspect of the whole matter that I would like to deal with first. There was some laughter the other day, Mr. Speaker, when I stood in this place and said that we did not oppose national Medicare. I do not think anybody in this House can doubt or would cast any doubt on the support of myself personally or of this government for the principle of providing protection against the financial calamity of illness, injury or large and difficult medical costs for the people of Ontario and Canada. We have supported the principle inherent in Medicare many times over. We have enunciated our support in this House on many

occasions. We are the government that introduced OMSIP into Ontario, let us not forget that. And this is an outstanding plan, it expresses the support of this government for the principle of health care and protection against illness and health problems.

OMSIP, in concert with private and group plans ensures that virtually every resident of Ontario, more than 97 per cent of our population can, and obviously do, obtain complete medical care without fear of financial disaster or denial because of limited income. No one will ever be denied medical care in Ontario and no one in this province is unable to obtain medical insurance if they wish it. No one is barred from medical insurance in this province because of the state of their health or the state of their finances, it is available to all our people. So let us not have an attempt to say that I and this government oppose the principles of medical care for our people, because we have been instrumental in making it possible in this province. What we do oppose is the method by which the federal government is trying to force us to do what they want us to do when it does not suit us. That is what we object to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, sir, there are many members in this House, now, and there are many, I suppose, who were not when our medical care programme was discussed here in some detail, some years ago. We had many long, long debates when that legislation was introduced and I think it might be interesting if we reviewed that, because I want to set to rest once and for all—and I know that the attack will be made on me, I know it as well as I am standing here; the attack is going to be that Robarts does not care about the health of his people. This is the obvious political ploy. But I am going to make it very clear that such is not so.

Now then, we go back to 1963. At that time we were determined as a government and as government policy that medical services insurance would be available to all the people of Ontario regardless of age, regardless of their state of health and regardless of their capacity to pay. Those are the three criteria we set up as far back as 1963. These principles are basic to OMSIP and I think they are also basic to the success of that plan. We also determined that in Ontario the most satisfactory medical services programme would encompass existing private and group plans and a government-operated plan, and

they would operate side by side and that is what we did.

Mr. MacDonald: The government established OMSIP because the insurance companies would not provide coverage to those in the low income groups.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the member says I am trotting out old stuff, I am told you heard all this before; I certainly have heard all that before. And I have not heard a thing here this afternoon that I have not heard *ad nauseam* for about five years.

In 1965 we were engaged in the approval in this House of the legislation designed to establish OMSIP. It was a very bitter debate on the part of the Opposition parties, in which every attempt was made, just as it is now being made, to mislead the people of Ontario. Speaking on second and third readings I made a few remarks. These are some things that I said in 1965:

What we are proposing is another part and another piece of a total health plan that has been developed over some long period of time in this province. Taken in conjunction with other progressive steps we have taken in the government in the provision of hospital beds, training of medical practitioners, nurses, paramedical personnel, this bill and these steps taken as a whole, not separated out and looked at one at a time, conform very closely with the objectives set out in the report of the Royal commission on health services. The Hall commission looked towards a programme to be worked out jointly by the federal government and the provinces with planned staging of various programmes which would culminate in a programme that could then, if properly implemented, culminate in a total health care programme for our country.

That is the end of my quote. Those remarks I made in this House in 1965.

And through OMSIP, Mr. Speaker, we took the lead by developing within Ontario an overall health programme with staging as set out at least in some degree in the Hall commission report. We recognize it as essential that Ontario develop a flexible position in the field of health services to facilitate the development of a national plan, and not to commit ourselves to any scheme which would hinder the co-operative development of a national health services plan in the future.

During that debate I said as follows:

This bill will fill certain gaps, and we do not feel that it will in any way prevent us from co-operating and working with any other jurisdiction in Canada, if it is possible to work these things out. I hope that I will never have such a closed mind that I will not be able to make a change if I think it is necessary for better legislation.

So, these were debates for 1965. It is very difficult to say that we are opposing national medical care, when you go back and read

these statements. There should be no confusion, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, on the part of any member of this House about the support of the government for the proposal of medical care.

Now, there was a federal provincial tax structure meeting in Ottawa on September 14, 1966. I was there and I made a statement. I have extracted an item from this too, and I think it is necessary—I am not given to quoting myself, but this will put the position that we took as a government in those days in 1966 when some of the present members of the House were not here:

The Ontario government supports the principle of universal, public Medicare and is in sympathy with the objectives of the federal government's Medicare bill.

Now, this is a statement that we put before a federal-provincial conference in September of 1966.

We welcome the decision of the federal government announced last Thursday to postpone the introduction of its Medicare proposal, we already have Medicare universally available in Ontario, through OMSIP and various private insurance schemes, but we do not have sufficient facilities and personnel to accommodate and teach the students who are already in their final years of high school. While Ontario believes fully in the desirability of universal Medicare schemes for Canadians, we are convinced that in the immediate future, expenditures on higher education deserve the greatest priority.

The Ontario government believes that the question of Medicare should be treated in the broad context of federal-provincial financial arrangements. Furthermore, the federal government has announced the Medicare offer, which is in the nature of a cost sharing proposition. We maintain that it should be discussed in the light of the general principles which we would like to see followed for cost sharing proposals.

In particular, we feel strongly that the federal Medicare proposals should be amended to remove the implicit equilization contained in it. The current proposal to pay each province only half the national average per capita cost of participating provinces, under-compensates those provinces with high costs.

Of course, of which Ontario is one, and it over-compensates those provinces with low costs. Mr. Smallwood, in fact informed me that he thought that they could probably

make money on Medicare on every unit of their population, or at least for a year or two until the inevitable escalation costs had caught up with them.

In any event—and I go on quoting:

We believe that the federal government's assistance should be based on half the actual cost incurred by each province.

Now the next one:

We are confident that if agreement can be reached on an acceptable package of federal-provincial financial arrangements, and on a formula for sharing the cost of Medicare, a way can be found for Ontario to participate in a universal scheme.

Now this we put before a federal-provincial conference. How can anyone say that we are opposed to universal Medicare?

Mr. Gisborn: The Premier never agreed to the government agency.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Still quoting:

We can arrive at this goal in much the same manner as we did when the Hospital Services Insurance scheme was introduced a decade ago, and thereby achieved a more satisfactory long-run arrangement.

Now, that is the end of that particular quote and I presented it myself, to that conference in Ottawa in 1966, and that states, in pretty forthright language, the support of this government for the principle of Medicare. It states our objection to the federal proposal, and I might say that our views have not changed.

I would remind the hon. members only that the decision of the government of Ontario not to participate up to the present time in the federal Medicare programme, was further enunciated on January 24, 1968:

When one considers the federal government's so-called social development tax and statements that without Ontario's participation the federal government will be able to come closer to balancing its budget, one might believe there have been developments which would tend to further discourage participation by Ontario.

In other words, their budget will be balanced well in any event. You can work that out for yourself.

But in any discussion of Medicare, Mr. Speaker, there are two basic facts which must be taken into consideration. First, and I have mentioned this before, a national Medicare

plan, as such, does not exist, nor can there be one under our constitution.

What, in fact, does exist, is federal legislation which makes certain financial proposals to the provinces which will become effective if the provinces meet a specific set of conditions laid down by the federal government. In other words, the federal government cannot do it themselves—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What would the Premier call a plan?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —so they say, “You do it our way or we will not give you that money.”

Mr. Singer: What a semantic waste of time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is neither semantic nor a waste of time. Mr. Speaker, we were getting along quite nicely until my hon. friend took off. I am ready for the hon. member, there is a short break here if the hon. member wants to break in.

Mr. Singer: No, no, I am just amazed at the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, that in itself is something. If I can develop a sense of amazement in the hon. member I must feel I have been quite successful in what I have been saying.

Now, sir, these conditions require that to be eligible for federal assistance, the programme must provide comprehensive physicians' services, universal coverage, be publicly administered and provide for the transfer of benefits throughout Canada.

Second, we must decide what Medicare really is. In Canada we have come to regard Medicare as being a physicians' services insurance programme, whereas, at its ultimate, it might be regarded as a description of a total health services insurance programme, and let me again emphasize that the government of Ontario believes in the principle of a sound scheme of publicly financed medical care.

Indeed, we believe that every responsible government must assume responsibility for essential social services, including the provision of these services when and where necessary. However, the government of Ontario insists that any publicly financed Medicare programme must be flexible, capable of implementation in an orderly manner. It must meet the expressed needs and priorities of people to whom it is responsible, and it must be within the scope and the ability of the people to pay for it.

We must keep in mind at all times that even the most desirable social programmes will not succeed if their cost is such that people cannot afford the programme. Bread, butter and a roof over one's head are also matters of importance, to the average man.

Now then, we have looked askance at the current federal proposals for these reasons. Firstly, they are excessively expensive, they are not consistent with our priorities in this province, they tamper improperly with matters that are constitutionally the direct responsibility of the provinces, and they are unfair to the people of those provinces which are unable to afford to participate. And believe me, there are some provinces, the leaders of whose governments have told me they simply cannot do it.

Now I do not think that any of the hon. members would admit that this is a proper national scheme, if it is only to be available to those provinces who are financially able to participate in it. These are largely questions of conscience, if you will. Social questions that one must consider before one takes a position.

There is ample and dramatic demonstration of the serious concern throughout Canada about the ability of our economy to finance the cost of Medicare as now defined. We have repeatedly urged and asked the federal government to reassess the inflexible position that it has adopted on the four criteria for the qualification of provincial plans.

If it will not do this, and to date it seems apparent that it will not, then we claim that we should be given the fiscal equivalent so that we may meet legitimate needs and priorities of our people, including the support and extension of our own OMSIP programme.

Now we are certain that the majority of our people here, for whom we are directly and primarily responsible, already enjoy protection against the financial difficulties of illness. Of the residents of Ontario, 93.7 per cent have insurance for physicians' services, supplied through a combination of private programmes and the government of Ontario's OMSIP programme. In addition, more than 99 per cent of our population is covered by the Ontario Hospital Insurance Plan. OMSIP is extremely successful. It meets the requirements of the people of this province, with a range of benefits, financial assistance to those who need it; it is available to all.

It is one of the most comprehensive medical services insurance plans offered in Can-

ada. When it began functioning in 1966, the maximum participation in the plan was estimated to be somewhere in excess of about 3,075,000 people. This number, it was forecast, would include approximately one million people in each of three categories.

The first category would be those who receive completely subsidized premium payments, including those receiving social assistance and their eligible dependants. Those are the people who would be looked after in their entirety. Another million who would be partially assisted in meeting their premiums and another million who would pay the complete premium for medical services protection from their own resources.

The government was aware that this maximum of three million participants represented approximately 45 per cent of the population of the province. We were also aware at that time that all but about 17 per cent of the population of Ontario enjoyed some form of medical services insurance, largely through group plans put into effect at their place of employment.

For this reason, OMSIP was offered initially on an individual and a family basis only. On January 1, 1968, OMSIP began offering coverage to groups, and to what are called collector groups, on an actuarially sound basis. This was done because many small groups were finding it increasingly difficult to purchase from private companies comprehensive coverage at a reasonable cost.

While there has been no vigorous campaign to attract groups to OMSIP, group enrolment is becoming very substantial. Some 439 groups encompassing 22,500 people have been enrolled to date. In other words, we are not seeking them out but we provide them with coverage when they want it.

To illustrate the success of OMSIP, at the end of December, 1968, an estimated two million people were enrolled in this plan. The following is a categorical listing of the current enrolment of OMSIP.

Social assistance recipients and their eligible dependents, 409,600; fully assisted recipients, 618,200; partially assisted 118,100; full premium pay 831,600; under group contracts 22,500.

We estimate that only about ten per cent of 1,045,000 who were estimated to be eligible for partial assistance actually have enrolled in OMSIP. The explanation for this is not that they are not getting medical coverage, but the great majority of these people are already covered under a group coverage provided in some other form.

For example, many employers absorb anywhere from 25 per cent to 100 per cent of the contribution required of their employees in the medical care plans. Of course, all these arrangements would have to be just simply scrapped and thrown out if we were to accede to the demand of the federal government in this regard. They just simply say, these arrangements must disappear.

Mr. Singer: Is that bad?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We think so.

Mr. Singer: Why?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Because we think that these are agreements freely reached between bargaining parties and that the people involved are satisfied with what they are getting. We would rather have the money, for instance, to create a few more doctors. Do we not need them? Certainly we do.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would permit a question, since he has taken a slight pause?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Certainly.

Mr. Nixon: Would he not agree that it would be possible and, in fact, desirable if over a period that would be stated in new legislation that these agreements arrived at, as you have described, in free bargaining, could be replaced by other agreements that would be equally advantageous to both parties if, in fact, the government were to take over the responsibility for the provision of medical care, as I believe they should?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If I understand, you are suggesting that all these present plans—

Mr. Nixon: What is sacred about these agreements?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just a minute. Let me try to understand. Are you suggesting that the present plans would all be phased out of their present set-up and phased into something else?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You cannot do this under the present provisions.

Mr. Nixon: The Prime Minister does not know the facts.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, you tell me. You get Mr. Munro to let me know if we can do this. I would be delighted to take a look at it.

Mr. Nixon: I often wonder if you are in communication—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We do our best, we do our best.

Mr. Nixon: I have no doubt at all that the government could pass legislation to accomplish Medicare now.

Mr. Singer: The Premier is going to announce it on March 4, anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have a sneaking suspicion that these members know more about the budget than I do. They keep telling me what is in it all the time. I have heard about four different comments—

Mr. Singer: There has been a leak.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —four different comments about what we are going to hear on March 4.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, sir, in the 1968-1969 Budget of Ontario, to get at the OMSIP costs, it was stated with clarity that our existing hospital and medical plans are making a very heavy claim on provincial funds. The costs have been rising quite steeply so that the expenditures for the hospital plan in 1969-70, fiscal year, will be about \$729 million. The cost of operating OMSIP will increase to about \$143 million.

The government has made it clear, of course, that it will continue to subsidize both plans by an estimated \$59 million for the hospital plan and \$37 million for OMSIP during the 1969-70 year and these funds will, of course, be in addition to the premiums that are paid by those who use the service.

We feel that it is essential that the participants in any programme make a contribution toward the operation of the programme and the premiums must bear some reasonable relationship to the cost of the services that are being provided.

However, and I think all the Legislature agrees with this point of view, a person unable to meet costs from his own resources must, of course, receive assistance from the province so that he is assured adequate physician's care. But nobody, and I make this point finally, nobody in this province need be

presently without medical care, and OMSIP ensures this.

Mr. Peacock: How does the Premier tie all this in with the Constitution?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I might put it this way: I would stop talking about it if I could get an agreement that none of you would talk about it. But I just have an idea that I am going to hear a little bit about this before this debate is completed.

Mr. MacDonald: I just got an idea—this is a weary record.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite an interesting story, in any event, whether I put it before the House at this time or some other time. It is a matter of topical interest and—

Mr. Trotter: We have had to live with it now—

An hon. member: Well, live it again. Live a little.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Live a little, yes. However, there have been suggestions made, and made here this afternoon, that Ontario is in a position to enter immediately into agreement with the federal government. And I think that these suggestions indicate a certain lack of understanding of the true rigidity that exists in the federal Act.

Mr. Nixon: The only people that would be disturbed would be the—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, come off it, come off it.

Mr. Trotter: The insurance companies are going to get—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Sure, sure. I remember one of your predecessors tagging all the insurance companies in this wild and woolly manner and—

Mr. Nixon: I am not attacking them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —accusing us of all sorts of things. What happened to him?

Mr. MacDonald: The companies Wintermeyer sponsored in his time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have been told that because 97 per cent of the population of Ontario now enjoys some form of medical services insurance coverage, Ontario can qualify for the federal government contribution. Well, that is not so. Section 4, sub-

section 1, subsection (a) of The Medical Care Act, which is the national Act, states:

The plan is administered and operated on a non-profit basis by a public authority appointed or designated by the government of the province.

The term "non-profit" used in this section applies in the exclusion of insurance companies which currently cover one-third of our population in this province. The definition also—

Mr. Trotter: And they insure health.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The definition also excludes doctor-sponsored plans. It excludes the county co-operatives which has done a tremendous job of providing medical coverage in the rural parts of Ontario unless, of course, they become publicly administered.

Mr. Nixon: I ask you whether you have got a specific decision that those were excluded too.

Is the Premier aware that at least one provincial plan has a statute that says the payments into those organizations are designated as in fact being paid to the Minister of Health or his agent?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I presume you are referring to British Columbia. We checked into that very, very carefully. And for the technical aspect of it, I would ask the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What has happened is this, of course the insurance companies are becoming nothing but post office drops, nothing more—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: These are the rigidities and I think we can document it in correspondence. The correspondence is taking place between the Minister of Health and the various Ministers of National Health and Welfare we have had in Ottawa during the last few years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But, perhaps the most rigorous debate with regard to Medicare revolves around the cost involved. People want to know whether it will be less costly to participate in a government operated universal medicare plan, than to continue the selected systems of OMSIP and private coverages which we now have in Ontario. Under compulsory universal medicare, the entire cost

would be met through a combination of tax revenues and premiums with the provincial government operating the entire plan.

Under our present selective system both private and government plans function side by side. Coverage under the government OMSIP plan is voluntary, the premiums are actuarially sound. At the same time, financial assistance, either partial, full or temporary is available. The government of Ontario is convinced that the selective system best meets the requirements of the people of Ontario. Our studies also show that the selective system is less costly on a *per capita* basis than under the federal Medicare scheme as now constituted, and generally provides a greater range of medical services than the proposed national plan of basic coverage.

I would like to underline the factors which we have considered in reaching this conclusion. The total cost of the universal medical care programme, if all provinces were ready to participate, if all provinces were in, is estimated at approximately \$1 billion annually or \$4.2 billion for the period 1969-1973. Of this amount 50 per cent would have to be raised by the federal government through increased taxation; the provinces would raise the other 50 per cent. The Hon. Mitchell Sharp when he was Minister of Finance, suggested that it would require the equivalent of 12 per cent of personal income tax to obtain sufficient funds for the first full year of operation, April, 1969 to March 31, 1970, at a total cost of \$1 billion. Since the people of Ontario contribute 46 per cent of the total taxes collected by the federal government, it follows that Ontario would have to contribute 46 per cent of the federal share or \$230 million annually to the cost of the universal Medicare programme.

Our calculations indicate that, based on an average of the first two years of operation and assuming that 90 per cent of the population would be enrolled, universal Medicare would cover about 6,600,000 people. The average *per capita* cost for the two years would be \$54.15 based on \$53.25 for the first year, and \$54.95 in the second. The annual cost of Medicare in Ontario would be an average of \$357.4 million. Administrative costs based on a conservative 5 per cent of services would be an additional \$18 million. And incidentally, I do not think those administrative costs are included in cost to be shared by the federal government.

Therefore our calculation indicates the total cost of operating Medicare, as defined by the Federal Act, would be \$375.4 million for each of the first two years of operation. I use this

figure with the realization that medical costs are rapidly increasing, and I am also aware and indeed extremely concerned that the federal government has announced that it will step out of Medicare after five years, leaving us to finance what undoubtedly will be a rapidly escalating cost programme. Because the federal cost contribution is based on 50 per cent of the national *per capita* cost, exclusive of administration, rather than the provincial *per capita* cost, Ontario would receive about 44 per cent of the cost of providing a Medicare plan for the people of this province. Somebody else would get the additional six per cent because they would be over the 50 per cent, and because we are a high cost province.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, no we will carry this debate on until everyone who wants to speak has spoken.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course it has, it has everything to do with the Constitution—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, you are going to hear the rest of it right now, so—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am actually enjoying it. This would mean—the member does not want to hear. That is the problem, he does not want to hear.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This would mean, Mr. Speaker, a return to Ontario by the federal government of \$157 million. Assuming that the provincial contributions to subsidize or fully pay premiums for certain groups remain at an average of \$60 million for the two year period. The province would need to raise, through premiums, \$158 million a year to finance the plan. In order to obtain the \$158 million, premiums would have to be charged at the approximate rate of \$1 per month, excuse me, \$8 for a couple, and \$10 for a family. It would be said of course that these rates are lower than those now in effect under OMSIP, but it must be remembered that these rates represent only a part of the true cost of universal medical care. There are other costs which would have to be paid through taxes. For example, these would include operating costs which are not shareable with the federal government. Increased taxa-

tion to provide the 46 per cent share which the people of Ontario will pay to the federal government to finance its part in Medicare must be considered. In terms of monthly premiums this taxation which would be required would represent an additional burden of \$4.16 per month for a single person, \$8.32 per month for a couple, and \$10.40 per month per family.

To illustrate more fully, the net effect of universal Medicare on the people of Ontario I should like to summarize the anticipated cost figures in terms of monthly premiums, comparing these premiums with the new rates for OMSIP which went into effect on July 1, 1968.

Now, the approximate Medicare premiums: single, \$4.00; the estimated additional taxation, \$4.16 for a total of \$8.16—as opposed presently to an OMSIP premium of \$5.90. A couple would pay the Medicare premium of \$8.00; then they would pay \$8.32 in additional taxes, to finance Ontario's share of the total cost, for a total of \$16.32—as opposed to \$11.80 that they presently would pay for OMSIP. For a family, a Medicare premium would be \$10.00; the additional taxation would be \$10.40, for a total of \$20.40—and their OMSIP premium is \$14.75.

I must also point out that the \$230 million a year which the people of Ontario would pay in taxes—which I suppose might be termed hidden premiums to the federal government to finance universal Medicare—includes an annual subsidy of \$74 million to the operation of universal Medicare in other provinces, from which the people of Ontario would receive no direct benefit. I should like to make it perfectly clear that the government of Ontario is, and always has been, a firm believer in and a supporter of the principle of equalization. I think I made that clear this afternoon. However, we think it is improper to embody equalization in the national programme of this type. If we are to have equalization payments let us have equalization payments; we all know what they are; they work out on the basis of the tax revenues of the provinces involved.

What we have here is what I might term implicit equalization. We have objected to this element of the federal Medicare legislation for a long time and we should continue to object to it. We in Ontario do not think the people of the province will receive as fair treatment as some provinces because the Medicare Act makes money on the deal while the people of Ontario lose money. Now this is not equalization, this is subsidization.

So we get to the constitutional aspects of Medicare and I would like to deal with those for a while. I have taken time to outline in some detail the developments to date in the formulation of a universal Medicare programme, and the objections the government of Ontario has found to that programme.

In summary these are the positions held by this government:

1. The government of Ontario is not opposed to any sound scheme of publicly financed medical care. We insist, however, that such a programme be flexible and within the express needs and priorities of the people and within their ability to pay for it.

2. The government of Ontario is convinced that the economy of Canada and of this province cannot afford at this time a publicly financed medical care plan as defined in the federal legislation. Taxation has already reached the point where it is biting into our capacity to produce. Further increases in the proportion required to support Medicare would further restrict our economic ability and greatly impede other urgent government activities. This will be compounded when after five years the federal government vacates this field and abandons the programme to us.

3. The government of Ontario—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): The Premier is living in a dream world.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We like it this way. We like it this way. The member will have his turn; he sounds off all over the place. He should sit and listen quietly for an afternoon.

Mr. J. Renwick: We wanted to have a realistic discussion, not the dream world that the Premier lives in.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Look who is talking about a dream world.

3. The government of Ontario is opposed at the present time to wiping out with a single stroke of a pen the medical care plans and benefits now existing in employment contracts and other labour agreements. Any change in these benefits on the part of government must be given very careful consideration.

4. The government of Ontario believes it would be inopportune to introduce compulsory Medicare at a time when our universities are only beginning to increase the number of graduate health personnel. Surely there is an obligation to be able to provide sufficient medical and other health care staff before a

compulsory programme is introduced. This, of course, is being seriously deterred by the federal government's reduction in the health resources fund. That is another area that I will not get into this afternoon.

An entirely new concept must be evolved for a national medical care programme, and it must be a fresh concept in universality. A plan must be devised to allow for phased implementation such as you are discussing and was mentioned this afternoon. The economic base for Medicare must be reappraised. Any such plan must form part of a programme of priorities of the people of the individual provinces in which it is to be introduced and put into effect.

At the moment I would submit the federal medical care programme has given an artificial priority which it does not deserve. Indeed, it is being shoved down our throats, as I have said before, and this priority must be reviewed before the economy of Canada is further imperilled.

As a government, Mr. Speaker, we have no power to dictate to the federal government what it can or cannot do. However, I suggest that as a government we have a constitutional responsibility, and within the means of the people of Ontario we shall continue to exercise that responsibility just as we did at the conference earlier this month.

In Ottawa we discussed Medicare within the context of the constitution. Medicare is very much a constitutional problem. As I have stated over and over again it is an outstanding example of the federal government invading a clearly defined area of provincial jurisdiction; of using its financial muscle to alter the intent and the provisions of The British North America Act.

There is very much a double standard involved. Would the federal government not object strenuously if this Legislature was to pass legislation invading its jurisdictional territory? Would it not take every means at its disposal to exercise its constitutional sovereignty if, as a hypothetical example, we were to pass legislation to have Canada withdraw from NATO or to form some unit of the Canadian military?

Mr. Singer: Oh, come off it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, come on it.

Mr. Sopha: You stood there the other day and said there was nothing unconstitutional about it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the question was raised in this House earlier this week

whether Ontario should test in the courts the constitutionality of the federal Medicare bill, and there would be no purpose in this. The government of Ontario does not oppose the basic principle of medical care services for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: As unconstitutional as it may be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, and that is true. You do not want to believe it, but that is true. Mr. Speaker, these people will do everything in their power to distort the position of this government, but you cannot get around the fact. This government objects to the method by which this is achieved and the coercion with which the federal government is forcing the provinces to change their priorities to accept the federal plan. It must be remembered that to get the federal share of the Medicare funds the provinces must also raise an additional large sum from the people of the province in taxes and premiums.

Mr. Sopha: Do you have to keep repeating these things?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, to convince people like you.

As the federal government has pointed out many times the Medicare legislation is a statute of Parliament. In other words, their answer to us is, a fact is a fact. Of more importance is our support for the recognition of the desirability of the federal government encouraging national standards in areas of national application.

There are some other things I might say but I think I might just leave this question of Medicare. I think I have made my point. From the comments I have received from the other side of the House I feel I may have reached through and got some comprehension to you of what the position is.

Now, sir, there was another matter we dealt with at this conference that—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): How about a few words on the Constitution?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You will find out in due course, Mr. Speaker, that the matters I have been discussing today, in my humble opinion, in terms of what is happening to the Constitution in this country could not be more important and could not be more to the point.

Mr. Bullbrook: Are you saying that is a significant aspect of the constitutional problem?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There are a thousand ways to change a constitution and we are not going to just talk about the one way of doing it where you sit down and change the words.

I would like to speak for a moment on our approach at this conference to the subject of fundamental rights. If you recall at last year's conference we stated—

Mr. Singer: Which position is that, last year's or this year's?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will get to that. At last year's conference we stated that our attitude toward the entrenchment of fundamental rights would be conditioned by four factors:

1. We said that any proposal concerning a constitutionally entrenched bill of rights should be considered in the light of constitutional reform, viewed as a whole. In other words, it could not be dealt with separately.

2. We said that such a bill should be dealt with in the light of provincial situations with consideration for the existing powers of the provinces, and what the provinces may have done themselves in this area.

3. We said that a declaratory or other nature of such a bill should be reviewed in the context of the existing constitution and the important relationship between a bill of rights and a constitution.

4. We emphasized a year ago this month that this government was awaiting the recommendation of the Hon. J. C. McRuer on this subject.

The observation has been made recently, and I believe that this is what the hon. member for Downsview is getting at in his interjections, that we have done an about face on the question of fundamental rights over the past year.

Mr. Singer: That is exactly what I meant.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It has been said that in the conference in February, 1968, we were not in favour of entrenchment of rights and that this year we have reversed our position. These interpretations do not coincide with the facts.

Mr. Singer: Quite wrong; I recognize that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will now set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, and tell you exactly what happened.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry that such a thought ever entered my mind.

Mr. MacDonald: There are certainly a lot of records that need to be straightened out.

Mr. Sopha: It is like a skill artist at a carnival.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Last year, if you recall, the federal government proposed—

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier reverses his position so often a long explanation is needed.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the member wants to hear he had better listen. When we approached that conference a year ago, the federal government's charter of human rights had arrived at my desk—five days before the conference opened. And, of course, in the period of time available to us before this was presented to the conference—

Mr. Sopha: That is more notice than we get around here.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is not so. But you can understand it was not possible, nor would it have been proper for us or responsible for us to advance a final opinion on a matter of this type on such short notice.

Mr. MacDonald: So you invent a false opinion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We had not been given any reasonable amount of time to study the question. This does not worry me particularly because, as I said before, we are not going to achieve these things overnight, and I knew we would never entrench a bill of rights in the Constitution at that conference in February, 1968. But we did need the time that we took between February, 1968, and February, 1969, to go pretty carefully into what the proposition was that was advanced by the federal government.

Our position then could only have been a tentative one predicated on the four conditions that I mentioned. We said at that conference we would examine their proposal in the light of those four positions I have mentioned to you.

During the intervening year we studied the whole question of fundamental rights very carefully and we examined the proposed charter the federal government put forward. We made some suggestions of our own in the continuing committee of officials and I do not intend to comment in detail our recent stand on this subject. It was pretty well completely reported in the Toronto *Telegram* and it may be that the Attorney General will feel that he would like to say something about it in the course of this debate.

Mr. Singer: Will he tell us about the compact theory of the Constitution?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: However, I do wish most emphatically to point out that what we said we would do a year ago at the conference, we have done. We studied the various proposals put forward concerning fundamental rights and we favour the entrenchment of some of these rights—not all of them—as being in the best interests of the Canadian people. I might say that this is far from our last word on this subject. Our continuing views will be aided by further recommendations which we expect in the second volume of Mr. McRuer's report, in which he is going to deal with the whole question of the bill of rights. I rather doubt from what I saw at the conference that we will be impeding the ultimate progress of this matter very much by waiting, because there—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member can ask his leader the attitude of some of the other provinces at that conference.

Mr. Nixon: That is right, but last year—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Sure, he will remember that. We examined it a little more carefully and came to the conclusion that there were certain aspects of it that were very sound, and with those we agree. What is the matter with that?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Then the member should stop yakking if there is nothing wrong with it.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Why does not the member go on signing those letters?

Mr. Sopha: Has the Attorney General given up the compact theory?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In any event, that is what happened and we are continuing our studies. It may be that we will find after another year when we listen to the ideas advanced by the Opposition, as they take part in this debate and when we hear what people from other province will have to say, it may be that our position will change again. But eventually we will come down to what we all agree will be, I hope, the right and proper thing to do; that is the whole process in which we are engaged.

The House might be interested in the consensus of the conference on this point. The

conference of first Ministers, noting the various views and the general interest that has been expressed in regard to guarantees of human rights, including those views brought before the continuing committee of officials, agreed that a committee of Ministers should be established to study all matters relating to fundamental rights, including the question of entrenchment of such rights in the constitutional charter. Now, that was the consensus reached in the final document issued by the conference, and I can assure the House that we will play our full part in those deliberations as they take place in the ensuing months.

I would like to turn to our position on the question of Canada's official languages and the propositions which we tabled here on February 5. There were three propositions that set out the principles as far as Ontario is concerned, but we, I would like to say too, have taken some firm action to translate principles into action. We think that the most effective means of insuring the protection of linguistic rights probably is by means of the legislative processes available to individual governments. That is why we did not object to the federal language bill. This is the federal government's method of dealing with this matter within its own powers, and we have no objection to that whatsoever. We hope the discussions that are going to take place between Mr. Turner, the federal Minister of Justice and the Attorneys General across the country, will resolve some of these difficulties in order that the bill may be enacted in the very near future. And then, of course, when it is enacted, there will be some areas on which we will have to confer with the federal government, matters of mutual concern, dealt with in that bill, and this we will do.

We have come some distance in the recognition of linguistic rights in this province in the past year and I do not intend to go into these at any length. I think all members are aware of what we have done in the field of education, the bills that we have passed and debated here. I think these matters have been dealt with in a very practical way. And I am personally quite happy about what we have done, and particularly I think we can all be happy at the reception it has had among our people. It has been accepted, and I think we have done something that needed to be done, whether we got into a constitutional discussion or not. It is something that needed to be done for our own Franco-

Ontarians and we are very happy about that. We really are attempting—

Mr. Sopha: The Prime Minister should keep his voice down low so Johnson cannot hear—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It that right?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Are they? Well, I do not need to turn around if those two are protecting my back.

We believe what we have done in this regard is in accord with the recommendations of the B and B commission and also in accord with some undertakings that we gave to the federal-provincial conference in February of 1968. Now, sir, we have been studying what we might do in other areas. You know, of course, and we all know, that we have had bilingual civil servants working for this government for many, many years but what we are in effect doing is stepping up our recruitment of bilingual civil servants. We also are stepping up our courses of training for those who wish to learn French, to achieve the basic idea that we would provide government services to the people of the province in those areas where French is predominantly spoken so that no citizen would be deprived of his communication with his own government because of language.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): How about the other ethnic groups?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, once again, I do not want to enter into a debate across the floor here, but there are all kinds of answers to the question that the member has raised, and we are talking about the two predominant languages in this country.

Mr. Haggerty: Canada is a nation of many tongues.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We are bilingual and multi-cultural. Now, sir, I might deal very briefly with what we have done. I have mentioned the public service, municipal administration—and here once again upon investigation we find that in the natural course of events in simply dealing with people, many municipal administrations in this province have been providing services in both languages for some considerable time. We are pursuing this as an active policy. It really amounts to recognizing what has already been done and insuring that action in this area is accelerated and that we make a conscious

effort to see that it is developed and increased.

The administration of justice is another matter and a very difficult one indeed. We simply do not have bilingual judges in this province, nor do we have many bilingual practitioners of the law. In addition, we have our statutes written completely in English. I am informed that this is one of the major problems—that is, to translate all types of precedents, and so on, into another language. But, of course, in this province, we have always provided free translation services in our courts, not only for French, but all languages, and we intend to press on with that programme to ensure that nobody appearing in any of our courts of any kind, regardless of what his language may be, will be without the services of a translator who can make his speech understood. We propose to continue, once again, to recruit bilingual personnel into this area, but I would not minimize for a moment the difficulties that one faces in this particular area of administration of justice.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier wants to be carefree like Joey and establish bilingualism by a wave of the hand covering everything.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, that was it too. It all ended right there.

Now in regard to the Legislature, of course, we recognize once again what has been the practice here for many years—to formalize the right of anyone to speak in this Legislature in either language. We are examining where we may go from here and what we might do, but I do not think it would be practicable to try to have all the proceedings of this House in both languages; it just simply is not a practicable proposition. On the other hand, there are various degrees that might be explored, and we are looking at these things at the moment.

In regard to bilingual districts, there was a recommendation in the B and B report that bilingual districts should be established. We have examined in some detail the question of whether we should establish bilingual districts in the province, and we have come to the conclusion that we really do not need to. The main areas, of course, in which there are significant concentrations of French-speaking Ontarians are in eastern and north-eastern Ontario, and in southwestern Ontario, down in the Niagara Peninsula and part of the county of Essex. These regions have not been declared bilingual districts, and we do not think it is necessary so to do. We will,

of course, place special emphasis on these French-speaking areas in terms of what government services are offered there and the provision of bilingual personnel in whatever government offices there may be, but we have a reluctance to delineate bilingual districts. We think, in the first place, wherever you put the boundary it is bound to have a certain degree of artificiality about it; we do not think it would achieve anything to delineate such districts. And there is the possibility and the difficulty that it might develop some frame of mind that we do not think would be healthy or necessary as we go about making sure that our French-speaking citizens in Ontario are properly served.

The federal government has decided for its purposes that its bilingual districts are necessary or proper or needed. We will co-operate with them, but we do not feel we need follow their lead in this regard.

No, sir, we think that what is being done by the subcommittee on official languages—that is, the subcommittee of the committee of officials—is really quite important. There was a statement on the official languages in the consensus, which I might just put on the record.

The conference recognizes that important steps have been taken by governments in the past year to encourage a fuller role for the French language throughout Canada, and it affirms study of linguistic matters should continue. In particular the first Ministers agree that:

(a) The recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, together with reports of linguistic matters from the continuing committee of officials and the subcommittee on official languages, should be referred to a committee of Ministers, which should consider both the constitutional aspects of the linguistic matters, and the method of implementation of language policies, including the nature of possible federal assistance for this purpose.

(b) The Royal commission's reports, together with other aspects of the subject of official languages, should receive such further consideration by the continuing committee of officials and its subcommittee on official languages as may be required to assist the committee of Ministers in its task.

So, once again, the study of this whole problem will go on at the official level and be transmitted to a committee of Ministers.

Now, sir, before completing, I probably should table a copy of this consensus; I think this should become part of the record of this House. I have quoted certain parts of this, but I will table it so it is available for any of the members who would like to see it, because that is the final official consensus.

Now, I think it is interesting to look ahead to see where we will go from here, this conference having been completed. It is clear, I think, to everyone that what we have started in the last 18 months must be continued, and in all probability we are in a position to accelerate it a great deal. These early meetings have really established the acceptability of the idea of doing what we are doing, in everyone's mind. We have made the first steps towards the creation of the necessary organization, and now, it seems to me, we are in the position to go ahead at a somewhat faster pace.

With the establishment of these various ministerial committees, it does bring what is being done to the decision-making level, because the continuing committee of officials, of course, has no decision-making power; all they can do is make their recommendations to leaders of the government. It was felt that by the establishment of ministerial committees we would have those who are going to be responsible for the decisions dealing with these matters as they were developed. And with this idea I am in complete accord. It is going to make an awful lot of work for a good many Ministers, but that is all right.

Now, sir, I might just quote from the consensus that I have tabled the general objectives of the constitutional conference, because I think this is important if one is to understand what we have done and the acceptance we have among all us.

The continuing constitutional conference reaffirms its intent to complete a comprehensive review of the constitution of Canada, to assess its adequacy for present and future requirements, and to determine the extent to which constitutional change is desirable, either through amendment of the existing constitution, or through promulgation of an entirely new constitution.

Now, procedure.

The conference expresses its intent that the review should proceed at an accelerated pace now that the basic organizational background work has been carried out. In this connection, the first Ministers will endeavour to hold more frequent ses-

sions of the constitutional conference and, in addition, will have informal working sessions with the continuing committee of officials to provide more continuous direction to the process of constitutional review. In order to maintain effective co-ordination of the constitutional review, the conference agrees that (1) all special committees of Ministers set up by the constitutional conference, (2) the continuing committee of officials should assist other ministerial committees as required, (3) all special committees of officials should be constituted as subcommittees of the continuing committee of officials, (4) the continuing committee of officials is authorized to establish such subcommittees, working groups or task forces as seem to be required for the purpose, and (5) the secretariat of the conference should also serve all such ministerial committees and committees of officials.

I realize that it is very boring when one just reads these things, but there is the basic organization that was established at this conference to provide for what will be done in the future. When you see the scope of that organization and the objectives it set for itself, I do not think there can be any doubt in anyone's mind that this whole task is going to move ahead, and that is what I think we have been able to achieve. The question is asked, "Well, what did you achieve in the time that you were there?" I have already noted, of course, the tax structure committee will resume its activities. The Senate and the Supreme Court also will be examined by committees of Ministers. I do not really think that these two matters had been given enough study prior to this conference, that they could be dealt with in any meaningful manner at all. That is not remarkable because a tremendous amount of work was put before this continuing committee to do in the short period of one year.

Mr. Singer: Does the Premier presently have any views on the Senate or the Supreme Court?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will have. Yes, we will have.

Mr. Singer: Presently?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: At the moment, I have not any views that I am going to express in this debate. But I would simply say that one is bound to have some views on the Constitution and reform of the Senate and the Supreme Court of Canada—

Mr. Singer: Views are very good to have.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: —but the reason that I read the agenda to you was to get the idea across that you just do not have well-thought-out opinions on all these matters in a hurry. They are very complex. In my humble opinion, it is going to take literally years of study and examination. We can only do first things first, and what I am attempting to point out here today is that we have got some first things done.

So, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the original question and the beginning of my remarks, what we are really seeking or what we are doing is to develop a federalism that we think is what we want for the future. We think that we must attempt to get a federalism that will truly reflect the spirit of partnership. I hope that we will be able to get rid of the attitude of oneupmanship that sometimes exists between various levels of government. We must develop a federalism that will recognize the very fine and very delicate balance that exists between the national interest and regional interests. We must match up responsibilities and revenues, and we must develop means for it to function in a way that the differing needs and requirements and positions of the component parts will be recognized and dealt with. It must, of course, be flexible and functional. All of which is quite a good deal to attempt to achieve, but this is the goal and I would suggest that we are well started down the road to achieve what we are after. In my opinion, nothing but good for our country and our people can come from these deliberations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would begin by saying that I am deeply disappointed in the Premier's remarks this afternoon on two counts. The first one, and surely the most important one, has to do with the matter of Medicare, which he drew into this debate at such length. I can only assume that this lengthy and statistical attack on the federal programme must simply reflect a decision that has been taken by his administration largely and perhaps exclusively at his direction and behest, that the Budget next week will not include an announcement that we are taking part in federal Medicare. Even this government, which has a history of changing its mind on constitutional matters, is not capable of that much of a flip-flop, even though the arguments can be put and have been put in this Legislature before,

which if carefully considered, would surely lead a reasonable administration to accept the federal programme as it is offered and for the good of this province.

I am sure that the Premier has had his advisors go over the accommodations that have been entered into by the provinces that have already accepted the federal programme—British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Nova Scotia. The point that the Premier misses, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a national programme. It cannot be tailored for Ontario. It will require accommodation on our part in order to take part in it, and this is what he personally is unable to do.

The inflexibility in his position shows through particularly when he lists his objections and lists among them those which can easily be overcome by an Act of this Legislature or by reasonable accommodation.

I would be quick to say to you, sir, that I am not a gradualist in Medicare. I believe that it is possible to accomplish the four minimum requirements that have been before us in the federal plan for many years now and to bring Ontario into Medicare—not only so that we can receive the \$170 million that is properly ours to support medical insurance and medical facilities here, but so that our citizens can have the adequate coverage that they do not presently enjoy.

Now, it seems to me that the real roadblock in the establishment of Medicare in Ontario is the Premier himself. He has the power to bring with him his supporters, who would be just as enthusiastic about the other side of the opinion if he espoused it as they are now in sitting gloomily behind him as he has decided that Ontario will hold up progress in Canada in this particular way.

Alberta had this same problem. They had a Premier and an administration, which were in principle opposed to this particular programme. At times, both the Alberta and Ontario administrations have referred to it as socialistic and opposed it on some sort of warped Tory basis, which does not come through in the list of difficulties that the Premier has put before us this afternoon.

Alberta cannot be considered to have a progressive administration. Nevertheless, they have accepted the federal programme, but they were able to do it only by replacing the Premier, Mr. Manning, with someone with a more progressive attitude. I would say this is what faces the Conservative party and the people of Ontario. We can wait until 1971, when this in fact will become a political

issue again. But surely there is another option. And that is to replace the leader of the government as has occurred in Alberta.

I would say this would not be too serious a matter for the present incumbent, if he is opposed to the implementation of this national programme, that he should step aside and let someone else do it, who could certainly bring this into the realism that we must have in the province of Ontario. As a matter of fact, Manning hasn't done too badly about. I notice today that he has taken a position on the board of the Steel Company of Canada and probably this is not the worst fate that could befall anyone. But I would say to you that I was deeply impressed as the Premier recounted his objection which we heard in this House in 1963, that he, and he alone is the repository of that Tory concept that Medicare is, in fact, evil, and in fact we cannot afford to have it here.

I regret secondly, that in this debate on the constitution the Premier has undertaken to spend one hour and a half dealing in minute statistical detail with this particular matter. This is one occasion when I believe we can share our views on the future of our province and of our nation on a basis that is broader, that does see us setting aside many partisan differences in order to at least have a say in the chart that lies before us as citizens of Canada.

I am glad to have the opportunity to respond to the order that is before us—the propositions that have been put forward by Ontario, for the reform and development of our constitutional matters, and I would say that there should be many more opportunities in this House for this particular type of debate. I, for one, am a strong proponent of a select or standing committee of the Legislature which could undertake an investigation of these matters, in a somewhat more informal atmosphere, one in which we could call before us those experts, some of whom perhaps are now sitting under the gallery, listening to the words of the Premier and others taking part in the debate. I feel, beyond that, that such a committee could assess the views of the people of this province, meet with the similar committee that has been constituted in the Legislature of Quebec, and share, I think, in a much more effective way the attitudes that have been expressed by that committee in months and perhaps years gone by.

Surely this is a vehicle that would bring the members of this Legislature into a much more meaningful involvement in constitutional affairs.

I think it is essential that we have a committee of this type. The objections of the government have already been expressed but I think that the main objection is that they want to continue giving us an opportunity to discuss, without any restrictions in length but in a very formal atmosphere, what has already been accomplished and the positions that the government has already irrevocably taken up. I do not believe this is good enough. I believe we must take a more progressive attitude in this connection and I would certainly hope that we would have this sort of deeper involvement in what has got to be one of the chief issues of the day, and one that must concern all of us as citizens of Ontario.

Before discussing in specific detail, the propositions, or some of them that have been put before us, I would say to you, sir, that I had the honour to be an observer at the conference. I did not see it on television. I am sure a different conference came over the tube from the one we saw when we were present in the flesh to see everything that was taking place, and perhaps some of the side issues as they were discussed as well. But I was there at the expense of the people of Ontario and I intend to indicate this afternoon, in the few minutes that remain to me, and this evening, for a short period of time, that the sending of observers there representing the Opposition is something which I hope I can convince the government is of value.

I felt it was an important conference, but one however that failed to make as much progress as the Premier has indicated. It was surely a great success as far as involving the citizens of Canada in our continuing public affairs. In the last two years there have been five incidents in which this has been of great importance. The three conferences that have been discussed, and the two leadership conventions, the federal leadership conventions, one in Toronto in September, 1967, and the one in Ottawa last spring.

I think as a result of those television happenings that the people of Canada no longer look to American politics for their interest in these affairs, but they think of Mr. Bennett and Mr. Smallwood almost as uncles who have come into their home to give them their views at length and for a very entertaining visit. They, I think, have a better appreciation of the problems that face the Premiers and the Prime Ministers.

And more than anything else, there is surely the realization that around that con-

ference table, without regard to partisan differences, there is a body of men which represents the goodwill that is the strength of our nation—and I do not hesitate to use the word—and which has, let us say, a sharing of goals which shows through. Particularly when those members in the front rows around that table set aside their prepared positions—often prepared weeks in advance, with all the irrelevancy that sometimes creeps into them under those circumstances—and state their views in response to positions and propositions put by their fellow members of the conference.

This surely is where the great value of television coverage comes in. That citizens everywhere can see this natural reaction which shows the varying priorities that leaders of provincial delegations must put on their discussions, if in fact the regionalism of Canada is going to have a form in which it can be properly expressed.

But I was an observer. I went into the Confederation room, a very grand hall indeed, on the Monday morning and was much struck with the fact that we were almost coming into a situation similar to Versailles—was it 1815, Elmer? You are the expert in these matters. All the publicity leading up to the conference was based on attitudes of confrontation and crisis. There were those there

who were prepared to make demands, often unreasonable demands. But in fact, there was the attitude of independent powers sitting together around the table on one of those rare occasions when heads of state would come together to solve the problems of the world.

This is the sort of attitude which I think can be softened and in fact destroyed if the conference meets on a regular basis, four times a year at least. And I was glad in the Premier's closing remarks that he indicated that he favoured the continuation of this conference on a regular basis. This is surely its strength when it becomes much more apparent that something other than heads of state are there. In fact, a group of Canadians with similar goals and similar problems are sitting around that table with a real effort of co-operation based on co-operation to solve these problems.

Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I would appreciate it if you would regard this a suitable time to recess.

Mr. Nixon moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Resumption of the debate on the constitution, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Yaremko	1653
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Trotter, agreed to	1687
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1687

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1969

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

CONSTITUTION DEBATE (continued)

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the spirit and hospitality of your dinner tendered as president of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has somewhat cut into the interest in constitutional affairs. Nevertheless I felt it might be useful if I recounted to you, sir, some of my impressions as an observer at the constitutional conference held in Ottawa a few weeks ago, and I thought I should remark on something the Premier (Mr. Robarts) said with regard to opening statements.

The first day of the conference was wholly used for that purpose, and in most cases, Ontario's representative excepted, the statements were based on carefully worded and prepared positions that were then put formally before the conference. I felt, frankly, if the hon. member or Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) will permit, that the Premier of Ontario was very wise indeed in not undertaking to present to the conference a statement that was prepared verbatim. Too often in the past—and I have felt that the leader of the Ontario delegation has himself been guilty in this regard—these views were put down very carefully with every “t” crossed and every “i” dotted many weeks before the presentation, and often they seemed to be completely out of step with the spirit of the conference when the time came for their presentation.

I felt, really, that the leader of the Ontario delegation was feeling his position of seniority, which, in fact, he has earned by virtue of having outlived in office many of those who have been present in these conferences over the years. I suppose the decision of the former Premier of Alberta, Mr. Manning, to relinquish his post after so many years, was the key decision that put the Premier of Ontario in a position where, in fact, it was his responsibility to carry a couple of bottles of oil with him wherever he went to pour on troubled waters—if, in fact, that developed—and in many respects

take up the position of the “honest broker”, so that from his position of seniority, and having established a reasonable attitude in conferences held previously, he could hold himself back a bit, particularly on the opening day, so that if there were serious difficulties—particularly in language rights, which had been predicted by the press—he would be in a position, perhaps, to assist.

I think he did that admirably on the opening day. I did not think there was much in his comment that was new, nevertheless it was well delivered, and certainly in my interjections in his remarks I was most sincere when I said it was a good speech. But I had the impression as a parliamentarian, Mr. Speaker, that the other members sitting in the front row around that table were reacting as parliamentarians. They were delivering speeches that were general in nature and well-mulled in their content for consumption by the folks back home.

In many ways this detracted from the effectiveness of the first day, but certainly if the conferences are going to be held only once a year, it is necessary to undergo that procedure, in order even to stay in the position that was achieved the year before, without even moving ahead. Frankly, I had the same impression that I sometimes get in this House, sir, during the Throne debate, with the feeling that although some of the ideas are interesting, in fact little progress, if any, is made. So I would heartily concur with anyone who might suggest that the opening statements—particularly if these conferences are going to come on a regular basis, as I believe they must—be done away with, and the conference participants get down to business in a serious way right off the bat. This is one way that something more effective might be achieved.

Having just given, let us say, an objective judgment of the Premier of Ontario's contribution on the opening day—I know he will feel very badly that he was not here to hear me give that judgment—I would like to say something about some of the other participants. I felt that Premier Bennett of B.C. was the only person who did give some new concept for consideration of the delegates on that opening day. He came out

of the conference with a new nickname, The Green Giant, because he presented for our interest a new map of Canada in which British Columbia, painted in green, extended right up to the Arctic Ocean. But his concept, or let us say new drawing, of the boundaries of the provinces had a great deal of interest and gathered a great deal of interest and merited a great deal of attention.

My feeling, however, is that we in Ontario can only damage the concept by saying very much about it at all, because it is purely the responsibility of those provinces immediately concerned to undertake the discussions which might, in fact, result in, let us say, a redrawing of these boundaries which, from our point of view here in Ontario, may not be correct, but should lead to efficiencies in government, and this is something which we might all favour.

I suppose in many households now Premier Bennett and Premier Smallwood are referred to as the bookends of Confederation; they usually drag out that old simile themselves. But Smallwood was the only one who seemed to contribute a certain spirit associated with his own personality that had a great deal of significance. I think it is interesting to note that the opening statements of the other premiers were so long that Mr. Smallwood's time at the end of the day was considerably restricted. While he may have contemplated a longer statement, and I do not know what was in his mind (I suppose it is only a coincidence that the live time on CBC ran out at five o'clock), Mr. Smallwood stopped his remarks shortly after.

But certainly his approach emphasizing regional disparities and the need for the recognition in our Constitution of these disparities and the requirements that all of us, as Canadians, do what we can in a most altruistic manner to relieve these disparities; is something that he always brings home to the delegates in a most effective way.

I have got to say that I have heard his speech two or three times, particularly that classic reference to, and I quote:

Somewhere tonight, in one of the outports, a little baby will be born, and that little baby will be consigned to third-class citizenship simply because he happens to be born in a certain part of Canada.

And while we may have heard it before, he always presents the case most effectively. I must say that the Premier of Ontario who, many have said has a face for many seasons, always reacts well to it. There was a time, and I can remember hearing of this with

great interest, when the Premier of Ontario proposed a \$1 billion development fund which would be assigned for the development of those areas less fortunate than our own.

It was drawn to the attention of the conference by Premier Smallwood himself that he presumed that Ontario became less enthusiastic when our Premier realized that, as usual, being the richest province we would pay the largest share toward the funding of this particular \$1 billion. Perhaps it was not precisely fair on his part to do that; nevertheless, he was the one person at the conference who did present to us from the wealthy parts of Canada, a realization of what life is like for those of us in Canada who are fellow-citizens but who have a different type of life, indeed.

It was brought home to me most succinctly when Mr. Smallwood turned to Premier Robarts and said, "If you were to tax your province as heavily as I am forced to tax mine, you would have an extra \$600 million to deal with in your Budget." I felt at the time that Ontario's response, having to do with equalization payments, was considerably beside the point and as a matter of fact added about as much to that debate as the member for Renfrew South is adding to this. In some respects I suppose that comment is unfair as well but maybe there is someone present who could help me in this connection.

Mr. Speaker, besides the comments that came from Bennett—besides the comments that came from the bookend Premiers—we, of course, always pay special attention to the views put before the conference by the Prime Minister of Quebec. Mr. Bertrand, of course, was suffering from special political pressures. It was interesting to compare these pressures at this particular session of the conference with the one held a year before. As you recall, sir, the federal government and the federal Liberal Party was, under those former circumstances, very much subject to the pressures. Those of us who were present and everybody who watched it on television remarked at that time and we think of it still—the confrontation between the then Minister of Justice (and now Prime Minister) and the late Prime Minister of Quebec—and the very fact that Prime Minister Pearson was facing a change in the leadership in the federal party. Within a few months it was a possibility which came, in fact, to pass that there would be a federal election.

But this year the pressures were considerably different and I had the feeling that the positions expressed by Mr. Bertrand on behalf of Quebec were in response to those

pressures. Not only did he have to maintain the traditional arm's-length, sometimes almost offensive attitude toward the central government for provincial consumption, but as we all know, and I think this is generally accepted, the real constituency to which he was talking was perhaps his colleagues in his caucus back in the Legislature. There is no doubt he is facing a challenge to his leadership and his position reflected that.

I think that both he and the Prime Minister and the Premier of Manitoba—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Surely, Mr. Speaker, you can keep that racket down over there.

Mr. Speaker: There are times when the racket from either side of the House is very unnecessary and unbearable, and I would ask, in this instance, if the hon. members on my right would please give the courtesy of a fair hearing to the hon. leader.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your interjecting in the debate in that connection but I would assure you, sir, that as an observer at the particular conference I was quite interested in some of the ironies of the political changes in pressure. I think that we would have to go back almost to—

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): His dogs were barking all afternoon.

Mr. P. T. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): We all know—

Mr. Nixon: Look, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to stand intelligent interjections of the type that sometimes come from the member for Port Arthur—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sure the hon. member for Renfrew South was not listening when I suggested a short time ago that the hon. leader of the Opposition be given a fair hearing. Interjections are quite acceptable, but not continuous interjections, and I would ask the hon. member to observe this.

Mr. Yakabuski: May I have the floor for a moment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member does not have the floor unless he has a point of personal privilege or a point of order. If so, he will state it.

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes, but Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when this debate went on, the hon. leader of the Opposition found time and felt—

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but what is the point of order?

Mr. Yakabuski: —he felt that he had the authority to interject at times, so we should be accorded the same privileges.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is as much out of order as were those this afternoon. I pointed out a short time ago that we do have interjections from both sides of the House, and it is unfortunate because it does spoil the effect of the discussion and it does hinder us from hearing what has been said. I have no objection to the hon. member objecting now and again, but continuous interjections will not be tolerated and if the hon. member persists I will have to find some way of requesting him to desist.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have already made some comment on the opening statement by the leader of the delegation from Ontario. I will recall one phrase that I thought befitted his particular argument very well. He called upon everyone around the table to participate in the discussion in a spirit of—I think he called it—a participatory federalism. That seemed to catch everyone's attention, and I thought that it was a point that was well made, particularly from his particular standpoint.

I think perhaps he was proud of his position as expressed on that first day, but perhaps the successes carried him into a situation at the opening of the second day which surely he will live to regret, both as a politician and as a person who is leading this province towards the kind of community that we all hope for. I would like to recount it to you rather specifically. At the beginning of the second day's discussions we were supposed to be discussing fiscal matters. This had been put forward by the Premier of Ontario and the Premiers from some of the western provinces. It was recounted in the newspapers as a great breakthrough and victory for the provincial forces, because in fact fiscal matters were going to be discussed before some others. Certainly the chairman did not seem to have any particular difficulties in permitting that. He seemed to be ready to go along with any reasonable request.

I had the impression, Mr. Speaker, that we were going to be treated at that time to the carefully prepared statistical presentation of all that was the matter with the federal medical insurance plan, a discussion of how it came into being, perhaps some criticism as

to the lack of what the Premier of Ontario would call consultation.

I even had the distinct impression that this was going to be a carefully scripted approach, unlike its presentation the day before, that there may have even been a point in it where the marginal notes would say "yell like hell here".

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, he got to that page within the first two or three minutes of his presentation, and the force in it, if any there was, was lost because of that.

I felt that if we are going to have open conferences where any Premier or any delegate sitting around that table can slant his position toward those who might be watching on television, it seemed to be a peculiar attitude indeed when the Premier of Ontario would look up into the glassy eye of the television camera and say, "I am speaking to you people back in Ontario when I say that is a fraud, the worst fraud perpetrated in Canadian political history."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: That is a Machiavellian fraud as well.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Look me right in the eye in the television.

Mr. Nixon: No. I submit to you—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to this, I certainly remember him looking up into the handiest camera, right into its eye, and saying, "I am speaking to you people out there."

I would say that if those people back in London town saw the side of his face, then his judgement in picking the cameras is similar to his judgment in decision on Medicare.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: I do not want to lose this point because I think it is an important one. If I can make a judgment over the noise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: If I can make any judgment as an observer who was in the room at that particular time, I felt that the best-laid plan of the Premier of Ontario had gone awry.

Mr. Singer: Here we go again.

Mr. Speaker: May I point out to the hon. members that a minute or two ago there was as much noise from one side of the House as from the other side, and if the hon. members wish their leader to have the courtesy of a hearing, then, of course, they should accord it to him themselves.

The hon. member for Renfrew South will please desist.

Mr. Nixon: I would certainly like to make the point as carefully as I can, that if the Premier's presentation at the conference—not this afternoon in this debate, but at the conference—was designed to lead the other Premiers and Prime Ministers into a support for his position and against federal Medicare, then it was a dead loss and a dreary failure. It fact, it was only the Prime Minister or the Premier of Nova Scotia sitting beside the Premier of Ontario who was able, after a rather embarrassing pause, to come along and say: "You're right, the consultation wasn't very good", and try very lamely to explain why he had taken his province into federal Medicare.

Now, it may possibly be that even after the outburst at the conference and the rather peculiar contribution to the debate this afternoon which the leader of the government turned into a Medicare debate, that he is even prepared to reverse that situation on Budget day next Tuesday or some time within the next two years. Frankly, I have my doubts.

But I would say again that when he looks into the cameras and says he speaks for the people of Ontario, that he is wrong. He speaks for the government of Ontario and his supporters, including the member for Renfrew South, but no one else.

If we are going to put a political balance to this, surely, Mr. Speaker, you must realize that many more voted for the Liberal federal candidate just a few months ago than voted for the Conservative candidates who were supporting the position that was taken by the Premier of Ontario then and now.

So surely his confrontation politics expressed in the second day at Ottawa were really in the nature of either a childish outburst or the nature of a mistake, because he could have put forward many of the orderly arguments—I would not say that they carried much weight, but orderly arguments—that he put before this House today at such length, but he did not choose to do that.

Now, if we are going to have a federal-provincial conference, when in fact someone's

arguments and ideas are going to impress those who do not at that time agree, then how can the Premier of Ontario turn to the Prime Minister of Canada and accuse him of perpetrating a Machiavellian fraud? Surely he is not expecting the Prime Minister of Canada to turn to him and say, "You are right, we will change this."

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I did not accuse the present Prime Minister of Canada, and I made it very clear that I did not consider him to be responsible for anything that had happened prior to June 25, 1968.

Mr. Nixon: As a matter of fact, I recall the Premier saying at the time that surely the Prime Minister of Canada, with the mandate he received in June of 1968, could ignore completely all those things that had been undertaken previously. This is precisely the matter that the Premier of Ontario objects to—that the government of Canada does not fulfil its commitments in an orderly and precise way.

Surely his advice to the Prime Minister of Canada was the height of irresponsibility and I think it was certainly proper and responsible that it did not even evince a response from the chairman of the meeting. As a matter of fact, I have heard some people say that the chairman, Trudeau, did not react, perhaps with as much flair, perhaps with as many new ideas as he had demonstrated at the conference the year before.

I would say myself that he was exemplary in his role as chairman. He did not intrude his ideas into the general debate, as was very proper. I could not help but think that he was sensitive to the fact that his predecessor, the chairman of the conference the year before, was sitting in the gallery. Not that he would be in any way, let us say, sensitive to him being there, but he would think back to the prime ability of Lester Pearson in conducting matters of that type. But I think Trudeau was able to conduct the affairs in a very fair and equitable way and surely there is no one here present, or who was sitting around that table, who would say otherwise.

So leaving the point relating to Medicare for a moment and coming to one area where there was some progress, a change of heart on the part of Ontario, I would go on to a contribution made to the conference by our Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), who also had spoken on behalf of Ontario a year before when the proposition of the charter of human rights was put before the conference.

The Attorney General has heard me on this matter before. He has objected to a statement that I made when I said that, in my impression, he, speaking for Ontario, scuttled the possibility of a charter of human rights, basic rights, that was presented in 1968 and which might very well be further along the way to implementation if it had not been for the very negative contribution that our Attorney General made at that time. Prince Edward Island was the only provincial government that took exception to his stand then, which shows, I suppose, the force of argument that the Attorney General was able to marshal. And I would congratulate him and the administration opposite for relenting in the negative attitude that they expressed a year ago.

They took a position that was entirely different this year and the Premier—I thought rather awkwardly—tried to justify that position by saying that they did not have time to think about it before they took a negative stand.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just five days.

Mr. Nixon: All right. So in other words, he is saying that five days is sufficient reason for him to take a wrong stand. If, in fact, he was not prepared to give a judgment, why did he not say so, rather than marshaling the arguments which, in fact, tended to put the whole thing almost underground until it was resurrected again in the federal position papers this year?

Unfortunately the skill and argumentation of our Attorney General was not strong enough this time to convince all of his colleagues around the table to agree with him. There are still those—and I am not prepared to list their partisan background right now—who are not prepared to whole-heartedly embrace the principle of the entrenchment of such a charter.

Nevertheless, I believe that progress was made and this time because Ontario moved—Ontario was not inflexible in this particular area—and I agree with the position that was taken, I believe it did not go far enough in that we could have very well given stronger support to the concept of the entrenchment of the charter of human rights.

I do want to say something more about the contribution of the Premier of Ontario and his major supporters at the conference, the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and the Attorney General. Because, you know, they tend to think of themselves as humble men—men who are prepared to react to situations

in, let us say, an informed, but basically human sort of way. I was amazed and really shocked to hear the Attorney General get up for Canada and say, "We in Ontario have a method of safeguarding the individual rights of our citizens that is unsurpassed in the world."

I am glad the Attorney General has a few people in the world who would agree with him, but I would say that only those who were beating their hands on the desks would find themselves in that number. What help is there in such an argument when the condescending, rich province comes in and says, "We are the best in the world. You might consider doing what we have done," taken in the light of a speech read for the Premier in this very House just a few weeks ago. It was a speech read by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), in which he accused the government of Canada of grandstanding in this particular matter of using the entrenchment of a charter of civil rights for public relations purposes. It was the sort of a statement which, for one thing, had no place in its particular order in the debate here, and which was grossly unfair in its formation and its presentation. It had nothing whatsoever to do—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What you say is defending the federal government.

Mr. Nixon: I am not defending them, I am attacking you because I feel that your approach has been inadequate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You are a front for the federal government.

Mr. Nixon: Your leadership has been non-existent in matters of import that were put before this conference.

I would like to pursue this point just a bit. The Attorney General told the assembled delegates that we had the best in the world as far as certain aspects of his legal responsibilities are concerned. Following that, the Minister of Education was brought up into the place of honour beside the Premier and he repeated the speech that he heard at the Confederation of Tomorrow conference about the dramatic steps that we have taken in language instruction here.

I agree with that, but once again we were preaching to the other premiers, saying all you have to do is look at our marvellous example and you, too, will have something approaching the best in the world. It went on with the offer made by the Premier to give advice and technical assistance to those Atlantic provinces that are having a bit of diffi-

culty because when they get up in the morning they find that they have slept on a mattress made in Ontario. When they wash their hands they find that the sink was made in Ontario, and so on.

There was an air of condescension that did not sit well with the delegates in the approach taken before the conference under these circumstances. Now I do not think humility is a particularly useful trait at the conference or in any other circumstances. Nevertheless I felt that the position that was taken did not enhance Ontario's situation as one of the leaders in these discussions, and in fact detracted from it severely.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal specifically with some of the propositions that have been put before us by the advisory committee to the government having to do with constitutional changes. I am not going to deal with them all by any means, but the first one I want to deal with specifically is number 7 in the blue book that has been made available, I guess, to some of us but not all. In it we are told that it is recommended by the advisory committee that the written Constitution of Canada must be flexible enough to be adaptable to fundamental social and economic changes.

This was strangely absent from the comments made by the Premier this afternoon. He seems to forget that these great disparities that are put so much to the fore by some of his fellow Premiers at these conferences, can only be removed by the flexibility that is recommended in proposition number 7. In his comments, he said little or nothing about a programme that would, in fact, undertake a change in the social development of Canada.

In his perfunctory listing of the separation and division of powers, I do not think it figured prominently at all. In my view, this is surely one of the most important areas and I concur wholeheartedly with the recommended flexibility in this connection.

I suppose I am a bit of an idealist in that I firmly believe that we, in Canada, should set as our goal in this matter the scrapping of The British North America Act and the development of a constitutional vehicle that is wholly our own. I will deal with this in a bit more detail later in my remarks, but I am further convinced that we here in this House have got to be practical politicians. We have to do what is possible, and frankly I do not think that approach is possible at the present time.

Although not a student of The British North America Act but one, I submit, who

has examined its ramifications, I am convinced that the flexibility that has been found there for a century by politicians and judges, can serve us for a good long time in the future, as long as there is this atmosphere of co-operation that everyone calls for but very few people seem to be able to undertake on their own part. Lack of co-operation seems to always be the other person's shortcoming.

It is always from the standpoint of Ontario that the federal people are not prepared to co-operate. From the standpoint of the Premier of Newfoundland, it is sometimes Ontario that is not prepared to co-operate. From those Premiers who are prepared to co-operate in a federal Medicare system and who have, in fact, adapted their own circumstances to what is recognized as a national plan, Ontario is very much the unco-operative partner in this particular matter.

I would say, as far as proposition 7 is concerned, the flexibility in the present British North America Act is there only if the participants in Confederation—the people that the Premier of Ontario is talking about, the people at the top who must make the Constitution operate—have this spirit of give as well as take, which is the basis of the kind of co-operation that we require and which we are looking for.

Proposition 8 is very closely associated with it—the central and provincial governments must respect each other's constitutional jurisdictions. This, I suppose, was one of the recommendations of the advisory committee, perhaps framed in response to some of the objections that have been stated in present constitutional matters by the administration of Ontario, the government of Ontario, but I think it has a much more far-reaching involvement.

The Premier, this afternoon, was talking about not wanting Canada partitioned with brick walls separating our fiscal and, I presume, other responsibilities. Now this I believe in most strongly. There are those at all levels who are saying that shared-cost programmes have no place at all in the future of our nation. I cannot conceive of our Confederation lasting long, if it is not at the centre governed with enough power and imagination so that those programmes which are designed and which, in fact, are required to cement unity and do away with these regional disparities, cannot be entered into.

While the Premier of Ontario objects to the brick wall separation with regard to fiscal transfers, I have the distinct impression that he wants all of the power to operate his

own province without any infringements on what he decides are his own constitutional prerogatives. The matter has come before the House in the question from the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid). While the Premier is prepared to accuse the government of Canada of infringing these constitutional prerogatives, he will not follow it up with a test in court. He says that is not the point; the decision is his and he believes that if they are infringing then they are infringing and he is not going to co-operate nor adapt.

I feel this is a position that is not in the best interests of the co-operation that all call for. Certainly, as it is applied to Medicare, the one shared-cost programme that seems to be so very much in our minds this afternoon and tonight, it is entirely irresponsible. In fact, when we look at the situation, it is difficult to comprehend why one man leading this government can obstruct the progress of a nation. That is, in fact, what he is doing.

Mr. Singer. Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: That is right, one third of the population. Now this gets down to the old argument as to whether the man sitting opposite thinks of himself only as Premier of Ontario or does, from time to time, accept his responsibility as a citizen of Canada. I have heard the old stuff about "I am going to speak for Ontario". This sounds great, and yet in the other face, the fact for the other season, we hear the leader of the government talk about his strong support for equalization programmes, and the fact that he is one who is prepared to put forward the dollars from his people in Ontario toward such a programme. When his people in Ontario pay those taxes, they are paying them as citizens of Canada, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, none of us should forget that.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Medicare is not the only shared-cost programme that has given us some concern, and those who pay the bills at Ottawa—and that means all of us as taxpayers—some concern. I do not know if I have the full list in front of me or not, but hospitalization is one that is well established. We are concerned about its cost, but it is established and we will never do without it. The argument that we are free to join it or not, and this was raised this afternoon with regard to Medicare, is a specious argument. You cannot do without hospitalization.

Heaven help you if you get sick and have to go to the hospital. If you are there for two days the bill is more than you can handle. Nobody in this province can get along without hospitalization. Just as I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that no one should be in a position where they have to get along without medical insurance.

ARDA is another shared-cost programme, and this, of course, is the subject of recurrent troubles—I would say recurrent difficulties at both levels. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), sitting opposite, is much too quick to blame his counterpart in the federal administration, or, in this particular case, the hon. Jean Marchand, for closing down the money in support, for example, of certain ARDA programmes. In fact, these limitations have been set for a considerable length of time, and the administration of the funds is entirely in the hands of the Minister sitting opposite.

Going on, we have a shared-cost programme in welfare, and in many respects the government of Canada picks up 80 per cent of the tab. The same is true of housing, in the assembly of land; 90 per cent of the cost of the land. Yet this Minister opposite—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Would the hon. member permit a question? We borrow 90 per cent from the federal government and pay them 6.75 per cent interest, and they never had a better creditor than the province of Ontario. They get every dime back with full interest, and the only thing they pick up is 50 per cent of any losses. We pick up 42.5 and we do all the work. We buy the land, we service it, we put the buildings on it, we manage it. Now tell me what the federal government does.

Mr. Nixon: Let us take a case in point. Let us take the land that was assembled around Kitchener, and one of the members to my left was talking about this in detail the other day. You are the person, you are the Minister who makes the brave announcement that you are assembling land for a new town. You are the Minister who decides without reference to any planning board where that land is going to be established and settled. You are the Minister who decides how much is to be paid for it, who is going to conduct the business, and you get all the credit there is, yet the Minister who signs the cheque for 90 per cent of the cost is Paul Hellyer. That is what I am talking about.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will not mind me correcting him. In the first place he gets his 90 per cent back at 6.75 per cent, and let me just point out to you, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Okay. Let me just correct this statement when you say I run roughshod over every other Minister. We have a task force at the housing corporation—a man from Treasury Board, a man from water resources, and they all—

Mr. Nixon: I did not say he rode roughshod over every Minister; that may be the fact but I did not say so. I tell you I could ask him about what he is doing with the Malvern development.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is a good question.

Mr. Nixon: But surely the point is this—

Mr. Singer: All he does is make noise.

Mr. Nixon: When we are talking about shared-cost programmes I think every one of them has given rise to some difficulty. We start with Medicare and we go on to hospitalization, which is becoming such a problem for the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), as if he didn't have enough trouble along the line. On ARDA, the Minister of Agriculture complains constantly that there is not enough federal money to support his view of what should be available. The Minister of Social and Family Services is concerned that there is not enough money to support his plans for, say, Indians, and so on—telling only one side of the argument, and never getting around to the point, even in his estimates.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): I always tell both sides.

Mr. Nixon: Not even in his estimates.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) is not here; he may be in later, I know he is on the list to speak. We will hear the old stuff about French education again for the fifth time, but you know, half the cost of post-secondary education is met from the government of Canada. All of these shared-cost programmes are a part of Canadian life. You could not get along without them, and no other province could either. Now I speak for Ontario, too.

Mr. Singer: And also for Canada.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, right. And speaking for Ontario, I would say that the serious lack

that I see in the present administration is a lack of leadership, other than complaining, in the approach to the Constitution. The main complaint, other than from Minister after Minister that they do not get enough money from Ottawa, is that in general there is not a spirit of co-operation in reapportioning powers, fiscal or otherwise. The Premier and the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) have been fulminating about this for the last six months. I will not go into the speech, which you have heard before, about no increases in taxation in election year and all of a sudden we find ourselves faced with this deeply serious financial problem—a deeply serious problem that has led us into the largest deficits in the history of our province.

Yet what is the result of this when we come to the one forum where something might be achieved—where the Premier of Ontario is sitting at one side of the table, the Prime Minister of Canada right beside him, the Prime Minister of Quebec right across? All their chief advisors are there in this beautiful room. They look at the propositions put forward by Ontario, and they say, "What does Ontario say we should do about the reapportionment of these powers, fiscal and otherwise?" Well, they say nothing. The advisory committee draws a blank. The Prime Minister, in his statement, simply says Medicare is no good. There is no leadership from this Premier, and who else is it going to come from? Certainly not the Prime Minister of Canada no less.

His advisory committee perhaps let him down, I do not know. But that page is a blank, other than the statement that in the division of powers there must be sufficient fiscal depth to support the responsibility, or something innocuous and meaningless like that. We have heard that from across the way for a long time.

If they are not prepared as the government of Ontario to come to grips with some meaningful reassessment of these powers, then nobody is and it cannot be done. So I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to hear these Ministers complaining as long as they are there, and it will not be much longer. They are going to complain this way, just like some frustrated housewives who simply can see no solution to their problems. I would say to you, sir, that if the government of Ontario believes in the redistribution of powers, fiscal and otherwise, it had better bring forward some definite and concrete proposals rather than the generalities for home consumption it has been guilty of up until now.

Mr. Sopha: Just like a bunch of highway-men when they move into Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: So the point is this, we have these shared-cost programmes, and you think they are giving you problems. All we have to do is see the embarrassingly huge federal deficits that have been entered into to pay the other half, or the other part—usually far more than half of these shared-cost programmes—to see why, I suppose, from the other side of the argument there is some considerable concern as well. Yet none of you make any headway toward even a semblance of solution or the background work that must go toward the accomplishment of such a solution.

I believe that shared-cost programmes are going to be a part of Canadian nationhood as long as we exist.

I would hope that these programmes are going to change in an orderly and gradual way, and I would believe that there would be all of the consultation that everyone would wish, the sort of consultation that we would wish this government would enter into, with let us say, last year's school boards and this year's counties and townships before they undertake the unilateral changes that they are quite prepared to impose on those levels of government under them.

Mr. Singer: Very good point.

Mr. Nixon: But the fact is this, if the government of Canada is going to have the powers that the Premier of Ontario piously hopes for them, and on most occasions when he talks about these matters, they must, using the mandate of the majority and the Parliament of Canada, reach the sort of decisions that lead them to bring forward a Medicare programme, trusting that the provinces in Canada will adapt themselves to it, as they should, or perhaps opt out. That is the word to use, opt out, that has been the decision, apparently, of the government of Ontario this afternoon.

They have responsibility across Canada. We have a responsibility here in Ontario. But I would say there will be a panel of shared-cost programmes that will be with us as long as we are a nation, and that we in Ontario will pay, as taxpayers in Canada, the major portion of these shared-cost programmes. That is our responsibility as Canadian citizens.

Who knows what the new programme will be? I would think that we in Ontario, in the near future, maybe we will do it on Tuesday, maybe we will do it next year, maybe we will do it after the election in 1971. We will in

fact take full responsibility, with fiscal equivalents supporting them, for the programmes that have been offered by the federal government and which we are already sharing.

The Premier is very much afraid that the government of Canada will relinquish these, only to build up a surplus which will lead them into some other chicanery, some other Machiavellian fraud, such as a new look at welfare leading to a guaranteed minimum income. I have heard even Conservatives advocate that.

I would think that there would be a shared-cost programme associated with the establishment of fuller support in education, particularly in the light of the need to approach equality of opportunity in this particular regard, and we must not expect to be more than consulted.

We must not have a veto or even expect a veto when we consider ourselves citizens of Canada. This is where I feel the attitude of the men opposite me in our Constitution lacks the depth that we must have if our nationhood is to grow and strengthen.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that is an Arthur Meighen statement.

Mr. Singer: What other reaction would you expect from London Centre? What other reaction would you expect from London? Go ahead. Go ahead, you will run out your strength. Defend the London Life.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, one of the other propositions I want to refer to briefly is number 10 which states as follows: "The relationships of the provinces with the federal government need not be uniform in all respects."

I suppose that could have been left with the proposition calling for flexibility. You may call this a sort of a "ready, aye ready" approach. But I for one, and I speak for my colleagues of this side, supported the Liberal Party a few months ago when their policy was, in the best sense of the word, one Canada.

I believe this is an essential ingredient in any Constitution that is going to unify our country. I would like you to consider the fact that this proposition, if I may call it that, was a part of the campaign last spring. It was put forward across Canada, and certainly very strongly in Quebec, and received a surprising amount of support there.

I do not believe in any regard that there is a narrowness in this view, because our present Constitution has within it a great deal of

flexibility that will permit Quebec even now to levy its own income tax, just as this right, and, in fact, in some circumstances the responsibility is available to any province, that Quebec has seized upon the flexibilities in our present Constitution, as well they should, to adapt to their own particular needs.

But believe me, if we are to revert to some of that old hocus pocus having to do with that word that the Premier does not like to use for this very reason, *deux nation*, or even the approach taken by the NDP which calls for special status for Quebec, surely we are not serving the long range goals of our nation.

No one is calling for a rigid enforcement of a Constitution that sets out in chapter and verse every responsibility on every fiscal back-ground.

We are looking at our present Constitution, and we see there the flexibilities that have permitted Quebec to opt out of certain federal programmes, and certainly the Premier of Ontario was most upset when that took place. It has permitted Quebec to bring about their own tax system when they saw fit to do so, and I would say that the flexibility is in that Constitution and must be maintained in that Constitution without its setting itself definitely along the lines to make Canada *deux nation*.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): They are so flexible they do not know where they are.

Mr. Nixon: Not at all. We are putting forward a programme that is a Liberal programme. It is a programme that has been put forward across our nation, and has been accepted in all parts of Canada. And we are saying the flexibility is there—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Did you listen to Molgat in Manitoba the day before yesterday?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I was listening.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): Are you supposing that the constitutional relationships be identical to all provinces?

Mr. Nixon: I would say in answer to the question put by the hon. member for York-Forest Hill that the flexibility in the present Constitution does not in itself select any part of Canada, nor any province for special responsibilities, nor for special favours.

It does however, permit any part of Canada—and Quebec has seized upon this and very properly so—to keep itself out of

certain programmes as it has chosen to do; to adjust its own tax system, as it has chosen to do. I am referring to the proposition that has been put before us by this government saying that the Constitution should have some division within it allowing for this.

My contention is only this; that the flexibility of our present Constitution has been found to be sufficient to encompass cultural differences, differences in aspirations which we will have for another 100 years and which should not be further divided by being enshrined in the Constitution.

Mr. Dunlop: Proposition 10, which you are debating, of course does not refer to flexibility. It is the one that refers to the nature and this would also include, naturally, the very special status for Quebec which has got an entirely different body of civil law, that you voted out.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would hasten to assure the hon. member for York-Forest Hill that I spoke of the two propositions; the one calling for flexibility and the one for differences in application together. I thought that they should be considered together and he makes a point there that is a very useful one in drawing this to my attention.

Certainly I believe in the flexibility of the Constitution that we have. I believe in its ability to accommodate differences that are presently in our nation. But I would be against a new Constitution which would set out those differences in such a way that would, let us say, underline or emphasize what they already are.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): It is what you might call—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, perhaps you would.

Mr. Singer: The *troisième* one being the London Life.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Mr. Speaker, while interruptions are taking place might I ask a question?

I notice that the leader of the Opposition mentioned the possibility of expanded cost-sharing activities in the field of education, but I also note that Mr. Trudeau has mentioned in his writings very clearly and very sharply, that this is a field in which the federal government should not intrude.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps you should discuss that matter with the leader of the government, since he considers me an apologist for Mr. Trudeau. If my view in this connection is different from his—and you are right, it is—then I am prepared to accept it, if you are. But I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that as a Canadian I can see that, in the next 25 years, the area where equality of opportunity must mean more than anything else is in the area of education opportunity. In my view, the involvement of the federal government in this matter is one that has got to grow and not recede.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I ask if there is any voice in the province of Quebec—Liberal, NDP, or separatist—that agrees with you?

Mr. Sopha: In where?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: In the province of Quebec.

Mr. Sopha: Well, what does it matter?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we—

Mr. MacDonald: Because it represents reality.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the same sort of programmes which have enabled the government of Canada to pay half the costs of post-secondary education in this province right now. They do not direct the money to pay the teachers' salaries, nor to build the buildings. The money is directed to the government of the province, which then applies it as, I suppose, what the Premier of Ontario would call a block grant, for the purposes that they see fit.

Certainly, I do not want the government of Canada to operate our schools. But the only way we can have equality of opportunity is with dollars; dollars buy equality.

Mr. Speaker, I would say much has been said about leadership in determining the course of our constitutional affairs and specifically, the relationships between the provinces and the federal government. But while setting the stage for the past five months for a confrontation on fiscal matters, Ontario was sadly lacking in providing the sort of leadership which might in fact have taken the conference into a meaningful discussion of the allocation of the powers, fiscal and otherwise.

The fulminations of both the Treasurer and the Premier would have led any reasonable observer to expect that this conference

would have seen Ontario lead the provinces in the kind of discussion which might have brought about the sort of solutions Ontario has called for. Yet we see that Ontario has failed in that regard.

The greatest disappointment was the failure of Ontario to lead the provinces into this discussion. It seems that even that special private committee that advises the Premier, and which is unavailable to a committee of this House, was unable to force itself to come to grips with the knotty problem of this type.

Perhaps if Ontario cannot do the research from the provincial end of this discussion it cannot be done and it may be a long time before an occasion is presented when as much urgency in this particular area of constitutional reform is felt by all participants.

I have never agreed with those in high places, in government or journalism, who have repeated, one after the other, that fiscal affairs cannot be divorced from all constitutional affairs. Perhaps the member for Carleton would like to point out to me what Mr. Trudeau has said and that I, therefore, disagree with him.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: And he also said, as I believe, that fiscal policies should not be used to intrude into Quebec's educational jurisdiction.

Mr. Nixon: Right. Right. There are many areas of meaningful reform which have no fiscal overtones at all. Even these were not dealt with effectively by the conference. I refer specifically to the entrenchment of a charter of human rights, which I have discussed already. The reform of the Senate which Ontario deals with in proposition number 25, and, of course, the Supreme Court.

Perhaps I should say something about the Senate. I have already said, outside the House, that I believe its usefulness is at an end. I believe that if this conference of Premiers and Prime Ministers can be constituted on a regular and frequent basis, there is every way for the reasonable aspirations of provinces and regions to be put before the other government and before the people of Canada. I, for that reason, would recommend that if this continuing conference does in fact become an effective adjunct to the regular processes of government, that the Senate would become an anachronism and should be abolished.

Mr. MacDonald: It has been policy for 30 years.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly the allocation of responsibilities that cost money to support must be considered at the same time as the allocation of tax sources. This is easily understood. But the platitude of the indivisibility of fiscal and constitutional matters in many respect was a block of meaningful progress in areas where it might otherwise have been expected.

When it comes to leadership and the real problems of our nation, I want to take a moment to quote from an article written by Stan McDowell in the *Winnipeg Free Press*:

Throughout the June election campaign, Mr. Trudeau persuaded the voters to make promises to one another and to him by winning applause in Quebec for his "one nation" stand and applause in English-speaking Canada for the proposition that the French-speaking should enjoy equality throughout the whole country. The Prime Minister has continued, since the election, to seize every opportunity to communicate to the people his belief in the need for a bill of rights, accompanied especially by a guarantee of linguistic equality.

These are surely two matters of great importance that have been put before the nation and before the conference by the Prime Minister of Canada. Progress has been made in both of these areas. Certainly not the least of which was Ontario. But no progress has been made in the realignment of responsibilities, largely because the Premier of Ontario failed at the conference to provide the leadership expected.

Now I want to talk about some solutions. The ideal solution for our constitutional difficulties would surely be to have seized on the mood of the public in our Centennial year and undertaken the full responsibility for a new, modern Constitution meeting the needs for our second century. This possibility seems more remote now than it did a year ago, when even Ontario cannot bring itself to do the hard thinking needed to specifically reallocate powers and fiscal responsibilities.

The time may come when we see fit to throw The British North America Act in the waste basket and start fresh with a document or a constitutional vehicle which is completely our own and which reflects—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? I did not know whether that reference to me personally was his or is that in the article he was quoting from some paper?

Mr. Nixon: No, I think I indicated the—if I did not, it was before that particular reference. The reference to the Premier of Ontario is mine.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: He will accept responsibility for it.

Mr. Nixon: Now I am talking about a goal which eventually must come to pass, whether in our time or someone else's, that we have a Constitution arrived at in our own nation, and which reflects the aspirations of what has become an independent nation with a proud history and a hopeful future.

But we, I suppose, practise the politics of practicality. There are short-term responsibilities that we must not lose sight of. As a politician and a Canadian, I demand that our delegation take every step possible to see that our Constitution is patriated and that the requirement that we petition the Parliament of Great Britain is eliminated for all time. The procedures for amendment must, of course, be a part of this solution.

But while we wait for time and opportunity to accomplish this goal, I am convinced that the continuing federal-provincial conference must meet on a regular and frequent basis to eliminate the formality and time-wasting of restating old positions. If the continuing conference becomes a new level of government in fact, then so be it; and it will be in Parliament and in the Legislature, and eventually at the ballot boxes, that the democratic controls will be exerted.

I have no doubt that men of goodwill, and that includes all of us I am sure, can use the flexibility that has been found already by the courts and parliamentarians in The British North America Act, to meet our continuing and changing requirements. While we have the long-range goals that I have already stated, this continuing conference must get down to finding solutions for problems that have plagued us far too long. At the head of the list must be positions of understanding on the fiscal situation, which has already been discussed on other occasions and will no doubt be a part of our Budget debate in the immediate future. The long-range sniping between the provincial capitals and Ottawa cannot be used as a political tool to fool the taxpayers any longer.

The conference as well must deal with the shared responsibility for many other practical and immediate matters, such as Indian affairs. It can come to some agreement on off-shore

mineral rights; the revamping of old-fashioned welfare into a truly effective modern programme of a guaranteed minimum income. It must consider and solve our continuing problems of financial disparity that are so much a real part of constitutional problems.

Taken all in all, the conference under discussion was a failure in its decisions—which too often relied on that old gimmick of committee referral—but a resounding success as an educational vehicle for all Canadians to hear their politicians in action, and to share with them the problems that are inherent in Canadian nationhood. Our Constitution must make us not rivals for power but partners for progress. The people of Ontario expect it of us and we must not fail them.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Prime Minister this afternoon, it occurred to me that any record that has to be defended at such length as he defended the Medicare record is certainly a very, very vulnerable one.

We have listened to this Medicare story so many times, yet for reasons that still escape me, it was injected to a degree that was really out of order during the constitutional debate this afternoon. Obviously, the government is engaged in laying the groundwork for the Budget or some tactic beyond it—I am not going to attempt to engage in the game of speculating exactly what the government is up to. I noticed at one point, when the leader of the Opposition was speaking and expressing some wonderment as to whether the Prime Minister's statement this afternoon meant that the government was going into Medicare or staying out, the Prime Minister interjected *sotto voce*, "Well, I've got you guessing".

He may have a lot of people guessing, but I do not think at this stage of the game that that is the point of debate with regard to Medicare. The Prime Minister contends, for example, that Medicare has been given "an artificial priority", Mr. Speaker, can you think of anything more preposterous! Fifty years after Medicare became a major issue in the politics in this country, a Prime Minister should rise in the largest Legislature in this country and say that it has been given an artificial priority because we are on the eve of implementing it? Only from a Tory could that kind of a comment come.

As a matter of fact, exactly what this party believes, and whether its members all believe the same thing—notwithstanding the firm assertions of the Prime Minister this afternoon—I invite you to consider by going

back to last year. Believe it or not, the seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne—and therefore he was something of a spokesman for the party because I think it is generally recognized that the mover and seconder are speaking for the party—the hon. member for York East (Mr. Meen) rose and delivered himself of a stinging attack against the principle of universality in Medicare. In commenting on it, to be found on page 220 in *Hansard*, I made this statement:

Already, in this Legislature, the Tory colours have been nailed firmly to the mast. In seconding the address, the member for York East proudly proclaimed his party's opposition to the principle of universality. He called Medicare a socialist measure . . . and implied his party would never countenance its implementation.

I am continuing the quote, and I repeat it this year:

I have news for the member. I predict that two years from now, in response to the public pressure, his party will have taken Ontario into the national Medicare plan and, what is more, this Tory government will be taking credit for the whole idea.

I repeat that prediction right here, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister simply is not going to persist—in whatever the kind of tactics he is engaged in and whatever be the motive and the objective in the short term—in refusing to take \$175 millions, from Ottawa and continue to lament that they are denying us the money that we already paid into the federal treasury. It is a case of taking the money and using it, and I would add, incidentally, without chiselling on it, by charging the same level or higher, as he attempted to argue this afternoon, in premiums, so that he can direct the money elsewhere though it has originally been given for Medicare itself.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if I may lower my voice and just say to the Prime Minister that in this issue, I think his statement and his conduct are demeaning; demeaning of the province and, in fact, demeaning of the stature which he has built as a leader among those reshaping Confederation at the present time.

It is this kind of attitude, with all of the vagaries and the inconsistencies in his presentation, that evokes a response that was so magnificently illustrated at one stage during the conference when Joey Smallwood referred to it as "feeding the fat sow". That is the kind of attitude, rightly or wrongly, that is evoked in the mind of other Canadians. To say that you are in favour of a social measure, as this government does, and then continue to object in the most vigorous fashion to the manner in which it is going

to be implemented, is the last refuge of a person who is, in fact, opposed to that social measure.

The record of opposition by the Tory government has been too long to be erased by a few words today from an existing Tory government which does everything possible to frustrate its implementation to assist people across the country. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the thing that makes it even more demeaning—and surely this must have struck the Prime Minister—is that as the Prime Minister of the richest province in this country, he continues to rail against Medicare and the manner in which it is being handled, when two of his fellow Conservative Prime Ministers in "have-not" or "have-less" provinces, namely Manitoba and Nova Scotia, are going into it because their people have desperate need for this social measure that should have come a generation, or two or three generations, ago.

The simple fact of the matter is that the Tory government in the province of Ontario was dragged in by events, was pushed in by events, kicking and squealing, into the Canada Pension Plan, making all manner of excuses for the reason it could not get in at an earlier date.

On the evidence of its basic doctrine, ideological objection and opposition to the plan, it is going to be dragged kicking and squealing into the national Medicare plan.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time tonight to discuss the Prime Minister's new figures on the cost of Medicare. I would like to read the figures and attempt to absorb them, because they are so bizarre as to be unrelated to any other set of figures on Medicare that one might have read elsewhere. He is trying to conjure up the image that Medicare, with his chiselling on the money he gets from Ottawa, is going to cost more than it is now with OMSIP.

This, again, is the last refuge of a person who is opposed to the measure and is trying to discredit it in the minds of the public. But I just want to make this basic point, and I do it in terms which I have used in the Legislature before because the figures are obviously generally accurate because they coincide with what the Prime Minister himself used this afternoon.

I was fascinated last spring to see the Canadian Press survey that had been made across the country indicating what the cost of the Medicare plan would be in each province if that province moved in to the national plan, and secondly, what is now

being spent in each of those provinces, through either public or private plans. If the province of Ontario were to move into Medicare through the national plan, the cost to the province would be \$350 million. The figures the Prime Minister gave this afternoon—even on per capita averages as high as \$54—were \$358 million plus \$18 million for administration, a total of \$375 million. So the figure is essentially the same as the \$350 million. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the thing we must not forget, yet this government will never face up to, is that the cost now for Medicare in the province of Ontario through private plans and through OMSIP is \$365 million—\$15 million more than it would cost to enter the plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can quite see the Minister of Revenue being perplexed by that because it appears to contradict what everybody—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): I am not perplexed at all. I am just astonished that you accept this comparison as valid.

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell you why it is valid. The normal argument has been that if you move into a universal plan it will cost more, not less.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the member like to listen for a moment instead of just opening his mouth and letting all that noise flow out? He might learn something.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): *Toujours la politesse.*

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Oui.

Mr. MacDonald: The Prime Minister should know that *politesse* has no effect upon the hon. Minister of Revenue. He does not know it, and he does not hand it out.

However, what I was saying before I was rudely interrupted, Mr. Speaker, is that everybody has contended in the past—those who were opposed as well as those who were in favour of a public, universal medical insurance plan—that if you implemented it, Medicare would cost more than existing expenditures because of the fact that everybody would have complete coverage instead of partial coverage—90 or 95 per cent—with coverage that had loopholes in it.

Hon. Mr. White: Cannot misuse.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let us not get into the misuse because that is another question.

Therefore, why would it cost less today if we had a national plan?

I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister will listen for a moment. Already, through OMSIP we are covering all of those who normally would not be covered and would have to be subsidized of the public treasury. We are spending some \$75 million for those in low income groups, on pensions and for others, so that we are now subsidizing what normally is done through universal coverage. In addition, there is the fact that a significant percentage of the coverage is handled through the private insurance companies who are creaming their profits out of it.

Therefore, we are subsidizing those who are a high risk and cannot meet their own premiums, and we are subsidizing those who are a low risk through the profits of the private insurance companies.

Hon. Mr. White: Would the leader of the NDP permit one simple question?

Mr. MacDonald: Coming from you I accept that description of the question, yes.

Hon. Mr. White: In those jurisdictions where this particular expense has been shifted from the private sector to the public sector, can he show any instance where costs were decreased in any way, or, in fact, can he show any instance in which costs did not balloon immediately after the shift took place?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I was being a bit sarcastic and unfair when I said that was a simple question, but that really is a simple question.

Hon. Mr. White: All right, let us talk about the differences in costs—

Mr. MacDonald: Costs are going up whether it is public or private, so let us not drag in a red herring that costs are going up because of Medicare. The point I just made—and if the member had been listening instead of talking while I was making it, he would have grasped it—is that I conceded in every—

Hon. Mr. White: I was not talking at all.

Mr. MacDonald: He is still not listening. I conceded that in every instance where you move from private to public coverage, costs went up, so I was addressing us to the question of why this particular survey suggested we are now spending \$365 million

in Ontario, yet the national Medicare plan would cost only \$350 million.

My answer is not that the figures are wrong. My answer is that the subsidy that would be required in universal coverage to give everybody complete coverage is already being made through OMSIP because we are now subsidizing that sector of society.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we are also subsidizing the life insurance friends of this Tory government, and that is the reason why this government is going to go down kicking and squealing before it will accept public Medicare. I hope that the Liberals in Ottawa are not going to weaken; that they will maintain the particular requirements of the plan so that this government will have to have a public plan which will be non-profit. I hope in the process of the argument somebody does not tell me that the private insurance companies are going to stay in the picture as benevolent organizations, not taking a profit. That is hogwash.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Well, you know what a terrible man you are to—

Mr. MacDonald: We will get back to that. I do not know who did the mathematics for the Provincial Treasurer, but we will get back to it, we will find out that he and his whole corps of advisors had better get a new adding machine.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the issue that I thought we were debating today, the Constitution, though we have been rather badly derailed through the lead of the Prime Minister on to this extensive and out-of-order debate on Medicare. I want to say in advance, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to attempt to deal with many of the propositions—those 40 propositions that the government presented to the continuing committee—because there are a half a dozen of my colleagues intending to engage in this debate and they will deal with them.

I want to focus my remarks on the constitutional conference itself, because, as is known, I, along with the leader of the Opposition, had the opportunity as official observers, to watch that conference at first hand.

Let me comment first on the waffling in the assessment as to what this conference achieved. I was interested in the Prime Minister this afternoon attempting to achieve a delightful balance. "We did not achieve too much," he suggested, but by the time he was finished, he was contending that it was an "extensive success".

Now, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what an "extensive success" is, but what I do know is that it is nothing in relation to the conference that was held in Ottawa February 10 to 13. Let us not kid ourselves that there was any extensive success.

It is only when, as the Prime Minister rather skillfully did, you put the conference in context—when you borrow from the success of the conference a year ago, and you borrow hopefully from the success of the "Future Conferences", that you can say that this conference was in any way a success, let alone an "extensive success".

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was little more than a holding operation. It was little more than that because of the lack of leadership that was given by the two people upon whom leadership must come if we are going to be able to move forward in reshaping our constitution, namely the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario.

Let us just pause for a moment, Mr. Speaker, and remind ourselves that a year has elapsed since the first meeting of the constitutional conference that was held in February, 1968. Federal-provincial relationships in this country deteriorated very, very badly. And they did so, I suggest, for three reasons. There were many reasons, but I am going to pick three.

The first one is that the Prime Minister of Ontario stepped down from his role of being the honest broker between the provinces and Ottawa. He lined up with the provincial governments in an all-out attack upon the federal government. On occasion, indeed, that attack degenerated into a verbal slugging match that could not help but harm federal-provincial relationships in this country.

Secondly, Ottawa's position, under Trudeau's leadership, is one of stubborn unyielding. Its inflexibility is not, I suggest to you, a viable posture for constitutional negotiations. It is highly provocative. It creates a sense of frustration that is not conducive to the kind of compromises that are going to be necessary in re-shaping the constitution in this country.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A very shallow comment. A majority government after six years of minority government. That is what it is. It is a majority government.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, if my comment was shallow, that interjection is irrelevant, because the fact that it is a

majority government has nothing to do with its inflexibility.

Mr. Sopha: The Premier of Ontario could push them around as long as they were a minority. He cannot do that now.

Mr. MacDonald: I wish we had minority governments so that we could be pushed around closer to reality.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me proceed. I come to my third reason. As the conference approached, an atmosphere of crisis developed in this country. It was created in part by the public repudiation of The Official Languages Act by the four western provinces. Prime Minister Trudeau completed that atmosphere of crisis by television statements on the eve of the conference that nothing less than the survival of the nation was at stake. He even implied in a taped interview—taped so that it could not be denied, although an effort was made to deny it—with the *Toronto Daily Star*, that if a bilingual Canada was not possible then he did not have any continuing interest in being Prime Minister.

Mr. Sopha: He said there would be no Canada, and he is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, under these circumstances, perhaps the most progress that we could expect was to halt the deterioration in government relationships in this country—the deterioration that had gone on in the past year.

Admittedly there were some successes. I am not going to dwell at length on them because I think we want to take a look at the lack of achievement, and why, so that we can improve prospects, if this government will heed, for the future. But there were some successes. Proposals were advanced, for example, for Senate reform and the establishment of a national capital. They were good in themselves, though I note with interest and welcome the fact that the leader of the Liberal Party has now come to support the proposition of eliminating the Senate as an anachronism.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What do you mean, now come?

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberal Party has never opposed the Senate except by saying it is going to reform it, and not doing anything about it. Now it is the chief refuge of their bag men, as evidenced by the appointment of the Prime Minister who was going to bring new politics into vogue in this country. All of these items, Mr. Speaker, with regard

to Senate reform and with regard to a national capital are good in themselves, but they are peripheral matters.

The prospect for entrenching fundamental political rights in the Constitution was much improved. Ontario's position has changed over the past year. The Attorney General told us that he had done his homework in the interval, and in doing his homework, as has been pointed out earlier in the debate, he virtually reversed the position of the Ontario Government. He certainly reversed it in terms of the validity of entrenching some of the fundamental rights in the Constitution, instead of going into an elaborate and extraneous argument that fundamental rights would not be protected any more with entrenchment.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Never opposed it.

Mr. MacDonald: I would have to concede to the Attorney General that he talked on both sides of the issue so that now he could say he has not changed his position. But the whole impact of his presentation a year ago was to say that he was not in favour of entrenchment and, as has been pointed out, most Premiers across the table tended to go along. It threw a shadow over the prospect of achieving what we have always felt to be a very worthy objective. And, when you couple Ontario's new position with the fact that during this conference the Prime Minister of Quebec indicated that they are open-minded on the proposition of entrenching of these fundamental rights, I think one can conclude that agreement for a charter of human rights is now a real possibility, with the continuing work of the working committee. Even, Mr. Speaker—and here I may sound as though I am out of step with the current wisdom—

Mr. Sopha: Conventional wisdom.

Mr. MacDonald: Current wisdom, because it has not been around enough to become conventional. Even on the question of The Official Languages Act, it is my impression that the opposition of the four western provinces may resolve itself into a face-saving device of a reference to the Supreme Court to confirm whether or not the bill lies within the federal jurisdiction.

I think the tragedy of all this, Mr. Speaker, lies in the misunderstanding which one has to acknowledge as being very deep-seated throughout western Canada, indeed in many other places in Canada. It was a pretty tragic

failure on the part of the federal government to explain what their bill was.

People had a grossly exaggerated idea of the application of The Official Languages Act—a picture of all the courts having judges who must be bilingual, and court clerks who must be bilingual, and so on. When it was finally explained to those who presumably should have been in a position to know, namely the Premiers of the provinces, it was interesting to note the greater acceptance. As the Premier of Alberta put it:

Well, if it does not make any more difference to the present situation than you now suggest, I do not think we would have any continuing opposition, but we still think it would be a good idea to send it to the Supreme Court.

There is no particular problem in reference to the Supreme Court, because the overwhelming consensus is that it will be confirmed as *intra vires* by the Supreme Court because it is strictly within the federal jurisdiction. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, on this issue, because of the educational achievement of the conference—among those who were at it, to say nothing of the public—I think we have broken through to the possibility of acceptance of The Official Languages Act.

However, having said that, on the basic issue of taxation and fiscal policy which is fundamental to government relations in Canada, and therefore to constitutional review, nothing of significance was accomplished. Whether or not the deterioration in this basic area has even been halted, is a very debatable question. There is reason to wonder, for example, whether sufficient consensus was achieved at the level of the first Ministers so that you can have meaningful work in the continuing committee to try to reconcile the sharp divergencies that we have at the present time on the question of taxation and related divisions of power.

Mr. Speaker, why was no progress made on this fundamental issue? On the federal side—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Do you not know?

Mr. MacDonald: If I do know, I am going to tell you, because that is precisely what I am addressing myself to. On the federal side, the Liberal government's position was intransigent. "If the province needs more money, raise your taxes," Trudeau says. Very simple. The consequences, Mr. Speaker, of that dictate are appalling to contemplate. Some provinces, including the province of

Ontario, let us admit it, relatively speaking, could go out and raise the money that is needed, because we have the tax base, we have the basic wealth. But the result would be a tax jungle that would destroy the possibility of building one Canada.

More important, other provinces simply cannot go out and raise the necessary revenues. The disparities in living standards and services would become even greater; equality of opportunity among Canadians would become a myth. A severe blow would be struck at the unity of this country; ironically, it would be struck by the man who was elected because he contended that he was going to build one country.

But let us recognize, Mr. Speaker, the Trudeau dictate, "go raise your own taxes" is not an isolated slogan. It is part and parcel of his concept of federalism. It is the Prime Minister's personal credo that the federal government should get out of the shared-cost programmes which fall in our 100-year-old Constitution within the provincial jurisdiction. He believes that these responsibilities should be handed back to the provinces. Indeed, he has already warned that, even on such a major share-cost programme as Medicare, five years hence it is his intention to hand it back to the provinces.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Including education, as the Liberal leader would not admit it.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. These basic beliefs, Mr. Speaker, were set forth in his writings—

Mr. Singer: Good. You two fellows have a common umbrella—

Mr. MacDonald: —writings on federalism before he entered politics. Now, as Prime Minister, he is proceeding to implement it.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): This is not completely a negative presentation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, when the provinces forced a reordering of the agenda to give top priority to fiscal and taxation matters, Prime Minister Trudeau's disarming ploy was to state that this was really a constitutional matter. Tell us, he said, where you want the federal government to exercise its spending powers and we will be glad to consider your proposals.

Well, as was to be expected, Mr. Speaker, the provinces responded with a Babel of voices, reflecting the varying interests of the provinces in the particular shared-cost programmes to which they give top priority.

After two hours of debate there was no alternative but to shunt the whole question for further study out into the tax structure committee.

That, of course, was precisely what Trudeau wanted. All the provinces had agreed that fiscal and taxation matters were of immediate urgent concern, but Prime Minister Trudeau achieved his purpose of submerging them in the broad consideration of constitutional review.

Now in my view, Mr. Speaker, the man who is responsible for the collapse of the province's hopes, on this particularly critical, basic, fundamental issue, was the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario. Nobody was more insistent and nobody was more strident in his demands, prior to the conference, than our Prime Minister. Yet he failed at the critical moment to give leadership to the provinces, and, by his failure, he conceded the field to the federal government.

I have no particular objection to our Prime Minister stepping down from his position of "honest broker" between the provinces and the federal government. Ottawa's inflexibility may well have made that inevitable. But my objection is that in forsaking the leadership role of "honest broker" in reshaping Confederation, he failed to assume a leadership role among the provinces to achieve the immediate consideration of urgent fiscal matters—so urgent that he, himself, had been responsible for the crescendo of the build-up to the conference itself throughout last fall and the earlier part of this year.

At the critical moment the Prime Minister was content, once again, to play the old broken record regarding Medicare; to resort to exaggerated language about a "fraud" and "the Machiavellian scheme"; to indulge in a straight piece of grandstanding to the television audience. The whole thing was a gigantic bluff—a diversionary tactic to soften the public in preparation for whatever this government has in mind. God knows what that is; quite frankly, I am not certain that the government knows at this point, because I think it is playing it by ear in a game which is confusing the whole effort to reshape the Constitution and keep a direction on it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of this is a little sad. A little sad if it were not so very serious. In the years that led up to Canada's Centennial, this nation drifted in face of the wide range of problems involved in constitutional review, including taxation, because

the federal government used the sharp divisions among the provinces to justify their lack of leadership and initiative. The whole period was characterized by what came to be known as the "Pearson drift".

It was the Prime Minister of Ontario who halted that drift.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Came to be known by what name?

An hon. member: First time I heard of it.

Mr. MacDonald: Never heard of Pearson drifting?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): No, never.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, how immune can Liberals be to the reality of the day if they never heard of Pearson drifting?

Mr. Trotter: More of your current wisdom.

Mr. Sopha: Tell us about that speech in Ottawa on special statutes.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute, we will get to that. Do not get ahead of yourself—or do not get ahead of me. You will have a chance to speak a little later.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, it was the Prime Minister of Ontario who halted that drift with his Confederation of Tomorrow Conference. Let us remind ourselves that the federal government refused even to send observers to the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference. I heard with my own ears from one Liberal spokesman in a discussion on the issue; they did so because they were convinced that the conference was going to fail—that the provinces could not achieve a consensus, and, therefore, they would be able to say, "Well, you see the normal difficulties we have to contend with; perhaps you will have more sympathy for us now. Perhaps you will understand why we do not take the kind of vigorous leadership that our critics said we should be taking." But, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: But, Mr. Speaker, the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference proved that the provinces could resolve their differences. At least, to the point of arriving at a consensus which would permit the detailed work of the continuing committee. That consensus carried through and was responsible in good part for the success of the first meeting of the constitutional conference held in February of 1968.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that consensus has dissolved. It dissolved during the last year. But the basis for a new and perhaps an even more solid consensus—at least, among the provinces—has emerged in the growing unanimity among the provinces that there must be more money made available from the growth taxes to meet their budgetary deficits.

The impasse developed into a sloganeering from both sides. "Give us more money," the provinces chorused. "If you need more money, raise your own taxes," was the federal retort. It was patently obvious, Mr. Speaker, to everybody—including, I am sure, even the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario—that Ottawa was not going to budge from its position.

That being the case, what could, or should, have been the approach of the Prime Minister of Ontario in the constitutional conference? Surely, Mr. Speaker, the constructive approach was to tackle the problem from the other side.

If Ottawa was firm in its refusal to provide the provinces through shared taxes, raised equitably on a national basis, with the financial resources to meet their constitutional responsibility, then the obvious solution lies in the re-division of some of those responsibilities to the federal government which has national access to the taxes to meet them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Not so obviously.

Mr. MacDonald: What was that interjection?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I say it is not such an obvious solution as you present.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is not.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you know, I was rather interested as I was listening to the Prime Minister this afternoon—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, I recognize the possibility.

Mr. MacDonald: —this afternoon and I jotted it down. He said: "The government most capable of doing the job efficiently should have the responsibility," and, "very necessary to match revenues with responsibilities".

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, my interjection simply means, Mr. Speaker, that I recognize the point he makes, but I do not think it is

quite as simple a solution as he says. I mean, if the federal government simply says: "We will give you no more money," I do not think the obvious solution for the provinces is to say, "Well, then, we will immediately surrender responsibility."

This is my point. I do not think it is that obvious.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We would not surrender responsibilities rapidly—nor do I think any of the other provinces would—for instance, in the field of education, or in many areas of provincial responsibility just because the federal government said, "No more money."

Mr. MacDonald: I want to get to that in a moment, because I was rather interested, not only in what happened at the constitutional conference, but also what happened in some of the comments of the Prime Minister this afternoon.

But the point I am making is the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario and his colleagues were calling upon the federal government to make more money available. They knew they were not going to get it, but they said it was an absolute and urgent necessity. The four western provinces were saying the same thing. Indeed, let us recognize you had unanimity on this issue.

That is why you had the possibility of the kind of consensus among the provincial Premiers, the potential consensus, which, at the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, the Prime Minister of Ontario succeeded in evoking so that you laid the basis for the kind of progress that was possible in the first meeting of the constitutional conference. I suggest that there was no area in which there was again unanimity among the provinces and a possibility for a consensus, more than this particular area with regard to the urgency of getting more money to be able to meet the budgetary deficits at the provincial level.

And what did the Prime Minister of Ontario do on that particular issue? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, other than his fraudulent intervention on Medicare—perhaps that is a more appropriate use of the term "fraudulent"—he did nothing. He said nothing on this to seek a re-division of powers. In spite of the fact, as he told us this afternoon, we have talked about this, not only outside of the House but in this House, down through the years. We got nothing more than the old refrain with regard to Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, if the needs of the Canadian people are going to be met in the second century, and if the Constitution is to help, rather than to hinder, the fulfillment of those needs, there must be a more realistic equation of responsibilities and financial capacity to meet them on the part of all levels of government. In my view, the Prime Minister of Ontario abdicated Ontario's historic role in giving leadership to the provinces in grappling with that basic problem. He left it to the new boy of the group, the Premier of Manitoba, to intervene persistently and vigorously in attempting to come to grips with the issue. Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of Quebec lamented at the close of the conference:

I was disappointed that the other provinces didn't show more interest in the question of the redistribution of powers after all the work that had been done by the continuing committee of civil servants.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: What powers?

Mr. MacDonald: We will come to that in a moment. Why did Ontario's leadership, Mr. Speaker, fail so completely at this critical point? Now I come back to the Prime Minister's comment this afternoon. Is it because Ontario and other provinces are reluctant to give up traditional powers, even though they do not have the financial capacity to meet them? Is it a case that Ontario—and I am not going to suggest Ontario alone, but other provinces—simply do not want to dismantle the empire they have?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is right.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is not an empire. It is part of our Constitution.

Mr. MacDonald: All right, if that word offends the member—do not want to dismantle the jurisdiction they have. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, once again the only man who at any point during the course of the conference said something on this point was Premier Weir of Manitoba. When he was arguing—not at great length, because they have fixed a date for going into Medicare—but when he was arguing about the shared cost, at one point he said to the Prime Minister of Canada:

If you are so convinced that Medicare should be given this priority, take it over; take the whole thing, pay for it 100 per cent.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there has to be leadership on this issue. That leadership has

to come from nowhere more than the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario, in Ontario's interests and as a Canadian statesman in the interests of the rest of the nation.

We have to face up to which of the powers we are willing to hand back to Ottawa, because surely it is obvious, in the year 1967, 100 years after Confederation that, because of the growth of government services, too much of the burden of government responsibility now rests at the provincial level?

Hon. Mr. White: Not necessarily.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, unless you are going to get an acceptance to hand over the tax base to the provincial governments to a degree that conflicts with another one of your major objectives, namely, that we must have a strong federal government. You simply cannot whittle away at the role of the federal government—if this is what the Minister of Revenue is arguing—to finance all the services that the province now has. You will end up with a federal government which is gradually having its national capacity eroded.

Hon. Mr. White: Not at all.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we will see.

Hon. Mr. White: If they have all the mandatory powers, most of the fiscal powers, all foreign affairs powers, and so forth—do not be so silly. They would have more power as a central government if they did their own duties well, instead of infringing on the provinces all the time.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lawlor: The Minister can make a speech on the subject.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He just did.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, he usually does it on other people's time—that is the problem—when he is seated and someone is standing, in violation of the rules of the House.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in the re-statement of the Ontario government's case this afternoon when the Prime Minister objected to the proposition of sort of under-the-table equalization through the financing of Medicare costs, that we get less than it costs us and some other province is going to get more than it costs them. Why is the Prime Minister of the wealthiest province in this country objecting to that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said equalization, yes, but equalization in an equalization formula

where we see it all, not buried in a whole host of programmes, hidden here, hidden there. Put it all into one so we know what we are doing.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is all—

Mr. MacDonald: Right, and the point that I was making is: Why does the leader of the wealthiest province in this country object to the proposition that the financial formula for a major social measure should have involved in it some equalization factor? What is the Prime Minister's objection—he is in favour of equalization in principle—this is the great merit of the constitution as we have had it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: But do not bury it in a thousand different places.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, a thousand different places—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Equalization as we have it in one equalization arrangement which we make periodically with the federal government. We take the tax basis of the provinces and equate them all to a common level and then make the payment to bring it to the common level. Why not do it that way instead of burying equalization in all these odd programmes, so that you have to be really an accountant to find out what the equalization is?

Mr. MacDonald: Let me say to the Prime Minister, I do not care a damn how many places they equalize.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: But I did.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if we had achieved something of equality of opportunity and living standards across this country, then there might be some validity in the Prime Minister of the richest province in this country arguing that he objects to hidden equalization. But the problem in this country today is that the disparity between the "have" and the "have-not" provinces is getting wider instead of narrowing. Therefore why does he persist in the theoretical, legalistic objection to it?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Because it is the wrong way.

Mr. MacDonald: I am suggesting to him—and this is echoing and joining with part of the argument that was advanced in the latter part of the remarks by the leader of

the Opposition—that one of the factors in building Canada in the future, as it has been in the past, is going to be measures that can strengthen Canadian unity—measures like national medical insurance. Involved in them, you are going to have some degree of equalization in the financing of it; what is wrong with it? That is Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, in my comment and analysis of the conference I want to turn to a related but somewhat different matter, and that is the whole question of the position of Quebec. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that the popular impression created by the media, electronic and traditional media, was that the position taken by Prime Minister Bertrand at the constitutional conference was a rigid intransigent position—to a greater extent than was the case of Daniel Johnson a year ago.

It is my view that this is not an accurate reflection of the reality of the situation. If you take all of the tough statements that were made by Prime Minister Bertrand, you will discover that they were to be found in one or another of the speeches of Daniel Johnson a year ago. There was no change in substance; I will agree that there was a change in atmosphere.

One man, the late Daniel Johnson, made his case bluntly and then he smiled and he withdrew and there would be the diplomatic gesture. In the instance of Prime Minister Bertrand, he makes his case bluntly. There it is on the table, and there is no qualification. But in fact it is the same case. Indeed, Mr. Speaker—here I begin to relate to some of the comments that were made by the leader of the Opposition—we have got to face the fact that in the province of Quebec, no matter who speaks for the province of Quebec, they have said essentially the same thing—whether it was Lesage, a Liberal, or whether it was Daniel Johnson, or whether it was Jean Jacques Bertrand. We must face that fact and not evade it, as was implied by an interjection earlier in the debate by the hon. member for Sudbury. That is one of the facts of Canadian life.

Now that presents us in English Canada with a choice. We can either accommodate ourselves to that fact or we can split this nation. We can opt either for a federalism—with the concession in that federalism of a somewhat different relationship between the federal government and the province of Quebec—or for separatism.

I go back, Mr. Speaker, to the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference a year ago last November. I recall two comments that were made during that conference by the two leading Prime Ministers at it. On one occasion Prime Minister Robarts made the comment:

Well, maybe the approach that we should take is that we, the provinces, who agree that there must be a strong federal government, all of us—with the exception of Quebec of course—should decide what are the inviolable rights the federal government must have. Perhaps when we have done that we will have guidelines for the reshaping of the Constitution.

Daniel Johnson's approach was different. His proposal, in a very detailed study that was presented and is available in the continuing way for the committees, was that the powers which are now shared to some degree by the federal government should, in total, revert to the provincial government, so that the provinces would be on an equal basis to start with. Then the provinces would have the right to delegate such of those powers as they wish back to the federal government. The contention is that because the English-speaking provinces want a strong central government, and they need the co-operation of the fiscal and monetary policy of the federal government to achieve equality of standards and to remove some of the disparities, the English-speaking provinces would be willing to delegate some, or many of those powers, back to the federal government.

When you take the approach of Prime Minister Robarts—whatever inviolable rights the federal government must have so that we can have a strong federal government—and you take the approach of Daniel Johnson—of theoretically restoring all the powers to the provinces, but giving them the right to delegate them back in the belief that all of the provinces with the exception of Quebec would delegate most of them back to the central government—then you sit down, as one day we are going to have to sit in the constitutional conference and narrow the gap between the two positions, so that the difference between Quebec and the rest of the country is as narrow as possible.

But I am firmly convinced we are going to end with something of a gap, and that gap will represent the special relationship of Quebec with the Ottawa government. I think it is idle—it is inflexible, it is simplistic—to have the kind of approach of Prime Minister Trudeau today—apparently supported by the

provincial Liberal Party—if I interpreted correctly the comments of the leader of the Opposition this afternoon.

Mr. Trotter: He has got you worried.

Mr. MacDonald: He has not got me worried, Mr. Speaker, I will pick up that interjection, he has got me worried, worried for the future of this country, because you are not going to be able to achieve the kind of compromise and the kind of flexibility by this rather simplistic approach. In fact, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: You will admit you are in the minority.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not in the minority. As a matter of fact, the overwhelming majority of the people in the province of Quebec support this, and if you want to delude yourself for the moment that the vote that Trudeau got for a complex of reasons that have no relationship to this issue, proves to the contrary, then you will have to wait until future events prove otherwise.

Trudeau's direction, Mr. Speaker, is clear. He wants to see federal and provincial power divided into neat watertight compartments. He wants Ottawa to withdraw from the joint programmes and abandon that approach as a future federal device. In doing so, he is going to make a strong central government less and less possible in this country. He is dismantling the national capacity to shape Canada's future.

And, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the reason for the limited success, if not the failure, of the constitutional conference, was the failure of the leadership of Prime Minister Trudeau and the Prime Minister of Ontario, I do not present it as my own words. Indeed, I want to back it up from a source that one would normally think—as far as Trudeau was concerned—would be a friendly source. On February 13—

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I am not interrupting to interfere with the presentation—

Mr. MacDonald: That is a change, I will be delighted.

Hon. Mr. White: There would seem to be an inconsistency here, the federal government having said, "No, we will not give the provinces any more tax room" leaves an alternative—

Mr. MacDonald: They have not?

Hon. Mr. White: The federal government having said, "We will not provide any more tax room or enlarge our grants to the provinces," offers an obvious alternative, as the member mentioned earlier, although not an obvious solution, there being a difference, and that obvious alternative is that the provinces automatically shift these responsibilities from the provincial level to the federal level.

Now, I think we can all agree with this as being a proposition and one that has certain advantages and disadvantages, but now the hon. member says something different. He says the federal government, in attempting to compartmentalize both responsibilities and revenues, is weakening the central government.

The question occurs to me, is the federal government doing these two things concurrently in an attempt to force a shift of responsibilities from the provinces to the federal government, thereby increasing the power of the central government, thereby enhancing the centralization of political power in Canada?

If they are using that particular device in the hope of that particular consequence, I think they are playing a very, very dangerous game, because I think Quebec will find it impossible to accede to that progression of events, and I think some other provinces will find it very difficult.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am not going to attempt to speculate on what the federal government thinks or what its motives are in doing two things at the same time, but my point is simply this, that in taking a stand in favour of this neat compartmentalization and saying that the federal government is going to withdraw from these fields that are constitutionally provincial fields, the federal government's role is weakened. It is eroding a national capacity to play a role in building one country.

Hon. Mr. White: We do not know yet exactly what is in their heart of hearts.

Mr. MacDonald: Well okay. But why do we need to speculate on what is in their heart of hearts. Prime Minister Trudeau, when he was a private citizen, elaborated his concept of federalism. Today, as Prime Minister, he is implementing it. So you do not have to speculate.

Hon. Mr. White: Those are the two party systems which are completely inconsistent one with the other.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, I missed the alleged inconsistency of it, but let me make my basic point. As far as I am concerned, the federal government, in its neat compartmentalization of power, combined with its refusal to provide the provinces with an adequate share of the growth taxes, is going to make it impossible for the people of Canada to be served as they should be served by their senior levels of government. It is going to weaken the federal government.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: You have stated the process. You have stated the problem.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. Now, we come back to the problem of exactly what powers are going to be handed over. Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. member from Carleton East tonight, I am not going to attempt to spell them out.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Why do you attack the Premier of Ontario?

Mr. MacDonald: Because if the provinces have powers far beyond their fiscal capacity, in its leadership this province should be taking a vigorous step towards finding out which of those powers, as a consensus among the provinces, can be handed back, and should be handed back—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: To whom?

Mr. MacDonald: To the federal government. All right?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: I asked you if you will put those—

Mr. MacDonald: I told you that I am not going to attempt tonight to define them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute. I am not going to attempt to define them, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to get into an idle argument. I quote what the Prime Minister—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why should you not do it?

Mr. MacDonald: The Prime Minister this afternoon made this comment.

An hon. member: You are the government, you define it.

Mr. MacDonald: The Prime Minister said, "The government most capable of doing the job efficiently should have the responsibility." All right, there is a very good guide. Instead of not grappling with this fundamental issue,

as this government did not at the constitutional conference this time, they should have been leading in grappling with it. They should have been saying, "Now, look, what are the powers which we now have that should be handed back so that our responsibilities can be equated with our financial capacities?" But the Prime Minister said this afternoon, in effect, "We are happy with the *status quo*."

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: He would not give them any.

Mr. MacDonald: "We are happy with the *status quo*." I do not want to argue with the hon. member for Carleton East any further because I want to have a quiet word with the Prime Minister.

Ontario can handle its own position. Let us not forget we are the fat sow. We have the capacities, we can hang on to the *status quo* of provincial powers.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not describe it as such.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, there were quotation marks around that.

Mr. Sopha: I did not see them.

Mr. MacDonald: But the "have-not" provinces across this country simply cannot do it. And I suggest to the Prime Minister that one of the functions of his leadership, as the head of the largest English-speaking province, is to sit down with the other provinces and to thrash out among them a consensus, that can be presented to the federal government.

Indeed, on this issue, I think that there is a place for calling the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference once again. The Prime Minister said a week or two ago in answer to a question that since we are proceeding in Ottawa with the constitutional conference, and we are going to be meeting quarterly, we do not need to have the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference.

I want to suggest to the Prime Minister that I think there is a very urgent need for the provinces sitting down and thinking through this problem which was not thought through at the Ottawa conference a week or so ago, so that you can achieve a consensus. Then we can sit down with Ottawa, and work out that consensus in terms of a new statement of the Constitution.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Do you not run the risk—this is a decent debate, I only throw it in—but do you not run the risk then of

being accused of this thing that we have worried about so long, and that is that the provinces are ganging up on the federal government. Our detractors would be the first to say that this was what we were doing. I am quite sure.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Prime Minister used that argument, because the Prime Minister was the man who rightly, and I congratulate him for it, dismissed the argument when he called the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not call it with that idea in mind.

Mr. MacDonald: I know you did not call it with that idea in mind. And I am not suggesting that you should now call it with that idea in mind. All I am suggesting is that if we are going to get a meaningful equation of powers with financial capacity, the provinces have got to sit down and work it out. The province which must give some leadership is the province of Ontario. The province of Ontario can get along by keeping all its present powers. It can, if it wants to, tax its basis of wealth, meet those powers, at least relatively better than any other province across this country, with the possible exception of British Columbia.

But most of the provinces of Canada, whom we have got to help to get into a position of equality in this nation, cannot do it. Therefore, I think it is the historic role of the province of Ontario, in this kind of a situation, to try to achieve that consensus. That is why I am saddened by the failure of the Prime Minister at this conference. Instead of giving a lead, and zeroing in on this issue—the heart of the whole of the constitutional review.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this is most important—

Mr. MacDonald: Not at the moment, if I may, please.

Hon. Mr. White: This is most important.

Mr. MacDonald: I know it is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has the floor. If he does not wish to be interrupted then he has that right—

Mr. Sopha: But we are debating about it.

Hon. Mr. White: There is a very important defect in this line of criticism that is leading him very far astray.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, just let me wrap up this point and if there is an important defect I suggest this is important enough that I do not entertain any interjection. But my point is simply this—

Hon. Mr. White: May I say a word, though.

Mr. MacDonald: No, not for a moment. This government has got to take the lead in achieving that consensus among the provinces on what powers it is willing to hand over to the federal government.

Mr. Sopha: None at all. He said this afternoon—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: What did he say this afternoon?

Mr. MacDonald: He said it, and I know he said it, and that is why I am berating him because he said it. You cannot reshape the Constitution meaningfully to get your equation of powers and fiscal capacities, if you are not willing to give some of them up.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Suggest one.

Mr. Sopha: In ten years I have a list of four that should be given up.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would not like to be put in the position that I said none, in the way it has been put. I said, we did not see any enormous reason to change the Constitution, but that we were quite prepared to consider changes that might be required or wanted by other provinces. So, do not paint the picture that I slammed the door and said we will not, because when you read *Hansard* you will find that is not really what I said.

Mr. Sopha: It is just what you said, *status quo*.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said that we did not see any reason why, and I have said this many times before. This is not an original remark this afternoon, but I have also always followed it up by saying that we would be quite prepared to discuss changes that might be required by some other part of the country. Now, there is quite a difference. You have got to put the two remarks together. You cannot take one without the other, that is all.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, my point is this, and I think I can make it in a new way. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that Ontario is not anxious to consider those things that have been working well, but

what he forgot to add is, "for us". They are not working well for the so-called have-not provinces in the country. They are not working well for them, and I submit that in advance of the third meeting of the constitutional conference—in my view it might even be preferable to be done in another meeting of the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference—you should achieve that consensus.

In other words, it is a variation of the proposition that the Ontario Prime Minister put to the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, when he said: "Maybe we should sit down and decide what should be inviolable rights of a strong federal government".

Maybe he should couple that with another question: What are the powers that the provinces now have that should be handed back to the federal government so that we can achieve more easily the necessary balance between responsibilities and the fiscal capacities to meet them?

I am convinced, in view of what has happened in the last 100 years of the growth of services in the provincial jurisdiction, that there must be some sort of a re-division, otherwise every ten years you are going to get into the same kind of bind we are in now. The provinces are going to be forced to badger Ottawa to get more money to meet their fiscal responsibility.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me try to bring my remarks to a close and, by way of summary, set forth what I think are the guide lines for action.

First, Ontario should firmly assert its support for an extensive rewriting of the Constitution, involving the elimination of the obsolete sections such as were listed in the second proposition presented by the Ontario government, and including a preamble, as suggested in proposition 3, setting forth the aims of the Canadian people and their reasons for preserving a federal union.

Second, Ontario should pursue with all possible haste the implementation of linguistic rights which lie within the provincial jurisdiction, and extend full support for such actions within the federal jurisdiction as is represented by The Official Languages Act.

Third, Ontario should give a vigorous lead in seeking support by all provinces for a charter of human rights through the entrenchment of basic civil rights.

Fourth, there is virtual unanimity that the provinces must have more revenue to meet their current constitutional responsibilities. Ontario should lead the provinces towards a

consensus as to the modern methods for achieving this. If the federal government persists in its determination to grant no more tax room, Ontario should move constructively to solve the impasse by proposing a new allocation of powers between the provinces and Ottawa.

Fifth, any rigid division of powers will inevitably become outdated as the needs of modern society undergo dynamic change. Flexibility in any rewritten constitution, therefore become highly desirable. Ontario should withstand the federal efforts sharply to compartmentalize respective responsibilities. Rather she should press to clarify procedures under which a shared-cost programme can jointly be initiated—or discussed as the Prime Minister stressed; consultation in advance—and under what conditions the federal government may later withdraw from them. Only in this way can adaptability to fundamental social and economic change, as espoused in proposition 7, be guaranteed.

Sixth, it may be desirable, and inevitable, that Quebec's eventual relationship with the federal government will be different from that of the other provinces. When we reach the crunch in negotiations even Trudeau is going to have to face reality on this point. Ontario should recognize this herself, and persuade the other provinces to accept it.

Such a development not only may be the touchstone of Quebec's continued role in Confederation. It may also make it possible for other provinces to co-operate more fully with Ottawa, to build a national capacity and a government which is strong, yet recognizes the constitutional sovereignty of its provincial counterparts.

Seventh, this Legislature—and I come back to a plea that I reiterate fervently to the Prime Minister because surely after this debate, its validity becomes increasingly obvious—this Legislature should establish a standing committee on the Constitution to permit continuing discussion and evaluation of the material which will be emanating from now on, quarterly, from the federal-provincial secretariat.

This committee would permit consideration by members of the Ontario Legislature of three crucial areas which so far have not imprinted upon the top-level talks. I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that these three are not exclusive of many others which, obviously, could be mentioned.

First, there is the matter of the agreed-upon process of decentralizing responsibility

for Indian affairs to the provinces. As the Hawthorne and Tremblay commission has pointed out, the current piecemeal approach to decentralization is unsatisfactory and far too slow. It would be preferable, within the context of an overall constitutional review, for agreement to be reached on complete and simultaneous decentralization, along with the appropriate financial adjustments.

Second, there is the future economic and political sovereignty of Canada, and how the new Confederation must be structured so as to ensure the strengthening and the preservation of our independent decision-making powers—surely, a matter of vital and basic concern for the future of this nation, and appropriate for discussions within the constitutional conference.

Finally, I refer to the equity of the whole tax structure through which the Canadian people provide the funds with which our country's future will be built. I was interested, once again, to listen to the discussions at Ottawa—the demand for more money—and not hear a single whisper in the constitutional conference of something that we hear down here periodically—though there has never been a lead by this government—about reform of the tax structure at Ottawa. Not only because it will bring equity to the people who have to pay the taxes but because it will raise more money and this government is going to share in any increase of the corporate and personal income taxes.

Surely, once again, this is part and parcel of the fiscal and taxation issues which are the warp and woof of the Constitution in Canada ever since Confederation. I plead with the Prime Minister that on this issue of constitutional review—where conciliation and consultation and involvement of all the people is desirable rather than an open and sharp confrontation—we need a legislative committee such as has been suggested by the Opposition. It could play a very important role here, just as involvement in the constitutional conference in Ottawa, as an observer, has made it possible for us to comment more intelligently—and I hope more effectively—on the conference, for the future guidance of the government.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have been invited by the Prime Minister of Ontario to be a member of the official delegation in—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I was not—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say that of my Confederation documents—and I have a stack of them 2½-feet high as most members of this House would have—I have already told the Prime Minister that to me one of the most important Confederation documents will be the notes that he sent me inviting me to be a member of the delegation.

It was a privilege indeed, and we of that number who were able to be there as part of the official delegation, really should count it as one of the significant moments in our lives. I am sure that the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party felt privileged to be there as observers, because I gather that this was an invitation which other provinces had not given out as extensively as this province did. I am sure that the delight of these two gentlemen sitting as observers was only spoilt by the fact that they wished that they had been either in the front row or in the second row. I say this in all humility because it is a privilege, indeed, that at the end of 100 years of Confederation, some men should have that special privilege of participating right in the middle of the action.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Just to give a little further information to the hon. Minister now speaking, I believe the leaders of the Opposition from Nova Scotia and from New Brunswick were in attendance, and one of us had the intention of moving, not to the second row, but the front row.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think it was Prince Edward Island which invited the leader of the Opposition to sit in the second row. I thought that was "*la politesse suprême*".

I will not be touching upon those aspects of the agenda of the conference which will be touched upon by other members—such matters as distribution of powers, the reform of institutions, regional disparities, the amending procedure, the mechanisms of federal-provincial relations—because it seems to be my destiny (much as I would like to be an academic in these other matters) to speak on one particular type of subject.

I take this opportunity of doing this at this time, Mr. Speaker. I will direct myself to the propositions immediately following the

last one touched upon by the leader of the Opposition, that is proposition 11, which, of the 40, to me is one of the more significant propositions, although it may not take up as much time of this House or in the rest of Canada. I will read it into the record.

Proposition number 11—the title—Canada Should Be A Bilingual Country While Retaining Its Multi-Cultural Heritage.

I read it as follows:

The historical and linguistic heritage of Canada has developed from two predominant communities, one French-speaking, the other English-speaking. Together with the many immigrants from other language groups, these two communities have moulded the shape and character of Canada.

Canadians whose mother tongue is neither French nor English are aware that they must learn one or both to participate fully in the life of the country. This fact does not detract from the quality of Canadian citizenship they can acquire. All Canadians must enjoy the same rights and privileges as any Canadian whose ancestors have been here for generations.

The bilingual nature of Canada includes the dimension of the country's multi-cultural character. Today, the English-speaking community in Canada is a heterogeneous one, continually changing with the infusion of many cultural influences. As more immigrants join the French-speaking community, this concept may also come to apply to that community.

To speak of our bilingual, multi-cultural heritage simply reflects the dual-faceted character of Canada, a country whose working languages are English and French and whose cultures are the product of many lands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this particular proposition will meet with favour with all members of the House. This is a proposition which has been developed in this Legislature and by the government and evolves directly from the statements which the Prime Minister has given in this House and elsewhere, through the years.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is a pretty contentious proposition—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): What has the hon. member got against the other people?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I come to—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The Prime Minister calls it "two nations". Does the hon. Minister agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of this province has never called it the "two nations".

Mr. Sopha: Has the hon. Minister ever read this book?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sudbury's gift to the comedy stage.

Mr. Sopha:—well on page 14—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Sopha:—well on page 14 that is precisely what the hon. Prime Minister calls it. Has the hon. Minister ever read it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have read it three times.

Mr. Nixon: If not, there are 40,000 copies of it on the fourth floor, the hon. Minister can get one.

Mr. Sopha:—we were going to read it to the hon. Minister to refresh his memory.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): In French and English.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sopha: I am a Prime Minister-watcher.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am a Sopha-watcher.

Mr. Speaker, this is one subject in which the intrusion of partisan politics can do nothing but harm. I will read into the record, for the member for Sudbury—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Have you forgotten what your Prime Minister did in the last election campaign—this is the one issue in which he introduced partisanship?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko:—from the Throne Speech of two years ago:

My government also recognizes the existence of two linguistic communities and many cultures within Canada and appreciates that this diversity is the source of much of our strength and the enrichment of our life. My government is committed to the assurance of full and equal citizenship for all residents of Canada regardless of their national or linguistic origin. Nowhere in this broad country is the diversity of our people more obvious than in Ontario.

And in the Throne Speech debate, he said:

Our concern in Canada is to ensure the existence of Canada as a viable nation. We believe that Canada is the national home and single voice of every Canadian citizen. Within this concept of a single nation there is room for the richness of diversity and culture, language and ethnic backgrounds which is nowhere more evident than in Ontario.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The hon. members cannot go wrong on that.

Mr. Singer: We agree with the proposition—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, we want to get it on the record, do you mind?

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister has two Union Jacks in the joint.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the February 27 debate in the House of 1968:

I would also like to make it quite clear that while the government of Ontario has accepted bilingualism we have not accepted biculturalism. It is a fact of life that Canada is a multi-cultural mosaic and this is nowhere more apparent than in our province here of Ontario. Of this, we are very proud and we think the multi-cultural aspects of our country are really a part of the true Canadian heritage.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that in Ottawa, which is the centre of the nation, this proposition will be accepted.

Mr. Singer: It is accepted—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would like to see in Ottawa a statement by the Prime Minister of Canada in these terms.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Good Lord, he has said it.

Mr. Lewis: He would not reduce himself to those terms.

Mr. Sopha: He is fastidious in his speech.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, nowhere is this more exemplified than in a book produced in Ottawa which I commend to the attention of all members of this House who may not have had occasion to read it. "The Canadian Family Tree".

This book was produced by the citizenship branch of the citizenship branch of the federal Department of the Secretary of State. It should, I think, be read not only by all

provincial members but by all federal members, in the 11 jurisdictions, because, Mr. Speaker, the table of contents list 47 different backgrounds—all the way from Americans through to the West Indians. In the course of the second reprint, from 1960 to 1967, that list grew from 23 to 47.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this because as a participant, as an observer, and as a spectator in Ottawa, I am convinced that there was a great deal of accomplishment. Certainly, if one were to be handed a foolscap sheet and asked to tick off the things which were accomplished, it might not produce a long list, but I am convinced that on the heels of the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, the first constitutional conference in Ottawa and now the second, that we are on the verge of a major breakthrough.

Mr. Lewis: A multi-cultural mosaic.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A multi-cultural society.

Mr. MacDonald: You have put the Minister of Citizenship (Mr. Welch) to sleep.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I say this because what has been going on in Canada has been a dialogue. There has been going on, a dialogue and a third member of the family, or a third sector of the family, has been very patiently and very quietly, in a general way, been listening to what has been going on, aware of the fact that the stresses and strains of the last few years were difficult enough without putting into being new and further thoughts which might require a great deal of discussion back and forth.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I am so pleased to see this as a proposition of the government which can be accepted by all members of the House, is that when the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission—that is the way I will refer to that commission—was set up, the terms of reference hurt a great many people in Canada.

I voice the concern that was expressed by them for I would direct the members opposite to the terms of reference which govern that commission:

To inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races.

And when I read that I said, "Where do I fit in, where does the hon. member for Dovercourt, fit in?"

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): I consider myself a Canadian.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. And so do I.

Mr. De Monte: Well, do not make an issue of it then.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And which of the "biculturals" would the hon. member belong to?

Mr. De Monte: The Minister is building up a false issue.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would like to draw the attention of the leader of the NDP party—

Mr. MacDonald: Do not be a professional "New Canadian".

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —to a statement he made in this House.

Mr. MacDonald: And I will make it again.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am going to do the leader of the NDP the honour, I trust, of reading into the record a statement that he made.

Hon. Mr. Randall: He will not be here in 1971 so read it well.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was during the Confederation for Tomorrow debate in this House.

However a constitutional preamble or declaration of purpose must recognize—

and there is a word here which I think is a misprint:

—the so-called third Canada. I refer to the nearly one-third of the Canadian people, and it is a growing third, who come from that host of backgrounds that are neither French nor English. In most cases these people are Canadians by choice, not by birth. Their loyalty to their chosen homeland is as strong as a native-born. Often, in the great Confederation debate, they found themselves standing on the sideline. They have protested that their existence, their interest and contribution should not be ignored, or appear to be ignored, in the discussions which will shape our national course for the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it was the Prime Minister of this province, it was the government that he leads, that set within official documentation this recognition. It was the first government—and remains one of the few governments, at

any level—which has accepted, in Throne speeches, in statements by the leader, in documents, that this is not a dialogue but this is a matter in which there is discussion in which everyone is entitled to participate.

Mr. Sopha: Could I ask the Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Would he do me the courtesy of reading into the record the third paragraph on page 14 of that book? And then tell me if he agrees with that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I brought in with me the quote from the leader of the NDP group. I have read—

Mr. Sopha: Well, this is the Prime Minister.

Mr. Lewis: Do your leader the honour.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have read into the record the position, as I understand it, of the leader—the Prime Minister of Ontario, and this government.

And, Mr. Speaker, the concept of biculturalism as set up in that commission—the member for Sudbury will have the opportunity of making his position on that basis. Because he, too, is aware of the fact—and he has referred to it—that within that great riding of Sudbury he is aware of the third element.

Mr. Sopha: That is why I voted against the adoption of that thing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the member for Sudbury and myself is this—and here we do differ. I ask others to respect and hold dear that which I respect and hold dear, and I will respect and hold dear that which others respect and hold dear. That is a very simple proposition. It may be over his head. He may want only those things to which he subscribes to be respected and be revered, I do not subscribe to that theory. The Maple Leaf flag that flies over Canada is my flag and the flag that flies over this province is my provincial flag.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make perfectly clear what I believe in: it is the flag that has the Union Jack in it, either *in toto* or in part, that has permitted me to occupy this seat. If I owe a debt—

Mr. Sopha: What a thing to say about 60,000 Canadians.

Mr. MacDonald: The establishment has conceded to the hon. Minister a small niche, and now the hon. Minister is their most ardent champion.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is no niche—the establishment has conceded me no niche. I hold a rightful place.

Mr. Sopha: You are a bon venue.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I hold a rightful place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is this government—this Conservative administration that has been in power for 25 years that has created the climate, Mr. Speaker—which has permitted the leader of the Opposition to have sitting on his side as his supporters members of the third element, and which has permitted the leader of the NDP to have them sitting on his side. Nowhere, and here again—

Mr. Trotter: We are just Canadian Liberals.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you for allowing us to breathe the polluted air.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I bring this to the attention of the member for Downsview who does not like this expression, but I say this with the fullest of conviction, nowhere in the world—and I direct the attention of the member for Scarborough West to it, so he will not groan and laugh at it that I say this with the greatest belief and conviction—nowhere in the world is there an environment which has been developed within which those who are of the third element have found for themselves as rightful a spot as right here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is the most utter nonsense—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has no point of order.

Mr. Lewis: What is this conspiratorial third element?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will resume his seat.

If the hon. member has a point of order, he will state it. What he has said is not a point of order.

An hon. member: A loud mouth, that is all.

Mr. Sopha: It is just impertinence to call Canadians by such a name.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, it can be documented, in fact, in figures, that the potential of the third element has found scope in this province as nowhere else. I invite the member for Sudbury to list for me the other jurisdictions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: What is "third element"?

Mr. Sopha: What is the third element?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is so completely out of order and disrupting things so much tonight, that I am disappointed. I would ask that you let the hon. Minister complete his remarks.

An hon. member: He is out of his element.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not in order. The hon. member will make his speech and have probably as many interjections and I hope he will enjoy them as much as he is enjoying interjecting at this time, but there is no point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Why is there no point of order? I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: State your point of order.

Mr. Lewis: My point of order is that I find the use of the term "the third element" a denigrating and abusive term.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order and I so rule.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is nothing denigrating in it at all. That is a term. One of the great difficulties in this debate which is taking place as to the development of life in Canada is language itself: "bicultural"; "Canadian duality"; "two societies"; "two majorities"; "two dominant cultures"; "two founding communities"; "two founding races"; "two nations"; "two main peoples"; "two peoples"; "two official peoples";—somebody said that! I hope he said it with tongue in cheek—two language groups, two solitudes, two large linguistic and cultural communities, both Canadian cultural communities, two existing cultural communities.

Bicultural: This is the language which is being used on the streets every day and not only on the streets. McGill University in its presentation to the Laurendeau-Dunton commission refers continuously to biculturalism.

Mr. Peacock: There is a conspiracy of silence against you and you should join it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The chamber of commerce, in its most recent report, refers to the matter of biculturalism. Recently the *Financial Times* used this word, Mr. Speaker, which, in the face of the reality of Canada today, no longer has meaning.

All I do is invite the support of the members opposite to join with me in making sure that the word that will be used to typify Canada is multiculturalism. We need it for the purpose of discussion, to give effect to those who are not French-speaking by descent, those whose language is not English by descent, to those who are neither of those two—who are the third element. All elements can be very powerful forces, and they are a very necessary item in the building of a strong unit.

Mr. Lewis: Are they Canadian?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are Canadian, and this is exactly where I will make my point. Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian. I am one of those who from now on will not only subscribe to decry the use of hyphenated Canadians, I will no longer use that term in respect of myself. I will tell the world that I am a Canadian of Ukrainian background, or Ukrainian heritage.

I trust and I hope that the member for Dovercourt will be a Canadian, as I am, but he will be a Canadian of Italian descent and origin. There will be in Canada by this list, by this family tree, 47 types of people in their many thousands who will say, "I am a Canadian of such and such an origin? It is that word "Canadian" that will bind us all. If someone should inject into the discussion "biculturalism", that is a divisive term. For I would suggest to the members of this House that the use of the figure two in respect of anything except the official languages, cannot be but divisive because it is misunderstood.

It is not what the speaker says that is important, it is what the hearer hears that is important, and unless the speaker knows that the term that he is using will bring the right reception in his hearers' ears, he should not use it.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate in this House. I am pleased at this proposition, because this proposition has emerged over a period of years as men in this Legislature have gotten to know Canada. The member for Sudbury is fortunate that he is

from Sudbury because he got a very quick and an early insight into a microcosm of Canada.

That is why it was wise that the four western provinces should come to Ottawa. If they learned nothing but the explanation that was given to them of certain aspects of the official languages bill, that was a measure of success, because I know that there was a great deal of misapprehension on their part.

You see this is important because, Mr. Speaker, there have been technically three constitutional conferences at the official level—the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, the two conferences in Ottawa, but there was—

An hon. member: How about the one in 1865?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am talking about the present ones. I am glad that the hon. member raised 1867, 1864 and 1867 because we have to look at Canada in the light of 1967, 1968, 1969 and 2067, because the Laurendeau-Dunton Report points out that even though today it may be permissible to talk about the majority, or the two dominant majorities, they point out that at the rate of growth, it will be surely less than 1980 by which these three elements—if I may use that term as a word of communication—will almost be equal and by 2067, because of the fact that it is to Canada that people from other lands and other cultures will come, that this proportion may be considerably changed. Those who are in the majority today may be but one of the minorities in Canada, as they are now in certain provinces.

Three constitutional conferences. There was in Toronto in the middle of December a thinkers conference on cultural rights. The participants—some 200 of them—who participated in that, I think permitted themselves the luxury, if not in public then in private, of thinking they were having a constitutional conference, if not as a whole, perhaps then as a sub-committee of the constitutional conference of the technacommittee of experts.

I attended that conference and there were others and there were learned people who attended. I was pleased that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) participated. Claude Ryan came from Quebec and delivered what was to my mind one of the most scholarly addresses on the matter. He has a mind which is refined to the nth degree—

Mr. Sopha: He believes in biculturalism.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: His mind, as I listened there with the greatest of respect, was trying to cope with this problem of bilingualism and biculturalism which he felt within his depths, and with the concept of multi-culturalism. I will send to the member for Sudbury the remarks of Claude Ryan; he talks about multi-culturalism.

In the course of the luncheon which was tendered by this government to the people attending that conference on the close of the conference, I paid my respects to him because, though we differ on certain issues, I respond to the way his mind is trying to grasp this unique situation of Canada.

I suggest to you in all sincerity—and I am not propounding any political cause—I say again with the fullest of conviction, that the unique contribution that Canada will make to the world is not the products that the Minister of Trade and Development will be shipping across the world, it will not be—with all due deference—to any contribution that Mr. Sharp may make to the world conferences, great though that may be. But what we can do and what we have in our grasp in Canada is to demonstrate to the world how 47 different peoples drawn from the four corners of the world can find for themselves a rightful place within the community.

I am hopeful that the leadership that this administration has been given by its predecessors in office, by its incumbent in office, will be taken to heart across Canada and recognized, as decisions will be made, that this is the great contribution that can be made.

The question of language really presents no problem. Languages are a wonderful thing. It is interesting that—

Mr. MacDonald: Speak to Mr. Weir.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Weir will be aware of the problems. Mr. Weir published, prior to the conference, the newspapers of that province, and I read into the records: “Scho zavtra, Canado?” which means “What tomorrow Canada?”

I can tell you that just as this is being asked in English and in French—what tomorrow, is being asked in all the languages. Here again is a great force, a great potential that Canada has within its midst.

Recognizing the two official languages, I suggest that there is a place for this Legislature to give support, as this government has done, in the evolvement of the French language and co-incidentally with it, that culture, because the two will go hand in hand in that instance, to those who wish to preserve their culture and their traditions.

I note, that, for example, here in the city of Toronto, there were groups; the Greeks, the Portuguese, the Italians, who approached the school board to use the facilities after school hours for teaching their language at their own expense.

I think this is something that we will go into, and I recall that the leader of the Opposition, in a passing phrase, lent credence to that support or to the support that within our schools, if it is feasible, that this be permissible. I bring to your attention that in Bloor Collegiate, 22 per cent of the students, almost one-quarter, have as their background, the Ukrainian language. Parkdale Collegiate, I think, has the highest, as I think the member for Parkdale will recognize—25 per cent, one in every four.

I see no reason why consideration should not be given, in those instances, of permitting, as an elective option, the opportunity of those languages.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the book, "What History? What Heritage?" applies to everybody. That is something that I am hopeful of, that when we come to the grips of writing the history of Canada to be learned by our students, they will learn all of those things that I see by the quizzical expression on the member for Sudbury, he has learned from first-hand experience.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister gave the wrong title of the book—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: "What Culture? What Heritage?" And that is exactly what I am hopeful that the books, in our schools and across Canada—

Mr. Sopha: Has the Minister read it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have.

Mr. Sopha: It portrays the dismal failure of history teaching in our schools.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, and it points the fault in many places. Much can be done in this regard, I think that this is one of the great emerging benefits, the accomplishments of this constitutional discussion that is going on; because it has directed our attention into this regard.

I would hope, for example, that perhaps somehow, somebody will find some place, the dollars for the publication of the deliberations of the Thinkers Conference on Cultural Rights to which I draw the attention of all members of the House. There were very vociferous participants from all parties. It

was in December 1968, after the publication of two of the reports of the Laurendeau-Dunton commission, rejecting biculturalism and asking for the recognition of multiculturalism. It is within the province of Ontario that they have that and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister pointed this out to the chairman of the conference in correspondence. This is what I ask.

I refer back to the words of the leader of the NDP, that in this constitutional conference, all voices be heard—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, because unfortunately the Laurendeau-Dunton commission was given terms of reference, which they are pursuing and which are impossible—impossible, I suggest to the hon. member for Sudbury. Does he subscribe to the terms, may I ask him? Does he subscribe to this:

To inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races.

Because you see I do not. You see, Mr. Speaker, I do not belong to one of the "two founding races."

An hon. member: What about the founding races in Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Sudbury, this is not the sense in which the terms of reference were given, and you know at this—

Mr. Sopha: He is too sensitive.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not too sensitive. I have, Mr. Speaker, no sensitivity about myself. I will not be here in 2067 but I will tell you, I would like to be around.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Sudbury, one of the men at the thinkers conference was a man for whom I have a great deal of regard and respect, Senator Norman A. M. MacKenzie, former president of UBC, who taught me international law at the University of Toronto some 30 years ago. He said this:

One other comment: I urge that the use of the term "founding races" be abandoned, for this inevitably gives the impression that there are first-class and second-class citizens in Canada and one can never achieve a good society on that base.

Incidentally, he put in a PS:

The Scots came to Nova Scotia in 1621. My people have been here for some 200 years. I am not a founding father nor do I believe in the doctrine of founding races.

He went on to say:

The fact of the matter is, of course, that none of us were here when this land we live in was empty and waiting for occupation. All of us, regardless of our origins, are personally on very much the same basis in that through the accident of birth we were born here, came here of our own volition or were brought here by our parents. When citizenship has been obtained, or acquired as a result of birth, we are all in fact Canadian. We should all be given the same consideration and treatment and we should all feel that we have the same rights and privileges.

If the member for Sudbury subscribes to the latter part, he must of necessity subscribe to the first part. I say this: that it is not what you mean by the two founding races that is important, it is what the hearer hears when he hears that phrase that is important. I say the same in the use of such terms as 'basic' or any other similar term except in a historical context.

This country was founded initially by two founding races. When you talk about 1867 or 1759, then you have to include the Indians and the Eskimos, who are listed as two of the 47.

Mr. Speaker, I belong to a very interesting family. There are nine children. Five of them are married to Canadians who are of Ukrainian origin; three who were born in Canada, two who came to Canada. One, the eldest, is married to a Canadian, French by descent, who, when she married him could barely speak a word of English, and she visited with a family in Hamilton.

Mr. Sopha: That is your brother-in-law.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is my brother, my eldest brother. My eldest brother is married to a sixth generation.

Mr. Sopha: Does she tell you she is a member of the founding race?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: She has never used that expression. I want to tell you the interesting thing about languages. The grandchildren speak to the grandmother in Ukrainian, to the mother in French, and to their cousins in English, and it is a delightful scene to behold. Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, with the member for Dovercourt, "I am Canadian," and I am hopeful that out of the discussions that will be taking place in the years ahead, that term will emerge with the fact that there are many cultures in our mosaic.

Mr. Trotter moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we will resume this debate at a time to be agreed upon. I think tomorrow we will go to the Throne debate. I would like to conclude that debate on Monday. This might necessitate a night session. We will see the length of the contributions from the remaining speakers in that debate. Tomorrow we will deal with the normal order of business, private members' hour from twelve to one, and the Throne debate as soon as we have reached the orders of the day.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.20 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, February 28, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Friday, February 28, 1969

Tributes to the late Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, of Israel, Mr. Grossman, Mr. Singer, Mr. MacDonald	1691
GO-Transit accident, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Innes	1692
Trenton and EIO programme, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Pitman	1692
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Haggerty, Mrs. M. Renwick	1693
Motion to adjourn debate, Mrs. M. Renwick, agreed to	1704
On notice of motion No. 20, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Meen, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Burr	1704
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	1714

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1969

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of the members that this morning the tour of duty of the 22 legislative pages from all over the province of Ontario, who have been with us for the past nine weeks of the session, ends. On Monday we will have new pages. I thought perhaps the members would like to indicate to the boys, who are all here this morning, their appreciation of their services.

Applause.

Thank you. May I also at this time, because I think this is the appropriate time, say that I have had distributed copies of the three prayers, the first one of which has been already amended a bit. I would ask that the party caucuses look them over and let me have their comments. If there are any others which the caucuses would like to have used, by way of trial, I would most certainly be glad to do so. Eventually, we will perhaps have our traditional prayer reinvigorated for the opening of the House each day.

Today, in the east gallery, we have students from Lourdes Senior School in Guelph; and later this morning in the same gallery, there will be students from Thistleton Middle School; and still later, in the west gallery, from the John G. Althouse Public School in Islington.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The hon. Minister of Correctional Services.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows today is the date on which the citizens of the state of Israel are laying to rest the remains of the late Prime Minister of that great state. The world mourns the passing of one of its most distinguished citizens, a world statesman and a leader,

whose counsel will be sorely missed—the late Prime Minister of Israel, Levi Eshkol.

Levi Eshkol led Israel through some of that nation's most perilous and finest hours with wisdom, courage and humanitarian statesmanship. He was the embodiment of pragmatic realism. His career gave testimony to that statement. As a man of action, he displayed a strong dislike for bureaucracy. As a man of peace, he was willing to negotiate and compromise for the common good. As a negotiator, he belonged to the persuasion-by-stages school, acquainting himself thoroughly with the other side's case, probing through, until he reached a common principle of agreement, then striving to build mutual compromise upon that principle.

One of the founders of the state of Israel, he served his country in many capacities, including the leadership of a number of ministries of that government, and in 1963, assumed the duties of his highest office, that of Prime Minister. Levi Eshkol was a pioneer in the colonization of Israel and in the founding of over 500 settlements; a leader in its agricultural development projects and the architect of the Histadrut, the powerful federation of labour of that country.

His dynamic leadership was an inspiration to the people of his own country as well as to Jews throughout the world. As we pay tribute to one of the great men of our time, who was admired and revered at home and abroad, I, on my own behalf and on behalf of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and his government, pray that God may bless his memory as he joins his ancestors, who have for so many millenia been in the forefront of those who seek a peaceful world.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my leader, my colleagues and myself, I join in the remarks just made by the Minister of Correctional Services and would say that the passing of Levi Eshkol leaves a great gap in the councils of world government.

He stood for the assertion of rights of people to enjoy their own way of life, to practice their religion as they saw best and to remain undisturbed in a very troubled world. It was from the work done by such

as himself that the world began to grow and to mature, and throughout the world some of the lessons that were taught to us by the horrible events of 1939 and later began to have some effect in changing the conduct of men. The idea of a "gentleman's agreement" to suppress minority groups became harder and harder to justify in the mores of the world community.

Levi Eshkol served well and leaves a mark behind him which will enure to the benefit of all free citizens of our community.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the feelings of our group associated with those views expressed by the Minister of Correctional Services and the hon. member for Downsview.

Prime Minister Eshkol was in a succession of people who in recent years have epitomized that indomitable spirit of the people of Israel as they struggled to establish a state and to build freedom in a part of the world that is surely in travail. One can only hope that this sudden death is not going to complicate the situation, but having viewed the history of Israel to this date, I think there will be a worthy successor, and that we can move towards the building of peace, which would be surely the best monument to his memory.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford has a question of the Minister of Highways.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways: What steps are being taken to avoid repetition of the GO-Transit tragedy in Scarborough a few days ago?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the right of way used by GO-Transit is, of course, owned by the Canadian National railroad and the operation of the commuter trains is supervised by that railroad. The appropriate officials of Canadian National have promised us a complete report in respect to the accident referred to by the hon. member, and when this is received it will be tabled in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, a very simple question to the Minister of Trade and Development.

Is the town of Trenton still receiving aid under the EIO programme?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): A very simple answer to the question also, Mr. Speaker. We have no immediate prospects for new plants for Trenton. We are letting them digest what they have, and if they get them digested we may come back a little later on if they need more plants, or take a look at it.

Mr. Pitman: If I may ask a supplementary question: Is the town of Trenton still designated for assistance under the EIO programme, in view of the fact that officials in the town have shown that they no longer regard The Municipal Act of Ontario as being of any matter of concern to them? They have flagrantly—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has asked his question.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All the towns that are designated stay designated until the end of June, 1969, and then they are de-designated; we hope at that time there will be a review.

Mr. Pitman: Even when they are breaking the law?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Insofar as the difficulties they are experiencing down there, this is in the hands of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough). I think he is investigating the things that they were doing with which other municipalities disagreed.

Mr. Pitman: Well, they admitted it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: So what?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would rise on a question of personal privilege. In view of the somewhat personal remarks made by the leader of the Opposition about myself in this House yesterday, and in view of the somewhat personal remarks made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in London last night in my own riding, I just wondered whether the leader of the Opposition wrote Mr. Munro's speech, or did Mr. Munro write the leader of the Opposition's speech?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps to answer the question I would simply say that great minds think alike.

Mr. MacDonald: Was that exchange in order, really?

Mr. Speaker: Whether it is in order or not it is a delightful way to start off a morning's proceedings.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I shall put my mind, Mr. Speaker, to delightful ways of beginning the business of the House, whether or not they are in order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has over the years been able to do that quite satisfactorily.

Mr. MacDonald: If it is within the rules of the House I shall pursue it, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I can only say in regard to this whole matter, that this is the first time in my entire career in this House that I have ever found it necessary to rise on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MacDonald: And it was not one, really.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, it really was not.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To continue with my speech on regional government in the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, regional government has been in existence since The Baldwin Act of 1849. Welland county government has been regional since 1856, after a division on policy that split the previous districts into the two counties, Welland and Lincoln. The reason for the division was the neglect of the people in the services required for the southern part of the Niagara peninsula. One hundred and thirteen years ago the government was accepted as the centralized control—and it was a government that would not recognize the problems beyond the centre core.

One could read between the lines of the report of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) on regional government, that St. Catharines would be the hub of activity. It is rather odd that Penn Central at St. Catharines should locate in the vicinity of

Highway 406, before its completion south to the city of Welland and then on to the city of Port Colborne. One can only visualize that industries tend to be located in the centre of a region, creating many transportation problems, so that at this point the government should be providing the region with a GO-Transit system of communications in the Niagara region.

The centre core of St. Catharines creates market regions where people will travel long distances to purchase goods. Many firms have already relocated in St. Catharines, Consumers' Gas for one. All in all, the centre is created mainly to suit the convenience of the computer. One can foresee that there will be many disparities in the larger proposed regions; many local businesses in Port Colborne, Ridgeway and Fort Erie cannot compete with larger markets in that centre, and eventually close their doors.

A region must justify its own size and shape in terms of people and those who are involved. Welland county represents a natural region of social and economic activities, since reorganization of the county school board boundaries, which is a natural region, recognized by the Minister of Education and the school boards. And the people have a common interest. Welland county has always had a measure of community interest. My own view is that the special problems of the Niagara region could have been solved simply by taking away the annexation privileges of the cities and putting them back into the regional county form of organization. Today there is no guarantee that annexation will not occur in five or ten years.

This spreading of the load to the non-users or the shifting of the city taxes debenture debt is no doubt justified in the Minister's mind as one of the urgent reasons why, according to his statement, regional government cannot wait for the slow and largely voluntary strengthening of the county.

Put bluntly, he is looking to the rural area municipalities to pick up the tab for city services they can never hope to enjoy. He knows very well that the ideas of differential taxation he has tentatively groped for already will not begin to equalize the burden. That is why he says so little about it.

But, of course, as is apparent from page 18 of the Minister's Niagara announcement where he says that the province will appoint the first chairman of the whole region for a period of three years, a sensible approach is far from the Minister's mind. This is a glorious opportunity for patronage on the

grand scale. It will suit the early need of government for complete control, and hopefully assist things in 1971.

The absence of a rural weighting formula in the representation of the regional government, as shown on page 19 of that same statement, will assure city control of the entire region. The rural areas will, in effect, lose the franchise at this level. Their affairs and their interests will not be presented, and control will slip out of their hands.

Last Monday the re-organization committee of the cities and some of the towns in the Niagara peninsula were meeting the Minister and his staff on problems of reorganization. Yet at this meeting there was not a single representative from the rural area, and in this report Wainfleet township is a single municipality, the only rural municipality in this whole region of Welland county, and yet no representation.

I see that got the eye of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch). He probably has the same problem in Lincoln county where very few rural municipalities have any say on the matter of re-organization. Small wonder they are suspicious and want to take a second look. But they do not have a chance. They are rushed into voting in October of 1969.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): They are represented through their county council.

Mr. Haggerty: Perhaps I can get the Minister involved in this. Maybe I can have his comments on it. What are his views?

What are the rural areas of Niagara being sold in this bill of goods? They are being asked to take on and shoulder an unfair part of the debenture debt of four cities—Niagara Falls, St. Catharines, Welland and Port Colborne—the staggering total for them of \$80 million. The people of Welland county look also with alarm at the debenture debt of Lincoln county, amounting to \$8 million. Further, the debenture debt of the municipalities within the county of Welland itself, including the county, totals some \$12 million.

So the sewerless and waterless rural residents will smilingly pick up the urban tab, the Minister thinks. Who does he think he is kidding?

But that is not all. In the Niagara plan, big brother moves in. Listen to this on page 21:

The regional government will further have the authority to control the capital budgets of the lower-tier municipalities in order that a rational setting of priorities may be achieved.

How is that for interference on a grand scale in the lives of the people who want the minimum of government, and who only want to be left alone to live their lives?

I expect the cost of land ownership to rise steeply in rural areas because of a crushing burden of taxation that will be out of all proportion to rural incomes. Rural people will lose their independence, and the effect will be loss of many small estates and the return of a kind of feudal system.

Instead of owing an obligation to the lord of the manor, however, today's serfs will be in thrall to the regional government, whose officers will live at the \$30,000-a-year-rate set by example of the county school boards. That is the new rule of thumb. Officials get six times the average annual income of the people who foot the bill. Let us not forget this.

Questions have been asked by elected representatives of municipalities on numerous occasions—and this dates back to 1966, the first offering of the Mayo report presented by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. Mr. Spooner, what are the per capita grants going to be in the larger regions? Will they be the same as the rate set by the Metro government, or set at the Metro rate, \$7.50, compared to an average now of \$5.50 within the region of Welland and Lincoln?

If the little estates crumble, the roads around them will crumble, too. There has been no clarification to date as to what the grant structure will be for road construction or maintenance. The paragraph on page 23 of the Minister's Niagara statement conveys nothing.

At the present time, grants for roads are 33½ per cent to cities, and 50 per cent to towns and township villages. Bridge construction grants are 80 per cent for town and township villages, and 33½ per cent for most cities. Yet Metro grants to boroughs with a large population remain at 50 per cent for roads and at 80 per cent for bridges and culverts. So it is all a jumble, and the Minister is giving no guidance as to what the future holds.

For example, the town of Fort Erie, which has a population the same as the city of Port Colborne, that town will receive 50 per cent for road subsidies. The city of Port Colborne today under the present programme will receive 33½ per cent. There is no justice whatsoever.

Who will take over the responsibility of Queen's highways within a region? The re-

gional government? The statement is not clear on this at all.

When one talks about entering into a region, the township of Humberstone, which is part of the city of Port Colborne, their telephone rates will remain 100 per cent higher per private phone, than what it is within the city of Port Colborne. In the long term they are going to be part of this city.

The question of hydro rates has never been answered by the Minister or by anyone in his department, or by the government. In cases of annexation in the past, in Welland County, for example, the city of Port Colborne annexed part of Humberstone township. They had to buy all the service from the rural hydro, which is Ontario hydro.

Is Ontario hydro going to come in and say, this is part of the larger region now, that you have to buy all of these services to further feather their nests, to put more capital debt onto the people of the region?

On page 24, the appointments to the board of health are upon the recommendations of the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), another vehicle for patronage.

The Niagara Parks system ought to be taken over by the regional government. Obviously Queen's Park wants to retain the plus. The profit from the tourist areas could be used to provide recreational facilities for the residents of the region. Furthermore, the representatives would be elected and not appointed, as they are now, to the Niagara Parks Commission.

Again, the Niagara Parks Commission could take over the park in Wainfleet township, which is under the authority of the conservation authority at the present time, in Ball's Falls. This could be all part of a regional park system within this region if this government wanted to enact legislation to provide this.

Page 25 is just a laugh. All the priority expenditures have gone to the upper tier of government. Certainly, there are enough responsibilities left to the lower tier, but where is the tax base to pay for them? The people are already bled dry by the inflated salaries and overhead expenses of the upper tier.

Then there is the last, and perhaps, the final question of the overlapping of governments as such. An editorial on Friday, November 8, 1968:

IN DARKEST METRO

Metropolitan Toronto is so widely over-governed by a multiplicity of bodies that

it doesn't even know how many of them exist or what they do. Forty-two per cent of them should be abolished.

That, said hard and honest, is the sum of a bulletin issued this week by the Bureau of Municipal Research, a non-partisan, non-profit research agency financed by voluntary subscriptions from non-governmental sources.

The dimensions of the problem were delicately underlined by the bureau when it said, "We list in tabular form all boards and commissions which we have been able to uncover." Discounting what other beasts may lurk in the underbrush, the bureau found that Metro citizens are burdened by 101 units of local government—seven municipalities, 54 boards, 11 commissions, 11 committees, five authorities, four councils, two societies, two companies, one bureau, one association, one corporation, one court and one foundation.

These bodies often duplicate each other's efforts, conflict with each other, leave gaping voids in public service and in general cross the citizens up. Or, as the bureau put it more formally, "The prospects for success become an inverse function of the number of players . . . The whole becomes considerably less than the sum of its parts."

The 101 players have a few other defects too. Because an excessive number of them are appointed, they remove large areas of our lives from democratic control, and serve as cushions between the people and those they elected to govern them (get the politicians off the hook, in other words).

Because they are naturally dedicated to their own survival, they sometimes stand between efficient and economic service to the public. The insistence, for instance, on maintaining a separate board of health for each area municipality means that some Metro citizens get poor services and pay 75 per cent of the cost of them instead of 25 per cent, which is all they'd have to pay if their local governors did what Queen's Park wants and established a single good district health unit.

Because some of them—the Metro Licensing Board, for example—not only write some of their own bylaws but judge the people who appear under these bylaws, there is a wholly unjust mixture of the legislative and judicial functions.

Because there are so many bodies having to coordinate their activities if Metro

is to progress and because they don't co-ordinate very well, Metro progresses—when it does at all—at a snail's pace, and it costs the taxpayers more to creep thus than to leap.

It was evident that the bureau, in its reticent way, felt that only total amalgamation was likely to cure most of these ills, but that for the time being (that is, until Queen's Park overcomes its fear of the political rival amalgamation would produce) we would have to stagger along with two-level government. Under this decided handicap, however, it made a number of very sensible recommendations.

It would reduce the number of governing bodies from 101 to 55. It would introduce a single Metro Hydro Commission to establish uniform rates and services (how many Metro citizens know that crossing a municipal boundary may push up their rates?). It would establish a single Metro health district (actually descending from its almost invariably gentle phrasing to blame the present mishmash on "parochialism").

Where members of governing bodies are appointed by elected councils, it would give the councils the power, also, of recall. This would mean that councillors would no longer be able to claim (when the Toronto Transit Commission cut services or raised fares, say) that this was no business of theirs.

When tax bills were sent out a list of the boards and commissions they support, with an indication of the amount of support in each case, would be included for the citizen's information. He would at least know whom he was paying for what.

That he doesn't know now was perhaps the most shocking of the bureau's discoveries. Conducting a poll among 30 individuals carefully selected because they were highly educated and well informed on local politics, it found that only one of them could name as many as 15 of the 101 bodies that help to govern their lives. Which can only mean that the vast proportion of Metro citizens don't know what services are available to them, what duties are expected of them, or whom to ask about it all.

Arrayed against their finding out, moreover, are not only all the elected council members, but 1,012 board members of special bodies, few of whom wish to see their little empires dismantled. They can hardly be blamed; but the Ontario Govern-

ment can. It is the Ontario Government which holds Metro in this state of paralysis.

Mr. Speaker, to continue with the course of the Royal Commission on Dominion and Provincial Relations of 1939. Just a week or two ago, this government was in Ottawa on the same basis, on the same programme of obtaining more assistance and funds from the federal government. We have heard the debate last night on constitutional change.

This report says that the federal government has tried to secure sufficient control over the administration of the particular activities by the provinces to enforce the maintenance of the desired standards. The need of Canadian citizens would be satisfied only if all the provincial governments in Canada are in a position to supply those services which the citizen of today demands.

The ability of the provincial governments to meet the demands of the citizens depends, in part, upon their financial capacity to perform a recognized function. The government expenditures are increased by overlapping and duplication of services between province and federal governments.

In the past the difficulties were surmounted by delegation of power, but they are now either embarrassed or being abandoned owing to the dubious constitutionality of the device. Generally, therefore, the power to deal with the pressing social question rests with the province. Federal government has made grants available to the province for special purposes on condition that the province undertake the work and maintain certain standards designed to serve a fair degree of uniformity across the country.

The federal government has made money grants to the province to assist in the maintenance of such services, hoping to ensure a nationwide maintenance of certain minimum standards. The federal and provincial supervision has grown up, causing duplication of government machinery and unnecessary expense and inconvenience. Federal government imposes certain standards, conditions, periodic inspection of the services given by them. This agreement at this level may prejudice federal and provincial relations.

Creating regional governments must not end up as just adding one more tier of government. It must justify itself. In the end, it must stand for less government and this implies the clarification of function at both municipal and provincial levels. I can see a case for the regional government and federal government, but I cannot for the life of me

see the need for regional, provincial and federal level.

I think that the regional government could well mean the end of provincial government in Canada. Because the people will not stand to be overgoverned and when they see that they are getting what they want from Ottawa and from their regions, they will say, "why are we throwing money away at Queen's Park?" I think that, in the half-baked form of regional government that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is pushing, they are writing their own death warrant and at the same time doing a grave disservice to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on with the balance of my remarks on the Throne debate, I want to say this. All of us know the score on pollution, and what it is doing to large areas of Haldimand county. I believe the Haldimand county and my own constituency have been shocked by the cavalier way in which the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) treated the nomination of the Ontario federation of agriculture to the committee on pollution of air, soil and water in the townships of Dunn, Molton and Sherbrooke in Haldimand county.

The federation wanted Mr. George Klosser, MA, Economics, a farmer with recent experience in preparing reports on agriculture matters, to serve on the committee. They wrote to the Minister to this effect on August 27, 1967. The Minister wrote back on August 31, 1967, stating that the recommendations would be given serious consideration.

However it was not to be. In the background was a former Ontario Federation of Agriculture president, Alec McKinney, a Conservative stalwart in Brampton, who was deemed more suitable to bring in the kind of whitewash report the government wanted. So he got the job over the OFA nominee.

It was as simple as that. With Dr. Hall committed to a previous position on fluoride, and with Alec McKinney to do as the government bid him, there was a two-to-one majority against anything Dr. Weingard said or did, and a whitewash report was a foregone conclusion.

They were directed to get the CBC and the Order-in-Council setting up the inquiry was not signed until after the broadcast.

This was the most shameful abuse of the Royal commission procedure that has ever been perpetrated in the Commonwealth or in any area of responsible government.

Many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, questions have been raised to the different

Ministers, especially to the Minister of Agriculture—he is not here today—questions pertaining to agriculture problems. The reply, often in a rather lengthy debate, a political debate, said the matter had become a federal matter, not a provincial matter.

This goes back to what I have said before on regional government. There is too much government in this province. The small man gets caught between the two governments and nothing is done. Not a thing! It is time that we did away with all our provincial boundaries and had complete assimilation of all people in Canada for a true Canada and for unity.

In closing, may I commend the Liberal approach in regional governments, in which the people set the pace of reform, the more adventurous regions leading the way and the rest following. Guided by an expert staff in the Premier's office which should stand above departmental rivalries, the people of the regions could write their own reports and sign them.

That is the Liberal way; democracy in action. Not the sad situation we have before us now, but a positive approach, within a framework of a well thought out master plan for Ontario. That is Liberal leadership in action, and the hon. members will see it after 1971.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow colleagues in the congratulations at finding ourselves in the good hands of yourself, and your able deputy. I realize that this compliment has come many times now from the floor of the legislative assembly, but I would simply like to say that it does not come any less sincerely.

I would like to deal first of all, Mr. Speaker, and I hope shortly, with the problem that is so flagrant in my riding of Scarborough Centre, of rent increases in the hope that the isolation of three or four cases, as I did in the last session, will draw the attention of the appropriate Ministers concerned.

At the address of 1340 Danforth Road, in apartment 1211, in Scarborough, I had an application for Ontario housing, the reason being that the rent was going up. I asked the tenant if he would send a letter from the landlord indicating the size of rent increase and the purpose of the increase.

The tenant had such a letter, Mr. Speaker, and I would like briefly to put it into the record. It is addressed to the tenant of 1211, at 1340 Danforth Road in Scarborough. I cannot use his name, Mr. Speaker because

this tenant has now slipped from contact of my files and the regular mail delivery.

Re your lease:

Dear sir:

Your lease respecting the above noted apartment expires on the date mentioned below. Will you please let me know by return mail if you wish to renew your lease with us, and for what term, one or two years.

Due to increased costs, it has been found necessary to increase the rent in your building. The new rent for your apartment is shown below and is due on the date specified. This increase does not include decorating.

Your lease expires July 31, 1968, present rent \$173 plus one free outside parking; new rent \$198 plus \$5 outside parking, due August 1, 1968.

Signed D. K. Bishop, Property Manager—
and dated May 27, 1968.

So, Mr. Speaker, another family unable to cope with the rent increase, in this particular case of \$30 a month by the time they included their parking, and they filed an application with the Ontario Housing Corporation, No. 0833E.

I talked to the municipality of Scarborough and asked them what sort of tax increase this building had incurred? What sort of expenses could we perhaps define of this particular owner, that felt he had to put up his rents \$30 a month?

I learned from the municipal offices in Scarborough that 1340 Danforth Road is called Danforth Park Apartments Limited, care of Canborough Corporation, 7-12 King Street East, Toronto. In 1967, the building did not receive full assessment for taxation as a part of the building was incomplete and so, the difference in taxation between 1967 and 1968 was really, Mr. Speaker, a full assessment in 1968 instead of a partial in 1967.

But even if we would like to treat the difference of that tax change—it is not a tax increase necessarily—as the 1969 taxes Mr. Speaker, which are identical with 1968, if we treat that particular change of taxation, the owner had to put out an additional \$12,-627.15 in taxes in 1968—that tax he escaped really in 1967 on his unfinished building.

The tax change of \$12,000 he offsets that, plus any cost which he might incur in the

care of the building, with a rent increase of \$30 a month. On the numbers of suites in his building, which are 172 suites, his total increase of income for that building would amount to \$61,920 at \$30 a suite.

Now, I asked the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) during the last session if he perhaps would take an interest in this problem, if perhaps the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) did not feel that there was some form of the Act that we could expand to give a rent review board or give some protection to these persons. I have respect for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I believe he has a very strong antenna in this House for sensing the mood of the House or the important nuances. I do hope that he will take an interest in these two or three cases.

I turn now to a case of an individual rather than a family, Miss Leonora Holgate. Miss Holgate is pleased if I use her name because she feels that the problem of housing is so severe that we must do this sort of thing to draw the attention of the people concerned. Miss Holgate lives at 135 Rose Avenue in apartment 104. She lives in a bachelor apartment. She pays \$90 per month rent. Her lease is up—this was at the end of August 1968, Mr. Speaker.

Miss Holgate is 74 years young. She is an ex-schoolteacher. She is a bright and able person and a delight to speak to. She was very concerned about the fact that when she called the owner to see if the rent was going up she was notified it would be increased to \$112 per month. We told her she should get this in writing because this is rather a flagrant increase. It is \$22 per month. She receives \$97 a month from old age pension and supplementary, and has a little bit of money on her own. She was quite concerned—my secretary wrote on this comment when she talked to her at intervals, about the increase.

Miss Holgate spent a great deal of time trying to get through to the Ontario Housing Corporation, she explained to me. So, one day she put on her hat and she just went down to see them and then, she started going down dozens of times. Then one day she said to me, "I have very different politics than you, Mrs. Renwick, but I know that if I talk to you, you might take an interest in my housing." And I said that the difference in our politics did not matter a bit, because I

too am quite interested that she would wake up one day and find that she had a \$22 increase on her apartment.

Then she mentioned that she knew people in our government, and I said, "Go to them, by all means go, and please take to them the message which you have left with me." So Miss Holgate talked to the Attorney General and he talked to the Ontario Housing Corporation. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario Housing Corporation officials were seriously listening, because I am sure that Miss Holgate and the Attorney General were very serious about the problem.

I would like to talk now about a family. The details will take but a moment to describe, and yet it is so similar to many, many files that I have in my particular department. My department, Mr. Speaker, is not Housing. My department is Social and Family Services, as critic for the New Democratic Party. But I do have a riding where one-third of my constituents live in apartments and I am bound to have this kind of case brought to my attention. In spite of the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) insisting that I seek publicity from these cases, I would not know what to do if I got any more than I have now. And, I do not go out and find them. But I do not turn them away, whether they are in my riding or not. Certainly, Miss Holgate is not, and certainly this next case is not. They are so indicative of the problem in my riding, Mr. Speaker, that I use this as an example.

Apartment B1 at 880 Pharmacy Avenue is occupied by Vernon and Geraldine Cunningham. They also applied to Ontario Housing. Their file number is 8522D. And if you would like to know the happy end of this story; first, Mr. Speaker, they were accommodated by OHC, I am delighted to say. This was a two-bedroom apartment. The rent was \$110. It was going up April 1, 1969, to \$130. There is a boy nine years old, a girl eight years old and a boy four years old. The wife was not working because of the age of the children. The husband's earnings in 1968 were approximately \$3,500. The husband had an accident at work, November 16, 1967. He chipped his spine and had to finish work at the end of January, 1968, and was on workmen's compensation. He resumed work about July but he was not able to do heavy construction because of the spine injury. Because of this, he was only able to get intermittent work through the union.

Things have become very bad and appear

to be getting worse, not only because of the rent increase which they cannot afford, but also because there is a strong possibility that they will get their notice since they have a two-bedroom apartment and should have, Mr. Speaker, a three-bedroom apartment because of the children. As you can see, this \$130 rent is for a two-bedroom apartment and is going up to \$130 on April 1, 1969, so it is quite current. They applied to the housing authority in May, 1968. They have had a visitor and were placed on the emergency housing list for medical as well as monetary grounds.

Mr. Speaker, my notice on the end of this file was, "Now have notice to vacate by April 30", and I am very pleased that that family is settled.

I just wish I could see some way in which I could settle all the families in our files, Mr. Speaker, especially those who are dealing with multiple problems. This is a family already dealing with rehabilitating the father. It is already dealing with our extremely high cost of living and with rearing three children.

I spoke, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs briefly and he evinced some interest in poor business practice by apartment owners. I have drawn one case from the file, and only one, to show this, although there are many, Mr. Speaker, where the tenants, as I am sure you know from previous comments from other members, have to fight tooth and nail—and have to get free legal assistance from people in the communities, in Metro Toronto, who will provide such service—to get back their rent deposits.

Mr. Jerry Rushlow was an applicant to OHC and he lived at 544 Birchmount Road in apartment 303. The apartment was quite unsatisfactory. It was not a clean building. It was not a place, he said, that was fit to bring up children and he was fighting the new rent increase, which was not as flagrant as some of the others, Mr. Speaker. However, I would like to draw attention to the poor business operation of many of these buildings.

Mr. Rushlow was given notice, and he was given notice in the manner that I see time and time again, where second-rate superintendents in apartments, presumably because of low wages, Mr. Speaker, often use the affairs of children in order to evict the parents. They use some sort of scheme that the children have done something which they object to under the multiple clauses in their

lease. And so Mr. Rushlow received a letter dated November 29, 1968, saying:

Mr. Rushlow,
Apartment 303.

Dear Mr. Rushlow:

Not long ago we wrote asking you to instill upon your children to behave themselves in the halls or strict action would be taken. On Monday night when the superintendent approached you regarding your son, instead of listening to her complaint you closed the door in her face. Your son was in the laundry room again, locked the door, inconveniencing the tenants and jumping all over the machines. He was also holding up the elevator so that tenants had to walk from the sixth floor. He pushed all the intercom buttons, disturbing everyone.

Due to the above, let this be your notice to vacate your apartment by December 30, 1968.

Your truly,

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no name. It is typed, "Management".

Now, to take this family to court and prove that some of these things are not right, or that this gentleman, the tenant, is entitled to his full rebate of his deposit, is an absolute impossibility, Mr. Speaker, on that piece of paper. I could have typed it upstairs myself. And I think this is of interest to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs—that this type of fraudulent business operation is going on. I think we have to ask what quality of operation is prevailing itself upon unsuspecting families.

I would like to add that Mr. Rushlow sent this notice to the Ontario Housing Corporation because he had to prove to them that he had been given notice. The fact that it was not true did not bother him nearly as much as the fact that he had to have a place to live.

When he came to Queen's Park and spoke to me because of the financial position he found himself in with this particular owner, regarding his rent deposit, he said, "This isn't true, you know. I never did get a letter. I never did get a letter and when the superintendent did come to our door, we pooh-poohed her away, because she was coming every other day with some sort of complaint. She, too, had an eight-year old son and we complained sometimes about the fact that he was smoking in the building. We tried to make her balance it out that it was a problem

of children and not necessarily of the parents."

So Mr. Rushlow, Mr. Speaker, has filed a signed statement with OHC saying: 1. that he never did receive written notice; and 2. that the superintendent, a lady, was always running to their door with petty squabbles.

But Mr. Rushlow is not a man of private means, Mr. Speaker, and he had a security deposit with this particular management. The security deposit was to the amount of \$158, and when he came to see me, he had a cheque for his security deposit for \$28. So I photostated the once more unsigned document which was sent to him along with the cheque and it says:

Mr. Rushlow;
544 Birchmount Road,
Apartment 303,
Scarborough, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Rushlow:

Re: Security deposit, Apartment 303.

Since your lease was terminated as breaking the terms of our lease from paragraph 5(b) and 7-IV, rules and regulations 12, 13, 15, 20, 21 and 41, security amount \$158.

And these are the amounts, Mr. Speaker, which have been deducted from the security deposit:

Cleaning costs \$25.00; paint \$65.00.

Mr. Rushlow has stated that he will swear to it that the apartment was never painted when he moved in.

Sub-lease charge—

In other words, that the tenant had broken his lease, rather than the landlord gave notice—

\$40.00.

So Mr. Rushlow was sent a cheque, which, I hope, from the legal advice we got for him, he has probably been advised not to cash. With it he was sent a letter, quote:

Enclosed please find a cheque in the amount of \$28.00, covering the balance owing on your security deposit.

Yours truly,
Management.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spend too long, but I felt that with two or three cases of that kind it was absolutely essential. We must look at the fact that more than 50 per cent of our families earn less than \$7,000 a year. You heard the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) in his remarks

earlier, comment on the expenses of a family of four earning \$5,200, and a family of four earning \$7,000.

I am not going to go through the item by item statement again, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to point out the fact that the family earning \$5,200, when they pay total taxes—exclusive of indirect taxes and motor vehicle taxes—their hospital insurance, their unemployment insurance, the Canada Pension plan, OMSIP, social development tax, the provincial income tax, their \$5,200 earnings come down to \$4,337. And this is \$361 a month.

When people are having to pay \$150, \$170, \$180 a month, they are paying almost 50 per cent of their income, Mr. Speaker. And even the family earning the \$7,000, if we take their net income—which, with the same deductions, is \$5,723—then end up where they cannot possibly cope with the inflated rents that we are dealing with here today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to the department of which I am critic, The Department of Social and Family Services, the whole community was shocked, when, on January 17 of this year, it read of the infant death of Carol Ann Young. Ralph Hyman in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, January 17, 1969, wrote of an aroused jury and I quote:

—described the death of a five months old infant by asphyxiation as having been unnecessary, and protested again what it called the obvious lack of communication amongst welfare agencies 'particularly in areas falling outside the main jurisdictions'.

In the *Toronto Daily Star*, January 19, 1969, the jury is reported to have stated:

We urge that the administrative heads of the welfare agencies be instructed to recommend and take whatever steps are necessary to improve the communication and resultant action of the agencies to achieve results more in keeping with the true needs of an individual.

On January 20, 1969, Mr. Speaker, the following comments were an editorial comment of the *Globe and Mail*:

THE MAKING OF A MONSTER

A five-month-old child is dead because somewhere along the string of social welfare agencies operating in Toronto, there was a failure to communicate. Carol Ann Young was accidentally smothered a month ago as she slept in a bed between her

mother and her mother's sister in a two-room flat on Queen Street east. She had no crib. Her mother didn't ask visiting welfare workers for a crib and they in turn didn't suggest that she should have one.

Evidence at a coroner's inquest disclosed that the mother desperately needed counselling in child care and homemaking. She never received it. Yet she was visited by welfare workers from the Metro welfare department who carefully scrutinize the affairs of welfare recipients and insure that they are receiving the proper amount and kind of welfare assistance.

Gordon Smith, a department district administrator, explained that it was not the duty of welfare workers to counsel mothers. It was the duty of social workers. And he said he had notified the Children's Aid Society.

How does an expert witness, Barbara Chisholm, executive director of Victoria Day Care Services, attack this division of function? As artificial, and in quotes she says: "What we have built because of short-sighted policies is a monster."

We agreed.

Now Barbara Chisholm was called, Mr. Speaker, as an expert witness, and she is truly an expert in the areas of social and family services. She said:

The most important impression I have gained from listening to the evidence is that the death of the child was an unnecessary one. It occurred, not because of tragic accident of being smothered, but because the community failed.

Now in the text here, Mr. Speaker, it says "community services", but I talked to Miss Chisholm the next day and she said she had stated it was the community—the total community—which had failed to prevent the death.

I would like to put on record, Mr. Speaker, that Miss Chisholm is deeply committed, exceptionally well informed, totally dedicated to administering alleviation and guidance in areas of human misery.

About six years ago, Mr. Speaker, Miss Chisholm lectured to a class of day nursery students when I was in attendance at that class at the University of Toronto. She stood out above all other lecturers as having brought before us the ability to look at the child as a whole package—the environment it had come from; the problems of the family—not just where the child fell in the area of categorical provision.

She brought before us, shockingly enough, a small story of a four-year-old child—the youngest ever to be charged. This four-year-old had been charged with having beaten up and severely damaged a couple of babies in carriages. Miss Chisholm was asked to take this child into the day nursery—this is about six to seven years ago, Mr. Speaker—and in taking the child into the day nursery in her fashion, she did not simply take in the child and counsel and assist the child. She brought in the father and the mother and the sister; and the father had a drink problem and she got him to Alcoholics Anonymous. She got him to the alcohol and drug addiction clinic.

At the three-month interval, when she addressed the students, the father had been dry for three months and had had a promotion in his work.

The mother was suffering from mental illness. The mental illness was easily understood because she had lived for a number of years with the husband's mother, who obviously must have been suffering from a form of mental illness which could be quite a burden for a wife to bear in that type of domestic environment. Because when the mother of the four-year-old sent for her clothes from the east coast, the mother-in-law sent them cut up in two-inch pieces, including shoes, packed in two suitcases.

Barbara Chisholm got the mother to two days a week counselling for her psychiatric disturbances. She put a visiting homemaker into the home for two or three days a week, and at this three-month interval the family was doing fine. I have only spoken to Miss Chisholm once or twice in that eight-year interval. When I saw her yesterday I asked her if she recalled this case and she said a four-year-old child who had been formally charged could hardly have escaped her memory. She said, "I would just like you to know that the father is now a permanent employee of the city of Toronto. They have a down payment on a house, and they are all functioning." It would appear quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the ability to look at the whole family is very, very important.

I said during the last session that we have welfare workers going out making sure people have not any money and then we give them some, and that this is not sufficient. The structure must be overhauled, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the time to do it is now. It is going to take some time to overhaul this kind of structure.

I want to point out that infant deaths should not be considered as an isolated inci-

dent. Such cases are symptomatic, as all extreme cases are. Barbara Chisholm has stated to me personally that in her work she has seen literally hundreds, if not thousands, of girls like the mother of Carol Anne Young.

I am going to turn to a report, Mr. Speaker. I would like to point out the broadness of the report. I know the Minister will note it is a British report. Mr. Speaker, it is the report of The Committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Services. It is a command report which was presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, the Minister of Housing and Local Government and the Minister of Health, by command of Her Majesty, July, 1968. There is not much point in anyone saying that this is a British report and that it is different here in Canada, because indications of this report pretty clearly show us that it is not necessarily any different in Canada.

The report took two and a half years to prepare, Mr. Speaker. The committee was appointed to review the organization and the responsibilities of the local authority personal social services in England and Wales, and to consider what changes are desirable to secure an effective family service. I would like to refer to a few sections without taking undue time of the House, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the broadness of this report is a revelation in itself. I know that there will be some comments saying that we have the PPBS—the programme planning budgetary systems—and that we are doing it, but we are not doing it, Mr. Speaker, because in the programme planning and the budgetary system, we are talking about the systems as they are at present and we should be talking about them, Mr. Speaker, on a total programme basis.

The background of this particular report states:

Although we were anxious to consider the personal social services in the broadest possible way and as a whole, we took the following present services as our starting point: the whole of the work of children's departments, the whole of the work of welfare departments, the social work element in health, education and housing departments, although we recognized that these could not be considered in isolation from the rest of the work of the departments concerned.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to draw to the attention of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) that although this

report, it states, is concerned only with the situation in England and Wales, events in Scotland have been moving on parallel lines with some difference in procedure and timing following the submission of the Kilbrandon Report on Children and Young Persons (Scotland) 1964. A working group was set up in Scotland resulting in the presentation of the Secretary of State in October, 1966, of the white paper, Social Work and the Community: Proposals for re-organizing local authority Services in Scotland, Command Number 3608.

This covered a somewhat wider field than those defined by our terms of reference. In particular, it included the probation service. Legislation has now been introduced in the shape of the Social Work (Scotland) Bill.

I am reading now from item 38 of this report—the previous one, Mr. Speaker, was 37:

Similar developments and the acknowledgement of similar problems have been described in both Europe and the United States in recent years. In several countries, notably Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark and France, administrative re-organization has recently occurred or is contemplated. Although each national situation is administratively, politically and geographically different, it is remarkable that the problems in organizing personal social services are described in such similar terms.

There appear to be two common features. First, co-ordination between the various social agencies is considered deficient with the result that families and individuals have received less than adequate services and scarce resources have been inefficiently deployed.

Second, the point at which these various services are provided is frequently considered to be too remote and both communities and recipients insufficiently involved.

Now when they did this report, Mr. Speaker, they were sufficiently concerned with the broadness of the problem. I would like to draw to your attention that they call heavily on experts and they have expressed special gratitude to:

Mr. Alvin Schorr, deputy assistant secretary for individual and family services at the Department of Health Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., who flew over for a few days in order to give us the benefits of his advice which proved invaluable. We are grateful to the hon. Lyle C. Carter for releasing him.

You see the relevancy, Mr. Speaker, of this report is the fact that it is so current. It was received in the legislative library here, January 3 of this year and much of the work for this debate that I put together between Christmas and New Year is covered in exemplary fashion in this report, far greater than anyone not associated deeply in the areas of social and family services could ever begin to do.

There were three main lines, Mr. Speaker, to the enquiry. It was decided; one, to discover the opinions of all those concerned with the services; two, to find out which local authorities have been making or considering material changes in organization and responsibility and to benefit from their thoughts and experience; three, to draw on what information could be made available by central and local governments and by research workers in the universities and elsewhere on the working of the services.

Mr. Speaker, it seems in gathering that type of information from the local authorities in the line of possible change, there are many minds working seriously at these problems at the local level. I have talked to such people in Metro Toronto, where, it must be said, there are many people who are intensely interested in improving the organizational structure at the local level.

To make a case for organizational change, the following questions were asked in section 71:

Our terms of reference require answers to three main questions:

(a) What is wrong with the present local authority's personal social services and can improvements be made?

(b) If improvements are needed, how far are these dependent upon organizational change and changes in the distribution of responsibility?

(c) If there is a case for altering the present organization and distribution of responsibility, what new patterns shall be recommended?

On section 79, dealing with poor co-ordination, which seems to be the problem that we are plagued with here in Ontario, Mr. Speaker:

Section 79: Our knowledge and understanding of social need have steadily grown, and this has underlined its complexities and the desirability of meeting it in comprehensive fashion. In consequence, the problems of co-ordination and collaboration within the personal social

services and between them and other services have loomed increasingly large. The present structure of the personal social services and the division of responsibilities between them is based upon the definition of certain kinds of problems (mental illness, homelessness or physical handicap for instance); upon age groupings (the elderly or school children) and upon legal and administrative classifications (delinquency or maladjustment).

Such divisions do not reflect the fact that families comprise members falling into a variety of these categories and that individuals may face a combination of inter-related problems for which different services (or none) are responsible. Under these circumstances, the growing desire to treat both the individual and the family as a whole and to see them in their wider context creates accentuated difficulties of co-ordination, both at policy and field levels.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would find a suitable place in her address to adjourn the debate so that we may proceed with the private members' hour.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. M. Renwick moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Private member's notice of motion No. 20, by Mr. Kerr:

RESOLUTION: That (a) the record of people convicted of an offence while a minor under any statute in Ontario, except The Highway Traffic Act, be expunged if no further conviction has been recorded against such person for a period of five years; (b) the Ontario government make representation to the federal Minister of Justice to have similar amendments made to the Criminal Code to erase criminal records incurred by minors who, upon reaching their majority, have become respectable members of society.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Meen) resolution No. 20 standing in my name which has just been read.

In dealing with this resolution, I wish first of all to emphasize what the erasing or expunging or records can mean to the

young man or woman who is convicted of an offence while a minor and has to live with that conviction as an adult. Our law has focused particularly recently on the rehabilitation of the individual offender. It must fulfill a number of functions pointed toward a single ultimate goal; the ordering of society in such a manner that each member has the fullest opportunity to realize his or her dignity through community life. There has been surprisingly little recognition of the fact that our system of penal law is largely flawed in one of its most basic aspects; it fails to provide assessable or effective means of fully restoring the social status of the reformed offender.

We sentence, we coerce, we incarcerate, we counsel, we grant probation and parole and we treat—but we never forgive. The offender who has paid his so-called debt to society really neither receives a receipt nor is free of his account. The fact is that the failure of our criminal law to clarify the status of a reformed offender impedes the objective of reintegrating him with the society from which he has become estranged. The more heavily he bears the mark of his former offence, the more likely he is to reoffend.

I have, Mr. Speaker, in this resolution referred to minors and the period of five years. It is quite valid to say that such provisions and rights should apply to adults and also that the period should be varied for different offences. However, I wish to restrict my remarks to the resolution, mainly because I think the complete rehabilitation of the teenager who intends to reform is absolutely essential. A young man or woman should not be marked for life for committing an offence which might be nothing more than a juvenile indiscretion in an isolated incident. It is not necessary for me to say that where there is a provision in a law to eliminate or expunge records, a young first offender, knowing the consequences of a record, would be greatly encouraged to take advantage of such a provision.

By expungement, I mean a legal provision for the eradication of a record upon fulfillment of prescribed conditions, usually the successful discharge of the offender from probation and the passage of a period of time without further offence. It is a redefinition of status, a process of erasing the legal event of conviction or adjudication and thereby restoring the offender to his previous status or *status-quo ante*. This is more than a pardon, because a pardon does not erase the legal event affecting status.

Expungement should be automatic upon application by the offender who has met the conditions set out in the resolution, or any other conditions under such rehabilitation that the state may require. Application could be made to the Minister of Justice or a board within The Department of Justice so that official notification should be given whereby the offender could now say he has no record. This right should not be discretionary, not judicial rehabilitation, but legal rehabilitation. There should be no prolonged investigation by the police or by social service workers. If this is done it would vitiate the very object and spirit of such legislation. An applicant would need only prove that the period of time had elapsed and that there was no subsequent conviction.

I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to learn in researching this subject how much more advanced the law is in many European countries in respect to the reformation and rehabilitation of the offender compared to our system on this continent.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They are more advanced in a lot of things.

Mr. Kerr: Even Spain has a provision in its criminal code whereby records of offenders are erased, although the crimes to which this applies are mainly of a minor nature.

To return to my original statement, Mr. Speaker, I might ask what does it mean to have "a record" in this country? In many cases, employment in the public service, enlistment in the armed forces, employment where bonding is required, and licensed employment such as taxi driving, is refused absolutely or seriously curtailed. Persons may be deprived of political and civil rights upon conviction of a certain class of crime, rights to hold any public office or trust, to serve as a juryman and to practise a profession are, in many cases, prohibited, or as I mentioned, seriously curtailed.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised the subject matter of this resolution on previous occasions in this Legislature, usually during the Throne Speech debate, and I might say before it became a popular topic of concern. However, the importance of this resolution was very dramatically impressed upon me when a young man, whom I had unsuccessfully defended in magistrate's court four years ago, recently attended at my office in Burlington. He was completing an application for a surety or bond and wanted to use my name as a reference. This young man had only the one conviction and has since completed grade 13

and now was married with two small children. He had been offered a good job and the future looked bright. One of the questions on the form was, "Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence?" This young man, who is now 22, asked what he should do. I naturally gave the obvious answer. I have since learned that he did not get the job that required the bond and he is still looking.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, legislation should be enacted which would have the effect of permitting people who have been legally rehabilitated to swear that they have never been charged or convicted of a criminal offence.

I have not dealt specifically with offences under a provincial statute. However, such statutes as The Liquor Control Act, The Minor Act, and many other Acts under the jurisdiction of a municipality, would to some degree carry a stigma for life.

Our record in Canada of recidivism or second offences is not good, and I believe adoption of this resolution would greatly improve that record and also improve the prospects of the reformed offender. Surely such persons should not be forced to bear forever the stain of immature and impulsive conduct.

One of the problems that was faced by the justice and legal affairs committee in Ottawa, which considered a bill embodying pretty well the same purpose as this resolution, was that the police had opposed the bill in the form it was presented to that committee. They were opposed, Mr. Speaker, to cancelling criminal records, mainly because many problems, in practical terms to the police, may result if there is another offence, to help identify and trace persons who may be wanted or suspected of crimes.

The gentlemen from the police force and the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police who appeared before that committee were not opposed to erasing the stigma of a record for a first offender after good behaviour, as long as they could still retain the records to facilitate their police work.

It was then considered that if these records could be locked up, or sealed for public purposes and still be available under special circumstances for investigation processes, then this would be acceptable, not only to the committee, but to the committee of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police.

I think this would be acceptable. The important thing is that the status of the reformed offender could revert to that prior,

as I have mentioned, to the conviction of the offence, *status quo ante*. If he is able to attain that status, if his record is locked up, or sealed away, then only in the event of the re-occurrence of an offence, can it be used and used by the police only.

The committee in Ottawa, the justice and legal affairs committee, is considering a bill, I believe by D. R. Tomlie, MP, making certain recommendations, and I am in favour of those recommendations. I think in the type of resolution we are dealing with today, Mr. Speaker, there could be many amendments to it. Five years, maybe, is not a reasonable period. Maybe it should be more or less.

As I mentioned we should also have the same provisions for adults. The problem, which would include adults, is how long would the period be? Would it be for ever? In the event of a serious crime, would it be after the completion of a term of sentence in a prison? Items such as that. These are the problems you would run into, particularly in including adults in this resolution.

The committee recommended, first of all, that there should be no distinction between infants and adults in any legislation dealing with the expunging of records. The elapsed time for the erasing of records should be a period of five years after service of the sentence imposed. The process of expunging the record should be initiated by the applicant directed to a board of convictions review in The Department of Justice.

The expungement of the adjudication of guilt should be mandatory upon the petition of the offender if the board find that he has not re-offended. Unless strong affirmative reasons exist for denial, any judgement denying expungement should be made appealable by the applicant. I do not entirely agree with that provision for the reasons I have already pointed out.

Next, the statute should not only reach the officially adjudicated case, the cases of arrest, release and cases of acquittal as well, it should extend the order of sealing to all law enforcement and other agency records. Because limited inspection of the records at a later date may be necessary, the statute should provide for sealing rather than destruction of the records. Records so sealed should be required to be removed from the main, or master file and kept separately.

The recommendation then goes on to prohibit questions such as: "Have you ever been arrested for, or convicted of a crime which

has not been expunged by a competent authority?"

That, in my impression, Mr. Speaker, is not a fair question. I think, as I have indicated in my previous remarks, that if there is a question to the effect "have you ever been charged or convicted of a criminal offence", upon regaining status, the answer could be no.

I think as I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to improve our record of recidivism in this province, or the rehabilitation of the offender, particularly the young men or woman who is convicted of what could be nothing more than a juvenile indiscretion, or even a crime under the Criminal Code, I think something as is embodied in this resolution must be done by the law officers of the Crown, both in our provinces and in Ottawa.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I regret about the resolution that is before the House today and that is that it does not go far enough. I support it, as far as it goes, in that it deals with minors and I would say that the same principles should apply to adult offenders. Suppose an individual was 22 years of age and ran afoul of the law, there is no reason why the same principle as set forth in this resolution should apply to him as somebody who committed an offence when they were age 17 or 18.

I know the hon. member who introduced this resolution touched on this point at the end of his remarks. I do not agree with him that the matter would be more complicated when dealing with adults because a boy of 18 or 19 can commit just as serious an offence as the person at the age of 25 or 35. But in essence, Mr. Speaker, and for the purposes of today's argument, I support this resolution.

It is 31 years, Mr. Speaker, since the Fauteux commission made a report to the federal Minister of Justice in an attempt to have the federal government assist people who have a criminal record. I have a very short quote from the Fauteux Committee which was given in 1938, and you know this is what is so frustrating, not only to an individual in public life, but I think to people who watch the processes of government—why does it take so long.

The need of some type of assistance to people who do go straight after having some difficulty with the law has been obvious for

many years. We set up a committee that costs money. They come up with a good report and yet, whether we be in provincial politics or in federal politics nothing seems to happen. But the Fauteux committee said this, Mr. Speaker:

In our opinion, consideration should be given to the establishment of a procedure for the grant of pardons, with or without conditions, on a much more liberal scale than is now the case.

Important factors should be, of course, the relatively trivial character of the offence, the nature and very limited number of past convictions, the continuity for a substantial number of years of admittedly law abiding conduct and respectable life in the community, and the undoubted assurance of its continuation.

Such a procedure would offer to a past offender, a further and powerful incentive consistent with the promotion of preventive justice, to maintain the highest standard of respectability in a community.

Well, Mr. Speaker, an individual who is convicted may or may not serve a sentence in a prison or in a reform institution. The conviction itself is the stigma that is far worse than being in a jail or reform institution, because when a man or woman applies for work and they have to fill out an application form, they are asked if they have been convicted, not if they have been in jail.

So, all their lives they suffer what is the second punishment. First, there is the conviction and the fine or possibly the imprisonment. But the second punishment is the stigma that will alter their social relationships for all their lives, their employment opportunities, bonding, immigration, automobile insurance, life insurance and even the right to hold public office.

This stigma is hanging over many hundreds of people in this province and literally thousands of people throughout the country.

Of course, in the end, Mr. Speaker, it costs the public and the taxpayer money. The individual who cannot get a job is either going to end up on welfare rolls or be back in trouble with the law. The John Howard Society, a few years ago, made an investigation as to how soon a person is a repeater, how soon after one offence does he get into trouble.

They found that if an individual has been convicted and they are apt to get in trouble again, it will be within two years of their first

conviction. Nearly 98 per cent of those who are repeaters commit their second offence within two years, and nearly half of the people that do repeat do it within six months of having been convicted.

So that if we were to introduce a law that would say that an individual has the right to apply for a pardon within five years, we have excluded literally more than 98 per cent of the repeaters. As I say, there has been some reasonable scientific research done in this matter. The people who are on parole in the province of Ontario, if they are going to violate their parole, over half of them will do so within six months.

A six month period is a matter of very short duration. A five-year period, I believe, is more than sufficient because undoubtedly the public certainly deserves protection and we must have the protection.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that assuming that an offender was to be pardoned, and admittedly such a pardon is a fictional thing, "to deem, that they have not been convicted." Well, of course, they have been convicted so such a fiction would be a legal fiction.

But assuming we have this legal fiction, I think that there should be one protection for the public that an individual does not just get the pardon as a right. I think that if an individual, after having been convicted, goes for five years without being further convicted, I think that they should apply for that pardon, and so long as they have not been living on the fringe of crime they should be given the pardon.

One of the great difficulties that the police have in our community, Mr. Speaker, is this gray field of crime; the people who may not have been convicted for many years and yet are known to be living off the avails of crime.

This is one thing I think of when these pardons are given—that we have to protect the public.

This is a broad subject, Mr. Speaker, and in the time at my disposal I cannot go into all the details. But one thing I think that in giving pardons should particularly be kept in mind, and that is the importance of bonding. Today, because of the blanket insurance policies that some companies have, in fact a great many companies have now, not even the delivery boy or the truck driver can get his job unless he is bonded.

I feel that the government, over and above introducing any policy having to do with pardons, should set up some type of fund whereby if premiums are increased on a

company that from such a fund contributions would be made in order to pay the increased premium so that the ex-con can be covered by insurance.

I think in the long run the government will serve the public, but particularly ease the demand on the public purse if it sees to it that these people who are released from our institutions have some opportunity to find work. Under our present system the discharges come out of our institutions with \$10 or \$20, a suit and an unemployment insurance book with no stamps in it.

But where are they going to get references? They have to account somehow for where they have been. They cannot be bonded. With one or two exceptions, discharges from our institutions have been bonded, but they are very few.

I see that my time has ended, Mr. Speaker, so that I just went to emphasize once again that this is an urgent matter concerning a good many thousands of people in this province, and I would hope that this House would support this resolution.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, in rising to join this debate may I say prefatory thereto that while I used to be unhappy at either the blank faces or the total absences of the members opposite, I noticed that yesterday they accorded the same treatment by and large to their own leader, and who, therefore, is a mere private member to expect any great attention?

On this major point, I am not concerned with the wording of this resolution as set forth. It is, I suggest, defective in many ways. I am concerned with the principle. As has been indicated, it is a matter that has all kinds of refinements that can be gone into, but there is no question in my mind, that the records—not only juvenile records, but as my friend from Parkdale has said, other records, too—should be expunged after certain periods of time.

The question then devolves upon the classifications of the crimes involved and the periods of time and here we have a plethora of different contentions.

Lawrence Pennell, now Mr. Justice Pennell, while Solicitor-General, recommended that the record not be expunged, but shelved, or vacated, five years after a conviction for an indictable offence, and for three years after summary conviction offences. This, in other words, was somewhat in the form of pardon.

Mr. Donald Tolmie, the MP for Welland, recommended to the justice committee of the Commons that twelve years after conviction would be the general rule; and he would have the erasure of criminal records of a minor at 21, provided that only one offence had been involved.

The Apps committee wanted the records of the juvenile court to be expunged after five years of delinquent-free behaviour. Mr. Justice Hayes goes off on the wider aspects of the thing and says that there is no magic about 21; it is a certain period of time for anyone in the community.

The five-man delegation of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police who appeared before the Commons committee recommended, rather more punitively, that not less than 10 years after completion of sentence, not conviction, plus a hearing before a body somewhat of the nature of the national parole board, be the terms on which we would operate.

Though there are other methods that can be used in the overcoming of the problem involved here—although I think we should attack it forthrightly—one of them is to give a conditional discharge. That is, a judge may give a conditional discharge without registering a conviction. Or they may place an offender on probation without ever registering a conviction. Or there is the ordinary pardon, about which the member for Parkdale spoke. And finally, under The Juvenile Delinquents Act—to come right to the point—under this resolution, under section 21 (a) and (b), there is the device of the juvenile judge simply adjourning the case indefinitely so that it will never come up again. The punishment, in effect, that is inflicted on the youth is simply to have appeared before him, which I suppose, in many cases, is punishment enough.

The real problem, of course, is as the *Star* of April 19, 1968, mentioned in its editorial: “it has been said that a convicted man’s real punishment begins when he leaves prison.” Some of the details of that have been brought before us here with respect to the bonding situation, which is a most iniquitous one.

The police argument is that you cannot expunge a conviction in this way either from public records, newspapers, or from the minds of men, but in reply to that many answers have been given, two of which I noted. You can bring legislation in to stop a bonding company from asking whether an applicant had ever received a certificate of

rehabilitation. Then magistrate L. A. Sherwood, of Ottawa, reporting on probation matters on behalf of the Ontario Magistrates' Association, stated that it should be made illegal for a company to even ask such a question after the period involved and delete that in that particular way.

I would like to revert to a contrary argument, though, just to have the fuller aspects of the debate set out from something of an authority. I refer to the report of a Department of Justice committee on juvenile delinquency, 1965, at page 189. It goes through along that page and into the next page, paragraph 340 to paragraph 343, setting forth arguments pro and con on this issue and about the stigma that attaches to the child. It mentions the Ingoldby committee, the British committee which rejected the deletion of records, goes down and speaks of employers and makes a distinction between these records being used by employers over against adult courts on subsequent convictions.

Their example is the case of someone, say 13 years of age, having been convicted of a sexual assault of some kind and then, say, at the age of 25 being similarly convicted again in an adult court. Their argument is that, this being the case, there is an inbuilt predisposition of some kind, and that the record ought not to be deleted.

In winding up my remarks I am going to cite a rather curious—for me, at least—authority on this matter. I never thought I would be brought to this, but I am rather delighted to find that this is the case—my mind broadens in this Legislature. I want to quote from the Commons Debates of June 26, 1967, pages 1946 and 1947—the remarks of the Hon. John Diefenbaker. He is speaking of the deletion of records. He says:

Every time he wants to cross the border into the United States to attend a convention he is asked whether he had ever committed a criminal offence.

Honest, straightforward and truthful as he was.

This is a client of his.

He would say "yes" and was refused admission to the United States. I believe that men in that position deserve to have their records clear.

I know this does not apply to any member of the House, but all of us have had things happen to us in our lives as a result of which, if it had not been for good

fortune, or providential protection, we might have found ourselves before the courts. I know there is nobody in that position within sound of my voice, but you know these things happen.

Many people have been in penitentiaries who have not committed any worse offences, but they live to regret what they did. Punishment has been not only reformative, but has been an eye-opener to them. They are doing everything they can to have their past forgotten by changing their mode of life. To hand this matter over for consideration by the Committee on Justice will not meet this problem. We know this is so.

Then he goes on in the next paragraph, to offer this proposal that, in effect, is before the House today, as the Centennial project to the federal government. And then he finally says:

We will have to start this on an experimental basis.

I have mentioned a period of five to ten years. Some say ten years is too long, but let us try it out. We would be doing something in this parliament to elevate the hope of those Canadians who today walk about fearful that sometime, somewhere, their past will be discovered.

I followed this principle at the bar. On occasion I lost clients because I refused to cross examine a witness who, at one time, had been convicted of a crime, followed by a period of years of decent living. I was told to bring it out because it would be devastating. It may be devastating, but it destroys the souls of men to no purpose.

I urge the Minister to bring in such legislation. Let him not follow the course of saying that "we are looking into it," or "the matter is receiving consideration." This would be a very worthwhile measure and has been proven to be such.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a good deal of pleasure to speak today in support of the principle behind this resolution proposed by my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr).

The basic concept for the erasure of criminal records of men and women who appear to have rehabilitated themselves by leading exemplary lives for a period of time following their latest conviction is by no means new. In fact, it has been advocated, as

has been mentioned by the speakers who have preceded me, by many groups and for many years.

The John Howard Society, mentioned by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), to name but one, has been most active in this regard. And in another instance, also mentioned by the previous speakers, Donald Tolmie, the Liberal MP for Welland, in 1967 introduced a bill recommending this principle.

Despite a good deal of debate—we know the records indicate this, the newspapers have covered it at some length—that bill went nowhere. Mr. Tolmie's bill is probably another good example, as mentioned by the hon. member for Parkdale, of the fact that reform often comes slowly.

However, the need for further review of this matter seems to me to be no less important today than it was before. Indeed, I think it is becoming even more important as time rolls on. And with our new type of enlightened approach towards rehabilitation, I think a different concept is, hopefully, emerging.

Judging by the views expressed by the preceding speakers, we seem to be *ad idem* on that score. As a group, the legal fraternity ordinarily considers that when a man has served his term and has been released, he has paid his debt to society. But we all know that, this philosophy notwithstanding, there is still a bias against the man with a record. Surely, in our so-called enlightened society, inmates can benefit from rehabilitative procedure, and can do so far better if they know and they can have the hope and expectation that when they are once again returned to society, they can take their places as productive and well-adjusted citizens.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, what I am really directing my thoughts towards is the young man over 16 and under 21 who is a minor in the eyes of our law but an adult in the eyes of the court, and who, for some whim or fancy, takes off on what I choose to call a caper, and winds up in the toils of the law. Our law presently recognizes that that man is not sufficiently mature to be able to commit himself to a contract, to execute something as elementary as a will and, at present, even to vote.

But it is prepared to treat him like any other adult over 21 and attach to him for the rest of his life the stigma of a record, which will haunt him and cause him everlast-

ing grief and embarrassment and insecurity, to say nothing of the fact that it might very well preclude him, as I have already indicated, from satisfactory rehabilitation and re-entry into productive society.

I look upon the mishap of such a young man and its inevitable consequences which flow from his conviction quite differently from that of an older person who, in other respects, our law considers to be an adult. Sober of judgement and capable of not only controlling his actions, but perhaps more accurately assessing their eventual results, and consequences. This young man with a record for a conviction, the legal price for which he has already paid, can still be refused employment by our federal and provincial civil services.

We have already heard, and we know, that an employer who requires a bond will have difficulty getting that man bonded; indeed, it is almost impossible—for something simple like driving a cab and being a cashier—and it would appear that in many cases such young people cannot even enter our armed services. And they, as also mentioned above, can be denied entry into some foreign countries. The United States is one of the prime examples in this regard.

Mr. Tolmie, whom we have all mentioned earlier speaking on the subject, observed that possibly the most glaring example, certainly in recent years, was that of the Nova Scotia citizen who, at the age of 17, was convicted of joy riding. Subsequently, he was obliged to give up his seat on municipal council down in Nova Scotia because of that record.

So, Mr. Speaker, the general basis and support for this resolution should be clear. We are talking about young people presently considered in the eyes of the law not to be adults; and consequently, in many respects, not responsible for the acts which they may perpetrate. To my mind, sir, the problem, however, goes a good deal deeper than this, and I ask you these more or less rhetorical questions.

How do you erase from the record the memory of the erstwhile friends and neighbours and relatives of the convicted person who well knew that story?

How do you erase the record when the employer asks his for his history of employment over the last five or ten years? We have talked about this one—that is to deny the employer the right to ask him a blanket question. Perhaps he could ask it on a limited basis but that really only gets to part of the question.

How do you erase from the record the newspapers that carried the report at the time? I see Mr. Speaker rising, and it appears that I am running out of time, so I will try to wind up my comments, Mr. Speaker, and let the next people have a chance.

It is really a very disquieting thing to understand because we all know that in our youth we have come very close to the kind of embroilment with the law that has been so very unfortunate for so many others, I think that there are very few of us here today who cannot have said at one time or another, in looking at a convicted young person, "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

I would suggest that what we have to do is to try to get some more enlightened view among our populace of the role to be performed by the person, the young person particularly, who has served his term, and who is now back into society, leading a productive, and filling a productive role. Hopefully, if we can do this with our people, we will have accomplished at least the other 50 per cent of this basic problem of rehabilitation.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution, I would like to look at a few aspects or implications of it that have not yet been covered.

I think the question of what we might call the employment problem has been covered by other members. I think it is certainly a very serious issue. What I would like to do now, sir, is to suggest that there are some flaws in the resolution, even though the principle is correct.

Part A of the resolution says the record of people convicted of an offence while a minor, and so on, be expunged if no further conviction has been recorded against such persons for a period of five years. What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes available to me, is to give the members present a case history of someone who had a record, who was not convicted and had to go to extraordinary lengths to have that record expunged from the police files.

This issue I have brought up in the past, sir. It is the case of Paul Toman in Scarborough and I would like to recall the case to the hon. members present.

At 3.35 one morning, several years ago, two policemen went to the Toman home and took 19-year-old Paul Toman to jail. A window had been pried off the house next door and the prowler had climbed into a bedroom. The young daughter screamed. The

prowler grabbed her by the throat. Her father came in and fought with him but he got away. The father and daughter identified young Toman as the attacker and sent the police next door. That same afternoon, Paul Toman's 17-year-old sister noticed one of the neighbourhood boys had a cut on his arm that had required 13 stitches.

That evening, Paul Toman's father reported this to the lawyer he had retained, Mr. J. O'Driscoll, and Mr. O'Driscoll phoned the police. Within a day, the other boy was charged with the crime. He confessed and was convicted. Later on the week, Paul Toman appeared in court with Mr. O'Driscoll, and the Crown withdrew all charges against Toman.

The other aspect of this case, Mr. Speaker, is simply that he could not get legal aid. I went on a fund-raising campaign and 80 people across this province contributed over \$300 to pay his bill.

Paul Toman had a bill of over \$300. Mr. O'Driscoll, an extremely capable lawyer, included in his charge a fee for the following service; to call on the chief of the Metropolitan Police to get Paul Toman's record for non-conviction removed from the police files. Mr. O'Driscoll stated in his letter to Paul Toman's father that he had been successful in this and had received assurances from the chief of police that Paul Toman's record at that point would, in fact, be removed from the police files and from the RCMP files. Mr. O'Driscoll felt he had to do this. He did it, and although this has never been stated in writing either to Mr. O'Driscoll or to Paul Toman, presumably Paul Toman's file with the police has been lifted and destroyed.

The thing that interests me, sir, besides the fact that Mr. O'Driscoll charged for that service—it may have been only a minor charge of \$25 or \$30, of course—why did the law not require this minor's record—if you can even call it that—to be expunged from, as the resolution reads, "the record of people convicted of an offence"?

So if I quarrel with the resolution, it is that it does not consider this problem of people, particularly young people, who are charged with an offence, and who, in the case of Paul Toman, were clearly not responsible for the offence, and yet their records remain on file. So at a future date, if this resolution is brought forward again because this government does not implement a resolution like this, I would like to see it include

the records of people who just have a police file, particularly if they are not convicted. I feel very strongly on that, Mr. Speaker. I think that this type of case study should make some impact on this government, and particularly on the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

The second aspect I would like to bring out, sir, is based on the recommendations of the report of the Ontario Legislature's select committee on youth, which every member here, I know, has read. It is on pages 272 and 273 under the title "Confidentiality Respecting Juvenile Court Records". In reading this over, I think there is another aspect to this problem that should be brought out in supporting this resolution. The said committee states:

There is no legal basis for refusing to supply adult courts with juvenile records upon request.

It continues:

Fortunately most adult courts do not make a practice of calling for juvenile records of those adults appearing before them for purposes of disposition.

Then the report goes on to say:

What difference in a man's sentence may be expected if he is convicted for car theft and the sentencing judge is made aware that, as a juvenile, the offender in the dock has had several similar convictions? Little difference in some instances, a lot in others.

The principle here, sir, is that there is a possibility of discrimination in this regard, that some legal minors who have records when they are minors may have these records brought into court upon the request of the judge or someone involved in the prosecution or defence, while other judges or other lawyers would not request this type of information. The fact is that it is a discriminatory practice. That type of discrimination, in my judgment, speaking as a non-lawyer, should not take place in our courts.

In this regard I was very interested in the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) quoting ostensibly from the Hon. John Diefenbaker.

Mr. Lawlor: Ostensibly—I thought the member said ostentatiously.

Mr. T. Reid: No, no, I am trying to get some support from the member's excellent quotation.

I believe Mr. Diefenbaker said that in some cases some older people have "the good fortune" not to have their previous record thrown at them again at a later date. This is what really worries me, because I think we really have to find out whether there is a persistent bias in this type of discretionary power in the court. I would suspect that there might well be a persistent bias in it.

I do not wish to make too much of the following point, sir, but I do think there should be further examination of this. I feel in some wealthy communities, when a son or daughter of a wealthy person in our society at the age of 16, say, breaks into a corner store to get a few extra bottles of pop or something, that if the store owner catches that young minor, that it is hushed up in some cases. I would say, sir, that if that same incident took place in a low-income area where a rough-and-ready youngster of 16 broke into a similar store, there would probably be very little hesitation in the police being called in.

I would like to speak in favour of the resolution, because it would remove any hint of discrimination against young people. It would help, too, on the basis of class. I think this is a significant step forward and I would like to support the resolution on behalf of my party.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, the resolution put forward by the hon. member for Halton West is in many ways a commendable one and we have heard a fairly full discussion of it. The first four previous speakers were lawyers. I wish to discuss this from a broader point of view.

I cannot help feeling, however, that we are trying to deal, as some physicians do, with the symptoms of a disease rather than the cause of the disease itself. We are like a doctor who tries to relieve the pain without diagnosing or worrying about the cause of the pain. If we retrace the steps taken by a young offender convicted of a criminal offence, we find in most instances a pattern such as this: At the age of 18, a criminal offence; at the age of 17, in trouble with the police; at the age of 16, dropped out of school; at the age of 15, in trouble with school authorities.

Going back further to Grade 1 and kindergarten, it is quite likely that his teacher could have identified and probably did identify him as a future delinquent. In many cases, there would be a broken home in the background or, at the least, an unhappy or

insecure home. Frequently it would be discovered that his parents had married with reluctance, and it would almost certainly be a fact that his parents had had virtually no training at all for the highly difficult but most important job of raising him, their child.

The whole problem of crime prevention, Mr. Speaker, is like a battlefield on which the defending army has constructed several lines of defence. And I am convinced that the first line of defence is an effective course in family living taught with understanding and concern in our school curricula. Let us face the fact that few parents do this job properly, except by example—and I do not underestimate that in any way. The contents of such a course and the methods of presenting it I have suggested on other occasions. I shall not repeat the details, suffice to say that all children should have the advantage of this training, not just the fortunate few who happen to have A-1 parents.

The second line of defence comes after the child is born to these parents who have been exposed to schooling in family living. The child goes to kindergarten in a school which has at least one teacher—preferably a kindergarten teacher who has had enough specified training to enable him or her to recognize behaviour patterns that indicate the existence of some kind of emotional problem. At this point a psychologist or psychiatrist, associated with or co-operating with the school, would have an opportunity through family counselling to deal with the problem before it became more serious. This second line of defence would be a deep one, stretching at least through the whole elementary school system.

The third line of defence for any particular child would be his own instruction in school in the art of family living, during which he would hear and take part in discussions about parent-child relationships and responsibilities, the place of youth in the community, self-respect, respect of children for siblings, respect of parents for children, and so on.

The fourth line of defence, Mr. Speaker, if the first three failed, would be the point at which the youth eventually was convicted on a serious charge for which a prison or reformatory sentence could be imposed. Here, greater use of the probation system would provide him with an eleventh hour chance to escape the permanent label of "criminal".

During the estimates of the Minister of

Correctional Services last May I spoke at considerable length on the urgent need in Ontario for rapid extension of the probation method as an alternative to incarceration. Obviously in the time allotted I can merely make mention of this, but this is a youth's fourth line of defence against a society which may be driving him—at least giving him a big push—into a hopeless life of crime.

The fifth line of defence is the one we are discussing in this afternoon's resolution—the wiping out of a criminal record after a certain period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of building all five lines of defence, but it seems to me that this resolution is directing our attention and our efforts to the last and weakest and the least likely to offer lasting protection.

Personally, I would urge the hon. members to concentrate their efforts and speak out whenever they can in favour of the first four lines of defence. In fact, if the first and third lines that I have suggested were well built for each family then its children would never have any personal need of the other three.

The word "radical" is one of the many good words whose meanings have been debased in recent years. Coming from a Latin word meaning "root", radical means "getting to the root of the problem," and I suggest to the members of this Legislature that the root of the problem we have been discussing lies in the life of the family.

Although there are many other contributing factors such as religion, I suggest that the most, if not the only, effective defence against what might be called the corrupting features of today's society, lies in successful family living.

The only solution to this problem, as to any other, is a radical one, "getting to the root of the problem." Encourage your local school board to make family living a priority subject in its curriculum. Do everything possible to enrich the family life of our citizens and you will automatically reduce crime. At the same time, you will improve the quality of life for all the people of Ontario.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, we might point out that on Monday we will return to the Throne Debate in the hopes of completing it, even if it requires an evening session on Monday.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, is there going to be a private members' hour on Monday?

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with the other Whips, and I think it is agreed that we will dispense with the private members' hour if necessary in order to complete the Throne Debate.

Hon. Mr. Welch: With that agreement, Mr. Speaker, I assume that we will proceed with the Throne Debate all day Monday.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, as we will not be sitting tomorrow I would like to remind the members that Saturday is St. David's day. On this occasion I am sure all hon. members will wish to join with me in extending our very best wishes to the Welsh people on their national holiday. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 3, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Monday, March 3, 1969

National Medicare plan, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	1717
Regional government, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	1717
Cyanamid strike, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. MacDonald	1718
Purchase of power from Detroit Edison, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Bullbrook	1719
Fishery research stations, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Paterson	1719
Film censorship, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Paterson	1720
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mrs. M. Renwick, Mr. Bernier, Mr. Pitman	1720
Recess, 6 o'clock	1749

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests this afternoon, in both galleries, are students from the Queen Alexandra Public School in Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions:

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves that this House will, tomorrow, resolve itself into the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves that this House will, tomorrow, resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre) moves, seconded by **Mr. R. D. Kennedy** (Peel South), that for the meetings of the standing committee on government commissions during the balance of the session, the party caucus be authorized to substitute members up to the total membership of each party on the committee, when notice of such substitution has been given to the chairman at least two sitting days prior to the meeting.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): **Mr. Speaker**, perhaps I should explain to the House that the committee on government commissions deals with a whole variety of government activities as embodied in the functions of these commissions. It was suggested to me by the leader of the New Democratic Party that there might be men who would have a particular interest in one branch of government as represented by one of the commissions and not in another, and that in this way each of the parties could rotate its membership so that those members who might be most interested in the particular commission that might be before the committee on any sitting date would be able to be present and take part in discussions.

This seemed to me to make sense in view of the rather specialized function of this

particular committee. This motion will simply permit the chairman of the committee to agree to such substitution.

Motion agreed to:

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

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

Is the government undertaking new discussions with the federal government regarding Ontario's entrance in the national Medicare plan as reported in this morning's Toronto *Daily Star*?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: **Mr. Speaker**, there are some discussions in the offing between the Minister of Health (**Mr. Dymond**) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I am not able to say anything further than that. I believe they will be meeting within the next week; and as far as we are concerned we would welcome discussions about Medicare, and I am quite sure that matter will be discussed at that time.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask as a supplementary question: If, in fact, the first time the Premier was aware it might be possible for present carriers to come under the ambit of the Act was when he was quoted as saying that was an interesting possibility in today's paper?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I had heard nothing directly, **Mr. Speaker**, about this suggestion of **Mr. Munro's**. It was not made to me, I heard it first through the news media. My reaction was just as I expressed it when it was brought to my attention.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier has heard of the possibility of such an inclusion?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In this context, yes.

Mr. Nixon: A second question to the Premier, **Mr. Speaker**. Will the Premier amplify his statement made on "Provincial Affairs" television on Saturday, March 1, that regional government depends on agreement of the people concerned?

I think the Premier knows my feeling in this. The requirement of the question period would not allow as much questioning now as perhaps on another occasion, but when I saw the programme I was wishing I could phone in and ask him a bit more about it at that time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to know that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) follows my television appearances. I made a somewhat formal address to the Rotary Club of Aylmer on Friday, December 6, 1968, in which I dealt with this subject and I said finally, in outlining the criteria to be used I must emphasize that we seek both community participation and community acceptability in establishing regional governments.

I want to make it clear that this does not mean that any municipality will have a veto over regional government proposals. However, it is imperative in my view that all communities participate in discussions leading to the establishment of a regional government and that local initiative, wisdom, and experience be a part of regional government proposals. That is the position of the government to which I was referring on Saturday night.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier would then say it really did not depend upon local acceptance?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I suppose, what the leader of the Opposition is really aiming at is whether we should have a plebiscite in each case—something of that nature. It all depends on what you mean by acceptance—but the point I was making, both in this address and on Saturday night, was that there is no intention on the part of this government to simply impose a whole grid of regional governments willy nilly on top of this province—I believe I used that form of expression during that interview—and we think that if it is to be successful it will require a high degree of discussion which we would hope would lead to acceptability.

We want the ideas and the initiative and wisdom of the local people. We all know that this province varies so much from district to district. It is pretty hard—in fact I would say impossible, to develop a formula for regional government that one could apply to any given area in the province. I would think regional government perforce must be adapted to the circumstances of the area in which it is to be instituted, and thus we think that full participation by the local

municipalities and local people is necessary, and that is the way we propose to proceed.

Mr. Nixon: A question, if the Premier will permit, Mr. Speaker. Bearing in mind these regional differences and how extreme they are in some cases, will he say that it is possible that a referendum might be a part of government policy in some circumstances associated with regional government.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that we would have to deal with each one individually and on its own merits. It is not the referendum, really, as an instrument of government, which is inherent in, or is a tradition of our way of government. I know it is an integral part of the American way of government, they have referendums on debt limits and all sorts of things. In the form of government under which we live, the referendum really does not play a large part. Governments are elected to do their task and if they do it badly then they are not re-elected.

As a matter of principle we do not continually go back to the people to have them decide some of the matters for which they have elected their government, so that, we do not adopt a referendum as an integral part of the political system of this province. On the other hand, I would not discharge it out of hand as never having any value because there may be a time when it would be. There have been a few national referendums in this country. I do not think they really ever solved anything, as you look at them historically. I just put that point of view to you because we do not really look upon a referendum as part of our governmental system.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two question for the Minister of Health, who is not here, but I wonder if I might ask the Minister of Labour when it might be possible to expect a reply to a couple of questions I put to him with regard to Cyanamid of Canada about a week or so ago.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers for him now.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister would answer those questions now and give me the number of the questions so that I can keep track of them also.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to. The first question was number

687, and if I could just read the hon. member's question:

It states with regard to the Welland plant of Cyanamid which has been on strike since January 6, 1969:

1. Is it true that some of the new work force, involving former supervisory personnel, have been confined to the plant for weeks, without returning to their homes and families?

2. Is it true that workers, as reported on radio by the wife of one of them, receive \$5 per hour while working and \$2.50 per hour while sleeping on cots beside the machines?

3. Has this company permission from The Department of Labour for employees to work excessive overtime, 12 hours a day regularly, day after day?

4. In view of the fact that the work of a normal maintenance staff of 150 is now being done by a few supervisory staff, is the safety of the workers and the community being safeguarded by this explosives manufacturing plant?

In reply to the questions as previously asked by the hon. member, I would advise that, as to the first part, the statement is not true as asked. Some cots were set up in a lecture room of the personnel building, and were used by various members of the staff. Latterly they were used by three permanent firemen.

The second part: The actual wage rates being paid, as I am sure the hon. member will appreciate, are a matter between the employees and the employers. I would say to the hon. member, however, that the minimum wage rates are being paid. And I am advised that the workers have not been sleeping on cots by their machines.

The third part: The company has a permit authorizing overtime under The Employment Standards Act in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

And the fourth part: The answer is yes, we are satisfied as to the matters being done at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, were the permits for excessive overtime given after the strike began?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I would have to enquire; I do not have the actual date. I can do so and provide it to the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the Minister an answer to the second question that was asked on February 24, No. 740?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

In reference to that question, it involved two parts. I answered the second part initially.

In the first part of No. 740, the hon. member asked me whether the Welland plant of Cyanamid was being operated in conformity with the regulations of The Operating Engineers Act. This plant has been inspected and is being operated in accordance with The Operating Engineers Act. The company has engaged the required complement of licensed stationary engineers.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Sarnia wish to ask his question from the other day?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett): Could the Minister advise as to whether present purchases per kilowatt hour for power from Detroit Edison are at the normal usual rate charged at other times? For the sake of clarity, I request advice from the Minister as to whether any premium payment is being paid to Detroit Edison for the purchase of power resulting from the present labour dispute in which Ontario Hydro is involved?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, rates are being paid in accordance with the terms of agreement drawn with Detroit Edison February 16, 1966. Therefore, no premium rate is being paid.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has answers to certain questions of another day. If the member asking it is present, would he identify them and give the answers?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I know question 713 was asked by the hon. member for Welland South. He is not in the House today. And I have answers to 716 and 717 asked by the hon. member for Sudbury East and I note he is not in the House today either.

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

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle).

Has the department hired a director of research at the fisheries research station at Wheatley? Is the department short of research staff at this particular station—or at other

fishery research stations in Ontario? Will the Minister be hiring more than the usual number of students to assist on research projects this summer?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Essex South, the department is in preliminary negotiation with two distinguished and accomplished candidates for appointment to Wheatley. We are short of research staff at Wheatley because of one resignation or educational leave.

Our other research stations are not so short staffed. The Sault Ste. Marie Lake Superior fisheries research unit is in final process of establishment. The number of summer students we will hire will depend on our budget for this year.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld).

Is the Minister contemplating the tightening of its censorship standards during 1969?

How many films were viewed by this department in 1968, how many were edited and how many banned?

Could the Minister indicate by classification the number of new films shown in Ontario in 1968?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, our policy with regard to film censorship, I think, was made quite clear in my remarks on the estimates last year. I would refer the hon. member to pages 2883 and 2884 of *Hansard* on May 11, 1968.

The figures that I can give on the films reviewed last year are all for new films. For the ten-month period April 1, 1968 to January 31, 1969, the theatres branch examined 463 feature films. Of these, deletions were made in 22 and three were not approved. Ninety-four films were classified as restricted, 119 as adult entertainment and 247 as general entertainment.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment of the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): On Friday, Mr. Speaker, just prior to the

adjournment of the debate, I was extolling the value, the thoroughness and the broadness of British Command Report number 3703, the report of the committee on local authority and allied personal social services.

I would like to read now two paragraphs on background, four lines on procedure, Mr. Speaker, and then I will endeavour to deal, as expediently as is possible, with such a remarkable report by drawing out about 12 examples of the various ministerial departments, which might be of some interest to the Ministers of each department.

The background to the inquiry and the terms of reference, Section 30:

The appointment of the committee was foreshadowed in the white paper, *The Child, The Family and The Young Offender*, presented to Parliament by the Home Secretary in August, 1965. This set out, for public discussion, the government's provisional proposals for practical reforms to support the family; to forestall and reduce delinquency and to revise the law and practice relating to offenders up to the age of 21.

It noted the growing public concern at the increase in juvenile delinquency in recent years and the numerous reports and proposals by official and unofficial bodies on the prevention of crime and treatment of offenders.

It went on to discuss the work being undertaken by the different departments of local authorities under different Acts of Parliament to reduce the risk of family breakdown, stressing its inherent social value and its relevance to the prevention of delinquency. From the point of view of this committee the following paragraph in the white paper was most important:

The proposals for the reform of the law and practice relating to young offenders, emphasized the need to improve the structure of the various services connected with support of the family and the prevention of delinquency. The government believes that these services should be organized as a family service but the form and scope of such a service will need detailed consideration. The government, therefore, proposed to appoint a small independent committee to review the organization and responsibilities of the local authority personal social services and consider what changes are desirable to ensure an effective family service. This was the immediate point of origin of the committee, a concern at the increase

in officially recorded delinquency, the need to concentrate resources and a belief that preventative work with families was of cardinal importance in this context. In addition, there had been a growing conviction among many of those concerned with a wide range of personal social services that if changing social needs were to be adequately met, a fresh and comprehensive examination of these services was urgently required. In particular, the problem of co-ordination between related but separately administered services was repeatedly stressed as well as the failure of services to reach all who were in need of them.

Mr. Speaker, to read just four lines or maybe eight, from a report on juvenile delinquency in Canada, a report of The Department of Justice, the committee on juvenile delinquency—I believe this is about 1966. It was received in the library here in 1966, Mr. Speaker:

“Trends in juvenile delinquency. In summary, the significance may be more readily apparent from the following tables; Percentage of increases between 1957 and 1961—general population—9.5 per cent.

“Juvenile court appearances—all cases”—once again, Mr. Speaker—“increases 17 per cent.

“Adjudging delinquents—all cases—increases 27 per cent.

“Juvenile court appearances—selected cases—increases 23 per cent.

“Adjudged delinquents—selected cases 37 per cent.”

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, the educational standing of delinquents. Table 7 summarizes the information on educational status according to age, both for the children appearing before the court and those found delinquent. According to this date, children in grades 6, 7, 8 and 9 contributed between 65 and 70 per cent of those found delinquent.

It would appear also that a large proportion of the children were a year or more behind the average grade for their age. In regard to the age groupings of the children found delinquent those 12 to 15 years, inclusive, accounted for the greatest proportion. Indeed, this age group constituted 86 to 88 per cent of the total found delinquent during the five-year period. Children under ten years of age were only a very small percentage of those found delinquent. I think the important—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question? If the hon. member will forgive me, I was not here during the earlier part of her speech. I am very much interested, I wonder whether the hon. member would tell me the report from which she is quoting?

Mrs. M. Renwick: The report, Mr. Speaker, from which I am making the main point of my speech is the British Command Report, number 3703, the Report of the committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Social Services. The committee evolved from the white paper, which is also a command paper, number 2742, *The Child, the Family and the Young Offender*. What I am attempting to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, is that from the concern of the problem of the young offender came a whole reassessment and rejuvenation of social and family services, and the report, Mr. Speaker, I was quoting from for juvenile delinquency in Canada, was the report of the Department of Justice Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. I would imagine the Minister is familiar with that. I was not familiar with it. I wanted to find some material in our library here and Mr. Rendall Dick mentioned this particular report was available.

I have not delved into that report, Mr. Speaker, the way I have into the report on the social services.

I touched, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that this report is relevant to the problems confronting the legislators in Canada, and in Ontario in particular, through patterns of similarity shown in several countries, other than Britain, i.e. Europe and the United States, and outlined the Parliamentary departments involved, the main levels involved, and the main three questions asked. The report, as I stated, Mr. Speaker, was presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, the Secretary of State for Education and Science, the Minister of Housing, the local government and the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say strongly enough how vital it appears to me, after a year as a legislator in the province of Ontario, that the four Ministers in the Cabinet of the government, corresponding to these four ministries, question whether this is what we need in Ontario now.

I urge the Ministers, Mr. Speaker, to glance at the report and hopefully to decide to tackle the same kind of reorganization.

Following section 79, which was on co-ordination, where I left off Friday last, I would like to deal with a paragraph or two—I have finished with the procedure, Mr.

Speaker—then make a comment on the shortcomings of the present services, and then comment on the various departments of governments concerned. Chapter 3, item 46:

Altogether written evidence was received was received from 160 organizations and 79 individuals. We also met representatives from 42 organizations and 54 individuals for discussion.

Although we were unable to meet all those who submitted written evidence, we gained a sense of the prevailing opinion on the main issue.

Under reorganization—I made the case on Friday of the need for organizational change. The shortcomings of the present personal social services, item 73, part 2:

There have been undoubted improvements in the last 20 years in the local authority personal social services, and in some areas new and exciting developments have taken place. Moreover, staff have worked conscientiously and in many cases imaginatively in situations of considerable difficulty.

There is, nevertheless, a growing sense of dissatisfaction which is focused upon several issues. We believe the following to be the most important which emerged in our evidence and during the visits we made.

The point has to be made, Mr. Speaker, that the same paragraph applies to the social services in this province.

There have been many, many people deeply dedicated and devoted, and I am sure in their inception probably fought for many of the services we have today. We are not saying that this is not what should have been done, we are simply saying it is only part way through the job at this particular instance. The chapter dealing with the inadequacy—74, said:

Local authority personal social services are not fully meeting the needs for which, on the basis of the duties placed on them by the statutes, they are clearly responsible.

Obvious examples can be derived from the waiting lists of different kinds of day and residential care for the mentally ill, the mentally subnormal, the handicapped and the aged. There is no doubt that in many areas domiciliary services like home helps or meals on wheels are falling short of meeting obvious needs which those in the services think they ought to be meeting.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have not begun to think yet in Ontario of services for the aged such as meals on wheels.

Inadequacies in the range of provisions, 76:

There are some needs or certain groups of people with needs for which no service has a clearly defined responsibility. This is particularly true of newly recognized, or newly emergent problems, and ones which do not fit neatly into conventional categories. The fragmented nature of the existing services tend to produce separate spheres of responsibility with neglected areas between.

And it goes on, Mr. Speaker, to point out some British examples which are perhaps a little different than our particular scene.

On Friday last we dealt with poor co-ordination and item 80, which follows it, says:

Other closely allied developments have also exacerbated this problem. Greater emphasis has been laid upon community rather than institutional care, and there has been more movement between the two.

Good co-ordination is required to support such policies for of necessity, a person living in a community needs the services of more departments and organizations than someone with similar problems accommodated residentially.

Likewise a family which supports a handicapped or disturbed member at home often requires a variety of forms of help.

Chapter 83 on “difficult access” is one which I have raised previously in the legislative assembly, Mr. Speaker. It is my deep concern that there are numbers of people who are not aware of what services are available for them.

I believe I drew an analogy in the last session from the 300 cases in the Big Brother movement where the big brothers were actually counselling the one parent, mothers of the family, as to what rights or what services they might have available to them under our social service structure. In access, “difficult access”, Item no. 83, the report says:

Many of those submitting evidence stressed the difficulty the public and members of other services found in approaching the local authority personal social services.

People are often unclear about the pattern of services, and uncertain about the division of responsibilities between them. Initially a person's true need (sometimes a matter for expert diagnosis) may not be clearly recognized. Sometimes the person seeking help may be confused, or inarticulate and unable to make claim for the

particular help he requires. In such circumstances it may be difficult for him to get straight to the right service. The delay and further referral this involves, may be discouraging, particularly if the local offices of different services are a considerable distance apart.

Furthermore, members of the public are often diffident about approaching the services, either on their own behalf or on behalf of relatives or acquaintances. They may doubt whether help is available, or they may fear officials to be remote and bureaucratic.

Section 103 might be of some interest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), in dealing with the possible administration of welfare on a regional basis. Titled "cure by the reorganization of local government", Item 103. On the case for maintaining the *status quo*:

It was also maintained that the present shortcomings in local authority, personal social services, are not mainly the outcome of their organization, but are due to the fact that some authorities are too small to provide adequate services, and others so large that the communication and decision-making are cumbersome and slow. The recommendations of the Royal commission on local government in England were, it was argued, expected to overcome this problem, and any other organizational change was, therefore, unnecessary. However, we believe this view oversimplifies the problem. Moreover, some of the evident weaknesses of small departments (for example, lack of flexibility in the deployment of resources, lack of opportunity for professional consultation and in-service training) could be lessened by alterations in departmental structure, quite apart from changes in the size of local authority units.

Equally, organizational changes could improve the personal social services in large local authorities, by clarifying policy, improving internal communications, and allowing more delegation.

Now, the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko), Mr. Speaker, might say to me, and I am sure he perhaps will, that we do have a family services branch, but I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the last session, under item 2004, the family services branch had a budget of \$433,000, and it is hardly a meaningful operation. At that time it did not have counselling services available. So I would like to read the final outcome of this committee to

recommend the formation of a new department, a social service department. Item 138:

Finally there are the proposals to set up a new department to meet the social needs of individuals, families and communities, which would incorporate the present function of children and welfare departments, together with elements from the education, health and housing departments, with important additional responsibilities designed to ensure an effective family service. Since this is the solution we recommend we discuss it in detail in the next and subsequent chapters.

Now, in the interests of time in the House, Mr. Speaker, I have chosen what I figured were, ten to 12 items that draw a particularly strong parallel as to how the same situation may be here in Ontario.

Under Chapter 8, Social Services for Children, item 173:

Figures such as these, however, tell us little about the extent of the need for help or about what help precisely is required. But the evidence we received and the long waiting list for some kinds of education and treatment, indicated that the present level of provision was sadly inadequate. At our request, Dr. Packman and Mr. Power, calculated the number and proportion of children in different categories who are likely to be in need of special help, and the number who actually received it. Their estimates are in Appendix "Q". They are not claimed to be absolutely accurate. There is, for instance, the problem of overlapping between the groups. What is clear, however, is that even taking such factors into account, the present services are falling far short of meeting the extent of need. Packman and Power concluded that at least one child in ten in the population will need special educational, psychiatric or social help before it reaches the age of 18, but that at present, at most, one child in 22 is receiving such help.

I think that particular item should surely interest the Ministers of Health, of Education, of Social and Family Services, who will all be asked to bear the burden of this particular problem as it comes to light in the province.

The general approach used, in Chapter 8, item 186:

First there is the issue of responsibility. Clearly the primary responsibility for their children does, and should, rest with parents. Partly because of the growing complexity of society, there are now, however, a

variety of circumstances in which different aspects of this responsibility are shared with public services in the community.

I would like to pause, Mr. Speaker, for just a moment, and make certain that emphasis is placed on the word "shared". Because this shared parenting and this shared responsibility is what is now totally inadequate in the cases that we are seeing every day in social and family services. Sometimes it is the children who need parenting, sometimes it is the young parents who need parenting.

This concept is widely accepted in fields of education, and medical care, but is less commonly apparent in other forms of social care for children. In the past, for instance, public authorities have tended to take full responsibility, including sometimes full parental rights for children in certain defined situations like desertion, neglect or antisocial behaviour, but have otherwise tended not to assume any responsibility whatsoever.

And that, Mr. Speaker, if I may pause there for a moment, is exactly the crux of my remarks today.

To continue, Mr. Speaker:

We believe there is need for a much wider acceptance of the idea of shared responsibility, and a greater development of mutual co-operation between parents and those social services with special responsibility for helping parents with the upbringing of their children. These services should be universal in scope in the sense that they should be readily accessible and available to all families. At present some attempt to be universal while others do not.

And in the same general approach, item 188:

Furthermore, the availability of different forms of help should not be closely defined in terms of particular kinds of behaviour or the means through which children with difficulties come to the notice of the local authority. There should, for instance, be no difference in the range of possible services available for children who are neglected or ill treated or those who commit antisocial acts or are beyond the control of their parents; nor should the latter be put in the segregated category.

The provision of assistance to children and their families on the basis of defined administrative and legal categories inhibits the use of the most appropriate services, for whether a young child commits an offence, goes out on the loose or is just unruly or

naughty is purely fortuitous. The present system produces uneven standards, duplication and the reluctance on the part of some parents to seek help which they may regard as stigmatizing their child because it is associated, for instance, with delinquency or mental subnormalities. These dangers should be easier to avoid when the general principle is accepted that all forms of relevant help should be available to any child or family who needs them without the rigid and sometimes permanent classification that the present system involves.

To bring us down to earth, Mr. Speaker, to something right at hand, we recently heard from the conference of provincial Ministers that the federal government would be interested in sharing the cost of juvenile detention institutions that fall presently under the Minister of Correctional Services. The Prime Minister, with all due respect, took the attitude that because the National Health and Welfare Minister said this should be under The Department of Social and Family Services he was interfering with how the Ontario Cabinet will run this particular government.

But I would ask that perhaps in light of item 188 of this particular report some consideration would be given to the reasons why it would be wise to have the children who have committed an anti-social act or are beyond the control of their parents come under The Department of Social and Family Services. In chapter eight, item 191:

Before turning to the consideration of particular services for children we must emphasize that expenditure of time, effort, talent and money on children in need of social care is above all, an investment in the future. It makes no sense to us, either on humanitarian grounds or in terms of sheer economics, to allow young children to be neglected physically, emotionally or intellectually. By doing so we not only mortgage the happiness of thousands of children and the children they in turn will have, but also pile up future problems and expense for the society into the bargain.

I would respectfully ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister—whose responsibility is surely the welfare of all people of this province—would consider some of the financial decisions that have reflected in the problems related particularly to children.

On the subject of day care in item 194:

Associated with the shortage of day care provision and the decline in the number of places in local authority day nurseries,

there has been an enormous growth in private day nurseries and child minding. The number of places in private day nurseries and provided by registered child-minders multiplied fivefold between 1956 and 1966. However, the actual number of child minders far exceeds the number registered and too many of the unregistered do not have the facilities or the personal qualities necessary for the care of young children. It is clear from the evidence including information from a number of medical officers of health that many children under five are being minded daily in conditions which not only endanger their health and safety but also impair their emotional and intellectual development.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there would be no point in anyone saying that this is not exactly the same situation here, and I will not attempt to deal with it today. I will deal with it at a later date. But the need for expanded nursery care and the need to go into the day care child minding type of legislated Act or amendments to the present Act as imperative to working mothers in Ontario, who number approximately one in three married women, and we will continue in more detail on that particular subject, if I may, at another time.

Somewhere in those last paragraphs of item 191 we referred to the children and the children's children. We are dealing today, Mr. Speaker, with a number of cases of children's children, where perhaps had we helped the now young parent, we might not have had the problem of the now young parent and the parent's young child.

In item 252, the report states:

Large numbers of vulnerable young people however, leave school at 15, have only the most cursory contact with the youth employment service and appointed factory doctors, do not benefit from further education and take no part in youth organizations. We do not regard any of the present services as satisfactorily meeting the needs of more than a minority of these young people. At the very least, they should have access to the same kinds of services that are provided for those who remain in full time education. Compare, for example, the amount of medical and psychiatric care, counselling, and vocational guidance which is available in most universities with that available to the great majority of young people aged 18 to 21, most of whom are helping to pay, through

taxation, for the education of their more fortunate contemporaries.

And item 254:

Young people who are still at school or who have recently left school may come into contact with the social service department as volunteers to help with the work of that department. This we see as a particularly fruitful field for co-operation between the social service department, the schools and the youth service. But the social service department must also be able to recruit young volunteers who have left school and are connected with youth organizations.

Mr. Speaker, at another time in the near future I will go into the trend of early marriages, which has shown that one-quarter of the brides in Britain are under 20 years of age, well over one-third in the U.S. are 19 years of age or under and in our own Ontario Department of Labour, we had a report—"Women in Ontario Economy"—not too long ago, stating that most married women in their mid 20's had completed their families and by their early 30's their last child was in school.

And for the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) and the Minister of Correctional Services, Mr. Speaker, item 258:

In discussing the issue of departmental responsibility for services for children who are either at risk or have been found guilty of offences we have taken into account the white paper presented in April, 1968.

And that white paper, Mr. Speaker, was on children in trouble. A command paper—perhaps the Minister of Correctional Services would like that number, it is 3601. It is a different white paper on children in trouble with the law.

In general we warmly welcome the proposals in this white paper as a logical step in dealing with children and young people in trouble on predominantly social and educational rather than solely legal lines. Though we have to take account of the fact that they still have to be translated into legislation and administrative action. It is clear, however, that the government has recognized considerable changes are required in the organization of the services in order essentially to unify the approach to the problem by the different services to bring them into closer relationship with the community and to

develop the possibilities of earlier diagnosis and more flexible treatment.

In speaking to a responsible member of The Attorney General's Department recently, he related that the amount of time spent on counselling in that department is astounding. He inferred that more time is being spent counselling on, I presume, probation and so on, than in pre-sentencing reports. It is good that counselling is coming from somewhere—thank heavens it is coming, Mr. Speaker—however counselling must be dispensed in a more uniform fashion throughout a broader section of our society.

Another item for the Attorney General and Minister of Correctional Services, item 265, paragraph 24 of the white paper says:

For young persons aged 14 and under 17, supervision following both criminal proceedings and care, protection and control proceedings will be by the local authority or by a probation officer. We are doubtful about the proposal to maintain a divided responsibility for this age group, as it runs counter to the general principle, discussed in paragraphs 186 and 191, that there must be a clear allocation of responsibility for the social care of children and young people. As far as children and young people under 17 are concerned, we are clear that the social service department, rather than the probation and after-care service, should carry the responsibility for providing a social work service for the courts, for supervising and assisting young people in the community, for after-care work with the young people who have left the new kinds of residential provision which are proposed.

This work would be part of the general responsibility the department would have for all other children committed to its care and for social work with those in special schools. Where necessary, this could be extended beyond the age of 18, as happens at present with some children in care. We realize, however, that if this additional work is to be performed adequately, many probation and after-care officers will have to transfer from the probation and after-care service to the social service department.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that you must wonder when this commentary is going to be completed. There are three more items. I feel very strongly that this is something which must be said.

In item 290, the need for experiment in ways of helping children.

In conclusion, in this chapter we must emphasize once more the need for a development approach to the multiple problems involved in helping children in special need. The present state of knowledge, particularly of what tends to produce persistent offenders, is not sufficient to enable anyone to say with confidence how effective particular measures are in preventing children developing obvious social needs which cannot be met. But that does not excuse the community from trying—

This, Mr. Speaker, is what I am trying to say beyond this report. It will not be easy. It will be a difficult administrative job, but it does not let us have an out. It simply must be done, and the things which are in this report must be said.

To continue, Mr. Speaker, and to repeat:

That does not excuse the community from trying by the best means available to prevent trouble arising. Some of the means may be so obviously right on general grounds of humanity, for instance the provision of better housing and better social care for the under-fives, but there is everything to be said for pressing ahead with it even though knowledge of their exact beneficial effects may be lacking. Common sense suggests that measures which look promising should be tried and systematically evaluated.

In chapter 10, items 332 and 333, we deal with one or two of many valuable comments. I hope I have selected the ones most useful and most pertinent to the problems here in Ontario. Dealing with the problem of the physically handicapped, item 332, chapter 10:

Secondly, there is the question of housing. There is generally no lack of sympathy for the special needs of the handicapped for bungalows or ground-floor flats close to shops and social facilities and for adoption and special aid. Nevertheless, many of them have to live in unsatisfactory conditions or wait for months or years before a suitable appliance is provided or adaptations made or suitable house provided. We know there are practical difficulties in many areas in the provision of ground-floor accommodation, but the social service department must take the major responsibility for securing early action in helping in the provision of adaptation.

Item 333: Thirdly, there are the multiple difficulties that arise when a middle-

aged wage earner becomes incapacitated through chronic illness or accident. Here the social service department must be concerned in co-operation with the general practitioners and the hospital services, the Ministry of Social Security and perhaps the Department of Employment and Productivity. And the housing department is trying to achieve some tolerable way of living for the man and his family, remembering that the disability is likely to get worse and will last until he dies.

It often happens that the sufferer receives early warning of impending illness in his late 40s or 50s. He then generally needs retraining on the lines of training for able-bodied people made redundant by industrial change. The reasons why some people, in situations such as this, adapt to their disability and manage to lead useful lives and some do not, are not clearly understood—but the social situation is undoubtedly important in determining attitudes, and this is where the social service department should be able to help.

Now, in Toronto, Mr. Speaker, for the rehabilitation of persons on welfare we have three full-time professional social counsellors, who have three, I believe, non-professional assistants and there is a request in for three more, because of the city taking over a new group, an over-50 group. But this is a very limited effort, and it deals only with the placing of people for employment. We must look at the counselling and the re-allocation of needs of the family beyond the two that we are presently dealing with—giving them money and seeking to retrain and re-employ them—as their difficulties go much deeper than this.

Chapter 11, item 344 is the last of this section of the report, Mr. Speaker, for today—

Item 344: Further survey is necessary to estimate needs that are not even expressed in demand for services. There are some pointers in recent studies, for instance in the study of morbidity. In about 50 general practices in London, ten per cent of the patients over 15 who consulted during a year were given a psychiatric diagnosis. This represents about 7,800 persons per 100,000 population.

The source for that, Mr. Speaker, is "Morbidity in General Practice", *Sheppard M. et al*, 1966.

In a survey made on the Isle of Wight, the prevalence of psychiatric disorders, excluding subnormality, amongst children aged 10 to 11 was 6.3 per cent in a year. About one-third of these were severely

disturbed. If this rate is applied to all school children, 319 would be expected in the severe category in a population of 100,000.

The source, Mr. Speaker, is Rutter, M. and Graham, P. *Proceedings of Royal Society of Medicine*, 59,382, 1966.

It is clear that there is no hope in the foreseeable future of offering conventional psychiatric or social person-to-person service to all adults or children who are seriously maladjusted. Several studies have shown that there are far more old people with serious mental disorders living in their own homes than in all institutions together—

The reference to that, Mr. Speaker, says:

—although the number of these is growing rapidly. For example, in England and Wales in 1954 there were 15,557 residents over 75 in mental hospitals who had been there more than six months. By 1963, there were 21,171.

How many of these people could be living in the community is another question. Some of them could. We are only beginning to appreciate the dimensions of the psycho-geriatric problem that its difficulties are already playing.

One could only hope, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps such a report might interest the four Ministers concerned and even extend sometimes to five and six. We used to say in nursery school work that sometimes we had to cut a child in four to serve him properly—to divide him between The Department of Social and Family Services, The Department of Health, The Department of Education and The Department of Correctional Services, if he should fall there, or the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) if he has a family problem of housing—and these are all related problems—and then to deal with the other members of the family we start all over again wherever their problems may fall; some under the Provincial Secretary for language, some under the Minister of Correctional Services and so on.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the way someone has to look at the total family, assessing the problems, the means of prevention and rehabilitation. It seems that we go along not doing anything with children except for education and public health service, with the many children who are in need of help. We are not doing anything to go to them. We wait until they have come to us as a vital statistic, needing assistance or custodial care.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I began this commentary on The Department of Social and Family Services on Friday by referring to a vital statistic, the infant death of Carol Ann Young. Her mother, an 18-year-old welfare recipient was living in two rooms on Queen Street. I said then, Mr. Speaker, and I reiterate that this is not an isolated case. I will deal briefly with at least two other deaths which have all occurred in the same three-month period.

The report of the committee on local authority and allied personal social services, presented to British Parliament, July 1968, recommended a new local authority department providing a community-based and family-oriented service available to all. They stated, Mr. Speaker:

That this new department will, we believe, reach beyond the discovery and rescue of social casualties. It will enable the greatest possible numbers of individuals to act reciprocally, giving and receiving service for the wellbeing of the whole community.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we are not so far away from having governments use the people who are the recipients, and having them give some experience, some knowledge to the service. We saw that the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I believe, stated recently in the press that he thought it was important that we include recipients of welfare in dealing with their problems on the National Welfare Council.

In the report, Mr. Speaker, they also stated:

That this department would be concerned with the well being of the whole community and it will have responsibilities that go beyond those of the existing departments but will include present services—

And they call the new department, the social services department. This is exactly what we need in Ontario, Mr. Speaker. Many of the people administering social welfare at the local level must be given broader scope to deal with the whole family, if we are to succeed in reducing the numbers of persons in need; scope beyond the generic as the welfare system is applied now, scope to apply partial preventative assistance at the local level, Mr. Speaker.

I have talked to administrators recently who are happy because they could call on the services of two visiting homemakers to go into homes, to assist and to teach home-making. But I ask, Mr. Speaker, why two visiting homemakers, when there are 30,000

to 35,000 recipients of welfare in Metro Toronto alone?

To enlarge this type of service as well as counselling services will require additional resources, needless to say. But, Mr. Speaker, it will assist in removing much of the need of welfare assistance in our midst and will be an assist to the war on poverty. Surely the goal is the important aspect, even with a five-year programme. Surely we could begin to roll back the numbers in need, the numbers now totally dependent on government in using a "rehabilitating formula."

To sum up the report, Mr. Speaker, is to say we must meet needs on the basis of the overall requirements of the individual or family rather than on the basis of a limited set of symptoms.

In the particular case of the inquest that I referred to—it was reported January 17 in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* and in the *Toronto Daily Star*.

Mr. Gordon Smith of the welfare administration in east Toronto testified, when questioned by Doctor Cranston at the inquest of Carol Ann Young, January 17, 1969, that his welfare workers' function is primarily a financial one, that welfare workers try often to counsel, but welfare workers are not social workers.

Mr. Gordon Smith, Mr. Speaker, should never have been in this position. As welfare administrator for 1,600 recipients and head over 25 welfare workers, he must have sufficient services at his disposal to virtually eliminate from public governmental dependency, the 1,600 recipients of his jurisdiction.

There are many, many dedicated people in our society administering welfare needs. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are many who are not so dedicated, and we must form a system to be able to isolate those from the people who have dedicated their lives to this service. I have found so far nothing but co-operation, dedication and interest and the point must certainly be made. But the Minister of Social and Family Services is failing his own administration at the local level, and I will comment on that later, Mr. Speaker.

It is sufficient to say that in the offices of welfare administration in Toronto there have been successful uses made of the system of putting a visiting homemaker into a family during some crisis, keeping the whole family from disintegrating and becoming wards of a society. And a great expense was saved in many instances by the weekly wage of a visiting homemaker—about \$60 a week—in place of total institutionalized care for the

individual, in the disrupted family. It can be disrupted, Mr. Speaker, for any reason: illness, death or just plain difficulties. Yet we find the staff of the municipality of Toronto has only two visiting homemakers to call on, for 35,000 recipients of welfare.

Cases such as Carol Ann Young are the failure of the social structure of social and family service in relation to the needs of society. Those needs are varied, Mr. Speaker: the need of government to cope with juvenile offenders; the focus on the family aspect of need. The focus on needs of older persons, as a thing separate and apart from other kinds of need. Carol Ann Young must not pass on simply as a statistic.

I point out to the public, to the media, to the government that whereas under special assistance of The General Welfare Assistance Act of Ontario, her mother could be allowed \$150 maximum allowance for funeral and burial costs, when the child was dead, she was allowed only \$25 a month for the infant for food, clothing and personal requirements when she was alive.

Carol Ann Young was by no means isolated. I have said this before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again. The fact that we have had three cases of deaths within two months speaks for itself. Except for her death, the attention might not have been focused on this specific case, and we have public relations workers in Ontario speaking and singing about a place to stand and a place to grow, and this particular child had no place, Mr. Speaker, either to stand or to grow.

The problem is compounded by the absence of a section of government which is primarily concerned with what is happening to all children in this so-called affluent province. Of course we do it in the field of education and the health services for school children, but in this specific case the mother and the child were caught up in the monster of unwieldy welfare services that do not have to exist if the government of this province would even embrace the intent and the spirit of the Canada Assistance Plan.

This is a matter of urgent public importance. Through public enquiry the focus has been made; interest and attention has been drawn. These same persons right up to the coroner in the case, must draw action from the Social and Family Services Minister and the Cabinet at Queen's Park, who have been conspicuously silent on this case, even though editorials called for action, and the jury recommended action, from this particular level.

Hopefully, this demand for action will throw light on the problem of being a recipient of welfare under the present system in the province of Ontario today. To begin with, the government of Ontario accepted the Canada Assistance Plan. It was sold to this province as a proposition that a means test could be evaluated on an individual basis towards putting an end to poverty. That was the proposal by the federal government.

The Ontario government, by availing itself of the monies had a part to play. That was to provide what was set out by the federal government in this Act. Any expansion by the provincial government of its services, and staffs, the cost would be of a 50/50 break financially with the federal government. The Act called clearly for rehabilitative and preventative programmes.

The Canada Assistance Plan called for work activity projects, non-existent during the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services during the last session. I said then, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again, respectfully, the Ontario government is fraudulent in accepting aid from the Canada Assistance Plan when not adopting the intent and the spirit of the Act. And they have chosen the most devious way out of their part to play in the war against poverty; by simply turning around and offering to pay 50 per cent of any municipal scheme or staff expansion to broaden services, leaving the initiative up to the municipality who cannot afford to embark on such a scheme. And so that is how we got, I am told, one professional counsellor for all Metropolitan Toronto, and his job, Mr. Speaker, is to set up a volunteer counselling service.

This is government operating on the cheap. Two teaching visiting homemakers, three professional, three non-professional counsellors for job rehabilitation and retraining—a grand total of nine persons to help in various ways to counsel and rehabilitate at least 30,000 welfare recipients in Metropolitan Toronto.

The municipality have, as I said, requested three more counsellors for their take-over of the over-50 unit as of January, 1969. Who would deny that this is the very least that the Ontario government could allow in expecting the municipality to carry a 50 per cent burden of any cost of expansion. The municipality, Mr. Speaker, finds it a strain to cope with the 20 per cent, while the provincial government takes 80 per cent of the cost of the general welfare assistance, and that is why we, in the New Democratic Party, have recommended for some time the taking over of the cost and administration of welfare by the province.

The private social agencies must have government initiative and understanding of what is happening to them, also. In *Hansard*, page 3140 of the last session, Mr. Speaker, I said it was imperative to appoint a commission, that the time had come when government's role and the private agencies' role had to be assessed in relationship to each other and to the community they were serving, the time to assess exactly what was happening in the field of private agencies. Volunteer agencies need some government understanding of what is happening to draw comparisons between the voluntary agencies, raising funds in their own communities for their own work. There is a large gap between what is raised and what they want. The very thing that the juries have stated in these cases, Mr. Speaker, was the lack of co-ordination and that the initiative must be taken at the provincial government level.

The private agencies are crying out in need of initiative by the Ontario government and government is wrong in not doing something about it. After all, the private social agency is one place where family counselling is done to help whole families from becoming totally dependent on government, or from staying in need of government financial assistance. And for the government not to do large scale family counselling is to say that theirs is a hopeless situation, that we cannot do anything with these people, or for the people who are welfare recipients.

This is simply not so, Mr. Speaker. The people can be helped to achieve a measure of independence and stay off welfare. The vast majority are there through desperate need, desperate inadequacy. The mother of Carol Ann Young is a good example; she is no longer on welfare.

The facts pertaining to this particular case are not uncommon, Mr. Speaker, and I will deal with them as efficiently as possible, because I know there are other members who wish to speak today. I find as a member of the legislative assembly in Metro Toronto that I run across the same problems. The faces and names change, but the problems roll on and the similarity is astounding. And this particular syndrome that I am going to point out is one which I am sure many other legislators of this assembly are also dealing with every day.

The pattern goes like this: the recipient's actual rent was \$108.33 a month. The allowance for shelter under The General Welfare Assistance Act is \$85 a month for one family head and one dependent, as was this par-

ticular case. The differential between the shelter allowance and the actual rent of \$23.33 per month had to be made up by the recipient by using money out of the other allowance. This induces hardship. In this case, taking \$23.33 for rent from their \$72 a month allowance for food, clothing and personal requirements, left the mother and infant with \$48.67 a month or \$1.50 a day for them to live on.

Now this particular welfare administrator in this particular case—and only because she determined to do so—had allowed an amount for utilities and she allowed that amount in the maximum, which was \$9. So the recipient received an additional \$9 for utilities. The same administrator allowed an amount in the maximum for household supplies of \$7 to the recipient. The recipient in this case did not have any utilities to pay, so she could conceivably put this \$9 towards rent and if she did not buy any household supplies she could put that \$7 towards rent. Is this, Mr. Speaker, what welfare recipients are expected to do?

I say this, not disrespectfully, I ask it because I was astounded during the last session when the Minister of Social and Family Services intimated to me that the administrators at the local level are bending over backwards to do all they can for welfare recipients. What he really was saying—I can see quite clearly now—he was saying they are giving them the maximum amounts wherever they can, and is this not recognition of itself from the administrators that the whole system and financial structure is inadequate? I will deal with that, Mr. Speaker, hopefully under the Budget Debate.

But, even having done that, the recipient could still not make up the rent money without taking \$7.33 from her meagre allowance of \$72 per month for food, clothing and personal requirements. In the final analysis, this left the mother and infant \$64.67 a month to exist on or \$2.12 a day, under general welfare assistance.

It is to be noted here, Mr. Speaker, that what amounts to special dispensation, the Act does allow under special assistance, any other special item or service authorized by the Deputy Minister, but the recipient did not know of this and recipients are not being advised of this particular section of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of people are these people in need; what kind of parents? Do they need parenting themselves? The chances are pretty good that the parents of these infants come from deprived backgrounds.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, making a baby is their singular achievement. These are young parents who had no opportunity until now for challenge, for change or for choice; no opportunity to say "this is what I want".

We have children who come into the day nurseries who think everything on four feet is a dog, and yet we have people who cry out about television sets for poor people being some sort of foolish purchase. People are short-sighted in saying this, Mr. Speaker, because while the child cannot feel or touch things portrayed on the television, at least the child can see them.

If we had an educational television station such as they have running very effectively in Boston, Massachusetts, which has wide recognition, we could be doing an excellent job of assisting some of these children.

These children do not get the experience of conversation, they do not learn how to use adults in their world, to perform better. You get the little child who is just sitting and not communicating with adults and does not really use his teacher to learn.

These children in 10 or 15 years, Mr. Speaker, are adults and you cannot legislate competence, you cannot legislate a feeling of self-worth, and an appreciation of authority for its good and its purposes. But these people can be taught, they can be ordered, they can be instructed into competent roles of adult parenthood.

I will digress to the inquest into the death of Patrick Carr, one year, eight months old, by reading an editorial from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, dated February 26, 1969:

TRAINING FOR PARENTHOOD

Young children cannot go for long periods without food. Yet 20-month-old Patrick Carr was harnessed in his bed from 9 p.m. until noon the next day before his 19-year-old mother found that he had tangled his neck in his harness and died.

The inquest jury recommended that greater control be exercised over the sale and advertising of restraining baby harnesses. But Barbara Chisholm, executive director of the Victorian Day Care Services, had a more important recommendation. "We have here very young parents—the first child at 16 and almost literally a child a year since then," she said. There was no indication of deliberate neglect, she said, but much time elapsed between feedings, which is bad.

"This kind of knowledge about small children and the risks involved raises ques-

tions about the kind of responsibility the community has in equipping our young parents to be parents. Accidents like this could be prevented", said Miss Chisholm, "If parents were given a course in child care, perhaps in high school".

It is a sensible suggestion. We now teach our children about sex. It would surely be a mere reasonable extension of the course to teach them what to do with the products of sex. How they must be held to give them proper support, how to bathe and feed and burp them, how to change a diaper and recognize a diaper rash, where—and perhaps this is most important—to go for advice and help that is already available.

Few human activities can have more traumatic effects upon the wide circle of humans than the raising of children. Yet many a mother is handed her infant without knowing the sheer physical facts about sterilizing his bottles, or heating his milk to blood temperature or determining how often he needs it. She doesn't even know how to pin his diaper without pinning him too.

In school she will have learned many facts which she will never need in her life after examination time. Surely the school system should be geared to teach her—and her future husband—these basic human facts which they are almost certain to need.

In Saturday's *Globe and Mail*, March 1, 1969, Mr. Speaker, on the same subject entitled: Schools Should Teach Teens How to be Parents Group Told:

Nursery schools should be attached to high schools so that teenagers can learn about raising and caring for children, a conference on pre-school education was told yesterday.

H. D. Dickson, an official of the Ontario teachers' conference, which sponsored the conference said schools should be teaching teenagers to be parents. He said this was brought home to him recently when he encountered a former student of his, who told him he was beating his two-year-old son whenever he did anything wrong. He had never heard that a child needs love as much as he needs food, Mr. Dickson said, "and I am guilty, because I was his teacher."

In a complementary proposal, architect John C. Parkins suggested building educational mini-cities. In a paper delivered to the conference Mr. Parkins stated that

“teenage boys especially, lose all contact with pre-school and public school children.”

In an effort to bridge this gap and render the period in a young man's life more viable in respect to his future role as a father, the concept of building groups of schools is noteworthy. This really then becomes a mini-city where each group can, through observing and training, learn to understand the problems of the very young.

The further extension of this concept, Mr. Parkins said would be to include in these complexes accommodation for the senior citizens of the community. In this way a secondary purpose is served, that of providing an interest for those elderly persons so often consciously fragmented from society.

Shared parenting, Mr. Speaker, is not replacing parenting. Parenting is too important a role to leave just to parents. Society must be prepared to assist the children of the handicapped—as an example, children of the blind, the deaf, the disabled. The people I am talking about today are the people who are personality amputees, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, parenting is too important a role to leave to parents who are not competent simply because so often the young person has become a parent.

The role of Miss Barbara Chisholm is that of a parent of the community. The Minister of Social and Family Services is deemed by an Act of the Legislature to be the good parent of the Crown wards. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the role of parenting is not something that comes overnight. We must assist in this service. Competence does not come with mother's milk. Children do not just grow, they develop; it takes lots and lots of conversation, and any of us who have worked in day nurseries, Mr. Speaker, see this on a day-to-day, week-to-week, month-to-month basis. Children must be given the opportunity to learn these things rather than have the thought of meaningful conversation towards an end never cross their minds.

We have a ghetto-ized style of living—young with young, old with old—children are not getting a cultururation experience. Many have virtually no language skills; we have five years to build language; five years for infants to learn how to associate with and get used to grown ups and how to get their help. The child learns to have ideas, he sets them in motion, he puts the ideas into action, he builds a trust—and I believe it is important.

Erickson in his “Six or Eight Stages of Man” said that trust was a basic need and children must learn to rely on that trust. They have to learn that parents are predictable people. We have to look at the parenting of the child and if the parent needs parenting, Mr. Speaker, we must answer this need and break the cycle.

Having babies is not just a biological function or a phenomenon. Our society, Mr. Speaker, is hung up on the belief that only a mother can mother, and that only a parent can parent. It is not necessarily so. We cannot legislate consistent parenting unless we are willing to share in that parenting, unless we are willing to teach young people going into marriage that there will be squabbles, there will be trouble, and that we as legislators will help.

We say a child must be with its mother. What if the mother herself needs parenting? Parents are still the same people they were before the child was born, before they became parents, and many of these people are simply, Mr. Speaker, inexperienced. Many are neurotic; many will be mentally ill. The most flagrant, last of the three inquest cases, proved an atmosphere of mental illness as being the cause of death.

The biological consequences of sex do not change the person one iota. It could mean that the coming of the child is an additional burden, especially if the parents have come from homes which have already suffered deprivation. The idea of a totally demanding, dependent squalling new baby may well aggravate the incompetence. We must put into context what, in fact, first of all, small children require, Mr. Speaker. Then we will realize the community has a responsibility to share as needed in the parenting of the children—in the sharing of the parenting, Mr. Speaker, once again I say—not replacement.

Many of the children who are now young parents have come from families where there was desertion or where there was only one parent, or where the family lived on welfare, or where the mother was plagued with worry, and was incompetent herself and was unable to impart to a child good learning experiences, good guidance, when she herself needed guidance. The chances are pretty good she was shut in a house, potentially even a mentally ill person, close to giving up, unable to assess or understand the needs of the child. As an example, a worried mother with a child said recently to a social worker, “One day I will hit him and I will not be able to stop.”

This is not theory, Mr. Speaker. I am dealing right now with a lady, 46 years of age. I thought she must be at least 66 or 76 when I first spoke to her, because she is rearing one boy of 14, who is an honour student, on a \$20-a-month IODE scholarship. Because he was 14 when he attained these marks he could not have, I gather from his guidance teacher, a Department of Education scholarship. Her rent has gone up and she works in a factory and she is unwell, and she said quite literally in the past two weeks, "I am almost ready to give up."

Her daughter, who is older, is an honour student also, and went through on the \$30-a-month scholarship which I presume was a board of education scholarship. She has successfully reared the one child and she is at the point of almost breaking down with the other. This is a clear case, Mr. Speaker, of a woman who is remaining economically independent of government, but is in dire need of counselling service.

The point must be made strongly that current programmes both in private and public, are the result of a tremendous amount of caring by an awful lot of people, possibly many of them dead now, and from this we got our basic social service programme which must be recognized as the breakthrough of its time. In the social Darwinism of capitalism—the survival of the fittest and the weak shall perish—this was a tremendous breakthrough.

Having said that the present programmes represent far-sighted care on the part of many individuals, it is now just the first phase, the public programmes in particular, Mr. Speaker, which are bed rock services to citizens. Because the need in those programmes is to institutionalize in order to manage the programmes, we constantly fall into the trap of beaming the customer or the client to fit the procedure to keep the programme rolling. The fact that it is an administrative programme does not excuse our reluctance to take it as a problem to be solved, to bring it to a central focus on the place of the individual who in the large programmes suffers the loss of identity.

What we have done with our rigid function related to definitions of our welfare programme is to decide categorically who may receive service and to check monthly or bi-monthly that the person still qualifies. We are not fighting the real problem at all, Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation we are obsessed with protecting the taxpayers' money. But this does not mean we are using his

money efficiently. We have made a situation where goals have never been fully established except to say that all persons in need may have special assistance above and beyond those outlined. And then the client, the recipient, is not informed that this clause is in fact in The General Welfare Assistance Family Benefits Act.

The deviousness of this type of operation, Mr. Speaker, defeats the full growth of a child and a parent in the case that we have spoken about. We are simply giving about a dollar-a-day-per-person to the least educated, the least emotionally stable, the least able to cope—possibly even the least nutritionally built in the first place, from a poor family background—and we are saying, "There is your money, go to it."

Carol Ann Young's mother was one of several children whose parents lived in Ontario housing. The mother telephoned the city and asked about the pregnant daughter living at home and receiving help and understood that this was not possible. When I checked with Mr. Whaley, the managing director of OHC, Mr. Whaley telephoned the mother to say it would have been possible. This, of course, was months later when the infant child was dead. This is a good example of the need of co-ordination. The mother of the infant took two rooms and was accepted for a cash allotment from our government and was left to fend for herself.

As recently as Friday night I dealt with the same kind of situation—an 18-year-old pregnant girl. Her mother had always worked and two incomes was what supported the family. I think it is important that some of these cases, Mr. Speaker, are told just as it is. The mother was able to work when the daughter was not in difficulty, but in being harassed by the father of the pregnancy, who was living then with another girl—who was also harassing the family by telephone—the mother took sleeping pills and ended up in the hospital. Fortunately, she has survived and we can see no real serious damage at the present time.

The daughter has applied for welfare and has been told by the east end welfare office that she will be provided for if she is not at home with the mother because the mother is to look after her if she is in her home, and they are not physically or financially able to look after her. And we find this variance of social services coming back to haunt us from each of these three inquests.

In talking to the east end office of the municipal welfare services I learned of a form

which has to be signed by the client, the recipient of welfare, allowing welfare workers to walk in at any time. Now I can understand, Mr. Speaker, that if a welfare worker is being kept out of a home we should be able to insist that the family having service must have some communication with the department but to have them sign a blanket statement such as this—and yet there is no trace of this form under Family Benefits Act or General Welfare Assistance Act. And in the burial of Carol Ann Young, where the allowance under the Act is up to \$150, I found that the people who are doing the burial of these people in the city of Toronto were still operating on the old Metro scheme of about \$100, being mindful that it could be pushed further if needed. Now I do not happen to subscribe, Mr. Speaker, to costly burial services but I do think we have to have a unanimity policy.

You add, Mr. Speaker, the problems of this particular inquest to the problems where the editorial called for training for parenthood in the other inquest, and it is shocking. I think it is important to state that in talking to Miss Barbara Chisholm at the Victorian Day Nursery, I learned that the father and mother of Patrick Carr were young. There had been three children from 16, I presume to 19 years of age. They had two other couples in that evening. There was nothing to drink in the house or in the living accommodation found by the Crown. They had apparently been drinking tea all night at 20 years of age.

I am sure that it is not hard to understand that six people having a relaxing time in the otherwise quite worried world in which they lived, obviously enjoyed their activities and began going to bed towards the early hours of morning. Patrick Carr had been forced to leave a crib to make way for the younger child—and once more, it is a sad thing, we again have a case of death where even maybe a crib might have made a difference. Because he had to be moved from the crib to accommodate the younger baby, he was put into a junior bed with the next child. But he was too small for the junior bed so the parents improvised a harness because he kept falling out of the bed. They improvised the harness for his safety. There was no lack of care. There was simply a lack of knowledge of dealing with infant babies as far as feeding and care in this particular death.

I think it is very important to say this because these young people were concerned parents. The mother went to sleep before the father—and there was a mother and young child who even slept overnight and that child

woke up and that child got fed, or there might have been two deaths. It was the dehydration, no doubt, in the small infant, plus the fact that he was 20 months old and was getting himself out of the bed to go down in the morning for something to eat.

There are many things to be said in this department, Mr. Speaker, which I hope I will be able to deal with under the budget debate. But one point of information that I think is necessary to know at this time in dealing with these particular cases: Miss Chisholm of the Victorian Day Care Centre, said that her costs for the type of rehabilitation and preventative counselling and general overseeing that she provides can be \$8.50 a day or can go as high as \$14 a day. But as she said, compare that, Mr. Speaker, with \$35 a day for residential care, \$23 a day for detention home care and \$20 for Clarke Institute care.

We cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, not to afford getting into a family programme, an intelligent welfare programme. This way we are doing nothing. We are doing nothing but barely keeping people alive, and because parent incompetence is not as flagrant as drug-addiction or alcoholic addiction, we have not, until recently, had editorials, we have not had public focus until these three tragic deaths. The subject allows journalists never-ending scope to tell it as it is, and it is a whole area of excursion for government who would set the goal to eliminate much of the need of welfare services.

These are chronically inadequate families, Mr. Speaker, and to negotiate is something they have never known. We can deal with them, we can rehabilitate them. The testimony in the final case which I shall be dealing with just briefly is different from the others. It was the coroner's jury recommendation February 17, 1969, that a newborn child of any mother with a history of mental illness automatically be considered "for protective care and supervision" by the children's aid society until the parents can prove their ability to care for the child properly. And in quotes, Mr. Speaker, "another contributing factor could have been the lack of communication on the part of all the agencies involved in not recognizing the situation and taking positive action."

This was the case of five month old William Ambing, whose parents had been recent patients in the Ontario Hospital, and who died from asphyxia in his crib at his home. The child was conceived while these parents were in the Ontario Hospital—but that, again,

Mr. Speaker, is a vital subject needing much broader scope than we can deal with today.

The testimony went this way; that it was not the responsibility or the concern of social administrators, or at least, of welfare administrators, as to the social situation in which their clients lived. We are operating a department of \$227 million, Mr. Speaker, and if we do not willingly put into that system what we can, by way of rehabilitation, by showing clearly the parenting role for the next generation, if we do not help bring about the change, then we are leaving these people with nothing; nothing in their hearts or in their lives but a "void". They do at least one thing successfully—they do make babies—and we must meet the need on the basis of the overall requirements, the individual or the family, rather than on the basis of a limited set of systems.

I would like to deal briefly with the guaranteed annual income in the light of an editorial in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* this morning, entitled, "Faulty As It Is, Welfare Must Go On." And I would like to record the editorial, Mr. Speaker, and maybe spend two minutes on what I consider a good analysis of what a guaranteed annual income really is. Reading from the *Globe and Mail*, March 3, 1969:

There is mounting evidence that our various welfare programmes, assistance plans, family allowances and equalization grants are indeed a "patchwork". Not only are they inefficient and overlapping, but it has been shown conclusively that they are not eliminating the poverty cycle.

The response to this realization has been a growing feeling that the most prudent approach would be to clear the battlefield and start all over again in the war on poverty.

The alternative that has been receiving the most attention has been some form of guaranteed annual income which might be implemented by means of a negative income tax. A family whose income falls below a certain level would receive a grant to bring it up to that level.

Ontario Revenue Minister John White has joined those who want an investigation into the relative costs of what he calls "straight welfare" programmes and guaranteed minimum incomes. He would also restrict spending on welfare programmes for the next two years until the comparison is in.

Mr. White would do well to study the remarks of Dr. D. L. McQueen, the director of the Economic Council of Canada,

made to a Glendon College seminar. He pointed out that the economic council's most recent report has been moderately successful in bringing home to Canadians the disgraceful fact that one of every five of us ekes out an existence in poverty.

But the Council has not been so effective in drawing attention to the failure of existing "conventional wisdom". We all know, for instance, that Canada's poor are to be found in the Atlantic provinces and eastern Quebec, rural areas, Indian and Eskimo communities.

They are also to be found in families headed by widows or divorcees, and families where the man of the house is unemployed. And we have designed our welfare programmes on this basis.

As Dr. McQueen puts it: "It is all too easy to draw the conclusion that strong support of regional development in the eastern extremities of Canada, plus special measures for Indians, Eskimos and Metis, plus more day care centres for small children, plus categorical welfare assistance for those too old or otherwise unable to work would just about add up to an adequate anti-poverty programme for Canada.

"But our figures indicate that, while all of the measures mentioned are highly desirable, a programme limited to them alone would leave untouched a very large part of the low-income population."

The economic council, which sets the poverty level at \$1,800 a year for a single person, and \$4,800 for a family of five, found when it began to count heads that most of the poor live in cities rather than rural areas, and more than half of them live west of the Ottawa River. Most poor families are headed by men under 65. Furthermore, most of those below the poverty line could be described as "working poor", not the unemployed, but at least part-time members of the labour force.

Dr. McQueen's economists have been studying guaranteed incomes and negative income tax. And they conclude that such a scheme would not be the panacea. Manpower programmes, individual improvement programmes and community improvement programmes would still be needed. They agree with Revenue Minister White, however, that more research is needed into the costs of welfare programmes as well as research into the root causes of poverty. Dr. McQueen has suggested that more use might be made of the Canada Assistance Plan (which at present covers only

the aged). The council, with the help of the Vanier Institute of the Family, is exploring pre-school education as a means of giving the poor a running, instead of a limping, start into the formal educational system.

But the council never suggests, as Mr. White does, restriction of spending while new programmes are under investigation. "It may seem," said Dr. McQueen, "that our main proposals for early action mostly involve the patching, coordination and extension of existing programmes. When, you may ask, are we going to get out and to something for human beings? In answer to this question, we should bear in mind that there are already people out there doing something—welfare workers and others who have dedicated their lives to dealing with poverty and its consequences.

To leave them standing still while the research went on would be unthinkable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. Minister from London South (Mr. White), we heard of his comments on guaranteed annual income when he was proposing a tax on food and children's clothing as being a form of negative income tax, a form of guaranteed income. But this is not what the guaranteed income is about. And the editorial clearly illustrates the need for continuing welfare services.

In my anxiety to embrace the guaranteed annual income concept, I believe I even made the error myself of stating it as a replacement for welfare. But it was a momentary error during the last session, because there is just no way we can suddenly replace welfare. We will still need counselling, we will still need rehabilitation, we will still need guidance, and this editorial has outlined very carefully the areas which will still have to be in operation under The Department of Social and Family Services.

This is also referred to in a review in the *Commentary* of January 1969, of a book called "Social Benefits: Children, Poverty and Family Allowances" by James C. Vadakin. The book was reviewed by Robert Lekachman. Family allowances are a pretty hot topic these days here and there, but since it is a federal matter, I shall leave it and go to the concept and the spectrum of the guaranteed annual income:

Guaranteed annual income has a spectrum much similar to that of our political system, of the far right, the centre and the left. The lesson to the left is clear: stress

should be placed upon measures that are genuinely capable of shifting the distribution of income and wealth in the United States in the direction of diminished inequality. Of such measures, family allowances are just about the least likely to accomplish that aim. A properly designed negative income tax, on the other hand, could indeed serve as an instrument of redistribution. The words "properly designed" of course, exclude the conception of conservatives like Milton Friedman, who have in mind quite different objectives. Dr. Friedman, in an effort to minimize costs and preserve work incentives, has proposed cutting out benefits once an income is attained which is half that of the poverty level. Moreover, a negative income tax on his model would replace all welfare benefits.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the philosophies of Milton Friedman—unless I am mistaken, I believe he is a professor in Chicago who was an advisor to Mr. Goldwater—I wonder if these are the philosophies of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White), since he wants to call for an immediate stop of the expansion of any welfare services.

There is no particular mystery, Mr. Speaker, about the workings of a radical negative income tax. One version of such a tax worked out by Professor James Tobin of Yale would confer either cash grants or tax benefits upon all families of five whose incomes fall below \$8,000.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted here that as far two to three years ago, the level corresponding to this \$8,000, the amount of money believed essential to adequately care for the family of five in a meaningful way in U.S. society was \$6,700. This figure—going back to the commentary, Mr. Speaker—this figure is high enough so that a great many working class families would receive some benefit, although less than that paid to the really poor. Hence the proposal would have some of the unifying effects imputed to children's allowances. In effect, the scheme shifts income from that portion of the population which can already pay taxes to those who are at the bottom half of income distribution. Tobin's sketch is one of many possible plans but the mechanics of all of them are simple. It takes little more than basic arithmetic to design a system which greatly benefits any given segment of the population and finances the improvement by removing funds from the relatively affluent.

There is a last word to be said. I do not anticipate that any scheme as direct in its objectives and as contrary to the temper of the times as a redistributive negative income tax has any hope of success. It is however, a programme for the sort of social science research into whose design enters radical possibility and hence an investment in the kind of social action one may hope to see in the future.

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, this is the third occasion that I have had to participate in the Throne debate and, of course, on these occasions I have had the honour of representing that great riding of Kenora.

Mr. Speaker, may I through you, extend our sincere good wishes, and my own personal wishes, to His Honour, the new Lieutenant Governor, our gracious Queen's representative in the second session of the 28th Parliament of this province.

To you, sir, I would again extend my compliments on the efficient, fair, and business-like manner by which you guide the affairs of this House. As many other previous speakers have pointed out, we all realize that your duties are difficult at certain times. However, we all welcome your efforts to maintain the business-like atmosphere of this Legislature on a very even keel. To the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter), who handles the chairmanship of the committee of the whole, I certainly offer my congratulations on the fine work that he is doing also.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to extend to you, thanks and best wishes from two of your former page boys, who worked in this Legislature last spring. Danny Chikane, who wrote me a personal letter is still residing in the isolated community of Round Lake, and Eddy Peters, formerly of Pikangikum, is now going to school in Kenora. They have both asked that I express their appreciation for the thoughtfulness and the kindness that you extended to both of them while they carried out their very interesting and pleasant duties here in the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add my thanks and compliments to you, sir, for the guidance and concern and the interest that you have displayed in all the page boys that lend so much pleasant help and atmosphere to the everyday tasks of this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would comment briefly on the remarks made in the House last week—February 19 and 21—by the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid). I am sorry to see he is not in his seat but I understand he

had to leave. I would point out that I have many friends in the riding of Rainy River, and a large number of people write to me and phone me when they want some information as to what is happening in the Legislature, or when they want or need some assistance in connection with their dealings here at Queen's Park. I say this, not to cast reflection on the member for Rainy River or to say he is not doing his job. Rather, as a life-long resident of the northwest it would only be quite natural to meet and to know many people in the adjoining riding. Many of these people are well known Liberals.

Since the member for Rainy River made his remarks last week, I have been plagued with calls from all over his riding. Many of the calls come from many Liberals and I even received a call from an NDP supporter—all who expressed disappointment at the lack of research done and shallowness of the remarks by the member for Rainy River.

So, Mr. Speaker, instead of going into detail and passing my own judgment on his speech—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The member for Rainy River is the voice of northwestern Ontario.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Brain-washed by the government!

Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the leader of the Opposition what happened to Mr. Molgat in Manitoba at the last by-elections.

Mr. Speaker, instead of going into detail and passing my own judgment on his speech, although I have to admit it was a pretty sad effort, I will only say to the hon. member that his own supporters were not impressed but, in fact, very disillusioned. The NDP, you may be interested in knowing, called it another silli-talkathon.

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest to my young friend, the present member for Rainy River, that instead of being a habitual cry-baby, and instead of going around and blaming his problems on the Conservative government, that he study the career of his predecessor, a Progressive Conservative, a distinguished, highly respected member of this Legislature—a man who stood and defended this Conservative government all across Rainy River riding—when the present member speaks so lightly of that same government—and a man, I might add, that in his time got more for his riding than many others ever got for ours, including the Noden Causeway. Perhaps this might illustrate, Mr.

Speaker, that in looking after a riding, method, reality and good common sense can be of equal importance as one's political affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the programmes taking place in the northwest, I would like to place on record part of an editorial which appeared in the *Kenora Miner and News* on March 20, 1968.

At the moment, Kenora, is in the midst of another large move forward. Its total size is not yet known.

Consider these projects, either completed or well underway:

1. The \$1,800,000 Holiday Inn, 11 storeys, 96 rooms, which will bring new convention business to Kenora, as well as project Kenora into a new area of the tourist industry.

2. The new provincial police headquarters, a \$620,000 structure, which will bring added dollars to Kenora's total payroll. It will be officially opened this spring.

3. The community centre—a \$700,000 building adding new dimensions to living.

4. The town's \$250,000 warehouse—a credit to the municipality.

5. The town's new electrical distribution system, completed now at a cost of just below \$1 million.

6. The town's new sewer system, nearing completion, at a cost in excess of \$600,000.

7. The new school of nursing, utilizing the St. Joseph hospital building.

8. The new Lakeside Baptist Church.

9. The enlarged telephone building, with expanded facilities soon to be in operation.

10. The enlarged Lake-of-the Woods clinic.

11. The enlarged plant of Vacationland dairies.

12. The looping of the gas pipeline in Jaffray-Meckick and at Shoal Lake, and several other smaller, but vital positive moves, such as modernization of several cafes.

On the horizon:

1. The opening of the new community college in September will improve education standards.

2. Shop Easy stores.

3. Expect to see a major addition to the newly formed District General Hospital.

4. The federal government has promised a start this year on a \$600,000 post office in the town of Kenora.

5. Ontario's Minister of Public Works said in Kenora this month to expect an early start on a building programme for their needs.

6. Tenders have been called for a Department of Transport wharf and building to cost over \$61,000.

7. Ontario Hydro has announced participation in Manitoba's power programme, which will mean major expenditures in power lines and transformer facilities locally.

These programmes involve expenditures of some \$11 million. Just as important, they show the direction Kenora is moving. The rewards for further effort are equally glittering, through property now utilized by the post office, following generally the CPR right-of-way. Some 12 acres of somewhat dormant land lie along this route; serviced property, ideal for business expansion. Discussions have taken place with the owners of the land, who are anxious to assist in its utilization. By keeping our business district in a compact area, such a development will not undermine the present investments.

So we have new hope, new incentives. We can truly say that in the realms of education, in health, in recreation, in municipal facilities and employment opportunities, we are on the march.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the potential of the great northwest, I would like now to spend a few moments discussing our tourist industry.

It is estimated that within 20 years, our population in Canada will be nearing the 35 million mark—90 per cent will live in the urban ant hills of steel, glass, plastic and concrete. 4½ million people will occupy Metropolitan Toronto and its fringe spreading 20 miles out from the present downtown core. Beyond it the golden horseshoe embracing the north shore of Lake Ontario will be solid with people from Oshawa to Niagara and North to Barrie. Closer to Kenora, one million people will live in Winnipeg and south of us 320 million vacation hungry Americans will be surging over our borders in search of a place to play and relax.

Mr. Speaker, within 20 years there will be technological efficiency beyond our wildest dreams—the work week will be only 30 hours or less. We will be better educated and have twice as much disposable income. There will be high speed transit systems of several kinds with superb motor vehicles available to all. Thus, while our numbers will have doubled, our demand for outdoor recreation will have

tripled—where will they all go to play? I can suggest to the rest of this province and indeed to this continent that the northwestern portion of this province has the elbow room to handle such recreational needs.

Mr. Speaker, our government is aware of this future need. This is evident in that just last July, the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), unveiled to the general public, in Kenora, a 92 page tourist industry study of the great northwest. This detailed industry study covering the districts of Rainy River, Kenora and Patricia, listed 27 recommendations which have since received the close scrutiny of all those interested in the promoting and the enlarging of this industry.

Last November, the Minister returned to Kenora to hear submissions and briefs relative to this study, and, it is interesting to note, that all were indebted to the department for taking the initiative in implementing such an important study. However, Mr. Speaker, growth exists on capital. In other words, we need money—money to further the development of our north. That is why I feel it is time for the terms of reference of the Ontario Development Corporation to be expanded whereby financial assistance could be made available to the commercial resort operators, so that they in turn could expand and improve their summer facilities to attract family vacation groups. The present terms of the ODC are not providing the financial assistance to the tourist industry whereby the job can be properly tackled.

Mr. Speaker, in this era of constant cries for additional industry, I say to you, sir, that we in northwestern Ontario possess such magnificent opportunities for recreational development on so massive a scale that its potential ranks among the most outstanding on this continent. The tourist industry study report states very clearly that the government has an opportunity to assist in the development of the tourist industry at a comparable small cost to the public purse.

While I may be critical at this time of the present terms of reference of the Ontario Development Corporation, I want to refute some of the charges of our opposition members who are quick to down-grade the entire efforts of this corporation.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that since September, 1967, the corporation has provided on-the-spot service in the area west from Manitouwadge by eight visits of a consulting team. This team spent nine weeks interviewing and travelling in the area, and the remainder of the time developing situa-

tions where assistance was possible. All the larger centres have been visited for discussions with interested persons, the Lakehead was visited on eight occasions, the area to the west on three, and the area to the east on one. During these trips, Mr. Speaker, and this is just since September, 1967, 160 potential situations were investigated and their present status is: 13 resulted in loans, 11 are being processed, 38 are expected to produce applications, and 98 were provided with advisory services. In all, approximately 350 interviews and meetings were held in the area, with applicants, municipal officials, industrial commissions, and so on.

It is interesting to note that financial assistance authorized to date in that area amounts to: \$678,613 in forgivable loans, \$246,000 in term loans, and \$505,000 in loan guarantees. I feel confident, Mr. Speaker, that in the ODC we have the vehicle that can provide the required advisory assistance and capital that will make northern Ontario play a larger role in the future of this province. However, again their terms of reference must be altered and slanted to attracting new industries to the north. If we are to achieve our full potential, major assistance is necessary.

I have pointed out on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Kenora area are fast becoming the capital of the northwest—and rightly so. This area is the hub for many government district offices and transportation routes. We have many provincial government district offices located in the area. I understand from my colleague from Rainy River that more are planned for the future, with the result that we have a large number of civil servants, and I would like at this time to say a few words on their behalf.

Civil servants, Mr. Speaker, carry on the day to day business of government, be it municipal, provincial or federal. I have heard it said that they are a tactless, indifferent, lustreless bunch of workers, interested only in security of employment and of course their weekly pay cheque that goes with it. The facts are not so. Most are conscientious and able employees.

In my brief period in public life, I have come to realize that civil servants are as co-operative, as reasonable and helpful as any group of citizens. Those of us who have a good deal to do with the government have learned that any reasonable request, backed and supported by logic and being economically sound, will be given every consideration. Those engaged in handling the

affairs of this province and municipalities which I represent, and I am sure that all other members will join with me when I say that most of them are doing a credible job.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on certain aspects of the Speech from the Throne related to the concept of regional government. This idea is particularly stimulating to me as the member for Kenora where we are faced with the challenge of a large geographical area served by four large towns and a number of smaller communities, both organized and unorganized. These areas have been developed to a point where residents are paying their fair share of educational costs to local school boards. The other necessary services are provided by this government and are paid for by the residents through the medium of the provincial land tax.

It is my considered opinion that the people of the district of Kenora are prepared to accept the benefits and responsibilities associated with municipal organization of a regional nature.

However, I would ask my colleagues who are members of the Cabinet to review the matter in depth by consulting during every step of the way with the people in the district of Kenora on the subject of moving to regional government. Amalgamation of several communities warrants, in my opinion a thorough study along with regional economic development prior to any positive moves to regional government. In making this request, I am aware that those legal and constitutional problems related to my Indian friends on reserves will require consultation at different levels of government and it may not be possible to include them in plans for a regional government at this time.

There is a growing desire on the part of my constituents to approach regional government and the solutions to social services, housing, roads, planning, and so on, with an awareness of the advantages and the responsibilities associated with unified action.

Having dealt with regional government, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to another matter—one that took place just a few weeks ago when we in the Kenora area had the honour and the privilege of hosting the 41st Annual Northwestern Ontario Tourist Association convention.

From your left side, Mr. Speaker, you have heard numerous complaints that the northwestern portion of this province is being neglected by the Cabinet. In this respect, I

want to read into the records for those who are here, the text of an editorial which appeared in the Kenora *Miner News*, following the Minister's visit to the NOTO convention. It was captioned, "Thanks For Coming", and it read, and I quote:

The Minister of Highways, the hon. George Gomme, last night produced statistics designed to refute charges that northern Ontario has been an ineffective part of the province. When the budgets of his department were drafted, his spirited defence of the government, delivered to an audience of 300 attending the 41st annual NOTO convention here, impressed visitors not so much with the logic offered, as with Mr. Gomme's obvious knowledge and ability. Those privileged to have met Mr. Gomme have a deep respect for a dedicated man, and hope that his visits will provide more people with the opportunity of offering friendship and hospitality.

The Minister is aware of course that requests for improvements to our roads are not demands, because we feel discriminated against, but real economic necessities required in our self help programme. On his return we hope that he will tell his colleagues of our conviction that this area has never enjoyed a greater report from Queen's Park than it has in the past two years.

How about that? Things are happening in the northwest!

This feeling comes from increasing frequent visits by members of Parliament to this area, and particularly because Premier Robarts has come to know our geographical problems and a great many citizens as well. We have received many changes and heard many promises of more during 1967 and 1968.

Not only have services of provincial departments been strengthened in the district, but more important, a modest start has been made to assist us to find new industry and to replace those that we have lost.

This editorial, Mr. Speaker, is indicative of the feeling of the northwest today. The people of northwestern Ontario shall be the first ones to point that out, that we in the area have a tremendous faith and respect for this government and our leaders. This was quite evident during our tour of northwestern Ontario last September, and I think most of the members will agree.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, all is not as desperate as the Opposition would have you

believe. That old, tired, and badly tattered cry of "the forgotten north" has fallen by the wayside and it has fallen because this Progressive Conservative government has made it so through action. As the editorial points out, in the past several years the Ontario government has taken up an increasing interest in the needs of the north—and more, Mr. Speaker, it has taken up an active interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I close, I want to draw to the attention of the House two areas that I think members might be interested in. First of all in Longlac, in northwestern Ontario—we saw this during our tour—there has recently been set up a forest harvesting operation, which in my opinion places great efficiency and stress on the much talked about multiple use concept of our forest harvesting. Here in this area—and we saw it last fall—full-length trees are being directed to either a sawmill, a pulpmill, plywood plant, and even some of the harvesting is being directed to a pole-mill at the Lakehead, thereby reaching the maximum and best use from each tree cut.

In this connection it seems to me that we are relatively unsuccessful in attracting new industry to the Sioux Lookout area where, I might add, some 65,000 cords of pulpwood are harvested annually and shipped some 250 miles to the pulp mills at the Lakehead. I would say I cannot urge too strongly that the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) should immediately do everything within his power, and in his department's power, to encourage, to plan and promote the multiple use concept of our forest harvesting in that area also.

The second point I would bring to the members' attention is the little community of Ear Falls, where the Ontario Housing Corporation has completed the construction of 100 housing units. In addition, I would point out that when members visited the northwest during the members' tour last fall, we had an opportunity to view the Ontario Water Resources Commission's ultra-modern sewer and water system which has just recently been completed.

This is all important progress in the northwest. However, during the members' tour Ed Falghren presented the members with a full outline of the government undertaking a fuller programme for the Indian people moving into centres such as Red Lake. I would join Mr. Falghren in stressing that the government must direct its attention immediately to the construction of additional homes for

these people living in the unorganized areas of northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, it was during the members' tour and our short stay in Kenora that I had the privilege to accompany the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), the Minister of Lands and Forests, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), and the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), to Minaki, a little tourist centre some 30 miles north of Kenora. We were there for an event of great significance, for there we joined the spirited citizens in the official opening ceremonies of the first provincially-assisted airstrip in this province. It is interesting to note that five months to the day from when we in this Legislature passed the new Airports Act, we were in Minaki at these opening exercises.

A 2,600-foot airstrip was truly carved out of the wilds of northwestern Ontario, one that will contribute to the progress of Minaki and of northwestern Ontario. The opening of this airstrip kicked off the commencement of a bold programme that will be of great significance to northwestern Ontario, as other airstrips are being built or planned for Dryden, Nestor Falls, Sioux Narrows, Pickle Crow, and in the isolated Indian communities of Sandy Lake, and Big Trout Lake.

Mr. Speaker, many of the airstrips being presently built and planned are being done so with the tremendous enthusiasm, vigour and co-operation of the local communities. The airstrip at Minaki became a reality because of the assistance and dedication of that community's energetic and effective leader, Rod Carey.

In Dryden we have a similar situation where a local committee headed by that sincere, aggressive, and determined individual Alex Wilson, and with the aid of municipal, provincial and federal funds, has recently completed the first stage of the development of an airstrip that will eventually be over 5,000 feet in length and play host to a regular scheduled air service linking Dryden, the hub of northwestern Ontario, with Winnipeg, Kenora and the Lakehead. This airstrip construction is more tangible evidence that this government recognizes the particular needs of communities in northern Ontario for access by air.

Earlier this afternoon each member received a small package of Hasti notes, which I hope they will use with pride, for this product, I am proud to say, is 99.9 per cent

northwestern. This is a sample of the exceptionally fine quality paper produced by the workers of the Dryden Paper Company. This firm recently commenced producing communication papers of this type. The colour printing of these cards illustrates the craftsmanship of the products produced by that nationally recognized firm of Alex Wilson Publications, a firm which defied the financial experts and proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that such associated industries can perform successfully and complement the general economy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch briefly on the subject of the pulp and paper industry of northern Ontario. Because of the tariff changes brought about by the Kennedy Round negotiations, the Ontario pulp and paper industry faces the serious problem of American paper flooding into Canada. Not only this, but the competition from south of the border is increasing rapidly, and combined with our less favourable geographic area in relationship to overseas markets you can understand why there is some concern at this time. Now, I am not suggesting that the new tariffs will be completely disadvantageous to Ontario. The tariff programme of course can work both ways. But I would stress that a great deal of understanding is going to be needed and required from the government.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Atlantic Development Board recently reports that the Maritimes enjoy lower wood fibre costs than the rest of eastern Canada. The report predicts that the Maritime output to 1975 will continue growing at an annual 6.5 per cent compared to a 2 per cent growth for that in Ontario. This, coupled with the special freight rates subsidies that the Maritimes enjoy, leaves our area of northwestern Ontario at a disadvantage.

I would point out that both these pulp and paper producing areas are equal distances from the markets. I have just raised this issue briefly because, quite frankly, there is a very large amount of uncertainty throughout the industry at this time. In any event, I will leave off at this point since I want to go into this subject in much more detail during the Budget debate.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker it is a very great honour for me to have the opportunity and responsibility of summing up the Throne Debate on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): The member is not a leader, is he?

Mr. Pitman: Is the Minister?

We will come to that in a moment. I will be talking about leadership.

I want to pass on my congratulations along with all the others who, in this group, have expressed our good wishes to you, Mr. Speaker, and to your assistant, your Deputy Speaker, your chairman of the committee of the whole.

I think one of the things which all of us approve of and hope that you will continue, is the task of improving the role of the page boys in this Chamber. I think you have done this Legislature a service and we hope that you will now begin to concern yourself with those of us who sit in this Legislature, as other members have suggested during this debate.

I would like also to say a few words about the speeches that have been made in this debate. I notice a degree of, I think, philosophy in debating in this House which I think is of high interest to those who will be reading the words that are spoken here in the years to come. I think there has been a degree of confrontation which is healthy and yet, I think, it has been with a feeling of goodwill which has characterized this Chamber and which is one of the things which we have some reason to be proud of.

I had some close association with another Legislature and I witnessed something take place there which I hope would never take place here. And that is, a sickness developed, where the degree of exacerbation in debate, the degree of confrontation, became so heated, the loss of respect for both leaders and followers became so prominent that the Legislature virtually became incapable of fulfilling its service to the people of this country.

I think that there has been a degree of concern over this matter at the federal level and that concern, I think, has developed into a better spirit. But I think that we, in this House, have something to be proud of in the way in which the debate has been carried on over the past number of weeks.

Now, I would like to say that in this debate there has been a kind of pattern—a number of themes have been coming through. I would like to comment on these themes.

I suppose the first concern is that which we have for ourselves as party members. I would suggest that the second concern we have is as a representative of a constituency in this House. I suppose thirdly we are con-

cerned—and I am certainly not putting them in order of importance, Mr. Speaker—we are concerned with ourselves as representatives of the people of Ontario.

I would like to turn to the first one first.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I thought the member had them in reverse order.

Mr. Pitman: Indeed I have, sir. Indeed I have. I wish to deal with them in terms of their importance and the amount of time I am going to give to each of them will indicate my priority.

So, just a couple of moments on what, you might call, the party struggle.

We have had a number of meetings over the last number of months. It was rather interesting that the Conservatives held a—I do not know whether it was a rally, a meeting, a convention. It happened very quietly, Mr. Speaker, one almost had to read the back pages of the Toronto papers to discover that it was taking place at all. However, since then they managed to elect that prophet of gloom and doom Alan Eagleson, who has been predicting terrible catastrophies ever since he was elected president of this party, and I would wonder that the faces on the other side would not be very glum, having heard all the things he has suggested are going to happen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Oh yes, well I was going to mention “dead from the eyeballs up and down” a few moments later but that could be placed in the same area of rhetoric.

Mr. Sopha: The member can say what he wants, but Mike Walton is scoring goals.

Mr. Pitman: I want to remind the hon. member across the way of Mr. Eagleson's comment that the provincial party organization is “so weak that the Tory government could be ousted in the 1971 election.” We on this side intend to make that prediction come true.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, you are going have to defend me from the—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Is the member saying he was right or wrong?

Mr. Pitman: I am suggesting that he is right—you are going to be ousted in the 1971 election, there is no doubt in my mind on that at all. He continues,

We have to get funds and get professional troops and “organizers” out or we lose the next election.

Then in another speech shortly after that, he went on to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the party to whom the Tories were going to lose was the New Democratic Party which I thought was an interesting comment. He simply stated that this is the party which goes out to meet the people; this is the party that is concerned and involved with their difficulties and this is the party which will replace the Tories in 1971.

Now our friends to our right had a meeting. They held their meeting in a nice quiet university town—in fact they held it at Trent University, and all I can say for that is that we certainly welcomed their presence there. Like any good academic institution which is worthy of its name we have an “academic” interest in lost causes, and I would hope they would continue to meet in university towns throughout the rest of Ontario.

I think they really did put upon the people of Ontario somewhat in the last few days when they suggested that Judy LaMarsh was going to be the leadership candidate in the coming area of excitement they expect to have in the next few weeks. I think they really could have done better than that. One wonders about the nature of leadership campaigns in the Liberal Party when really there is only one candidate as good as that candidate may be, that the rest of the party does not seem to be able to find itself able to find any successors.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Tell us what happened in Kitchener.

Mr. Pitman: I would be very glad to tell members what happened in Kitchener. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that historians will look back upon the Kitchener convention as a turning point in the fortunes of the New Democratic Party in Ontario.

It was at that point in Kitchener when the people in the New Democratic Party realized that they were choosing the next Prime Minister of this province, and I want to say this too, that this party owes a very great debt to the member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) who proved that a leadership contest in this party is a meaningful affair, not a facade, and this party proved it has the stuff to make a government by the way in which we returned as a united, strengthened force to this Legislature—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman:—ready to prove to the people of Ontario that over the next two years we will be ready to take over the government, the faltering government, of this province in 1971.

Something else happened in Kitchener, too, I might say. We realized as well out of that convention what the particular role of that party shall be, and there was, I think, a moment of insight and a clarity which came out of that leadership contest, when we recognized that our role is not only here in the Legislature, but out there in the street, and that is where we have been, and whether it means marching—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Pitman:—with the people, yes. Whether it is with the workers at Proctor-Silex, or the grape growers in California, we are going to be out there with them against the government. In that world we have made our position very clear, and I would suggest once again that the member for Riverdale has, you might say, played a very prominent role in developing that insight, that point, that emphasis, on the role of this party in the next two years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: A comment came from my right, Mr. Speaker. It is rather interesting that our friends to the right would like to be on the street but somehow they do not feel that it is quite respectable. They do not feel that they really can walk in those picket lines and therefore they just cannot bring themselves to marching with the people in their support against the problems which these people have.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I seem to have roused the forces slightly and I apologize to you. I want to read to you, though, a comment made by a young person in a book "Our Generation" which is very often distributed to members in this House. I think this points up in a more philosophic way the position of this party.

The issues which divide the political parties in this country are artificial—questions of management, rather than basic policy.

I disagree to some extent; I do not think that is entirely true, but this is a danger which this party for one recognizes.

Electoralism is fundamentally ritualistic. The important questions of the day, the nature of the growing liberal totalitarianism, the growing distance between government and people—

Incidentally, a problem which members on the other side are able to see, but are never able to recognize in their importance.

—the lack of content in our lives and the purposelessness of our society, racialism, the arms race, and so on, are not usually put before the people. This is a phenomenon characteristic of our type of society.

The profound crisis of our society is not, and cannot, be explained to the people by our political parties because it cannot be put within a programme for the democratic seizure of administrative power which has no room for changing the nature of power politics. Even when fundamental social questions are put, electoralism forces them to be put according to a traditional pattern, to be applauded not because they are worthy of applause, but because applause has always been accorded to them.

The electoral system in a consenting neo-capitalist society serves the purpose of creating a feeling of identification and a sense of excitement in this largely fails in what it seeks to do. Politicians and opinion makers exert strenuous efforts to affix attention on the ritual act itself, in this case the casting of a vote.

Voting, as a result, becomes an isolated magic act set apart from the rest of life and ceases to have any political or social meaning except as an instrument by which the *status quo* is preserved.

Electoral pageantry serves the same purpose as a circus—the beguilement of a populace. The voter is reduced to voting for dazzling smiles, clean teeth, smooth voices, and firm handshakes, playing the role of a shaking puppet manipulated by the party image makers.

Now we, Mr. Speaker, have decided that we shall create in this Legislature and beyond it the sharpness of issues, the degree of confrontation which will make democratic life in this society meaningful, and this will be our role for the next two years as we march toward the government of this province.

I would like to move now to the second concern within the pattern which has emerged in this Legislature—and that is our role as members of the provincial Parliament in this Legislature.

Now I am not going to deal with it *in toto*, I think that the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), and particularly the remarks that were made last week by the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), and although one might disagree with the ferocity of his articulation at that time, I am sure you must have agreed with what he had to say about the role of the member for the provincial Parliament in this House.

I would like to come to one particular area, and that is the role of this Legislature. I want to leave all these matters which have to do with research and office matters and secretaries and all the paraphernalia outside this Legislature to others.

One of the things which brings this to my attention is, the fact—and I think that as we sit here today we are very, very much aware of the fact—that tomorrow evening we are introducing into this Legislature the television camera. Now we have already introduced television cameras, Mr. Speaker, as our members know, in order to take part in the pageantry of the Throne opening, or at least the opening session and the Throne Speech, but this is perhaps the first time that television will be used to deal with the real cut and thrust of this Legislature—at least it should be the cut and thrust of this Legislature—but instead we are bringing it in for the set piece.

Now I think that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) is a handsome man who will undoubtedly make a good account of himself before the television camera, and I suspect that the show itself may—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): We learn something every day. He is a handsome man.

Mr. Pitman: I want to say that I suspect that this show will probably receive an Emmy as a horror show sometime later in the winter with all the balloons that have gone up over the last few weeks turn out to be true. However, I suppose we will probably have a couple of educational television programmes a week later, which may be able to correct the balance in the province.

But I want to deal rather seriously on this whole question of the introduction of television into this chamber, because I think it has implications which I am not sure the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has considered, and I am not sure that all of us have really taken account of. Right now in the country to the south of us, there is a very major debate going on about the role of television in

public life. It is not just a play thing. It is not just another window on the public as some people tend to see it. It is a very, very demanding media, and right now there is the suggestion in the United States that, in essence, the television camera and the television media are moulding politics and public affairs rather than reporting public affairs.

One only has to remember the 1961 presidential election when a great many experts suggested that it was the television performance of John F. Kennedy over that of Richard M. Nixon which brought about the defeat of Mr. Nixon on that occasion.

A great many have suggested in 1968 that it was the television coverage of the events which took place, those ghastly events which took place in Chicago, which created such a hopeless situation for Hubert Humphrey that he was never able to catch up before the elections took place in November.

Indeed, the President who now occupies the White House may very well have the television media to thank for what took place at that time, but that may even be just a small part of it.

On top of that you have a debris of disillusionment, bitterness and anger among the people of the United States towards the whole political process. It is the whole political party and its role in society that I think that the people of the United States are particularly concerned about; the way in which television is indeed changing, and changing radically, what goes on within the Legislatures of the states and at the federal level.

What does that have to say to us here in this Legislature? I think it has a great deal to say. For one thing the television media is one which demands participation. It demands a high degree of involvement, and I suggest to you, sir, that bringing in television cameras and training them on the Provincial Treasurer for 30 minutes, or however long it is going to take, is just about the most unimaginative way that we could have introduced a television into this Legislature. I say, in spite of the fact that I am sure that the Provincial Treasurer will give an orderly and interesting performance, and the expectations of the Ontario public, will undoubtedly provide him with a very good audience, none the less, I suggest that this form is simply not good enough. If we are expected to use television as a means of involving the people of Ontario in the public affairs as it affects this Legislature.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Oh, they will get the member for Owen Sound.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest to you that the proper way to use television in this Chamber would be to have it here constantly, not for live shows, but constantly through the video tape recorders, so that the video tape recorders would be there to portray whatever takes place. The operators would have the same role in the editing of what took place, and went out from this Chamber, as the gentlemen of the press who sit above you at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the television medium can play a very real role in making this place an exciting, relevant Legislature. For example, I would suggest changes in a number of areas. I am sure I express the views of at least some members of this Legislature in suggesting that the long, extraneous "kitchen-sink" debates that go on regarding the Throne and Budget Debates are simply no longer relevant in this kind of a Legislature. While the members say "hear, hear," I hope they are willing to accept the other aspect of what I have to say.

I would be very happy to see the individual members in the Throne Debate limited to 30 minutes if we were able to transpose the kind of involvement which should take place in this Legislature to Item 1, the estimates. In other words, instead of having a major speaker speaking on Item One, and then the rest of us sort of nit-picking at various areas in the estimates, why could we not have Item One as a place where individuals of parties could take part in the debate with the individual Minister and have a real exchange, real involvement? I would suggest that even when we have Throne speeches they should be 30-minute Throne speeches and that it should be incumbent upon the member to inform the Minister, whose department is going to be discussed, and it should be felt to be incumbent on the part of the Minister to be present when that discussion is taking place, over the speech that is being made.

This is no criticism for the Ministers who, I would suggest to you, sir, do remain in this House with a high degree of regularity. I speak of the Minister of Correctional Institutions who is here a great deal of the time, but unfortunately when the member for Scarborough was making an extremely searching, profound commentary on The Department of Social and Family Services, it was the Min-

ister for Correctional Services who was in his seat.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member will permit a question. In view of the hon. member's remarks regarding rules on supply if, in conjunction with what he is saying, would he agree with a limitation on total supply?

Mr. Pitman: I think the member is suggesting that we should have some limitations. I would want to discuss it with him and with you, Mr. Speaker, before making any comment of that nature, as to what the limitation would be.

I think one of the things which limits the effect of the debate is the fact that, for example, we spent about three weeks on the estimates of The Department of Highways, and one day on The Department of Municipal Affairs. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that you put them side by side. Where are the real problems emerging in this province in an urban society? In The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I feel it is incumbent upon myself, in view of what I am just going to say, that I yield the floor, because one of the things that I was going to suggest is that if we really want to get a debate in this place, a real interchange of opinions, let us adopt the congressional system of yielding the floor. I want to say to you that if we get on television and start to yell to each other across the floor, we will look like a bunch of lunatic yahoos.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, but one never knows whether the other guy is going to cut or thrust.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): In accordance with the hon. members as to yielding, I wonder if the hon. member will yield? I suggest to him that since three weeks were taken up with the estimates of The Department of Highways and only one day with Municipal Affairs, why did not the Opposition think it was important enough to take more time on Municipal Affairs?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It took us three weeks for Highways because we couldn't get a sensible answer from the Minister without persistent questioning.

Mr. Pitman: One of the things that would help, I think, would be a planning of the esti-

mates throughout the entire session. Very often, for example, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in the hot days of July when both government members and Opposition members are scarcely able to fulfill their roles in an effective way dealing with The Department of Municipal Affairs. The first estimate to come up was The Department of Highways, and I would suggest that being a new House there was no way of gauging just exactly how the session was going to be planned; there was no indication of any planning by the government in bringing the estimates down in an orderly fashion. So I think this is a perfectly logical way of dealing with it as things now come into this Legislature.

I return to my point, Mr. Speaker; I think it would be well if we had some trial of the system of "yielding the floor" because if we are going to have television in here in a meaningful way, let us give it some kind of meaning. By that I mean, some kind of involvement, some kind of interplay, so that the people of Ontario can see the juxtaposition of different views. So that people can see either the logic of the government, or the demands of the Opposition in some kind of a context.

I suggest to you that this kind of debate that we have here, is not a sensible context in which to introduce this medium. I would suggest, too, that it is extremely important that we do this. A moment ago I mentioned the feelings on the part of the people in the United States that television has badly distorted their political system. Well, we are an institution in this province, Mr. Speaker, and we live in an age of, what we might say is an institutional revolt.

I was rather interested to hear the remarks of Dean Smythe, of York University, who was speaking some time ago on the whole problem of discontent, particularly youthful discontent, and he mentioned the fact that some 300 or 400 years ago we had what can be called a revolt against—I suppose one could say—political institutions. Then, of course, previous to that, a revolt against religious institutions. And we have had, in this century, a revolt against economic institutions, as they suppress the will of people, and he would say that what we really find in our schools—we find this in the church, we find it in labour unions and in corporations—is a revolt against institutions themselves; all institutions.

Mr. MacDonald: Even in the Tory Party.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, it has even gone as far as the institution of the Tory Party. And this is healthy, Mr. Speaker, if this kind of ferment can be channelled. But I suggest to you that if the effect of television is to create, first, an emotional response to this chamber; if the feeling of the people is that this place is completely disoriented in expressing what they wish as the representation of their views, as a means of conveying information, as a means of conducting public business, then we can be very sure that there will be a negative response to this Legislature. And I, for one—and I feel that I am speaking for all of those in this House who have a great deal of respect for this Legislature—I would be very sorry to see this take place.

As well as that I would like to see the television medium, in a sense, perform a balance about what goes on over your head, Mr. Speaker. I have been amazed as I have come into this Legislature about the lack of concern—the lack of real concern—on the part of the press for what goes on down here—the real drama of what goes on in this Chamber, the characters that inhabit this Chamber—and I wonder about it. I wonder that the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the member say character or characters?

Mr. Pitman: I am not referring to the reporters, sir, as much as the editors, who simply—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not chicken out now!

Mr. Pitman: I am not going to chicken out. I can assure the hon. Minister I am going right along with it. One of the problems that the press has, I think, is that they always have a fear that they may drop down from up above to over in the corner there. I think that has been a fear that has been expressed on many occasions.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It is not a fear; it is a hope.

Mr. Pitman: One of the things which I think is most inappropriate is the degree to which the press gallery is a stepping stone to some part of the government service. We saw the oldest member of the press gallery gobbled up by the educational television department last spring, and some years ago perhaps one of the finest education writers in North America, Bascomb St. John, was gobbled up by The Department of Education. He was providing the people of Ontario with an amazing service indicating what was really

going on in education in this jurisdiction. And he has gone forever; we never see him. The service became completely—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It is a Machiavellian scheme!

Mr. Pitman: I am not going to suggest that the government is undermining the press of the nation by gobbling up—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We recognize talent; that is all.

Mr. Pitman: Well, the problem is, if I might answer the Minister, that we are all corrupting the press. And I am going to say something now which I hope will not be regarded as a criticism of all that is being done here. But we have just got to stop reading speeches to one another. We have just got to stop it. I think we are carrying on an incredible waster of time, reading speeches back and forth. And I suggest that if we do this on television, we are gone. We will look like complete idiots if we stand here, reading speeches for hours on end, back and forth across this aisle. I would suggest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for having initiated this particular aspect of the debate, and it appears to me that we are getting into a degree of involvement here this afternoon which perhaps has not been properly structured.

In fact, for a moment the other night in the Confederation debate, there was a degree of back-and-forth action in this Legislature which really gave, I think, a degree of relevancy and point which I had not seen for quite some time. I think that this is what we want.

Now, as I said to the Minister a moment ago, we corrupt the press. We bury them in paper releases, just bury them. I have never seen anything like it, the amount of material which is churned out to send up to the press gallery, assuming that they cannot listen and that they cannot write. And then they corrupt us because what we do is we read our press releases to each other. So the whole thing becomes an evil circle which we do not seem to get out of and which we do not seem to be able to reform.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Mr. Speaker, will the member permit a question?

Following this description the member had of the television watching the Opposition—particularly, concentrating on the estimates,

and those on the government front benches, I wonder if he could take a moment to describe the role of the government back bencher under such a television performance?

Mr. Pitman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am only too delighted to have this opportunity of talking about the government back bencher and I do this in the very serious and sincere way in which the question has been asked.

I think this would encourage a degree of criticism on the part of the back benchers which would, I think be of a healthy nature and serve the interest of government in this province. I think that it would be a matter of the government back benchers putting up or shutting up and I think it would provide them with a role and a degree of relevancy which they would perhaps achieve in no other way. I think it is an excellent idea to do exactly that. Look at the coverage the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) would have got if the television cameras had been in here on the evening on which he gave us his exposition on all the failures of the health services provided by this province.

I think, once again, it would provide—I would hope it would provide—a degree of honesty and candour about the reporting in this House, because by the time the events of this House go through the sieve of the press gallery and the editors and so on, what comes out in the newspaper, you know, is a pretty long way from what really takes place in this Legislature and—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Debate, as distinct from the estimates, is the only place where the government back bencher can operate.

Mr. MacDonald: Why can the member not get in on the estimates?

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister's desire to see the estimates go through as quickly as possible but it seems to me that we have two functions in this Chamber, do we not? One function surely, is that of carrying out public business. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this function has been well served in this Legislature. We have had no flag debates. We have had no pipeline debates here, which have brought to a complete grinding stop, the work of this Legislature. I do not think the government can complain one iota about the degree of co-operation which it receives from this side of the House in getting through any legislation which is put before this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because it is good legislation.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Have you been receiving any letters these last few days?

Mr. Pitman: The point I think is that this would give the Opposition back bencher a role to play in the second function—informing the public. He should have a role to play during the estimates. You have local problems that have to be brought to the attention of the Minister. You surely have a philosophy of what should be done under The Department of Health and under The Department of Agriculture and The Provincial Treasurer's Department. The point is, if the hon. member for Carleton East (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) sees the back bencher's role simply as sitting and providing, on occasion, the votes necessary to plunge the estimate through the House then, of course, television will reveal this as well. And I think we will receive some very interesting reactions from the people outside when they see just what takes place in a Legislature like this.

Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to move into this area with quite the degree of minuteness which I seem to have done, but I do suggest to you one final point and it is one I do not want to carry too far because it has been discussed again and again, and that is the question period in this House. I do suggest to you, sir, that you would have far fewer questions and ones which, as has already been stated, would be urgent, if they were asked orally in this House and the Minister had an opportunity to answer them. With the greatest respect, sir, I want to say to you that the question period has two roles. One, of course, is to gain information. But I think it also has the role, and one which it certainly would have under the television camera, and that is to reveal the degree of competence of the Minister it concerns.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Or incompetence!

Mr. Pitman: And I think this is important, that the people of Ontario have the feeling

of confidence that the people who are at the top of each department are competent. I am reminded of a recent book which describes The Peter Principle, and which says that everybody rises to its own level of incompetence. I do not want to go into that, but I do think that the people of Ontario have a right to know the degree of sensitivity and intelligence and grasp of the department in question. But I would suggest to the House that this would provide a degree of drama and would provide you with control because you would be able to decide on the spot whether that question was of sufficient urgency to make necessary that reply. Along with this, of course, would have to be a much quicker answering of questions which were put on the order paper.

I have one more point, Mr. Speaker, before the hour; I would suggest that another way by which we could set up the juxtaposition of views and make this a place of involvement would be on Ministerial statements. We have Ministerial statements taking place nearly every day, and one of the things that does not take place in this House—but I think it should take place—is that there should be a real opportunity for reaction. As the Minister makes the statement I think it should be incumbent upon the Minister to inform the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party that the statement is being made and what the statement is. And there should be an immediate opportunity on the part of each of these groups to state their position in regard to that statement. Immediately the people of Ontario would know just where each party stood—

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): And this demonstrates the level of incompetence.

Mr. Pitman: Well, that might very well be revealed as well, but I think it would have a salutary effect upon this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member wants to be the government without getting elected.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 3, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Monday, March 3, 1969

Conclusion of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Singer, Mr. White	1753
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1795

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1969

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, at the supper hour we were discussing our roles as members in this Legislature and the effect which the introduction of television might have.

I would like now to turn to another subject which I hope will lay the groundwork for what I have to say in a more specific way about the functions of this government. This has been called a taxation session, one at which the full question of how we raise taxes, from whom we raise taxes, and how much we shall raise, will receive a considerable amount of concern by all of us here. One of the greatest advantages of the taxation session, I think, is that it brings up the whole question of political philosophy in a very pointed way. It is very easy for a government to be all things to all men when there is no great concern over how much is being raised and where the money is being spent, but when the crunch comes, when a government has to determine priorities, when it has to search out methods to hold the line, to make sometimes unpopular decisions, that is when I think a government shows its true philosophy.

I would suggest to this government, Mr. Speaker, through you, that this session I think could be an extremely useful one in determining just exactly what kind of a government we have. We are told that we have to hold the line. What is meant by "holding the line" in this particular situation? We on this side have stated our position quite clearly. We believe in the expansion of the public sector, the necessity of that expansion. We have indicated that we are willing to raise the necessary taxes, but before this is done we have suggested that a reformation of the tax base is necessary. I am sure that all members may simply read the speech of our leader, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), to see exactly what we mean by changing the tax base, exactly what we mean by determining the kind of taxes

which we would raise. But we also are concerned about the misuse of taxes, and throughout this debate the New Democratic Party, I think, has put forward its position on how those taxes should be spent.

I think one of the worst examples of misuse of taxation is in two areas—one in social and family services and the other in health services. I do not want to repeat that magnificent speech this afternoon by the member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick), that penetrating analysis of what we are doing both to people and what we are doing in relation to the misuse of human resources, what we are doing in allowing these gaps to exist, what we are doing in giving over to the private sector, to private groups in our society, the job that should be done by government, what we are doing by unco-ordinated and wasteful system of social services. I am not going to repeat those comments at all here this evening; I simply state to you that one of the things that does anger people is when they see this kind of wastage.

I am delightful to see that the member for London South, the new Minister of Revenue (Mr. White), has turned to the guaranteed annual income as the panacea. I hope he has a little bit more success in securing this for us than he had with improving the workmen's compensation board in the speech he gave last year, which also gave, I think, an excellent indication of the direction the government should go. But this surely is a direction in which we must turn if we are going to deal with the whole question of human resources.

There is nothing which I think is more debilitating than seeing the penny-counting which goes on day after day after day. And I have the greatest sympathy for those who work as employees of The Department of Social and Family Services, who see the needs—who see how they could, if they had the time, be out consulting with people, offering them advice, providing them with counselling—but instead find themselves adding up these interminable budgets, month after month and week after week. This is what I call a misuse of human resources

as well as a misuse of taxes, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is an example where we could move in a massive way to deal with that kind of a problem.

We have already seen in debates that have taken place in this House, the misallocation of human resources, and particularly tax sources, in relation to health services. We have huge gaps. I am not, as well, going into the whole question of Medicare, or the position which the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has taken in this regard which has been dealt with, I think, quite adequately—perhaps more than adequately as far as the Prime Minister is concerned, during the constitutional debate that took place last year. But there is another example of a government which is unwilling to make real decisions in the effective use of tax sources.

As well as that, of course, we have also suggested that the main problem is one of philosophy. I am not going to try to delve deeply into philosophy here. We have our resident philosopher, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) sitting in the back row, and he jumps easily from Aristotle to Plato. To show the level on which I am, I am clutching in my hand the latest bulletin from the Canadian Manufacturers Association. I want to read a statement here, which I think to some extent summarizes those who sit on the other side. It is a description of what capitalism and socialism are:

Capitalism is that form of economy which is based upon an awareness of the power of the profit motive in commanding the actions of the individual.

Socialist theory denies that power, or when that denial is shown to be observed, insists as an alternative, that a man's actions can be motivated just as strongly or even more strongly by a desire to benefit society at large.

I accept that. I am proud of that definition which comes from a source which one would hardly expect clearly and accurately to define the differences between those two philosophies.

For existence of the profit motive can scarcely be denied. It is so much a part of the human make-up to work for our own welfare and that of those whom we hold dear, that supporting arguments are needless. Frankly, every action from our cradle to our grave is dominated by this primary urge—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Conditioned reflexes.

Mr. Pitman: Indeed, conditioned reflexes as the member for Lakeshore suggests.

But I want to stress this final paragraph:

That there also exists in each of us a desire to do things for the benefit of society should not be discarded either.

It certainly does exist but—and here is the rub:

Since the beginning of the world there have been few men indeed of whom it could honestly be said that they put the welfare of mankind before that of themselves and their families.

I suggest to you that if that is true, and I have a great deal of suspicion that that necessarily must be true, it is the role of this political party to educate the people of this province that the social welfare has its place, and that indeed there are more than a few people willing to put the needs of society against their own individual needs.

I meet people day by day, and when they come to talk about this government, their criticism constantly is: Why do you not follow your philosophy? You say that private incentive, individual incentive, is the thing which makes the economic system go round. Presumably they have been taught to believe that this is the philosophy of this government. And yet, Mr. Speaker, they continue to increase taxes and now the cry is heard, You are destroying individual incentive, you are destroying productivity. And because there is no overall philosophy on the part of this government, because they are unwilling to concede the needs of the public sector, this criticism is entirely valid for this government, entirely valid because certainly there has been no educational process on the part of this government to convince the people of this province that indeed our society is a fabric in which a failure or a flaw in any part will destroy the whole.

We have done nothing to indicate to the people of Ontario that the needs in this province are social needs; that indeed, for the next 20 to 25 years the happiness of the people in this province will depend far more on what happens in the public section than what happens in the private sector. Wherever you look, the areas which are causing the greatest area of distress re pollution—air and water pollution—urban chaos, and the transportation problems that we face around our cities; the urban sprawl, the need for service in order to make life even bearable in some suburban regions. We have emphasized the problem of health services, the filling in of all those gaps that have been left by this government—making

this health service a dynamic thing which provides preventive opportunities instead of just being an ambulance that is trying to pick people up.

The whole idea of the educational fabric which goes right from the cradle right to the grave virtually, this is this government's greatest failure, Mr. Speaker. It has not developed a philosophy of government which will coincide with what it is doing in a taxation area.

This is why now, when the whole problem of taxation comes up, it is hold the line and dig in your heels because the people of Ontario will not accept more taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that the people of Ontario will not accept more taxes if they feel that these taxes are being effectively used, if they feel that human resources are being effectively allocated, and if they feel that there is an equitable tax base. I suggest that until the government does those three things, it is going to be in very serious trouble.

We want goals. This province wants goals. And these goals I suggest to you, sir, are essentially in the public sector. Until this government will accept that fact they will continue to fight these mock battles and will carry on this facade of the financial crisis.

I hope that in the next few weeks, that is directly after tomorrow night, Mr. Speaker, we will have a very real opportunity to discuss the whole question of the political philosophy as it relates to the kind of taxation situation that we find ourselves in in the next few days.

I would like now to turn to the other area which is very close to this political philosophy, dealing with the problem of youth. Youth has been talked about a great deal in this House over the last number of days. I think we are extremely concerned and extremely nervous about the way young people look at our society; the way young people are looking at institutions in that society. They have every reason to be critical and to feel this way. We have been extremely fortunate that our young people have not, I think, wrought any kind of destructive rampages as we have seen in the United States and in Montreal.

On the whole, the student leaders in this province have been responsible. I think they have attempted to be reasonable and sensible, but I suggest to you, sir, that unless our society is more responsive and we are willing to modify and change these institutions we, too, will face the same kind of situation.

I was interested to read an article on the whole question of student protest which I think are well worth our attention:

The studies made of activists at the university and at high school level reveal that they generally come from affluent middle and upper middle class families who permit free discussion and encourage liberal ideas. Surprisingly, in spite of their heavy involvement in the movement, the students are often academically talented and frequently make the honours list.

In Ontario high schools the activists are most often found among academic students. They thrive in schools with selective admission policies, and with the reputation for academic achievement. Intellectual, highly critical (especially of arbitrary regulations) and restless, they constantly irritate by seeking confrontations with authoritarian teachers and principals. Kenniston describes the activists as members of a generation raised on the corrosive scepticism of *Mad* magazine, taught paradoxically by television to be sceptical of commercial acclaims, reared during their pre-adolescent and adolescent years in the era of togetherness which denied but did not conceal the rifts in American life. Thoughtful, articulate, and principled young men and women, taught from an early age by most of their families that there was more to life than success and remuneration, they began in late adolescence to challenge the impersonality, dehumanization, over-organization and commercialization of American life.

The description aptly fits the Canadian scene. Dr. Corey of Queen's University suggests:

The main root of the distress is the severe shaking-up of the society in which we live, the students are responding to an unpredictable and bewildering future in which the only certainty is change. In an attempt to adapt, the students have developed new styles of living—the beats, for one style, the hippies for another, and the activists a third.

Society has compounded the problem by prolonging the learning period, developing a more sophisticated group, more vocal, more searching, less receptive to authority. At the same time, society has provided them with greater and greater leisure, because it needs them less in an increasingly automated labour market.

Fundamentally, the activists are protesting the establishment, the adult group that gives them a feeling of being put down every time they want to speak up on

important issues. The establishment is perceived in bureaucracy that puts organization ahead of people, in school systems that are reducing pupils to numbers in a computer, in teachers and principals who shred student dignity in public or in private by demanding a pass to the john or denigrating teenage manners, music, and modern-day heroes.

Kenniston adds that activists are protesting hypocrisy on all sides, the hypocrisy of parents who profess to support racial equality, but who react violently when their children date those of another religion or colour.

Hypocrisy of teachers who pretend to support democracy while operating rigidly authoritarian classrooms. The hypocrisy of principals who set up toy governments from whom they accept suggestions on minor projects while continuing to run the school to suit the staff.

If the unrest that is rapidly linking the activists in the colleges and universities across Canada is any indication—

And this is what I want to bring to the attention of the Legislature:

—then the secondary schools are in for a period of upheaval. A recent survey conducted by the editors of *Nation's Schools* reveals that 45 per cent of school administrators fully expect student power to erupt in high school campuses this year.

“The high schools will become a special target simply because they are a common target and because they exemplify the kind of bureaucratic institution in which many students have lost faith. Teachers are the very symbols of parental domination from which young people wish to be free. Principals as agents of manipulation and control are seen as the source of irksome and sometimes dehumanizing regulations. Central office superintendents and administrators are the faceless organizers of the system that has deliberately concealed its aims, obscured the perception of stark reality, keeping students in a perpetual fog, never quite distinguishing true from false.

“Are the activists in sufficient numbers to disturb seriously our high schools? ‘We submit the proposition,’ says James Cass, writing in the August 17 issue of *Saturday Review*, ‘it is not the extremists, that small band of anarchists and nihilists, who present the most serious challenges to the academy. It is the non-radical student, receptive to new ideas and sensitivity to

the changing world around him who has the power to bring down the academic house’.”

And there, Mr. Speaker, is the problem that we face.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Does that writer have any specific solutions? We all know the problems. We would like to have some solutions.

Mr. Pitman: He did go on to some solutions and I would be very glad to mention one or two of them. I am sorry I was not prepared to go on in this way, but he does suggest a number of areas. The extension of far more participatory democracy in the high schools is one of the solutions he suggests, and he gives an example of Gloucester high school where they develop new concepts of house government; where they develop policy cabinets involving students.

The whole question revolves around the development of structures within the high schools. I think there are people of goodwill as principals, people of goodwill as teachers, and certainly I think most of the students do not want to see disrupted high schools. At the same time they are unwilling to accept the dehumanizing process; they are unwilling to see their own personalities being undermined by something which they regard as inherently evil and wrong, and which even the adults will agree is wrong.

I am sure the hon. Minister would not want his son or daughter to have to ask for a pass to go to the john as it suggests here, or to undergo in this day and age a great many small and picayune types of regulations which exist in many high schools.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, are these changes not coming about?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Will that Minister make some regulations like that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On the contrary—

Mr. Sopha: How about the phones for the visitors?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On the contrary, we are away ahead of some of the schools; and I ask the hon. member, does he not really believe that some of these changes are taking place?

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I was going to mention this, but I was just going to suggest that here we are in an area where I think the question of change is one of relativity, and the change

is not relative to the speed of the demands of the students. And this brings me to the very things I want to go on with—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Too little and too late.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The story of this administration!

Mr. Pitman: —the whole problem is of building any structures and communications. Sure, there are schools in this province in which there will be no student unrest, usually because the principal is aware. I think in most cases the principal has the most difficult job in our educational system today, by far the most difficult.

He stands in the middle with the needs of society coming at him from one direction, and the demands of the parents, who in many cases do not know what to do with their children, coming from another direction. Above him is the administration, with all their demands upon him, and there is the staff, too, which is pushing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is tough for the parents too.

Mr. Pitman: It is tough, it is really tough, but I would suggest to you that it is not so tough that we cannot do something about it. I would suggest that one of the major areas we must consider is some way of upgrading and retraining the secondary school principals in this province, especially at the secondary school level. I say this in no way of being over-critical of these principals. Rather, in a way of recognizing the tremendous pressures under which they operate, and the needs that we have. We recognize the need to upgrade people who are dealing with technology, of dealing with machinery. We say that an engineer cannot remain as an engineer for more than five years without being upgraded and retrained. And yet, we seem to believe that we can operate in these areas where we are dealing with people, and that no change need take place.

You know the old adage, that kids are always the same, that kids are the same as they were 20 years ago, and why cannot they treat my children in the same way that they treated me. Of course, we assume that kids do not change, and they do change, they change radically. They are living in a society in which the television set and Marshall McLuhan have all the answers, but certainly kids are very, very different. As Lester Pearson said, "It is tough being a kid today." I think we desperately need a process—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Was it tough in your day?

Mr. Pitman: Was it tough in my day? I do not think it was as tough as it is today. I do not think that there were the pressures in those days that there are today on young people. I do not. I think that the maturation process is speeded up by our media, it is speeded up by the pressures now of employment which are on these kids and the tremendous number of decisions which they have to make. For example, when I went to school nobody asked me what course I had to have at grade 9, you just went through the same keyhole, you were pushed through. Okay, so you got through, and you were pushed out.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: There is too much freedom.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I do not accept the conclusion which the hon. member has made that there is too much freedom. I think rather there are responsibilities which we have not yet been able to develop young people to accept, and realize the freedoms that they have and to use these freedoms effectively. I think this is one of the major difficulties we face.

I want to go on to this whole question of training, and I think this is an area which The Department of Education surely cannot slough off, as not being one of its responsibilities. It does not choose the principals, but it does train principals, they have a principals course. Unfortunately this principals course is concerned with teaching them how to timetable, teaching them how to run a nice quiet ship and how to push a great deal of paper around. But, I suggest to you, sir, that it does not teach them enough about the kind of society which is affecting those kids that are in those schools. It does not give enough information about the structures by which this communication can take place within these schools. So often it is a matter of structural deficiency. There is good will on all sides, but there is no effective way of getting the communication to go back and forth from the administration to the students, through the councils which should be really effective and really operating. These structures simply do not exist. I suggest to you that this is a role that The Department of Education could well take in hand, because it had better be done, and it had better be done quickly, Mr. Speaker, because unless it is we will be in a very serious situation.

Although I understand all the reasons for the defence mechanism that took place last fall, it saddened me very greatly when the

headmasters of Ontario decided to put that terrible ad in the newspapers. It said that student unrest in Ontario was being caused by all kinds of activists and newspaper editors and various other people. I think this was extremely unfortunate, Mr. Speaker; I think this was an over-reaction to what was essentially a problem which is found throughout the world.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I might also deal with the low calibre of teacher training. The whole area of teacher training is, I think, a crucial one. A few minutes ago we were talking about the whole question of priorities and the establishment of priorities in our society. I would suggest to you, sir, that if there is a priority in education right now, it is in the area of teacher education, and yet this is the area which is being held up, this is the area which is delayed, this is the area where certainly the crisis point seems to be at the moment.

We have just heard that there is going to be a shortfall—we have not been able to get any exact figures from the Minister—of perhaps 2,000 teachers in the coming fall at the secondary level. Now, this is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, when you have 2,000 teachers in your secondary schools who have not had the minimum amount of training which is considered to be adequate by the standards of The Department of Education at the present time. They are on letters of permission, apparently in order to get into the summer courses. Unless we are all willing to accept the limitations of the summer course, we will simply have no course and we will have people in classrooms who have had no training whatsoever. I think this is a very serious problem today when we are talking about the tremendous pressures in education and the need to upgrade our whole system of education. Today, when we are talking about the incredible advances in numbers of subjects and choices of subjects, in timetabling patterns, and the difficulties of including all this new philosophy of education of the Hall-Dennis report into our system, at this point in time surely this is when the teacher becomes the most important person in the entire setup. And yet we have done nothing specific about teacher education, or what we are doing is being done so slowly that it is almost imperceptible.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is an area where one has to fault The Department of Education, and fault them, I think, very seriously. We have a situation

this year where, in some of the teachers' colleges which are normally capable of accommodating 300 students, we have over 500 students. What an anachronism at a time when we are talking about individualized education—at the teachers' college level the students are getting less and less individual treatment than ever before. The teachers' colleges are all over-crowded, they are massively understaffed; at the same time that we say the teacher is the important person, we find ourselves in a situation where the teachers' college staffs do not know where they are at.

They are told they may be going into the university but they are not told whether they are going to go or not, or where they are going to fit in. At the same time their salary level, which previously has been linked with inspectors, has now gone down. They are not maintaining their pace along with those with whom they were previously linked. They find themselves hopelessly overworked. They, in many cases, are doing some very exciting experimentation but they find themselves overwhelmed by the numbers which exist in these teachers' colleges.

What are we going to do about it? Well, there is a report that came out in 1966 called the McLeod report on teacher education. We have delayed, we have hamstrung this report. I think by next fall there are going to be only two of the teachers' colleges in the universities; about the others, there is no decision as to whether they are going to be put into universities or not. There is even talk they are going to try to make bigger teacher education institutions instead of trying to individualize at this level. They are talking about making larger institutions now. I think this is a backward step. No one misconceives that there are not difficulties.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): What suggestions has the member got?

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Let us have something positive on it.

Mr. Pitman: I have already suggested—

Mr. MacDonald: Implement your own report—it is as simple as that.

Mr. Pitman: —that you read your own report. And what I am suggesting to you is that you make it a priority.

I tried to set the stage for my first remarks here, Mr. Speaker; I am sorry if I did not get through. At a time when you are dealing with the tax crunch, the problem is to set

priorities, and if you cannot set priorities you have no right to govern. That is what it is all about. What I am suggesting is where you have a department which wants to build 18 colleges of applied arts and technology, which is committed to expansion of universities, and which goes into a county board system which means it has to provide services to every rural area in the province, and which has committed itself to a very expensive educational television system, it is ending up with a situation where it does not know where its priorities are. It does not put teachers in classes where they are capable of handling the problems of the Hall-Dennis report, it will ill behoove us to have the most expensive educational television system in Canada. That is the point I make.

I would suggest that as well as setting a priority for teacher education, surely it is a matter also of dealing effectively with the whole question of teacher education, the kind of teacher education they are getting. As with the principals, I suggest to you, sir, that the present course, particularly the one-year course, does not fit a young person to go into a classroom with the kind of security that he must have if he is going to carry out the kind of individualization which the Hall-Dennis report and various other reports have suggested. There is absolutely no way by which a teacher one year out of high school can feel that kind of self-assurance which allows him to deal with young people who are in ferment and would enable him to handle in a humble way the demands which young people have of him.

I suggest to you that this is a major problem in helping them to understand themselves, helping them to understand the ways of young people. All of these, I suggest, are a major priority. As we go about our work today, we are not dealing with that priority, we are sending young people into the classrooms unprepared, and here at the secondary level we are sending maybe 2,000 without even a six-week course in the summer.

What happened to the system that was suggested by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation—the idea of providing interns, of letting people take a four-week course in the summer and then testing them in the school for a year. It seems to me this does a number of things. It solves the problem, first, of providing more bodies in your classrooms—trained, at least to some extent. As well as that, it provides something else, too. It provides a new recognition on the part of teachers that there must be a team

concept within a school, that teachers have been badly used, their human resources have been badly misallocated, you might say, and that they have been doing jobs which are not teaching roles. They are about the highest paid teachers in the history of mankind but instead of finding a teacher role and providing interns and training them at the same time, or providing teacher aids and teacher assistants, we simply drag along and try to blunder through. I suggest it scarcely behooves a province like Ontario, this province with a place to stand, to be carrying on in this fashion with its educational system.

As well as that, we do not teach young people how to create their own curriculum. We are expecting young people, teachers, to go out and to create the educational atmosphere in the classrooms, to be able to organize their curriculum as they deal with young people in front of them. But they have no training to do it; they are not trained to do this kind of thing. They do not have the maturity which at least four years in the universities might provide them with, as the McLeod report has suggested. Again, I say, this is a priority area. I would suggest that if there has to be a cut it should not be in this area. If there is a priority in education, this should be first. Heaven only knows, this government has made cuts in some of the strangest places.

One of the things which surprises me is the belief that you can cut service areas. I see the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) sitting over in the corner and I would suggest to him that he of all people should not be the Minister of a department which is accepting cuts in personnel at this point in time. What happens is that the workers in the social and family services offices across this province have case loads, and the case loads are large. They are that less able to be of any help to the people in that particular jurisdiction. It seems to me this government should decide on where cuts can be made.

Cuts can be made in The Department of Highways. You can cut out a highway and it does not destroy the service that is already being given, but you take a cut in the social and family services field and you do destroy the service which is already being given, you destroy it in a very real way. I suggest to you that that is also the kind of decision that should be made by a government in power at this time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Could the hon. member name a couple of other departments.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Yes, name the departments!

Mr. Pitman: I would suggest to the hon. Minister who has just spoken that his department is one where it scarcely behooves us to have a cut, but I think there are other areas. I think that The Department of Lands and Forests is one where personnel can be held back for a cut, or The Department of Highways or The Department of Public Works. I think there are a number of areas, because you would not destroy the existing service by cutting in those areas.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): A couple of those Ministers could go.

Mr. Pitman: I would certainly accept the last remark of the leader of the Opposition on that point.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: Without the Opposition there would not be any government in this province.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the member a question?

Before the hon. member for Peterborough finishes his remarks on education could he let the House know whether he considers the recommendations from the Hall-Dennis report to be more expensive, or could the recommendations actually reduce costs in the education system?

Mr. Pitman: I am very pleased to have that question. I think there are many recommendations of the Hall-Dennis report which, over a long period of time, would undoubtedly be costly, if you tried to provide the kind of facilities which are suggested in the Hall-Dennis report. But I am sure the hon. member would agree with me that there are many—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not the answer he wanted, as the member knows.

Mr. Pitman: There are many of these changes which could easily be accommodated. I would suggest, and I think he would agree, that it is the teacher education area that will have to change if they are going to change the attitudes which will enable these young people to carry out this kind of enlightened and liberal educational system—small 'l' Liberal education system—which would then allow the kind of opportunities

for the young people which are provided in the Hall-Dennis report.

I would suggest to you that we have not even begun to think of how we could use teacher assistants at a much lower pay level, and teacher aids. We have got our colleges of applied arts and technology. They are turning out all kinds of para-professional people. But here again this government will not deal with that kind of a problem.

We bring forth these people from courses in our colleges of applied arts and technology. For example, we have got social workers coming out and what happens? The Department of Social and Family Services does not want to use them now. They are being denied opportunities. In fact, they are being denied opportunities by agencies which are supported by this government. At the same time that the government is producing these kinds of para-professional people, it is denying them the opportunity to carry out the work for which they are being trained. That is what I mean by a government which is unable to deal with a specific problem in an effective and useful way.

I would like to go on to another area which I would say is of top priority. That is the whole question of teacher-pupil ratio. We have just talked a bit about the whole problem of student unrest, and one of the major causes of student unrest is a feeling of disorientation on the part of the student. He does not feel that anybody really cares. He is in too big a class whether it was at the university or at the secondary elementary level. He does not feel a teacher really cares.

Yet it seems, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, The Department of Education has some kind of a scheme whereby it is trying to raise the teacher-pupil ratio, raise the number of pupils which each teacher will be expected to deal with.

This has gone on throughout the entire province. There has even been the suggestion that the grant structure is going to be used to try and keep boards from getting those teacher-pupil ratios too high, or too low I should say.

I think this is unfortunate because of all the areas where we need a priority is this area, as well — the relationship of teacher to pupil. If we allow these ratios to rise, if we get to the point where teachers are dealing with too many students, then it becomes utterly and completely hopeless to try to implement any of the things which are found in the Hall-Dennis report.

We talked about two things, two priorities—one, the priority in the area of teacher education; and two the priority in the teacher-pupil ratio. I would hope that this might even be thought out at the university level.

How strange, how ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, that at the time when you have all this ferment at the university level because students do not feel that they have any kind of relationship with their professors and with the faculties, the very system by which this government gives its grants to universities exacerbates the problem.

The whole grant structure to universities is based on a pupil basis. The number of students you have provides the amount of money you get. That is the only criterion except for a capital expenditure which we can deal with in another point.

But it means that a university which wants to develop its programme, which wants to provide the best kind of programme, has to expand its student enrolment, and the whole emphasis and the whole problem of expanding lies in deciding where you could stop the expansion. So you have larger classes and you have less contact with professor and student.

Even worse than this is the fact that your pupil grant is the least for the student undergraduate who happens to be in an arts course. If you put your emphasis on graduate studies, it means you get six times the amount you would receive for that student if he was undergraduate.

Where your trouble centres are, where your crisis points are, where your areas of ferment are, is among your undergraduates who feel that they are not getting a fair deal; they are not getting equality in the educational system; they are not getting attention. They believe they are not really feeling a part of the university. So, they strike out against this inhumanity.

This, I suggest to you, is the problem with this grant structure. It forces the university to develop large classes. It forces them to put their emphasis on graduate students instead of upon undergraduate students.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Do you know what the student-faculty ratio is?

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. White: Do you know what the student-faculty ratio is?

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I do know what the student-faculty ratio is and it is a good deal less than California. But I suggest to the hon. Minister that if you want the problems they have got in California you just raise it to what they have it in California.

An hon. member: Afraid you walked into that one, John.

Hon. Mr. White: It is the lowest in North America.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to turn also to the whole question of county boards. I would say that the development and the organization of county boards in Ontario was probably the most important administrative change in the educational system I guess since Egerton Ryerson.

But there are a number of fears which I think have arisen and which were indeed suggested on this side of the House when this legislation was brought forward last year. A major fear, I think, is the feeling of people across this province that they have lost all control of education, the education of their children. They do not know where it is going and I think this is best shown by the percentage of people who voted in the last election for county boards.

In some areas it was as low as 11 per cent; 11 per cent went out and voted for the people who are spending more money in this province than we are, essentially, although the money, I know, comes from this source. But they make the decisions about that money in a way in which we do not even have an opportunity to do.

How do we re-establish some kind of contact between the people who have the children and the educational system? I say it is a major problem. It is not a small problem.

It comes right back to this whole business of unrest and ferment, because I would suggest to you tonight, sir, that the educational system as it exists today is widening the generation gap. An educational system within the fabric of our society should be bringing the people together. It should be providing lines of communication, bridges of understanding—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): We do, we do!

Mr. Pitman:—between parents and children, between students and teachers, between teachers and administrators in the whole educational fabric.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: —if the hon. member will just be a bit patient, I will try and get to it for him.

Mr. Speaker, we have to find a way by which we can inform the parents about what is going on in the school; provide them with an opportunity to be a part of what is going on in the school system. That is why I suggest to you, and your Hall-Dennis report suggests, an advisory committee of people at the ministerial level. I suggest there should be an advisory committee including parents at the board level. I suggest that there should be advisory boards at every school level. Every principal should have an advisory board, including parents in his district.

I suspect that eventually the school may be the only unit in which the people in a community will have any sense of orientation with the government above them, and this is, I think, a very serious problem.

Maybe the school system will be the way by which we identify. Maybe these advisory committees might be the way that we inform ourselves of the needs of the social services in that entire community. They would be the nub, the centre, the place where information could be gathered, the place where action could be taken to deal with community problems.

I suggest to you that this is the only way we are going to make the parents a part of the input. The election of the county boards —I am sorry, I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): You are over-estimating them.

Mr. Pitman: The hon. member says I am over-estimating parents, and it may be true. But I do have a feeling that the reason why parents do not go to home and school meetings, the reason they do not feel that they really are a part of the educational system, is because they have been successfully blocked off. The home and school association unfortunately has been a way of keeping parents separate from the real decisions.

What they do essentially is let them sell candy, let them buy a clock for the gymnasium, let them deal with John's teacher individually. But do not let us start having them talk about what Johnny is doing in the classroom; what is the curriculum; and what the rationale of the curriculum is, or all these silly rules that the Minister and I were talking about just a few minutes ago. In other words, home and school keeps them out of those essential areas, those critical areas. Let them play around.

I suggest to you that it is time that the parents became a part of the input; that they have to be responsible; they have to be concerned. I think the time is now. The time will be, I suggest Mr. Speaker, when they get their education bills in the next few weeks. They are going to be very concerned about education, and I may very well—

Mr. W. Newman: The schools in our area are open next week for the parents to go and see, for two weeks to—

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, we are not on the same wavelength. I am not talking about going and seeing the school; I am talking about being a part of it. The parent who walks into the school immediately feels as though he is a guest in the school. He goes in expecting to be told and to see what is going on. He is never asked what he thinks should be going on. He is never asked what he thinks the community problems are. He is never asked what kind of an administrative pattern his children might be happiest in. Is he? He is simply asked to look, see and then go home, and we will see you next year about the same time. I suggest to you that that is not good enough.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I think one of the greatest problems of the county board is that they have an opportunity to begin innovations; they also have an opportunity to frustrate progress. This is one of the things which really bothers me. We are reaching a point in our education system where teachers should be given the greatest amount of freedom possible. They should be not only given the greatest amount of freedom, they should be given the greatest amount of opportunity to be part of the input, too.

We talked about advisory boards a minute ago. Surely this is what teachers should be a part of as well? They should be making the decisions about curriculum within their school, and the administration within their school, along with the parents and along with students as well, because they have to be a part of this input.

Mr. W. Newman: What about discipline?

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I would suggest to you, sir, that the discipline question should be fought out in these committees. It is being done in high schools, across this province as it has been done in elementary schools across this province.

Young people have shown a high degree of responsibility once they have been given to believe that they are doing something which is worthwhile, as long as they are not being played with. The problem right now is that there is no structure for this. The hon. Minister is not here, but we saw this last fall when the whole question of extending the school year came up. That has been like a very small inconsequential aspect of the total, but it has many ramifications. The decision did not recognize, in terms of employment the wishes of the student. The whole administrative structure during June was ignored, and the effect this would have upon individual assessment of students and so on. But the point was this, and that is the point I am trying to get to—the students had no effective way of making their voices heard. The student councils have as their main purpose to organize the dances, buy the crêpe paper and so on. They have no effective way of channelling the views of students. Therefore, what was the only way they could express themselves out there in front of the building? I suggest to you that it is not really the most effective way that people can express themselves and be a part of the input of government of Ontario—standing out on the steps of Queen's Park.

I suggest to Mr. Speaker that this is not worthy of an educational system which is attempting to develop responsibility among young people. This is what the game is all about, isn't it? If you do not want the students burning schools down, or if you do not want students disrupting school, you had better teach them responsibility. The only way you are going to teach them responsibility is to give them responsibility.

Mr. W. Newman: Do you know what is happening in our schools toward this end.

Mr. Speaker: Order! This is an address, a speech by the hon. member from Peterborough, not the hon. member from Ontario South. While I agree with the hon. member for Peterborough that a great deal is to be gained by this type of exchange, it is not yet the custom of this House, nor permitted by the rules. I would therefore ask the hon. member to continue with his speech.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—the order being in regard to the motion. In my area we have the Ontario School for the Deaf and they have a sign language. I have seen so much movement of hands and one thing and

another that I have this speech all confused. I think sometimes the member talked contrary to his motion.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not the reason for the member's confusion. Don't blame it on the deaf children.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has the floor and will continue.

Mr. Pitman: I am very sorry. I will try not to confuse the hon. member any more.

An hon. member: Put your hands in your pockets.

Mr. Pitman: One of the things that I did want to mention is this whole question of the administrative structure growing up within the county board. As I began to say, I think teachers most of all need freedom as well as the security within their county boards. I fear the numbers of administrators and pseudo-inspectors and pseudo-supervisors and so on which are being pyramided above the educational system.

I must say that when I was teaching, I used to think that the best thing about the inspectors was that the departmental inspector had to drive 100 miles before he got to my classroom. This always meant that his visits were infrequent, but sometimes helpful. I think the main point is that a teacher under this structure could very well find himself daily being supervised or pseudo-supervised or inspected or in some way being looked upon. I think this is a development which I see as a pernicious one and which very much bothers me.

Another thing which I have noticed is the degree of concern on the part of teachers on the number of reports that are being made and are being planned, so that everybody is reporting on everybody else. Some of these reports are made in secret sessions in the county boards and this, I think, is also an extremely dangerous development. If the whole county board system is going to work, it is going to work on the basis of some kind of faith and trust on the part of teachers and administrators and board members.

I suggest that written reports shown to the individual teacher concerned will do, and it will undermine the very best kind of work that could be done within these county boards. This comes again to the whole idea of advisory committees. The suggestion has been made by the Ontario Teachers Federation, and I think it is a wise suggestion, that teachers be included on advisory committees

through the county boards. I would hope that there would be a change in legislation in this House during this year which would allow teachers to be a part of the decisions which create the kind of system in which they are going to work.

I think it is extremely important if the teachers are going to be responsible, that they be given responsibility; that teachers are going to be expected to go to the second-mile phase; that they also will have an opportunity to decide or at least influence the major decisions that are being made in these county boards.

I think this is, too, the reason for the teachers' concern over a transfer review board. They are not terrified of being sent from one school to another, but they are concerned that this may be used in an inappropriate way. They are concerned that in these large units a teacher may have to travel 60 miles to get from one school to another, and they may be transferred to a school 60 miles away by a board—which may be unwise, but more accurately may wish to use this as a means of disciplining the teacher. I think this is inappropriate in this present day, and I would hope that the Minister would move ahead on that area as well.

Bill 81, which was passed in Toronto, removed all teachers from boards within the metropolitan area. Members who were in this Chamber at that time, Mr. Speaker, will realize that many teachers did serve on these boards and provided, I think, a degree of expertise on boards outside of areas in which they live. The creation of the large Metropolitan board removed many of these teachers from this function. The creation of a large county board has the same effect. I think it is an unfortunate thing when the teachers, from whom you expect you will receive some enthusiasm for democracy and some respect for the public function, are deprived of a very important aspect of that public function, that is, of serving on trustee boards, and serving on boards of education throughout this province. Those are just some areas that I think need a good deal of thought by this government.

My final comment in the area of education—at least my final comment at this time in the area of education—is on a matter which I think is the cause of a good deal of concern in this House. I shall try to deal with it in as low-key a manner as I can, and that is the whole area of separate schools.

We have in this province, as you well know, a complete system of public separate schools. They are supported by the province to the

end of grade 8 fully; they are supported to the end of grade 10 partially. It is the feeling of many of the people of the Catholic faith that separate schools should be completely supported by the province.

I think that we have to recognize first their historic right in the support of the public Roman Catholic schools. They have that right. At the same time, I think we have to recognize that if in 1867 it was their right to have these schools supported to the end of grade 8, then in 1967 that right should probably justly extend beyond grade 8. I think that we would recognize, secondly, that if the modern trends toward non-grading, toward a continuum of education, have any validity at all, this makes it impossible to cut off separate schools for Catholic young people at the end of grade 8, or particularly at the end of grade 10.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think we are all conscious of the cost of education. It would not be justice to anyone, if, in attempting to provide justice to one group, we ended up by really removing justice from all young people in the sense that the total fabric of education might be weakened. That is, the cost of education might be so great that the programmes would have to be restricted in all schools.

Quite frankly, it would not be a great cost to the province to immediately begin the development to transfer funds from the public purse to students in secondary schools at the end of grade 13. I have heard suggested a sum of \$8 million, which is a very limited amount of money. But I think hon. members of both sides realize that once the public becomes involved in the separate school system, the costs are going to rise considerably. They have to rise, because it is at the secondary level that the public Roman Catholic schools cannot provide the vocational courses and the reasonable spectrum of courses which a young person in a modern society must have access to.

So I think there are two problems here. One is the provision of justice to Roman Catholic people in this province, and the whole problem of justice in terms of the total school population. My thinking in this particular area is one which I would hope all political parties are moving toward. There are some problems which will not disappear but I suggest to you that this is not a problem which will disappear. It is one which continues to grow and continues to be an ulcer in the public process of this province, and it is one that we must do something about.

The first thing we might consider is a development within each county, because for the first time, Mr. Speaker, if nothing else, we have in our counties some kind of order in the sense that the smaller number of jurisdictions now has contiguous units, in many cases, of separate and public schools. Very often you will have a public separate school county board and a public county board. Now that is not true all over the province, but there are variations which can be found, I think, in this pattern I am suggesting.

The first thing we need to do is to set up a committee to deal with the problem of finding the areas of co-operation to assure the people of Ontario that there is not going to be a proliferation, a duplication, of services as a result of the entry of the province into the financing of the total separate school cost.

I would suggest the first thing we could do is begin co-operating on bus routes. How many times have we seen a separate school bus go by and then a public school bus go by? We could co-operate in the areas of special services. We can co-operate in administrative costs; a number of members have brought up this whole question of upper administration and its cost. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this is an area which could very well be dealt with in one of these committees.

Eventually I hope we might even deal with the area of facilities and co-operative use of facilities. I see no reason why we could not leave the separate school operating as a confessional school, with students going to a public school to get some of their vocational subjects. I would suggest that some of the public school students could well go to the confessional school to get some of their subjects.

In this way you would break down any concern which some people seem to have over the separation of people in one system and another. I think we must begin to develop a rational pattern for dealing with this problem. We cannot let prejudices which are gone long ago, which are away in the past, debilitate us in our efforts to try and react in a unique and a dynamic way to this kind of problem.

It is a difficult problem, but I would remind you of all of the things which have happened in this province—the development of the larger units of administration, the development and the coming of the Hall-Dennis report and the kind of fabric of education suggested. And, of course, there is the desperate need of Roman Catholic people in this province who, in some cases, are being

doubly taxed because of the system which exists now. Finally, the county board can be a cause of tremendous concern to people in this province when they hear about the taxation rise which is going to take place apparently in the education costs in the province.

When this bill came before the House last year I made the point, or I tried to make the point, that there was no way by which the creation of larger units of administration would cut down cost of education to individuals within the county system. The Minister talked about creating a more stable tax system and spreading out the cost, and so on. I think anyone who looks at the various counties will see that the costs are going to rise. The administration costs have already risen. Special services will be demanded and they will be costly. On top of that, of course, the demand for these services in all the rural areas will create a welter of demands upon every county school board.

The question becomes, how could The Department of Education really believe that by putting rural areas in with urban areas, it was going to cut down the cost of education in each county? The indication was that it was hoped that by combining these units there would be a saving in the cost of education.

Mr. Kerr: Eventually, yes.

Mr. Pitman: The government's own member says eventually, yes.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: The government has never suggested that.

An hon. member: He just indicated it.

Mr. Pitman: I am not going to raise chapter and verse here, but there was certainly indication that by creating a stable tax source, by being able to place other sources of revenue in the cities into the rural areas, that you would be able to hold back the rising cost of education to the individual person in the county.

The question becomes one of dealing with the rising mill rate in each of these rural communities. In some areas the mill rate in the rural area, which is contiguous to an urban centre, has risen two and three times. The cost of education is a terror in the hearts of some people in the rural areas because they see their taxation bill for education doubling and tripling. In some parts of Ontario this is the case.

Mr. Kerr: To you, that is.

Mr. Pitman: I can assure the hon. member I do not wander about the rural parts of Ontario giving harrowing details. They call upon me to ask why this government has done this, and I try to explain actions which are clearly inexplicable. That is the role I find myself in too often.

The hon. member asks me whether I supported this move. Certainly I have supported the larger jurisdictions. We suggested, though, that it be phased in a rational, sensible way, and that it be done over a period of time which would have allowed the development of service and the development of patterns of administration. This would have allowed the people in these county boards an opportunity to be a part of it. I can tell you right now the number one problem which the Minister of Municipal Affairs faces as he moves the province toward regional government is the concern which people have that it is going to be done in the same way as the county boards of education.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No, it is not.

Mr. Pitman: I am so glad the Minister said it is not. All we suggested is that people should have been involved. What you meet everywhere is the reaction, "If regional government is coming, I hope it does not come the way the county board system came, with no—"

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You dispel that rumour, do you not?

Mr. Pitman: Indeed I do. I was in Innismore township speaking to the council this morning, telling them what a fine fellow the Minister was and that he would come and talk to them before regional government came, so you see this is a role which I happily accept.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Obviously he does not agree with the way county boards of education came into being.

Mr. Pitman: That is the point.

Mr. Pitman: May I suggest that a rise in taxes on the separate school boards is a matter of some concern. I was talking to a member of a separate county school board whose taxes for education were based on last year's grant structure. We do not know what the grant structure is going to be this year; it may be the same, it may be different. It may help, it may not. But the point was, his taxes based on last year's grant structure

was \$79. This year it will be over \$250. A jump from \$79 to \$250.

This man is a member of a separate school board in the delightful little township of Douro, and if any of you have been there, you will know what I mean when I say that his comment was, "If you think they are having troubles in North Ireland right now, you wait until these people get their bills for taxation on education in a couple of weeks. You have seen nothing yet."

All I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, to this government is, there had better be some clear thinking on a grand structure which will help these municipalities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to protect me again from all the—

Mr. Sopha: I think you should withdraw the analogy, we have never been an Ulsterman.

Mr. Pitman: I am not going to get in Northern Ireland politics with the member from Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: You amaze me!

Mr. Pitman: May I turn now to the whole question of regional development. There is probably no problem in this Legislature which is more difficult to assess than the whole problem of regional development.

I am not going to repeat what I think was the magnificent oration in this House by the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) on the whole question of regional development and regional government. But I do want to indicate to the House my concern, and I am sure it is the concern of many other members as to exactly where we are going.

When I made my first remarks in this place a year ago, this is the subject to which I turned some of my attention. The Prime Minister's comment in his remarks on the Speech to the Throne this year was, "Much has been accomplished since design for development was outlined in this House."

Well, I would like to know just how much has been accomplished. Certainly we have seen a mass of committees; committees everywhere. What are they? Regional development councils; cabinet committees on policy; advisory committee at the deputy minister level; regional advisory boards in all the various regions; regional development branches of The Departments of Treasury and Economics. A whole mirage of committees.

But I suggest to you, sir, that it scarcely behoves us to suggest that much has been done. One only has to read the comments of Mr. Krueger and his feelings about what has been done. Mr. Ralph Krueger, is the professor and chairman of the department of geography of the University of Waterloo. Just one paragraph:

However, I regret having to say that much of this co-ordinating machinery is not working.

Well, what an understatement.

And there still seem to be overlapping responsibilities and confused jurisdiction concerning regional planning and community planning and development. The regional development branch of The Treasury Department, responsible for the planning of regional development councils, and the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs, provincially responsible for the planning done by municipalities and joint groups of municipalities do not seem to be adequately integrating their research and policy programmes.

As a result, the regional development councils are being encouraged to formulate regional development plans, which, to be implemented, require the use of The Planning Act which is under the jurisdiction of The Department of Municipal Affairs. Furthermore, the regional development branch is doing, and subsidising pre-planning research at the regional level, while at the same time, the community planning branch is doing, and subsidising pre-planning research at the community level.

Well now, what does this mean for the local municipalities, Mr. Speaker. It means utter confusion. They do not know where they are going. The local township does not know whether to go ahead with the official plan. Regional government is coming. Should it go ahead with the county plan. We do not know.

Should several townships go together and make a plan. Who knows. We do not know what the regional development branch is up to next. And as far as the regional development—

And this can come out in very unfortunate ways, Mr. Speaker. One of the most tragic things that took place in the last summer, in an area very close to my home, in Smith township—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Where?

Mr. Pitman: Smith township, I am sure you are quite aware of the existence of that township.

In this particular township a nursing home existed. It was a much-needed nursing home for older people in this community. And because there have been delays, because of not knowing exactly where we are going, this nursing home has been allowed to develop in what was an area that was not zoned for a nursing home.

All I am using this for is not as a stick to beat the municipal department, but simply as an example of what happens when something goes wrong in this area.

Well, as it turns out, the neighbour disliked having the washing on the line, and so complained and demanded that this nursing home be closed. The local council tried to spot zone and were refused by the Ontario Municipal Board. So these old people who had made a home in this nursing home were moved, were forced to move out of that nursing home, and one died very soon after being moved to another area. Others found immense difficulty in moving from one place to another.

I suggest to you that that is an example of the human suffering which results because we do not seem to know exactly where we are going in this particular area.

As far as the other comments of Mr. Krueger are concerned:

Unrelated and unco-ordinated planning activity is a needless waste of both financial and leadership resources.

This is what we on this side have asked for again and again:

What is required is a rational province-wide system of planning agencies, each planning within a framework of policies established at the next higher level. A provincial development plan is also needed to provide the overall policy framework within which the government departments, regional and local municipalities can do their planning.

I suggest to you sir, that we desperately need this overall regional plan. In fact, the great difficulty is that we do not really know what a region is. We do not know whether we are talking about regional government with its units. We are only dealing with two departments here. Thank heaven it got out of The Department of Trade and Development down there where we did not know where we were at.

So at least we are dealing with the Treasury and Municipal Affairs. But I do not know just how to get these two Ministers together to solve this problem, or their staffs. Get them in the same building, the people who are doing this, because for heaven's sake, one cannot lose the feeling that while both are on their own tracks, both going in, I will not say opposite directions, but certainly different directions in deciding—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do not worry about it.

Mr. Pitman: Well, it is not really my responsibility to worry about it, but I would suggest that I—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): The hon. member should not concern himself.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I simply here express the concerns of people in my area. I am sure there are people in a good many other areas. They do not know what is going on. Waterloo county has had some problems, Lakehead seems to be having some problems, and every other region seems to be having some problems. They do not seem to know where you are going.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are our concern.

Mr. Pitman: You have created some of the problems, and that is the very point.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not the Minister of Correctional Services.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I correct them all.

Mr. Pitman: Here you have the statement of the Prime Minister again. In "Design for Development" it is clearly stated that the implementation of the regional development policy of the government could make a groundwork for changes of area government which might be considered appropriate.

Now, we do not know whether the regional development is guiding the municipal changes, or the municipal changes are guiding the regional development. And there is very little contact. The Minister himself admitted this last year in his estimates, that there is not enough reaction and action between the elected people and those who are dealing with the regional councils.

As well as this, there is another problem. We had a plan in each of these regions, a plan was developed last summer. I do not think these plans have come out yet, I think they are all done but they have not been

released yet. But they were given \$5,000 or \$10,000 to develop a plan.

You could have spent \$500,000 to get the data which was required on that plan. It was impossible to get the kind of information which was needed to develop a policy. It simply was impossible to carry out the statements made by this government to those who were trying to carry out these plans in the various parts of Ontario.

And this brings it right back again. For example, they talk about growth points. The Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) and I had a great scuffle over these last year, this whole question of growth points, but there is no definition of growth points. I suspect that a growth point in one part of Ontario will be very different to the growth point in another part of Ontario. As a result, there will be no effective way of co-ordinating.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is right.

Mr. Pitman: I am right? The Minister evidently thinks this is a good idea to have different criteria for a growth point in one part and another part.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not think one can have positive criteria.

An hon. member: They do not have any criteria.

Mr. Pitman: Well, if there are no criteria, no wonder we have the chaos that we have now, because at the same time as the Minister is talking about orderly development and the Minister of Municipal Affairs is talking about orderly paths toward regional government, you have the other Ministers going off on their own sweet way. The Minister of Trade and Development is giving grants to all sorts of people. Of course, in my particular area he designated it everywhere else but growth points. Of course, we have already heard about his manipulations up in western Ontario. It seems to me that this government does not have a very clear idea of what planning is. Surely planning starts off by getting control of the crisis points.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): It was only a year ago they dared use the term.

Mr. Pitman: And once you do control the crisis point, then you can start to develop plans. I do not think that this government really recognizes that planning is not a sort

of a final point, it is a continuance. You are never going to get to the point where you simply gather data and gather data and suddenly a plan emerges from the data. It does not emerge out of the data because the data keeps coming in and coming in, and you never reach a point where you could draw a line and say now we can develop a plan. This does not happen. And that, I am afraid, is the impression which people get.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Is this NDP policy?

Mr. Pitman: Is this the NDP policy? Yes, a rational planning is getting control of the crisis point and recognizing that planning is a continuing device.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we are all in favour of motherhood, so what is next?

Mr. Pitman: Well, I am only answering the Minister—I am only answering your colleague in the second row.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): He is against fresh air.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I do not intend to carry this any further. I suggest that we get on one track so far as regional development and regional government are concerned. We do not know where we are going as far as the relationship of the boards of education for regional governments is concerned.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs suggested there might be a couple of county boards in a municipality but certainly he made no clear indication of just how much chaos we have created by going ahead in this area without some relationship to the regional developments in other areas.

An hon. member: The member is against county school boards, I take it?

Mr. Pitman: Oh, Mr. Speaker, really.

Mr. Lawlor: See what happens to your dialogue.

Mr. Pitman: One of the points which really bothers me in the Speech from the Throne is my final area.

Mr. Singer: That is the fifth final area.

Mr. Pitman: My final subject area. It is the comment during the session that an opportunity will be afforded the hon. members to give serious and responsible attention to the machinery of collective bargaining and related labour and management matters rising out of the recommendations contained in the

report of the royal commission inquiring into labour disputes.

Perhaps I have a particular concern about this Rand report and the suggestion that this report is going to be acted upon in this session. As members will well know, this report came out of a dispute which took place in the city of Peterborough. This government found itself in the very embarrassing position of putting in jail some of the leading citizens of the city, 15 in number, and some for several weeks.

I am particularly interested in this matter because at the present time there is a strike which still goes on; it began in November and is still present in March, 1969. I am particularly concerned because of the nature of this strike, it is not even so much the union which is going to lose, it is the community. Mr. Speaker, we are losing a newspaper that was once a very good newspaper, a quality newspaper. Some rated it seventh in Canada. And now I am afraid it is going to be nothing more than a very poor newspaper in the hands of the Thomson interests.

The Rand report came from a very learned jurist but unfortunately jurists—and I hope I am not going to excite all the legal buffs here—have a tremendous respect for the *status quo*, have an obsession for law and order without, I think, perhaps so much concern that law and order be part of justice. I think you oversimplify the relationship of man to man, and try to put it into a set of rules. I think if there is any area of education where the legal mind does not operate quite as effectively as it should, it is in the sociological and psychological areas.

The member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), of course, made a number of comments on this and I am not going to answer his arguments here tonight. It is true, strikes are untidy, it is true that they do cause public discomfort, they get in the way, they are not very respectable, they are dangerous and picketing somehow seems to disturb the tenor of our lives.

In many cases, of course, we distort the concept of the strike, in many cases the strike is the one thing that creates a settlement, in 97 per cent of the cases. In some cases, of course, the strike is the only way that settlement can be gained. But I think what Mr. Justice Rand was complaining about or what he should have complained about was not this small area of picketing and small area of dispute; I think he should have done away with his obsession with law and order throughout the entire world and confined himself to the society in which this takes place, because

we are dealing with a capitalist society where the creed is profit.

Unions are merely imitating what is the accepted credo within our society. They are placed in a demanding role and they have to be in a demanding role. After all, it is management which desires the *status quo*, it is the union which is trying to change the *status quo*. The conflict is built in, in other words. You cannot simply move it out by some kind of government action.

We would suggest that there are other ways of dealing with society, of planning the society, of providing guidelines for wages and profits and prices, but this was not the suggestion of Justice Rand. Rather, it was to zero in on the union and its role in society and say, we are going to restrict that union, we are going to make it more difficult, we are going to involve that union in all kinds of legal dispute which will destroy its financial viability and which will destroy its ability to protect its members. I think even the member for Eglinton will realize that the union would disappear as an agency whereby we would get better hours, decent wages, decent conditions. I think it would have well behooved the hon. member to concede that at the time his speech was being made.

I think the greatest stumbling block in the Rand report is that it has cut off what is the most important area of development, and that is, how unions can play a more effective role in participating in decision making within a modern corporate society.

Now, we are all getting hung-up in a dispute as to whether unions should be able to picket in a certain way and whether injunctions should be possible, when what we really should be talking about is, "What is the effective role of a worker in our society?" I suggest to you it is far greater than the role which has been assigned to it by this government and certainly by this report.

As I say, I have a special interest in this area because in the city where I am it is very easy to quote The Labour Relations Act and say that men have the right to join a union. But what happens when the employer, when the Thomson interests say, "We are not going to have a union. We are not going to have the union because we are not going to accept any kind of a system which allows you to restrict those coming into the paper so that we cannot bring in enough people to destroy your union"; or "We are not going to accept any system which will not allow us to transfer your members out to another paper so that we will be able to destroy your union that way."

The law becomes a façade. It certainly loses the respect of the trade unions. In fact, so far as our labour laws in total are concerned, I suggested to the union, "Why do you not bring a charge of not bargaining in good faith against the Thomson interests?" I simply had to wait five minutes while they broke into hilarious laughter, they thought it was the funniest thing they ever heard. What is the point of bringing these charges, when even Tilco, I think, beat that charge. There is absolutely no point whatsoever in bringing that kind of a charge against a company under the system we have at the present time.

I suggest to you, sir, that government intervention is not the answer. It would be the answer to the Peterborough *Examiner* where you have 22 people being destroyed by a newspaper. Those who are left, and many have already left and taken very good jobs in other newspapers, those who are remaining in Peterborough are still fighting on. They are hoping for some kind of justice. They are hoping to restore a newspaper. They are hoping we may have a community resource which we have had in the past and which we have lost the last five or six months. We are hoping and I suggest to you that the actions of this government are not giving us much reason to hope.

Why was it that in Oshawa they were able to beat the Thomson interests? What happened in that case? What was it that moved this government to carry out an action which brought the Thomson interest to their knees and gave those workers a chance to exist within that pattern? I do not know except I have a feeling that the member for Oshawa may have the very key, the fact that this government realizes that in the city of Oshawa the existence of the UAW would have created so many problems of embarrassment to this government that it could very well, in the long run, have been a matter of some electoral concern. I suggest to you, sir, that it is about time that they became concerned in Peterborough.

You might say, well, why do all the workers not turn up and do something about the *Examiner* in Peterborough? I will tell you why—because they are intimidated. The Tilco strike did one thing—it convinced the union members and many of their wives that it was not a good thing to be found on a picket line in the city of Peterborough. That is an unfortunate thing when the labour situation has reached that point.

Of course, the intimidation is not helped by having police taking pictures of everyone who is on the picket line. That is simply

another aspect which I think is an unfortunate one. I do not think this encourages union members to feel that they are doing what is essentially a proper and respectable thing, and support a fellow unionist by being on a picket line in front of a company which is acting in an unfair and unreasonable way.

I am not going to give you all the reasons, all the wage settlements and so on. I simply say to you that the existence of that strike in Peterborough should be a matter of shame to this government and should be a matter of some concern to those who are supporting this government.

Finally, and this is my final comment I assure the member for Downsview, we in this party are concerned about the other Ontario. A few years ago in the United States a man wrote a book called "The Other America"—Michael Harrington—I think most of you read this book. He called it "The Other America" and he defined and designated and pointed out that a third of the people in the most affluent nation in the world were deprived and depressed. They were herded into the centre of cities and they were, in one way or another, put at a serious disadvantage in carrying out their responsibilities as citizens in the United States.

I want to suggest to you tonight that there is another Ontario and during this Throne debate, what I hoped this Legislature has seen and what is on the record of *Hansard*, is a description of that other Ontario. Ontario is a great place if you are not a miner. If you have to work at INCO, read the speeches of the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) and the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) and the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson). Ontario is a great place if you are not an inmate of a mental hospital. Once again, read the remarks of the member for High Park.

Ontario is a great place if you are not a person who is too ill to be working but not ill enough to be in a hospital—read the remarks of the member for Quinte. Ontario is a great place if you are not a workman who has a bad back or has lung trouble and you are trying to get some kind of compensation from the workmen's compensation board.

Ontario is a great place if you do not have to be a worker for Proctor Silex, where you have not a hope of beating a very strong and powerful company in an area where there is virtually no support for the union at all—read the remarks of the member for Oshawa, the member for Riverdale, the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans).

Ontario is a great place as long as you are not an Indian living in the north—read the remarks of the member for Thunder Bay. Ontario is a great place as long as you are not at the mercy of a particular kind of welfare officer—read the remarks of the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk).

We, in this party, are concerned that there is another Ontario that is not depicted in "A Place to Stand." There is another Ontario and we, I think, would proudly accept as our position a very simple one—it is found in the Declaration of Human Rights, United Nations. It is quoted in the social policies for Canada:

Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food and clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood and in circumstances beyond his control.

It is very easy to see an Ontario which is rich and prosperous where there are no problems. Indeed, one can read the remarks of the Speech from the Throne, the words of the Premier. He paints a picture of an Ontario which virtually has no problems at all and in which there are virtually no emotionally-disturbed children; in which there are no difficulties in regard to juveniles who have to come in contact with the law; there are no proper detention facilities; there are very very few probation officers; where training schools have to be used for purposes which I do not think anyone in the Legislature would recognize as being the best purpose. There simply are not the facilities between the training school and the home which would deal with these minor breaches.

We, Mr. Speaker, have a commitment in this party to a really just society. We have a commitment to the belief that government can play a part in creating that kind of society. We deplore and we oppose the lack of sensitivity of this government to those who are unfortunate. We abhor the attitudes that are taken toward those who are on the fringes, those who fall in the holes in the legislation which is provided by this government.

We in this party are ready; we are ready now to deal with the other Ontario and we simply ask that at the next election the people of Ontario provide us with that very opportunity.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the custom in this debate that I must extend congratulations to all those to whom congratulations are due. Now, let me get on with my speech.

I have listened with great interest to the pedantic remarks of the hon. member for Peterborough. I was rather impressed by the seriousness with which he put forth the first portion of his speech and the way he took the gentlemen of the press and their editors to task and suggested, at some length and, I thought, reasonably well, that perhaps the time had come in this legislature when we should no longer hand press releases to the people who work up there and we should trust to their training and intelligence to properly report the speeches. Much to my surprise, there came into my hand over the supper hour some six pages of press releases released by guess who, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Peterborough. And there it is.

Mr. Pitman: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I had these ready for the member for Downsview who had his assistant come to me during the supper hour and asked me especially if I would provide him with these remarks so it would better allow him to carry on his speech.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Self-righteous socialists!

Mr. Singer: There it is, Mr. Speaker, the press releases speak for themselves, as does the seriousness we must attach to the remarks of the hon. member for Peterborough and the equal seriousness to which we must attribute the remarks made by several of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this is usually a most interesting debate—very interesting to hear the so-called cut and thrust as it moves from one side of the floor to the other. Very interesting to listen, Mr. Speaker, to some of the better speakers in the House. One gentleman who impresses me inevitably when he gets up to speak is the hon. member—I am sorry he is not in his seat—for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis).

He is really a joy to listen to; he has a good voice; he has an excellent command of the English language, the words fairly flow from his mouth as he puts ideas before the House. But one would believe he was a bit more credible, Mr. Speaker, if his suggestions about the faults of this House—I think he called this place a mausoleum—if one could believe that his suggestions about this House were backed up by his greater participation in its proceedings.

It is awfully sad, Mr. Speaker, that the talent that lies with that gentleman, unfortunately, does not seem to be devoted to the activities of the government of the province of Ontario. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, as well, that with all of the sound and fury that hailed the arrival of 20 of those fellows here, the ability to portray in opposition an alternative to government has lessened. I do not know quite what the proportion is but it has substantially lessened from the ability that eight of them were able to portray before 1967.

Mr. Speaker, these are some very sad things and it is unfortunate that they seem to have lost interest. They seem to be most concerned with making speeches in other places, with agitating in other places, but very little concern, Mr. Speaker, with forwarding the democratic process through the media that is available to us, the media of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, on the date of the last election—

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Stick where the enemy is!

Mr. Singer: No, no, I know where the enemy is. It is there and there, and I am going to get to those fellows in due course. But let me deal with the hon. member first.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We can hardly wait.

Mr. Singer: Unfortunate as it may be, Mr. Speaker, in the provincial election of 1967 the voters for better or worse gave to those fellows over there—the government—a larger proportion of the vote than they gave to anybody else. Albeit that it was a decreasing proportion of the vote, they still gave them more than they gave to us, or they gave them more than they gave to the third party over there.

So, Mr. Speaker, those of us who have run for office, and those of us who have been chosen by the people, have a role to play either on that side or on this side. Surely, once the voters have spoken, and until they speak again the next time, there is a duty and responsibility on each and every one of us to continue to play that role.

I have been on this side of the House for a long period of time, but I like to think—and I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is true—that in a number of pieces of legislation that pass through the legislative process and that are now a part and parcel of our way of life, that I have played some role; that my colleagues and I from time to time have put

forward suggestions that have been adopted by the House and are now part of the law of the province of Ontario. Now that is the role, Mr. Speaker, that—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I told the people in my riding you were responsible for both Bill 73 and 74.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister is backing away from both of those now.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say very much about Bills 73 and 74 at the present time, but if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs insists, perhaps I can say a word or two about the arrogance of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) or the arrogance of those colleagues who brought these bills in without consultation, without concern, and without any real idea of what they were getting at. Perhaps we could talk about that, Mr. Speaker, but I think that can wait perhaps for another day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: They never asked the dogs or cats.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or the pussies.

An hon. member: That is a very popular subject right now.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me not get detoured from my original theme. It is a pity that the fine talent of the hon. member for Scarborough West must direct itself to this feeling of frustration, and probably to his removal from an effective role that he could and should be playing in the legislative process of the people of Ontario.

It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that these hon. members here on our left have been so ridden with internal dissension, are so unsure of themselves, that as they have the 20 members here they are unable to work as a group any longer. They are constantly in agitation, one against the other and they are so unhappy, Mr. Speaker, with their leadership that they have to have a soul searching and breast beating session every few moments or every few days in order to be able to try to present some kind of an unusual feeling to the voters that they are trying to appeal to.

Mr. Pilkey: You just made a good case for an alternative to the government.

Mr. Singer: Well now, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the hon. member for Oshawa has said that. I am very glad that he makes this point so well, because I wanted to talk for a

moment or two about the leadership in the New Democratic Party.

Mr. MacDonald: It is obvious where his worry lies.

Mr. Singer: Well, it is obvious that I am worried.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member had better talk against his real opponents when he gets a chance because his time is getting shorter and shorter.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, they are awfully sensitive to this. Let me continue to make my point. You notice, Mr. Speaker, this is the day and age of political confession. There are books like "Memoirs of a Bird in a Gilded Cage" and other things of that type.

Some of us have begun to enquire, sir, about what we have heard has been the latest book which is very shortly going to hit the newsstands and it is being produced, I gather, on behalf of the NDP.

Now, through a process I would rather not go into in any great detail, we have managed to obtain an advance proof of a book that is shortly about to be put on the newsstands. It is called "The Thoughts of Chairman Renwick," or "What I really think of DCM" whoever he might be.

The cover seems to be a pale pink and the picture on it—I do not know whether that is going to be the final picture on the dust jacket or not—but the picture on it certainly, Mr. Speaker, is recognizable by all of us who sit here in the House. At the moment, while the text is not complete, I do have available the chapter headings and the little excerpts which I believe come from speeches made by the hon. member for Riverdale which are going to be inserted at the top of each chapter.

Chapter one, I am told, is going to be called "We will not be needing you, Don" and it has, Mr. Speaker, a quotation taken from the Toronto *Daily Star* of November 13, 1968, where it says this:

NDP supporters had to face up to the fact that MacDonald's leadership, good as it has been, is not enough to carry the party to victory in 1971.

Now, we leaf through, Mr. Speaker, and we come to chapter 2—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Will the member read that statement again for the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Singer: Yes, there will be many copies of this available soon.

Chapter 2, Mr. Speaker, is called "What Makes Jimmie Run?" or "Labour, Us?". They seem to like the quotes from the *Toronto Daily Star*. This one comes from the *Toronto Daily Star* again in November, 1968, "Lack of party involvement with the people made me a challenger".

And from the *Globe and Mail* of October 14, 1968, "The party was not established to be a labour party".

Chapter 3, Mr. Speaker, is headed "Yes, We Have No Policies". This comes from the *Globe and Mail* of October 15, 1968, and again in quotation marks it says this:

Ontario NDP leader Donald MacDonald has made no effort to prepare a programme on which the party could win the next provincial election and then govern the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All in favour, say aye.

Mr. Singer: Still quoting:

If there is ever an area in the province in which we have to have a programme, and it is going to be a socialist programme, we have to have policies. I have waited specifically since the 22nd of July for some initiative from Don MacDonald in this field. There was none.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame!

Mr. Singer: Chapter 4, Mr. Speaker, headed "Donald the Man", and just to show we are not partial to either the *Toronto Daily Star* or the *Globe and Mail*, this quote comes from the *Telegram*, Mr. Speaker, November 15, 1968:

The people of Ontario can not visualize the scrappy, determined and invariably predictable Mr. MacDonald as the head of government.

Then, Mr. Speaker, Chapter 5, which the author is going to call, "They never believed me", October 21, 1968, from the *Toronto Daily Star*:

Who really believes that Don will be the next Premier of this province? The public certainly does not believe and for that simple reason, it will not happen.

As I said, the title of the book is "The Thoughts of Chairman Renwick". These are all direct quotes from the various newspapers that were made by the hon. member for Riverdale during a certain period of his political career.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Give the member five minutes so he can withdraw.

Mr. Singer: Then finally, Mr. Speaker, chapter 6, and there may be some additions, but chapter 6 is the final one that I have a note of. It will be called "The Future" and it has another quote from the *Toronto Daily Star* of October 21, 1968, and it says this:

The New Democratic Party won't win the next provincial election with Donald MacDonald as leader because he has acquired the image of a loser.

Well, there it is, Mr. Speaker. It is not hard to understand with that kind of dissention, with that kind of disunity, with that kind of disorganization, why this party no longer presents any viable, reasonable alternative, and presents nothing more than a vacuous amount of noise in this Legislature; why the member for Scarborough West wants to opt out and we hardly ever see him; why the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) is hardly ever here; why those who are here hardly ever participate in the debates, except to drone on for hours and hours in the Throne Debate, as we have heard in the last three or four days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say that in the official Opposition, led by the hon. member for Brant, there is one real and genuine alternative to this government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what we like, both as alternatives, nothing but alternatives.

Mr. Singer: Let me draw to your attention, sir, the fact that in the election of 1967 the Liberal Party elected more members to this House than it has since 1937.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Big deal

Mr. Pilkey: That is not saying too much.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for York South does not like to be called a born loser more than once a year, but he is and we know it and he knows it so let us forget about that aspect of it.

Mr. MacDonald: We shall see. We got 300,000 more votes in 1967 while the member's party stood still.

Mr. Singer: Well, I only refer to the member's deputy leader and the chairman of his national party and if we cannot quote him, who can we quote? I say, Mr. Speaker, that in the hon. member for Brant that we have a leader who will be the next Premier

of the province of Ontario, a man whom we all support in our caucus without exception, a man whom all the people of Ontario will support and be proud of as our next Prime Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to another subject. I am very concerned about the state of student unrest in our universities.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): That is unusual, for the Liberal Party to be concerned.

Mr. Singer: If the hon. member for Brantford will just pay attention for a bit. Some of us have paid attention to some of his words throughout the province and we are concerned about those words, too.

I think most people in the province of Ontario are concerned about student unrest and the myriad reasons for this unrest. We know that the system needs much improvement, that it must be changed. But the methods now being employed for these changes have become as loathsome as the system itself. It is time for us to take a firm stand against the malaise that has infected our universities through so-called student activists, a term that has become as hackneyed as, say, "doing your own thing," a malaise that has spread to our secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, revolution has become an end in itself to some of these student extremists. They claim to be interested in presenting their views through the democratic process, but the events we have witnessed in the past few months have clearly indicated a negation of democracy. A great deal of genuine embarrassment is spreading amongst the members of the pseudo-radical political party that has fostered student activist movement in its initial stages.

Members of the New Democratic Party have stood on the steps of this building and we have heard them urge student demonstrators on to bigger and better things, rather than meeting with them, and teaching them that there is a right way through dialogue and a wrong way through wilful destruction, to make their demands known—

Mr. J. Renwick: What wilful destruction?

Mr. Singer: —to university and school administrations.

In a few badly chosen words, they have undone whatever good was attempted by

more reasonable men who have endeavoured to aid students and keep buildings intact.

Mr. J. Renwick: Has the member looked at the Ontario College of Arts bill?

Mr. Singer: I stood outside these buildings, Mr. Speaker, one afternoon and watched the NDP in full force, smiling encouragement at a group of students as it rapidly became a mob. We all read with disbelief the words of two headline-hungry men, who jumped in over their heads and said, "Demonstrations are good" but then they went further.

Their encouragement included such sage advice as sit-ins, burn-ins, chop-ins and anything else that would endear them to the irresponsible. And chaos, like a sticky snowball, rolled on, picking up whatever flotsam and jetsam was scattered along the way. All this, Mr. Speaker, in the name of reform.

The final proof of the shame felt by their colleagues is the fact that NDP apologists are now writing very learned columns in the daily newspapers, washing the hands of these architects of anarchy, because they do not have the backbone to do it themselves.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Read that column.

Mr. Singer: And so we have come to the point where a student who witnessed the destruction of Sir George Williams University could say that the only thing that averted a bloody messy riot pitting activists against pacifist backlash, was the fact that the building had started to burn. Maybe that is why the hon. member—and the hon. members on my left know to whom I refer—maybe that is why the hon. member in question urged Ontario children to burn their schools. It is a proven way, Mr. Speaker, to avert a riot.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Who was that?

Mr. Singer: Through you, Mr. Speaker, I advise the members of the House that it is time to put the whole picture of student unrest into prospective. We agree that the system must be changed. We feel that university administration has tried to understand the demands of the students and has met them more than half way. But this vocal minority is not satisfied to take the time to participate in meaningful dialogue. They live by a creed of intimidation mostly, I would say, because like all extremely vocal minorities, they have really made no attempt to understand the philosophy and the mechanics of the issues at stake. Any reasonable voice is very quickly stilled, and the militants

blunder on, the bowers of academy laid bare in their wake.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come for us, the elected representatives of the province of Ontario, to take a stand. I think it is most important that we do, and with this in mind I am going to set out six principles that I think should govern the actions of all of us.

First of all, we are not going to abandon our responsibilities merely because we are over the age of 25 years. Secondly, we must serve fair warning that we will not tolerate riots, burnings, physical violence, sit-ins and destruction of property. Thirdly, we encourage all students, Mr. Speaker, to participate in a meaningful dialogue that will bring about desired reform. We hope that the majority of students who now turn the other cheek will not continue to walk out and leave the field to a vocal and irresponsible minority who want to leave the impression that they speak for all.

We encourage, Mr. Speaker, the stands of our universities and administrators to be brave and bold, to stand up to this challenge and not cravenly to give way to these pressures merely because there seems to be an idea abroad that this is what higher education is all about today.

As politicians on the government's side, the members of the Conservative Party, must say to the people of Ontario, that since you were the people who put us here, we will accept these responsibilities. And on the Opposition side, Mr. Speaker, we must say that since we are here, our job is to watch and criticize and to suggest practical alternatives, that this is what we shall attempt to do, but that we will carry out our task with responsibility. We will not encourage chaos merely to embarrass the government. Our criticism, hopefully, will be meaningful and we will suggest, Mr. Speaker, reasonable alternatives, as is our duty.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, all of us must say to the people of Ontario that we have a responsibility and we will try to carry it out to the best of our ability; to provide the best educational system that we are able; to provide equal opportunity for all. This system must be within our collected means to pay for and it must relate to all of the other responsibilities that the government of Ontario has to all the rest of its people.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Read the book again to the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Sopha: What, is the third element back again?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, and it is here to stay!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, we come, as we must come, to some comments about the most Machiavellian political fraud ever perpetrated on the people of Ontario.

That is the one called the basic shelter exemption. Subsequent to the release of the Smith report and to begin the 1967 campaign the leader of the government party plucked out of that interesting volume one little goody which he thought was going to stand him in great stead. He was going to bribe the people with their own money and so, at the cost of \$150 million the commitment was made. Machiavellian-like in fashion, it did fool the people and they did what they did in that election, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sopha: Out-Machiavelliing Machiavelli.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs announced in this House, on April 3, 1968, that after intensive research, his department had come up with a system of providing property owners in this province with a basic exemption of \$2,000.

A system that beyond any doubt would contain these features—

And I now quote from the Minister's own words:

—that would extend its benefits in the greatest degree possible to each person who pays residential taxes—

I will continue the quote—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is right.

Mr. Singer: To continue:

—and beyond that, to the person who bears the impact of these taxes for each dwelling.

And get this one, Mr. Speaker:

It would make sense from an administrative point of view, being simple enough it would not require a cumbersome bureaucracy to handle it and would not require excessive costs.

That is what he said:

It would have the greatest possible degree of reliability—there would not be imposed on any individuals any red tape.

The Minister went on to say:

Since taxes are one of the cost factors that determine rent, the government has devised a guarantee that tenants would

benefit. This provision assures every household in Ontario, whether owned or rented, will get the benefit of this property tax reduction.

According to the Minister, the bill required landlords to pass on to the tenants the full amount of the rebate. Now let me ask, Mr. Speaker, if there is a member in this House, be he Conservative or Liberal or NDP, whose constituency work has not quadrupled in the area of landlord and tenant problems as a result of the gaps in this legislation?

Is there a tenant in this province who will not, sooner or later, suffer from this administrative nightmare? How many unscrupulous landlords have been given a perfect out for unwarranted rent increases as a result of the department's lack of foresight?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What have you done for the landlords?

Mr. Singer: Quoting the Minister again:

The bill will provide about \$150 million in 1968 in the form of tax credits to those who bear taxes on residential property.

And let me repeat—

—a system that would make sense from an administrative point of view, being simple enough that it would not require cumbersome bureaucracy to handle it and would not require excessive costs.

I would assume that the Minister referred in the latter quote to costs to the government in administering the plan; that an estimated average of 50 cents in cost of administration comes to about \$1½ million. Remaining with the cost of administering the rebate for a few minutes, have hon. members considered the added cost to property owners who pass on the rebate to their tenants and who the Minister has ignored completely?

Let me provide him with an example in case he does not already know about it and read from a letter that I received from one property owner:

I am more than pleased to give you the details of cost I, as a small property owner, incurred through the distribution of the government-sponsored tax rebate.

We look after some 750 suites. Usually, one woman handles the office load for these. However, to make rebate cheques I employed a second person. The two ladies advise me they spent three-and-a-half to four weeks to get the rebates out to the tenants, checking the rental cards against the leases, old and new, computing

the portion of tax due to each tenant, writing our cheques, filling in the cards so that a record of this is kept and mailing out the cheques. Apart from the wages paid to these people of at least \$800, we have bank charges of 15 cents a cheque and postage charges of six cents a cheque.

Since in many apartments there was more than one tenant for the year 1968, we estimate we made out no less than 1,000 cheques. Add to this the cost of stationery and supplies. We must also consider that all these cheques will have to be processed by our bookkeeper and accountants.

I therefore feel that the cost of sending out each cheque has cost my company no less than \$1.25 to \$1.35 per cheque.

The arithmetic is fairly simple—\$1,200 to \$1,500, to this one apartment owner. That is one of the benefits of the simple system that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is passing on to the people.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To 1,200 or 1,500 apartments?

Mr. Singer: No, 750. And I gather the Minister is not concerned with the man who owns 750 apartments. He has no concern at all; he has no concern with the tenants, either.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am just asking.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, you will recall with me the date, January 2; that was the date after which those rebates should have been sent out. This must have been a terrible day for the Minister. Tenants who had not received their rebates by the December 31 deadline began taking the advice given by the Minister in July of 1968. "Call the police!" That is what the Minister said, "Any problems, call the police." So thousands of people started to call the police and the police threw up their hands in horror. The police had no authority to do anything. Had the Minister bothered to consult his colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), he would have ascertained this very quickly.

But the Minister is not a good consulter, so he did not consult the Attorney General, and he was giving out free legal advice as he had continued to do throughout the piece, and most of the free legal advice was wrong. It was worth exactly what the people were paying for it—nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the police sent them to the justices of the peace, most of whom were very indignant, and so the Minister thought

everyone had better call a special number, a hotline, and he set it up. The number was 365-6881. The calls averaged some 900 a day.

In the meantime, the Minister said that it would not be unreasonable for tenants to deduct the amount of their rebate from their rent cheques, hastening to advise the public he was not advising them to do so but merely suggesting it was a reasonable thing to do.

Then the Attorney General felt that he must perforce get into the act, and I have a clipping here where it says:

HOLD-OUT TENANT RISKS, WISHART WARNS

Attorney General Wishart yesterday disputed Municipal Affairs Minister McKeough's advice to the tenants who didn't get their 1968 property tax rebates to deduct the amount from their rent. Wishart told the Legislature—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Why does he not resign?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member asked me that on January 3.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Minister does not realize the significance of what he is doing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: January 3, and I am still hanging on.

An hon. member: Just hanging, that is all.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to point out to the hon. member on my left that when he is in his own seat he is entitled to be heard in this House, and when he is not he is not so entitled and he has been very vocal just now.

Mr. Singer: I will continue quoting:

Wishart told the Legislature that such a step would not lead to court action because most tenants are bound by their leases to pay their rent in full at regular intervals. But he said landlords might be ill-advised to refuse to pay the rebates and then take the tenants to court for non-payment of rent because they would face possible counter-claims from the tenants.

Mr. Speaker, sitting on the same front bench within a few feet of each other are two Ministers, one of whom offers to give free legal advice which is invariably wrong, who has to be caught up from time to time by the Attorney General, and who adds to the confusion of the greatest Machiavellian political fraud ever perpetrated on the voters of the province of Ontario.

Employees of the information department

of the Minister of Municipal Affairs were also confused by the Minister's pronouncements. They must have laughed bitterly at their Minister's promise that the scheme would be carried through without a cumbersome bureaucracy to handle it. And perhaps they smiled in tired satisfaction when the costs of installing more telephones and staff began to mount.

By January 4 the tenants were panicky. Landlords were becoming abusive, the police and justices of the peace were refusing to clean up after the Minister and the Minister himself was whining. He was whining through the piece that the department's role was to slow down landlord and tenant disputes.

Caught in the trap of his own making, he could only supply day-to-day excuses and by January 9 he decided he had better issue another press release, still insisting that 99 per cent of the tenants had received the rebate with no problem. He concluded his press release with a paragraph that subsequent events must surely have made him regret, and this is the paragraph:

This system has nothing to do with rents which are geared to supply and demand. The tax reduction allowance did not come out of the landlord's pocket; he simply passes on what he has received. The landlord has exactly the same rights as he has always had in setting rents and the tenant has exactly the same rights to accept or reject the same.

There you are, Mr. Speaker, he stirs up the storm, he gives bad advice, he tries to retreat. He does not recognize or understand what he did to the landlord-tenant relationship; the disturbance he has caused, the extra costs he has caused and the confusion that this \$150 million political fraud has reaped on all the people of Ontario.

I would like the voters of this province, Mr. Speaker, particularly those who voted for the Conservatives in the last election, to be made really aware of the over-simplification of an extremely complex situation; of the diabolical twist of mind that assumes they are so gullible as to believe that the rebate really did not affect the rent.

I would like the poor people who are not property owners and have to rent apartments or flats on a month-to-month basis, to take some comfort from these words when they face the increase of up to \$40 a month. Because the substantial part of it, Mr. Speaker, has to be laid at the feet of this Minister of Municipal Affairs.

It was in anticipation of just such a situation that I asked the following question the day that this bill was first introduced, and hopefully the Minister will still remember. I said to the hon. Minister, how can he ensure that the credit will be passed on to the tenants who have something less than a yearly tenancy, such as a monthly tenancy, unless he brings in rent control?

This question, of course, Mr. Speaker, went unanswered. But it was so obvious in this ill-conceived, badly administered, stupid plan, that this is what would have to happen to any tenant who was not there on the basis of anything less than a yearly lease. It had to happen. And if the Minister had thought, he would have known it, and he would not have perpetrated this fraud on the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Of course, a year ago the member was not for rent control. He would never have voted for it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this question went unanswered, as I say, but the implications of the nightmare of increased rents was imminent. It was supported by the Minister in this House on April 11, 1968, when he stated that the only way to insure that unwarranted rent increases do not take place is to have a rent control.

Hon. Mr. McKeough. That is right.

Mr. Singer: And rent control, Mr. Speaker, is something that this government has consistently refused to consider. And we do not have to look any further than at what took place in the private bills committee when the government majority shot down the efforts of the city of Ottawa to bring in rent control on a temporary basis to relieve some of the people of Ottawa from the havoc wrought by this Minister.

Thousands of tenants are afraid to seek their rebate, Mr. Speaker, because if they do not have a lease they run the risk of being thrown out of their homes or having their rents increased. The rebate itself is practically worthless. In essence, it is a stupid little amount, which is meaningless, even though in sum it cost us all \$150 million.

Surely this money, if it was really intended to help those people who most need the help—the elderly, the poor, those on relief, those unemployed—could have been distributed in a meaningful way, Mr. Speaker. Surely it would not be beyond the ingenuity of all the talent that inhabits the front benches over there to devise a system whereby, if we are

going to spend \$150 million of our money in these days of fiscal chaos, the people who really need it will benefit, and it can be administered without all this confusion, strife and fraudulent intent.

Surely this money, Mr. Speaker, if intended to help these people, should have been distributed in a way where the help was going to be meaningful. Why could we not build some homes for elderly people; why could we not build some government assisted houses; why could not that \$150 million have been put in the hands of the Minister who had the responsibility for housing so that working people who are earning something less than \$12,000 a year could go into the market and reasonably hope to buy a house.

This is the kind of planning, or lack of planning, the kind of misconception, the kind of naivety, Mr. Speaker, that must make every citizen of Ontario wonder about the intelligence of those people over there who are charged with making such decisions.

I would like to read a letter, Mr. Speaker, that states beyond a shadow of a doubt that this scheme is now ending in complete and absolute chaos. This is a letter addressed to me by a practising lawyer, and if the Minister wants to know what his name is I will gladly tell him or give him a copy of the letter. It is re the tax shelter allowance and it concerns a particular tenant. He says:

Further to my telephone conversation with you in which I advised you that I act for "so and so", a former tenant of some property on Spadina Road, the tenant has occupied these premises for a period of some seven or eight years and has since vacated on February 15, 1969.

He advised the owner of the building that he had not received his tax shelter allowance for 1968, but he got no reply. I wrote to the owner of the building and I received no answer. I arranged for the tenant to speak with the proper department of the province of Ontario in order to discuss this matter and this was done some five weeks ago.

The letter, Mr. Speaker, is dated February 20, 1969,

—and he was told that his complaint would be disposed of in due course.

Today I telephoned the department and spoke to a Mr. Stevens who appears to be the man in charge, and who advised me that they had some 4,000 complaints—

The hon. Minister of Correctional Institutions wondered how many thousand. Mr. Stevens

is quoted—and it has not been denied—that on February 20 there were some 4,000 complaints before him—he apparently is one of the Ministers officials—

—from tenants who had not received the tax shelter allowance for 1968. He did not know when they could process the tenant's complaint.

He further advised me that no charges could be laid against the landlord after June 30, 1969, and that if the tenant's situation was not reached by that time—

The Minister must think this is very funny. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that when this kind of charge is being made against an apparently responsible Minister that all he does is sit there and cackle as though there was no problem, as though his administration was good, and as though this scheme was being well administered.

I am ashamed, Mr. Speaker, really of the actions of this Minister all through the piece, and particularly at this time when he is under serious criticism. The least he can do is sit there and listen and not think it is all a great joke. He further advised:

—that it would be fruitless to file a complaint with a justice of the peace since the justice of the peace would not accept any complaint without the approval of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Further, the department was not in a position to give approval at this time so the complaint could be lodged, and we are now in the unfortunate position of just going around in circles.

It appears to me that the legislation is there, and that my client is being prevented from taking any action by reason of a lackadaisical negligent approach of the particular department handling these matters.

May I have your decision in this connection?

Well, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that I put to the Minister on February 24 this question:

How many complaints has your department received to date concerning the refusal of landlords to pay the tenants the rebate provided by the provisions of the Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968? What has been the disposition of these complaints? How many of these complaints have not yet been processed? How soon is it anticipated the balance of these complaints will be dealt with? How many justices of the peace in Metropolitan Toronto or anywhere else in the province of Ontario have been instructed

not to accept information concerning offences alleged to have taken place under the provisions of this Act unless the acceptance of such informations is first approved by your department? If so, on what authority? If not, why should a Mr. Stevens of your department, have so advised an enquiring solicitor on February 24, 1969? Is it correct that no charges can be laid alleging breaches of this Act after June 30, 1969? If so, on what basis? If not, why would a Mr. Stevens of your department have so advised an enquiring solicitor on February 20, 1969?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not answer me. He ordered that the question be tabled as an order for return. It sits today on the order paper and one must presume that by reason of his silence all the suggestions and charges made by the solicitor in his letter to me are, in fact, correct; that there are some 4,000 complaints sitting there in the Minister's office; that the staff he has employed are not able to deal with them; that time will run out on June 30, 1969—and I knew the answer to that question without asking him.

But you and I know, sir, that the provisions of The Summary Convictions Act allow six months within which an information must be laid, otherwise no information can be laid. So that if they are not laid by the end of June, 1969, the cut-off date having been made December 31 by regulation under that statute, then no charges can be laid.

But the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is how they were able to get to the justices of the peace and instruct them not to accept any complaints. By what colour of right does the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs have to instruct justices of the peace in the administration of the job they are charged with by the people of Ontario?

Surely, Mr. Speaker, a Minister such as this one, who sits and chuckles and guffaws in the face of charges like this, has something better to do with his time and his effort than to interfere improperly and illegally with the administration of justice in the province of Ontario.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when this Minister seriously should hand in his portfolio; that he should resign, because he is a disgrace to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, this plan has been such a washout, such a failure, and everyone else is doing a little Budget predicting, let me do one too. I predict that tomorrow the Provincial Treasurer is going to say that it is

abandoned. It really has achieved no useful object at all. Nobody is happy with it.

The people intended to benefit have not benefited; the criticism that is levied justifiably on the Minister's head mounts all the time; it has been an expensive, wasteful, and politically embarrassing piece of government business; it has benefited very few of the people who really need to benefit. As a political plan and as a political bribe it has served its purpose in the election of 1967. That election is gone, they achieved their purpose, now they need the money, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully that horrible plan will vanish tomorrow and hopefully with it the Minister of Municipal Affairs will go too.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How could the member ever have voted for this?

Mr. Singer: Is that the only answer the Minister has?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It was just a question.

Mr. Singer: Is that the only answer the Minister has? Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Minister now has launched an interjection himself: Come, get into this debate with me.

Is that the only answer you have? Have you no better justification, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, for such a haphazard, useless, stupid plan than to hurl a question across the House, "why did you vote for it?"

Mr. Speaker, as we said at that time—notwithstanding our grave doubts about the effectiveness of the scheme; notwithstanding our graver doubts about the Minister's competence to administer it—who really kicked Santa Claus in the teeth?

Here was this great government giving away \$150 million. In the words of the Minister it was going to be wonderful, everyone was going to benefit. We took him at his word, but we expect better than that from this Minister and from the gentlemen who inhabit the front benches. They failed, and this failure will haunt them for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn now to another subject. We look forward with great trepidation to tomorrow's Budget. If anything we have read in the papers, or heard in this House, is meaningful, we must anticipate substantial tax hikes. After all, are we not in a tax jungle, a time of fiscal nightmare, and financial chaos?

These are the words and phrases we have heard many a time. Have we not got a large

deficit behind us? And are we not looking to an even larger one ahead of us? Why, Mr. Speaker, must we anticipate that our taxes have to go up tomorrow? Why is every government to whom we pay our money spending more and more and caring less and less what these dollars do?

I do not think any government is exempt from this criticism, Mr. Speaker. I do not understand why our federal government had to increase its net expenditures by 10 per cent in its most recent budget. Can we never expect a reduction on that level of government? Do we have to have more Bonaventures or more hydrofoils with the waste of money involved in both of those?

Granted, we here at Queen's Park have no direct control over these matters, but surely we must make our voices heard about this kind of waste and extravagance.

Coming a little closer to home, Mr. Speaker, and within the control so-called of two Ministers and two departments, we have absolute authority over our municipalities and our boards of education. How long is it since anyone in Ontario has received a reduced municipal tax bill? Is it really necessary, the competition continue to build—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right across the province!

Mr. Singer: Right across the province? The Minister has not looked at the tax bill. He may have noticed in these new computerized bills that came out—I have got one of them—that the reduction was there if he looked in the figure, but the end total went up and continued to go up in most municipalities in the province, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are not accurate.

Mr. Singer: Well, if I am not accurate I hope the Minister will get into some of these debates and explain his folly because he has not.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, perhaps just—if I might—

Mr. Singer: Oh, please do.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On the house with an average assessment which is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$4,000 or \$5,000 right across this province last year, the average rebate was about \$50. The average taxes went up \$40, so the taxpayer, the average taxpayer in this province, on his property tax bill, was ahead about \$10 last year. I know you would want to be fair about that.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I assure the hon. member that taxes did not go down!

Mr. Singer: Certainly I would want to be fair. In the case of the average man the level gets awfully low.

I would say that more tax bills went up in the province of Ontario than went down. When the Minister reaches his average, he is dealing with the people in the lower income bracket, so that most people did not benefit.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is the—

Mr. Singer: Let me say, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is the people we are interested in—the people in the lower income bracket.

Mr. Singer: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding all this, has the Minister ever really asked the question, whether it is necessary that the competition must continue amongst municipalities to build bigger and better and more expensive City Halls? It is going on all over the province—each one with a new architect, each one more elaborate than the last one, and each one with an addition being planned before the cornerstone really has been laid on the one that was planned the year before.

Municipal elected official salaries have been soaring beyond control. Why is it that elected councillors and aldermen seem to travel thousands of miles to technical cement conventions, which they cannot possibly understand? Why is it that they travel to Europe and to Asia and all over the world at the expense of their taxpayers and the Minister does not say nay, not even one little bit?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is up to their taxpayers, their voters.

Mr. Singer: I say, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the remark of the Minister of Correctional Services, that if there was a concern in the minds of this government about cutting costs there would be the odd direction, the odd comment from the Minister of Municipal Affairs about this kind of expenditure of money. But he does not seem to care. It is the fashion that taxes go up. It is the fashion that more money be spent. It is the fashion that bigger trips be made. It is the fashion that we go to more conventions.

This is the thing, Mr. Speaker, that puts up the tax bill that municipal taxpayers have to pay every year. Take our boards of education, for example. Does each new school have

to be bigger and better and more architecturally unique than the last one? Does each one have to have a separate architect? Does each one have to pay another seven per cent in architectural costs? Do they all have to have swimming pools and multi-gymnasiums?

Is it necessary that administration buildings must be sufficiently elaborate (and that is the newest competition) to compete with the municipal buildings I talked about a moment ago?

In our county school boards, Mr. Speaker, we have created a new monster, the administrator. He, of course, must have a deputy or several of them or an executive assistant; that is a very popular phrase. It is getting endemic around here as well. He must be served by PR men and so on. The base wage for these administrators seems to be about \$30,000 per year. And if one gets a little more, the one beside him gets angry and goes to his board and convinces them that his salary has to go up a bit more.

That \$30,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, at last count, was \$1,000 higher than the provincial deputy Minister of Education was receiving, and substantially higher than that salary paid to the Deputy Minister of University Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, can one who understands these facts not wonder about where the control lies or if there is any? Whether there is any real concern in the minds of those gentlemen who inhabit those benches about helping the person who lives in this province, who pays taxes to all these levels of government?

I say, Mr. Speaker, there is apparently no real responsibility in this government to review and control these expenditures. They do not seem to care. They do not seem to have an interest. Let us look closer to home. Let me first talk about Medicare and the \$175 million that is available to the province of Ontario if we join.

I must admit I just do not understand what the Premier's approach to this subject is. He says he is not opposed to Medicare and yet, with the exception of Quebec, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, he is (today at least, who knows what tomorrow will bring), standing almost alone against the federal plan.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Nonsense, two thirds of the people of the country disagree.

Mr. Singer: The Prime Minister is getting a little testy. We have listened to his speeches about Medicare at great length and hopefully, he is going to listen to these criticisms because

as long as I have to stand here, he is going to get them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just be right.

Mr. Singer: I am right. You are not the only one who has the right to express an opinion. We here have a duty to examine your opinions and to criticize them and this criticism, I think, is reasonable. My colleagues think it is reasonable and most people in the province of Ontario think it is reasonable.

Mr. Sopha: I was not here to hear the criticism, but I agree.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is the kind I like, that is the kind I understand from your benches.

Mr. Singer: He knows, Mr. Speaker, that in this time of fiscal chaos he can get \$175 million by opting in and nothing if he stays out. He knows that the federal government is not backing off from its decision. He knows that the federal government is supported by—what is it—66 hon. members who were elected in the last federal election on the Liberal side; by all the members who were elected in the last election from Ontario on the NDP side; and by most of the members who were elected from the province of Ontario on the Conservative side.

In fact, if the count was taken, Mr. Speaker, I would think that only six members from the province of Ontario do not support federal Medicare. Now these people, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Now these people, Mr. Speaker—all right, name who does not.

An hon. member: Who did not vote?

Mr. Singer: Stand up, one of you and name a federal member from the province of Ontario who does not support Medicare, no matter what party he belongs to.

Mr. R. T. Potter (Quinte): What about Trills from Hastings?

Mr. Singer: Well, there you are, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Potter: You asked for it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, those 86 have at least as much claim to a right to speak for the people of the province of Ontario as does the Premier. After all, their mandate came a year later than his. After all, the leader of the government in Ottawa, Prime

Minister Trudeau, made this an important part of his campaign and what could be more responsible than those people in Ottawa saying that they, too, have the right to speak for those Canadians who live in the province of Ontario?

We do not believe and we resent bitterly the fact that the Premier takes upon himself, only apparently, the right to speak for the people of Ontario, that he expresses all their opinions. We say he is wrong. We just do not believe that he knows what he is talking about. The Premier knows that of those presently covered by medical insurance in Ontario more than 70 per cent cannot take that coverage with them if they change their jobs, and that they could if they had federal Medicare.

He knows that two per cent of those presently covered in Ontario are covered only if the doctors come to give them treatment in hospital and that this is far from adequate and would not apply if Ontario joined the federal plan. He knows that doctors have long since ceased to object either to OMSIP or to the federal Medicare plan and that he can anticipate no trouble from them.

He knows that private plans such as those run by London Life can give better rates and more benefits because—using the Premier's own words as they appeared in Saturday's *Star*—they do not have to insure the lame, the halt, the blind, the poor, the unemployed, those on welfare, and so on. OMSIP does this, and he knows that OMSIP's rates could be substantially reduced if they were able to cover the healthy, the civil servants of the province of Ontario. Their rates could be lower than those offered by London Life because they do not have to take a profit out of the service that is being provided. He knows all this, Mr. Speaker, and yet he continues to object.

He says that he is not against equalization grants—and I like this little approach—provided they are identified as such, all put together in a neat little package as I understand, but that he does object to subsidizing poorer provinces under the guise of a tax for Medicare. Yet he knows that Ontario, of all the provinces of Canada, is best able to provide more in equalization help.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, he is not an advocate of the single tax theory? His budget tomorrow will again reveal that he is going to get funds wherever he can find them and in as many ways as possible. He knows that the people of the poorer provinces need more help from the wealthier provinces, and that if Ontario

gives more—and in so doing raises the standard of health of other Canadians, this is not something that should be called a political fraud.

Why then the reluctance; why then the recalcitrance; why the stubbornness; what is he trying to prove; who is he trying to serve? I do not think he is trying to serve the people of Ontario at all in this stubborn, unreasoning attitude.

Mr. Speaker, since preparing these remarks last night there was an event that took place in the House this afternoon and there seems to be at least one new development in this plan.

That is the matter referred to in today's *Toronto Star* by my leader in his question addressed to the Premier before the orders of the day. Has something new been added? Has Ontario ever before suggested that private carriers such as PSI and London Life be allowed to carry on as if they were on a non-profit basis in a manner similar to those arrangements that have already been made in British Columbia and Alberta? If so why have we not heard about that before? Why has the Premier just discovered this?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it at all. He is looking for a way out; he is looking for a method to save face. All of his other arguments have gone and so he stands here before us this afternoon and says, "Yes, there are some consultations going on this week".

Well if British Columbia was able to do it, and Alberta was able to do it, why has he not been able to do it long before now? And if this is all that stands between him and entering Medicare, for goodness sake, Mr. Speaker, have the Premier exercise his control and direction, back away from his stubbornness, be a big enough man to admit he has made a mistake. Let Ontario get into Medicare for the good of all of the people of Ontario; for the good of all the people of Canada; and last but not least, to give him another \$175 million to put in his budget tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me address the attention of the members of this House to the fact that the Premier of our province must surely be called the taxiest Premier in our history.

Since he became Premier there have been 17 tax increases. Each year, with the exception of three, and the three exceptions are interesting too—the year he took over as leader, that would have been a bit too soon, and the two years immediately preceding

general elections in 63 and 67 there were no tax increases. Now, let me read what the tax increases were, Mr. Speaker.

In the Budget in 1964, gasoline tax up by 2 cents a gallon. Diesel fuel up by 2 cents a gallon. Succession duties up by 25 per cent.

In the Budget in 1965, tobacco tax removed from retail sales tax—average 5 per cent increase.

In the Budget of 1966, sales tax up by 2 per cent—from 3 to 5 per cent. Gasoline tax by 1 cent. Motor vehicle fuel tax up 1.5 cents. Tobacco up one tenth of a cent per cigarette. Land transfer tax from one fifth to two fifths of 1 per cent.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, we skip 1967, election year.

Mr. Nixon: No new taxes that year.

Mr. Singer: No, sir.

Mr. Nixon: Untamed rivers that year.

Mr. Singer: That is right. That is the year we give away wastefully, exorbitantly, irresponsibly, \$150 million. So by the time we come back, Mr. Speaker, in the Budget of 1968, more increases—4 per cent for cigarettes, 2 per cent for gasoline and motor vehicle fuel; 1 per cent for aviation fuel; and 1 per cent for racetracks; 100 per cent registration fee for cars; increase of 10 per cent licence fees for trucks; registration fee for buses, trailers, and other trucks raised along the same general line; increase in fees in licences in The Department of Lands and Forests and fishing licences for the first time in the province of Ontario.

I am sorry the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) did not mention that in his remarks this afternoon when he was taking my colleague for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) to task, but I think it is important, we do have fishing licenses.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter a few days ago from a constituent of mine who owns his own house, has no debts, but is denied most of life's luxuries because he cannot afford them. He had many interesting observations and these were just a few of them:

For years, we, as taxpayers, have watched and listened to people spend our money and we have been very placid about it. The time has come for someone to do some serious thinking, to find ways and means of saving our hard-earned money without hurting the little people.

Mr. Speaker, I agree. Surely the time has come, and perhaps it is not too late on the eve of the budget, to urge with all the sincerity at our command, that this government look to itself before it takes more money out of the pockets of the people of Ontario.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the only years in which we do not have taxes filed upon us are those immediately preceding an election, and, of course, the year that the good premier first took office.

This year, again, we are faced with the prospect of tax increases, and I ask the Premier if it has ever occurred to him that a little house cleaning might turn up the odd million.

For example, how much of the taxpayers' money has been wasted on the Confederation of Tomorrow booklets resting on the fourth floor, carton piled upon carton, both in English and French, that he does not know what to do with; or the 7,000 copies of the economic report that were never distributed—that was even indecent enough to draw the attention of the Provincial Auditor. Our Provincial Auditor really has not been noted over the past years for drawing too much attention to government extravagance, but he did comment on that one.

And that Tory headache, Mr. Speaker, the Centennial Centre of Science Technology. I do not know what the Minister of Public Works is going to tell us when his estimates come along—the last time his arithmetic was not so good—but it was obvious that the price had moved from \$5 million to \$30 million at last count. The government has no idea how these things work, no control over costs. It is small wonder that we face financial chaos and a fiscal nightmare.

How about a real economy drive? In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt that that Cabinet over there is far too large. There are 23 of them heading as many departments, which duplicate, in fact, sometimes triplicate services. Surely this is the height of economic inefficiency.

I noted that President Nixon, the new president of the United States, appointed a cabinet of only 12 men. If he is able to govern that country of some 250,000,000 people with a cabinet of 12 men, one wonders, Mr. Speaker, why we need 23 of those fellows over there.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have a peculiar breed of cat amongst those 23.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, we have this peculiar breed of cat, the Minister without Portfolio. I have yet to hear the Premier or either of his Ministers without Portfolio designate what their responsibilities are. It is very nice to have them about, to have them in private offices. One of them, Mr. Speaker, even now has an executive assistant. Can somebody please tell me what an executive assistant does for a Minister who has no duties at all? Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do something about our fiscal nightmare the government must look to itself.

Mr. Speaker, in The Departments of Highways and Transport we have the most obvious waste. The government could certainly save a substantial sum of money by amalgamating these two as they once were, and provide a much more efficient and satisfactory service.

Besides, as we sit in the House we wonder why we need a Minister of Transport when his superiors will not let him do anything. He makes no decisions. All the important decisions are made in Highways or Treasury and the Minister. All he has to do is make comments about why he does not have vehicle inspection. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is the sort of reform that should be brought about.

The information branch of The Department of Education estimates its expenditures at \$386,000. What do we see for that? How many useless brochures cross the desks of our teachers briefly, on the way to the wastepaper basket? What was the last estimate given to us by the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) that his report cost \$4 a copy to distribute? Surely even the words of that worthy Minister are not worth that much in expenditure on thick paper, fancy artwork, expensive printing to distribute throughout the province of Ontario. Either the quality of the publication should improve, or the practice should be dropped.

Radio broadcasts cost \$65,000, and who do they get to? Have we ever heard a justification for that expenditure? We spent \$25,000, one tenth of the operating costs of Lakehead Teachers' College, in recruiting teachers from other countries.

Mr. Speaker, what about the horrible cattle market of teachers that just went on a few days ago. The hundreds of thousands of dollars wasted in newspaper advertising because it does not lie within the ingenuity of the people who sit on the Treasury benches to work out a better scheme of allocating teachers to new jobs.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there are so many avenues that could, should and must be ex-

plored whereby economies could be effected in this government. It makes one shudder to think that tomorrow, we are going to get another tax raise.

What about the central purchasing system that was supposed to be set up? You will recall with me, Mr. Speaker, the interesting article that appeared in the *Financial Times* a few months ago. It has been referred to in the House. I have yet to hear any denial coming from the Provincial Treasurer saying that the article was wrong, or that the system is working properly or an admission that it has failed because of the petty jealousies existing amongst the various Cabinet Ministers who will not allow a central purchasing system to work.

Mr. Speaker, we are just not convinced that those people who are Canadians and who live in Ontario are getting their money's worth. They are finding it harder and harder to live and to pay the taxes that are being levied by all levels of government. It is with a feeling, Mr. Speaker, of complete frustration that we must look forward to tomorrow's Budget. Our people are going to take it on the chin once again and this government just does not give a hoot. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the amendment moved by my leader, which reads this way:

That the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House, be amended by adding thereto the following words: That this House regrets that the government:

1. Has failed to conduct the province's financial affairs responsibly and neglected to cause an independent and all-embracing study of its programmes and administrative procedures to be made.

2. Has failed to protect tenants' rights and to insure adequate housing for the people of Ontario at a fair price, including a system of permissive rent control.

3. Has neglected the proper development of the northern part of the province of Ontario, and by the lack of a sound policy toward the north and its natural resources, the government has thereby failed to promote the economic well-being and prosperity of all the people of Ontario.

4. Has failed to provide educational opportunity, facilities, and financing to insure that all Ontario students have an equal access to our educational institutions, and has failed to develop an effective policy to

meet the unrest on our university campuses.

5. Has failed to provide suitable programmes which allow our agricultural community to realize their fair share of the benefits available to other segments of our economy.

6. Has, by its inaction, allowed the pollution of air, water, and land to worsen.

7. Has failed to insure equal access to proper medical care for all our people.

8. Has failed to plan for the proper economic development of our province.

9. Has failed to bring about meaningful reform to our ancient and inefficient system of municipal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all members of this House to support this resolution. This amendment may be the last chance for you fellows over there to do something for the people of Ontario.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must advise you that we will be unable to support the amendment to the amendment as was expected and was deliberately designed because we just cannot buy the last paragraph about the federal Liberal fiscal policies which will result in the dismembering of the Canadian nation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker, if they had merely said, we do not like the fiscal policies of the federal government, we might have agreed with them. But, I do not believe and I do not think any one of them really believes, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to lead to the dismembering of Canada as a nation. In fact, we have in Ottawa, a government that will keep Canada together. I wish we had one in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, what a weird, wild and woolly world is that inhabited by the NDP members of this Legislature. And, what a curious contrast it offers to the quagmire occupied by the timorous beasties who call themselves Liberals here in Ontario.

But before I go into details to substantiate these allegations, let me congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the progress which you have initiated in the rules and procedures and the effectiveness of this Chamber and indeed, of its committees. And let me thank you, sir, for the services of your office and for the stature, character and very fine attributes which you bring to this high position and which contribute so much to the

effectiveness of the work of the Parliament of Ontario.

Let me congratulate also, the member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) on his re-election as deputy Speaker and let me say, to him also, how much we appreciate the fairness and firmness that he brings to debates in committee.

Now I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. These fine members are a credit to their area, an ornament in fact, to the public life of Ontario. They have set forth in some detail, the progress which we have made and the progress which we can expect in the years to come.

Now in the woolly world of the NDP, we find these incredible, unbelievable situations. We find the poorest attender in this legislative Chamber, the member for Scarborough West, taking three quarters of an hour to demand more power, to demand more prestige and to demand more pay while he takes the hard-earned tax funds of the people of this province and spends his time trying to be the hero of Mount Royal, flitting here and there like Peter Pan all over the world and ignoring those serious responsibilities for which he was elected to this Chamber.

We see the white knight, the personification of all virtue, the member for High Park, maximizing for his own profit, ignoring ethical and moral considerations time and time again for personal profit. The most damnable of these instances, and the only one I will deal with now, is the fact that he sold the Canadian dollar short when that dollar was under pressure. He sold the Canadian dollar short and yes, bragged about it on the Merv Griffin Show and explained what he had done and urged other people to do it. Yes, most traitorous and most—

Mr. Pilkey: What about the money from West Germany?

Hon. Mr. White: —unfitting, despicable for any citizen and certainly for any legislator to do.

We find the social welfare prophet, the member for Beaches-Woodbine, restructuring his corporate organization and refining his subsidiaries to maximize his profit and to minimize the chance of loss.

Mr. Pilkey: The Minister opposes the profit system?

Hon. Mr. White: In this never-never land called socialism, in the never-never land of the NDP, we find the deputy leader calling

the leader, was it Hitler, did he say that? Did he call him a Hitler? Did he say in a sneering fashion he was Messiah? Did he say that? Did he say he was a tool of the union bosses?

An hon. member: That is right.

Hon. Mr. White: A tool of the union bosses—did he say that he lacked the will to win—

Mr. J. Renwick: You are confused—

Hon. Mr. White: And so we have these strange beasts out of the never-never world—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Now the Minister has got his beasts confused.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Aberrations.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh yes, that is right. My colleague, the Minister of Mines, says, "aberrations". We have these strange aberrations emanating from the never-never land of the NDP.

Now, what do we find in that quaint quagmire called Ontario liberalism?

Mr. Sopha: Virtuous and outstanding.

Hon. Mr. White: We find the deputy leader from Sudbury calling a special press conference, was it only a year ago, to condemn Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Sopha: It did not hurt him very much.

Hon. Mr. White: And now, my friends, we witness the incongruous spectacle of seeing that same member, the leader of the "Ready, Aye Ready" school, here in this Chamber so that every time the Ottawa Liberals suggest thus and so, the member for Sudbury says, "Ready, Aye Ready." He springs to attention and says, "Ready, Aye Ready."

I must admit that we were very satisfied and very well pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have the Liberals meet in convention in London a couple of weeks ago, at which time they tried to come into the 20th century. They had a large clinic to which were invited several hundred thousand people in that county. I am very glad to be able to report to you, sir, that that offer was well used, because five citizens from 300,000 came out to register complaints or to make suggestions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is what you call vested interest.

Mr. Pilkey: They could have held it in a telephone booth.

Hon. Mr. White: This was a very helpful service to me because as the hon. members may know I have had a clinic in London for eight and a half years. I have had more than 400 such meetings and I have served more than 5,000 citizens.

Mr. Nixon: Those were the days when you never came to the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. White: On an average day I got 20 or 30 people and it was really most interesting that you were able to get five.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister was handling two ridings then.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me mention a curious incident that took place here a week or two ago.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The Minister showed up!

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Sudbury got up and scolded our Premier and scolded our government and had a small temper tantrum because of the space he had been allocated on the first floor. And did the leader of the government have anything to do with that? No, sir, he did not. And did the government itself have anything to do with that? No, sir, they did not. Did the leader of the Opposition plan that move? Yes, he did. But did he 'fess up, and say to the member for Sudbury who sits on his left, "That is my doing?" No, he let the member hurl his complaints and insults at this side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: But I do not want to belabour that point, as a matter of fact, because the leader of the Liberal Party has many troubles within his own caucus, and many troubles within his own party. I think it is not fitting that I should contribute to those difficulties.

I have been in here ten years and I have witnessed four changes of leadership, I think it is, which is an average of about two and a half years per leader, and I think that would mean the incumbent's time is just about up. I think so. As evidence of that fact I hold in my hand, a newspaper entitled the *Scarborough Mirror* of February 19, that is a week ago Wednesday. The heading is "That is no lady, that is our Premier" I would

like to quote a couple of more meaningful portions:

The president of the Scarborough Centre provincial Liberals said, "It is either that or the premiership." Mr. Martin says, "You can't have it both ways." Then he adds, "It is an exciting idea, isn't it, a lady Premier." He hastens to explain, "Of course, Judy is no lady as she herself claims. She is a politician first, last and always."

Scarborough Liberals admit Judy did not say yes and she didn't say no. She didn't even say maybe, but she batted her eyelids and everyone is excited. That is charisma for you, just like Trudeau.

"Poor old Bob Nixon," the LaMarsh-Yump group says. "He has pulled the Ontario Liberal Party together, but who has ever heard of him outside of his cleaning lady at Queen's Park."

"There is a story going around," Mr. Martin says, "about the Canadian from a foreign land, Etobicoke maybe, who was asked what he thought of Nixon. "I figure he'll make a good president if they give him a chance," the man said.

That could spell disaster for the Liberal Party in the next election, Mr. Martin claims, and the Scarborough Yump group sincerely believes that Judy spells la difference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me mention briefly the interesting and stimulating experience that 13 of us had this summer. You recall that this Legislature established the select committee on taxation at the end of May, 1968. Early in June, we started a series of meetings that took us to 12 cities in Ontario which enabled us to receive 117 delegations and 357 briefs, if I remember correctly, with the result that we turned in a report on September 17 as we were required to do.

Now, sir, I have to tell you in absolute seriousness that that was a most remarkable summer, I think I can say for all of us. We put aside our partisanship, at least until the final week or two of the exercise. We travelled together from place to place through the north country in a chartered aircraft, and through southern Ontario east and west in a chartered bus.

I remember my wife saying to me—I think this was early September—"My, this has been a warm summer" and I had to say well I do not know, that is news to me, is it? We had gone from the bus into a city hall, and from the city hall into a motel, and from the motel back on the road. I had compared it in pri-

vate conversation with no experience of being on a ship in war time, and that is the kind of camaraderie we did develop.

I must say that I have tremendous affection and respect for members from both sides of the House that participated in that gruelling summer. I think the member for Ottawa said it was the long-hot summer.

Now, those recommendations as distilled by the select committee will form the foundation for tax reform in Ontario, no doubt. It would be inappropriate for me to speculate about the nature of the Treasurer's presentation tomorrow, but I hope and expect that those of us who spent that summer together can look back on those endeavours with a feeling of satisfaction and accomplishment on behalf of all of the people of this province.

I think it would have been better if the Liberal caucus and the NDP caucus had not jumped in in a partisan way in the last couple of weeks.

Mr. MacDonald: How about the Tory caucus?

Hon. Mr. White: No, the Tory caucus had absolutely nothing to do with that report—not a single word of direction was given by the Tory caucus or its leadership.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: I do not want to overstate the point because perhaps it was fitting that that should happen, although I must say it came as a surprise, not only to me but to some members of the opposite parties. It came as a little bit of a surprise, a little bit of a disappointment, that that partisan tack was taken. But as I say, sir, perhaps it is most appropriate that these recommendations go through the cauldron of partisan debate.

I would like to turn to the Throne Speech for a minute or two but before I do that, Mr. Speaker, and in summing up my very slight and inadequate tribute to the members of the select committee, I would like to quote a little passage from the *Saturday Review* of November, 1968, in which Robert Macnamara was interviewed at some length on a variety of matters.

The final question was this: why have you never tried to become a politician? Mr. Macnamara replied:

The word politician means, according to the dictionary, one actively engaged in conducting the business of government. Well, I was actively engaged in conducting the business of 50 per cent of the U.S.

government because the Defence Department, with some 4.5 million employees, and 10 per cent of the gross national product, was obviously in the business of government.

I think what people frequently do is to consider the word "politician" synonymous with the words "elected official".

This is the part I want to draw to your attention:

I have immense admiration for those who do. I think in a sense it is the highest form of political activity because it is the means of translating the diverse interests of our people into some movement toward a common goal. It is a very intricate process and requires skills of the highest type. I think if I had my life to live over again I might well want to pursue that course.

That is the way I feel about the members of that committee and that is why I am so saddened when I hear the member for Beaches-Woodbine, or the member for Scarborough West, criticize the members of this Chamber, and try to destroy the orderly, democratic, process as they do in this place and outside of it.

On the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, we set forth a 25-point programme for this legislative session. It is another chapter in an endless series describing Ontario's progress. We are building here a place where a person can do what he wants to do and be what he wants to be. We are pursuing this goal with a great deal of success.

I am thinking now in economic terms on the one hand and legislative terms on the other. I am thinking now of the economic progress, the strides we have made towards equity through OMSIP. What is wrong with it? I have not had a single letter saying to switch off. What is wrong with OMSIP? Who wants anything different? In point of fact, nobody except the opposition members and that is for a purely partisan reason.

Mr. Pitman: The Minister must be kidding!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If they go out and ask for letters they will get them.

Hon. Mr. White: What is wrong with OMSIP? If you can pay for it, you pay for it. If you cannot pay for it you get it free. If an employee group over the bargaining table want to switch off a private carrier into OMSIP they can do so. What is wrong with that? If General Motors workers have 100 per cent of their premium paid for

through their private carrier, why should they be forced into a government plan with the employees paying part?

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): How about that, hon. member for Oshawa?

Hon. Mr. White: Do the people in Oshawa really want that change made. I do not think so. Now on this point, sir, there is some political, philosophical confusion. The day before the election in the United States, I think it was November 3, James Reston had a column in the New York *Times* reprinted in one of the Ontario papers, in which he said:

When the people go to the polls tomorrow they will be testing two democratic precepts. The first of the two is that people vote not because of past accomplishments, but because of future possibilities.

Point No. 2—they will go and elect the man not on the basis of the issues he has defined, which is simply symptomatic of the man and the party, but on the basis of the character of the leaders who are offering themselves.

I think this is an interesting and valid comment. And if one accepts that proposition, then one is driven to the conclusion that the vote in June, 1968, was not a vote for Medicare, and that the vote in October, 1967, was not a vote against Medicare.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that the Minister's rationalization?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, how do you explain it then? Why did the people vote in 1967 quite differently from a few months later? In spite of that they were not voting for or against Medicare. They were voting for us, the men. They were voting for the Premier of Ontario to lead this House in an appropriate fashion for the future. I see ourselves in no way bound by the results of the June election or the results of the October election, because these were not paramount issues in either of those campaigns.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have a very lengthy portion here dealing with efficiency in government which I think will be of interest to the members and which I propose to defer until a later date, perhaps during the Budget Debate. If you will give me just a moment I will reorganize my papers here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a

minute or two on the idea of government revenues and the idea of the cost of these revenues imposed on the citizenry. There is quite a lot of fuzzy thinking on the subject.

It is typified by this newspaper heading in the *Sudbury Star*: "Income tax lament: Work for nothing first four months." The member for Peterborough will know what I am getting at, because he hinted at it earlier this evening.

Mr. MacDonald: They get more from those first four months' payments than from all their other taxes.

Hon. Mr. White: What kind of a country would this be without public services? What kind of an income would this typical worker have if it were not for the highways and the schools and the hospitals and the thousand and one public services provided by the province and the other levels of government? I think, sir, that we do our society a grave disservice if we over-simplify this complicated matter and if we seek personal popularity by perpetuating the old cry that taxes are too high.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the existing tax structure presses with undue severity on certain classes of our population, and it can be said with some justification that the taxes are too high on those groups. At the same time it might be said the taxes are too low on other groups.

I remember seeing a CBS television broadcast a week ago Sunday, I think it was, on *The 21st Century*. It was a very interesting programme. It dealt with the future in the urban centres and it had a number of interesting clips from science fiction movies. Of course, it was full of weird and wonderful ideas and good-looking girls and handsome-looking men and so on. One clip was from the 1937 *World's Fair* in New York and it portrayed the world in 1967, if I remember correctly, 30 years later.

In that world which was portrayed in that futuristic movie of 1937, there were tall clean spires, beautiful architecture, housing, residences, offices, factories. There were wonderful parks and playgrounds for the children and for the adults. There were no slums. There was no pollution. There were no transportation difficulties in that wonderful world that imaginative men pictured 30 or 32 years ago.

What happened? My guess is that in the United States in particular, and to a much lesser extent here in Canada—and by the way this is not smugness because I am quoting

John Galbraith, J. K. Galbraith, who is certainly an American through and through now, notwithstanding his early days in Elgin. At any rate, it is possible that the authorities in North America taxed too little? Is it possible that we have too many—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is stealing our lines.

Hon. Mr. White:—consumer goods through the private sector and not enough services through the public sector?

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is going to be thrown out of his department.

Hon. Mr. White: No, no, do not be so silly. I will remember that member's interjections when he goes around this province crying about high taxes, because he is one of the men who does it. And so do the Liberals.

At any rate, I am going to quote from Mr. Macnamara again. My colleague reminds me we heard the Liberals again tonight on it.

Now, here is what Macnamara had to say on that and it is interesting enough, I think, to quote:

People are worried by higher taxes—of course that is what is involved.

—but people mistakenly believe that an increase in taxes moves us toward bankruptcy. It does not have anything whatsoever to do with bankruptcy.

Taxation is a transfer device which governments use when they want to make a shift in priority. We ought to have an intelligent discussion in this country of what people want to do with our national wealth. Do we want to spend it on adding to our luxury goods, many of which we don't need, or on education for the poor, or elimination of pollution in our waters, or on aid to the developing nations of the world?

In the long run, these kinds of expenditures will add far more to our personal happiness and self-fulfilment than will expenditures on luxury goods. But this is an issue for the people to face. All I ask is that they face it directly.

That is the challenge that I put to my colleagues on this side of the House and indeed to the members of the Opposition.

Interjections by many hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker,—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Hon. members opposite may not believe it, but they did not invent thinking.

Hon. Mr. White: The prospect has been raised here by one, or several members, of having a committee of legislators to consider constitutional matters. I will not deal at length with this proposition except to say that the Premier has agreed with the merit of the idea and has wondered how it might best be utilized or what precise function it might have.

I call attention to the *Globe and Mail* of a couple of weeks ago—I am sorry I do not have the date—in which Mr. Trudeau dealt with the same rather perplexing idea at the federal level. Mr. Trudeau said:

I think I am inclined to agree with the Rt. Hon. member for Prince Albert. I would hope that this question may be raised in various Legislatures across the country. I do not think I would venture to answer the question, but I can say that if we do set up a parliamentary committee, I suppose it would deal in part with subjects which are of provincial and federal interest and the question might arise as to whether we are interfering with provincial affairs. I would hope that this would not be the interpretation and that such a committee could, if necessary, travel across the country. But it is a delicate subject and might require the kind of consultation which the leader of the New Democratic Party has suggested.

It is a delicate subject, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason for the caution and the thought that is being given to it.

Reading history about the early days of this country and more particularly about the events which preceded 1867, I am quite intrigued by the idea of legislators taking full part in the negotiations and discussions—and I might even say the camaraderie—which led to the climactic event of Confederation. I am wondering if we here now, in this more sophisticated and much larger and much more complicated governmental world in which we live, might not have the wit and the wisdom to find a role for larger numbers of politicians, for the legislators in this Chamber, and indeed, for municipal politicians also. It seems to me that our success in the future is going to depend on rationalizing the present system so far as revenues and responsibilities are concerned.

This is going to be—I will not say an almost impossible job—a very, very difficult job. It is going to depend very largely on the education which is garnered by the legislators and municipal politicians and the federal politicians, too. I do not know, but

it seems to me that something not unlike the select committee we had last year might be a way to approach the idea. It is my understanding in the province of Quebec they have had a constitution committee. My surmise is that they had some expert staff on that committee and I have been informed that was one of the reasons why Quebec went to some of the earlier federal-provincial conferences so well prepared. I think it behooves us here in this chamber, all of us I mean, to try to devise a way in which the talents and the energies and the dedication of our legislative members can be best used.

Mr. Speaker, this very interesting little booklet, "Government Reform in Ontario", deals with the problem which citizens have in attempting to assign responsibility and in attempting to seek redress from the appropriate politician. This is one of the large number of reasons why we should try to rationalize this division of responsibilities in revenues. That is why, if I may say so, it is so unfair for anyone to suggest to the provincial Premier that the idea of fiscal rationalization is in some way inferior.

It is an inextricable part of the re-apportioning of powers and revenues. It is absolutely impossible for one to proceed without the other, and I think it is cheap politics to suggest that the fiscal side is being introduced for inferior reasons of any kind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I am going to bring my remarks to a close here with some reluctance, but I will put a portion into the Confederation debate and a portion into the Budget Debate and thereby hope to edify members of the Opposition.

The amendments, Mr. Speaker, which have been offered by the Liberal leader and by the NDP leader, are an affront to the energy, ability, enthusiasm and performance of the people of this province. They have been framed by men of little faith, unaware of the progress our people have already achieved and blind their potential for even greater achievements in the decade ahead.

We say to you—discard your partisan blinkers, reject these amendments, awaken to the reality that is Ontario 1969—and our possibilities for growth and development in the decade ahead. Stand with the Progressive Conservative government. Stand with our Prime Minister, a leader who knows what the people of this province can accomplish, a leader who looks forward and upward for the greater progress of this province. Stand with us now as we stand and cast our vote

for Ontario, as we vote for Ontario, its people and its future.

Mr. Speaker: The debate on the Speech from the Throne being now concluded, we shall vote on the original resolution and the amendments which I shall now read:

Mr. Belanger moved, seconded by Mr. Jessiman, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, PC, CD, QC, LL.D., Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects in the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Nixon moved, seconded by Mr. Singer, the following amendment in reply to the Speech from the Throne, namely:

That this House regrets that the government:

1. Has failed to conduct the province's financial affairs responsibly and neglected to cause an independent and all-embracing study of its programmes and administrative procedures to be made;

2. Has failed to protect tenants' rights and to insure adequate housing for the people of Ontario at a fair price, including a system of permissive rent control;

Now, there has been a great deal of disturbance tonight, and I would appreciate you giving the chair the opportunity to put the motions before you as they have been made on both sides of the House.

3. Has neglected the proper development of the northern part of the province of Ontario, and by the lack of a sound policy toward the north and its natural resources, the government has thereby failed to promote the economic well-being and prosperity of all the people of Ontario;

4. Has failed to provide educational opportunity, facilities, and financing to insure that all Ontario students have an equal access to our educational institutions, and has failed to develop an effective policy to meet the unrest on our university campuses;

5. Has failed to provide suitable programmes which would allow our agricultural community to realize their fair share of the benefits available to other segments of our economy;

6. Has, by its inaction, allowed the pollution of air, water, and land to worsen;

- 7. Has failed to insure equal access to proper medical care for all our people;
- 8. Has failed to plan for the proper economic development of our province;
- 9. Has failed to bring about meaningful reform to our ancient and inefficient system of municipal government and, therefore, that your government does not enjoy the confidence of this House.

AYES

Pitman
 Renwick
 (Riverdale)
 Renwick (Mrs.)
 (Scarborough
 Centre)
 Stokes
 Young 16

NAYS

Carton
 Connell
 Davis
 Deacon
 Demers
 De Monte
 Downer
 Dunlop
 Dymond
 Edighoffer
 Evans
 Gilbertson
 Gomme
 Good
 Grossman
 Guindon
 Haggerty
 Hamilton
 Haskett
 Hodgson
 (Victoria-Haliburton)
 Hodgson
 (York North)
 Innes
 Jessiman
 Johnston
 (Parry Sound)
 Johnston
 (St. Catharines)
 Johnston
 (Carleton)
 Kennedy
 Kerr
 Lawrence
 (Carleton East)
 Lawrence
 (St. George)
 MacNaughton
 Meen
 Morningstar
 Morrow
 McKeough
 McNeil
 Newman
 (Windsor-
 Walkerville)
 Newman
 (Ontario South)
 Nixon
 Paterson
 Potter
 Price
 Pritchard
 Randall
 Reid
 (Rainy River)
 Reid
 (Scarborough East)
 Reilly

Mr. MacDonald moved, seconded by Mr. Renwick, that the amendment be further amended by adding after the words "inefficient system of municipal government" the following words:

- 10. has failed to alter the existing structure of power and wealth in our society, and to use the full powers and resources of a modern state, to
 - (a) affirm housing as a basic right, and assist this by channelling corporate surpluses and investment funds into a major, government-directed housing programme;
 - (b) establish a universal, public car insurance programme at cost, based on compensation without fault;
 - (c) set out a realistic charter for hundreds of thousands of unorganized workers, including a minimum wage of \$2.25 an hour and proper overtime and holiday provisions, and laws which will facilitate organization and collective bargaining;
 - (d) set up a public development corporation to undertake policies aimed at increasing Canadian ownership of Ontario industry;
 - (e) solve the financial impasse by radical reform of the tax system, including a tax on capital gains and land speculation.
- 11. has failed to express adequate condemnation of those federal Liberal fiscal policies which will result in dismembering the Canadian nation.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. MacDonald which was negated on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Burr	Apps
Davison	Auld
Deans	Bales
Gisborn	Belanger
Jackson	Bernier
Lawlor	Boyer
Lewis	Braithwaite
MacDonald	Breithaupt
Makarchuk	Brunelle
Peacock	Bukator
Pilkey	Bullbrook

NAYS	AYES	NAYS
Reuter	Nixon	Hodgson
Robarts	Paterson	(Victoria-Haliburton)
Rollins	Peacock	Hodgson
Root	Pilkey	(York North)
Ruston	Pitman	Jessiman
Simonett	Reid	Johnston
Singer	(Rainy River)	(Parry Sound)
Smith	Reid	Johnston
(Simcoe East)	(Scarborough East)	(St. Catharines)
Smith	Renwick	Johnston
(Hamilton Mountain)	(Riverdale)	(Carleton)
Smith	Renwick (Mrs.)	Kennedy
(Nipissing)	(Scarborough	Kerr
Snow	Centre)	Lawrence
Sopha	Ruston	(Carleton East)
Spence	Singer	Lawrence
Stewart	Smith	(St. George)
Trotter	(Nipissing)	MacNaughton
Villeneuve	Sopha	Meen
Welch	Spence	Morningstar
Wells	Stokes	Morrow
White	Trotter	McKeough
Whitney	Worton	McNeil
Winkler	Young 38	Newman
Wishart		(Ontario South)
Worton		Potter
Yakabuski		Price
Yaremko 83		Pritchard (Mrs.)

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 16, the "nays" are 83.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost. We will now vote on the amendment moved by Mr. Nixon.

The House divided on the amendment moved by Mr. Nixon which was negated on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Braithwaite	Apps
Breithaupt	Auld
Bukator	Bales
Bullbrook	Belanger
Burr	Bernier
Davison	Boyer
Deacon	Brunelle
Deans	Carton
De Monte	Connell
Edighoffer	Davis
Gisborn	Demers
Good	Downer
Haggerty	Dunlop
Innes	Dymond
Jackson	Evans
Lawlor	Gilbertson
Lewis	Gomme
MacDonald	Grossman
Makarchuk	Guindon
Newman	Hamilton
(Windsor-Walkerville)	Haskett

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 38, and the "nays" are 61.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the motion lost.

The vote will now be on the motion. Shall we use the same vote? Same vote reversed?

I declare the original motion moved by Mr. Belanger carried. 61

Resolved, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Budget will be introduced to the House. May I point out to the members that this will be televised and we are all slaves to the medium. The bells will start to ring at 2:20 in order that we may make a time commitment. We would like to open the House on time, so that the bells will go perhaps five minutes earlier than usual. May I ask that the members assemble with dispatch.

When the Budget is completed, we will resume the constitutional debate which will run through Wednesday. Then tomorrow, I hope to be able to give you a list of the departmental estimates in the order in which the first few departments will be called and we will go to estimates on Thursday.

We will sit tomorrow night, of course, and Thursday night.

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

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Premier, is it not his intention then to go to the order paper otherwise this week?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, not at least tomorrow. If there is legislation that needs to be dealt with on Wednesday, I will so inform the House tomorrow.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The estimates for Thursday, has that been designated?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The first estimate to be called will be The Department of the Treasury

and Economics. That will be called on Thursday, but I will give a list of several tomorrow.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Will the Prime Minister, perhaps, be going to the question period and other material before the orders of the day after the Budget address?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes. We will start with the Budget, as soon as we assemble. When the Treasurer is finished with his presentation, we will revert to orders of the day.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The questions are after the commercials. Why do I have to order my affairs to suit the television people? It is an invasion of my rights.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the member might consult with his leader; this was done by agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you quite frankly this is an experiment, and if it proves to be distasteful to the members it will never be done again. But at least we thought we might try it. We have some real reactionaries here; maybe they do not want to try anything new.

But if it is the opinion of the House after we have tried this that it is distasteful to the members, then of course, we will not do it again.

An hon. member: We will let the member for Sudbury do the commercial.

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

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! May I elaborate on what the Prime Minister has said, that it would be helpful if we could open slightly before 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. I would ask the co-operation of the members.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:00 o'clock, midnight.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Budget address, Mr. MacNaughton	1799
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	1821
Seventh report, standing private bills committee	1821
Tobacco Tax Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. White, agreed to	1822
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. White, agreed to	1822
Hospital Tax Act, bill to repeal, Mr. White, agreed to	1822
Chemical Mace, statement by Mr. Wishart	1822
Hydro strike, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon	1823
Abolition of boards of control, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon	1823
Ontario development corporation, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. R. S. Smith	1823
Burwash industrial farm, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Lewis	1824
Gas explosion, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. B. Newman	1824
John Sheeley, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Jackson	1824
Family court judge, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. R. S. Smith	1825
Industrial accident rate, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. Jackson	1825
Centennial centre of science and technology, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Sargent	1825
Resumption of the debate on the Constitution, Mr. Trotter	1830
Recess, 6 o'clock	1834
Appendix	1835

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By his own hand, W. R. Macdonald, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending May 31, 1970, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, March 4, 1969.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order. House in committee of ways and means.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves that Mr. Speaker, do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the Ontario of the 1970's stands before us in a splendid array of opportunity and challenge. Although man will probably be on the moon by the time we enter that decade, we must continue to seek a good life on the earth. There is surely no part of this planet that offers more and, for that very reason, demands more responsible preparation than Ontario. Governments must, at all times, pioneer a pathway for the people. To a large degree, the engineering plan for that pathway is the government's budget. A modern budget is not simply a bookkeeping statement or a testimony to financial management. It is a deliberate instrument of social and economic guidance; it is part of the very fabric of our society and economy.

Consequently, the budget requires deliberate timing, careful selection of and balance among objectives and, above all, purposeful planning on a long-term basis. The placing of a man on the moon is a triumph of technology; the planning of a social and economic environment requires equal skill and

firm judgment. Such is the underlying quality which we are seeking in our budgetary and fiscal policy as we prepare for the Ontario of the 1970's.

Nor is this an easy task as demonstrated by one particular issue. In recent years, we have been confronted in the development of public policy with a growing dilemma. I refer to the conflict between the need to provide the public services and facilities required by our society and the difficult problem of containing the tax burden in the face of increasingly restricted revenue-raising capacity. Consequently, I am daily aware of two constant refrains from my critics: those who claim that we spend too much and those who claim that we spend too little. Both cannot be served and I know that the citizens of this province will recognize the importance of maintaining a deliberate balance.

The low growth capacity of our revenues obliges us to finance essential increases in expenditures with successive increases in tax rates and a continual widening of the tax base. In the long run, an accumulation of *ad hoc* changes of this kind, without reference to a co-ordinated fiscal framework, runs the risk of overloading the tax system and making it economically punitive and socially burdensome. Up to the present time, it has been possible to raise revenues at the provincial level without serious economic and social effects. But, at the municipal level, the pressure to provide essential services has already led to disturbing increases and distortions in property taxation.

In planning our fiscal structure for the 1970's we have drawn on the considerable body of research undertaken in Ontario over the past six years. I refer, of course, to the impressive work done by the Ontario committee on taxation and the select committee of the Legislature on the report of the Ontario committee on taxation. The reports of these two committees provided a substantial basis for reform. During the summer and fall of 1968, the Smith and select committees' reports were studied intensively by a task force in The Department of Treasury and Economics, which worked particularly closely with the staffs of The Department of Revenue and The Department of Municipal

Affairs. This task force delineated the Smith and select committees' recommendations in terms of their implications for provincial-municipal finance and operations. The task force then provided a comprehensive range of policy options for review by the government.

We are now prepared for decisive action in the best interests of the Ontario taxpayer. This budget has been specifically designed as a "Fiscal Framework for the Future"; it is a two-part plan to lay the foundations for a modernization of the public finance system in Ontario. First, it provides a budgetary basis for 1969-1970 with emphasis on the continuation of essential provincial services and municipal aid within the limits of our immediate financial manoeuvrability. The first and foremost stage in a programme of fiscal reform must be the containment of expenditures. The only way to arrest growing tax burdens and to relieve the pressure on the province's tax system and debt-raising capacity is to arrest the growth in total public spending. I can assure you that this objective has been pursued rigorously, although not, I trust, slavishly in this Budget.

The second part of the budgetary plan involves a blueprint for a longer-term programme of basic reform in provincial-municipal taxation and finance. The guiding principles are contained in Budget paper B, which is the white paper on our intentions in this area as promised to the people of this province. Simply stated, the broad objective is to provide a more equitable and viable financial basis for the development of provincial and municipal operations in future years. Concrete measures will be taken to integrate provincial-municipal tax systems and to permit a more measured and systematic control of the level and distribution of tax burdens. A series of measures will also be advanced to strengthen and modernize the financial and functional structure of the municipal sector of the Ontario governmental scene. Because of the central importance of this fiscal reform programme to the development of public policy in Ontario over the next few years, I propose to read Budget paper B immediately following my Budget statement on our expenditure and finance plans for the fiscal year 1969-1970.

According to the technique of presentation introduced in 1967, this Budget statement is supported by two other Budget papers. Budget paper A contains a review of the Ontario economy in 1968 and an evaluation of Ontario's economic prospects for 1969 as a basis for determining the appropriate form

of our fiscal policy. Budget paper C presents the government's financial statements. These statements contain some additional refinements to the developing format which we have introduced over the course of the past year.

I should first like to review the financial operations of our government during the 1968-69 fiscal year. Although the results of this fiscal year are not yet complete, we are confident that our expenditure guidelines and restraint policies will result in our final expenditures falling somewhat below the total spending estimates presented in last year's Budget. At this stage, however, we are obliged to present our 1968-69 financial picture on the basis of eight months' actual spending and revenue, along with forecasts for the remaining four months as presented by individual departments and agencies. In recognition of this limitation, The Department of Treasury and Economics is preparing to introduce new and more sophisticated accounting practices throughout the government to ensure an immediate flow of financial data to the department. This should provide a continuing profile of the current financial situation and clearer guidance for cash management and investment decisions. Meanwhile, details on the estimates and our present performance for the current year are contained in Budget paper C.

The performance of the economy surpassed my expectations at the time of the 1968 Budget and our revenues clearly reflect this buoyancy. Although the federal government is expected to reduce payments under the income tax collection agreement by some \$22 million as the result of an over-payment in 1967-68, our total net general revenues for the year are estimated at \$2,520 million, compared with our forecast of \$2,505 million in the last Budget statement.

Net general expenditures, on the basis of our present information, are expected to reach about \$2,787 million compared with the 1968-69 estimate of \$2,780 million. As a result, our budgetary deficit in 1968-69 should amount to approximately \$267 million. This substantial deficit, notwithstanding restraint and extensive review of all government programmes, clearly illustrates the problems facing this province in its attempt to meet existing priorities and to provide relief to local governments.

In recent years, our non-budgetary transactions have been an important factor in helping us to finance budgetary deficits, largely because of the investment funds

which we borrow, through debentures, from the proceeds of the Canada Pension Plan. In 1968-69, we estimate the surplus on non-budgetary transactions at almost \$182 million. We can anticipate a net cash deficit of approximately \$149 million compared with our forecast deficit last year of \$252 million. As you know, we have been very successful in establishing a first-rate credit standing in the European capital market. As a result, we have met our financing requirements, exclusive of debt retirement, at highly favourable rates and terms in West Germany, while employing our liquid reserves to redeem the major portion of our maturing debt.

The overall result of these financial operations will have the effect of raising our net capital debt by the end of the current fiscal year to \$1,718 million. This level of debt remains well within the financial capacity of this province; in fact, it could be retired with only eight months' revenue and represents a per capita debt of only \$231.

In laying the groundwork for our fiscal framework for the future, I wish to discuss two factors which have been important in determining the form of our budgetary plan for 1969-70 and our long-term framework for fiscal reform: first, recent developments in federal-provincial financial relations that set the larger governmental framework within which we must work; and second, anticipated economic developments that dictate the speed and manner in which we can move towards our objectives because of the need to exert positive influence on economic activity generally.

Federal-provincial developments—You will recall that, in my last Budget statement, I devoted considerable attention to the need for securing a rational solution to the problem of federal-provincial tax sharing. The chronic imbalance in the distribution of tax capacity between the two levels of government, relative to the division of expenditure responsibilities, is well documented. I warned then that this misallocation of tax capacity must lead to intergovernmental fiscal discord and a breakdown of the Canadian tax structure, characterized by tax competition, uncoordinated tax pyramiding and increasingly oppressive methods of taxation, particularly in the form of rising municipal property tax levels. Consequently, I stressed the need for a constructive and fair-minded review of federal-provincial expenditure requirements and financial capacities, within a total framework of national priorities and taxation control, along the lines promised in the original terms

of reference of the tax structure committee in 1964.

It is with considerable disappointment, therefore, that I must report that our efforts to obtain a sensible resolution of the tax-sharing problem have gone unrewarded. At the meetings of Ministers of Finance in November and December, 1968, and during the Constitutional conference in February of this year, the federal government maintained its refusal to negotiate new tax-sharing arrangements. Indeed, its insistence that each level of government develop its own expenditure priorities and tax policies has been reinforced recently by a series of unilateral expenditure decisions and pre-emptory tax moves without regard for their broader intergovernmental and economic consequences.

Foremost among these moves was the social development tax, imposed in the federal Budget of October, 1968. This contravened the spirit of intergovernmental co-operation in two ways. First, direct application of the tax to the taxable income base effectively excluded the provinces from sharing the revenues under the terms of the existing tax collection agreement even though, by common understanding and convention, the personal income tax is a shared-tax field. Second, since the social development tax was clearly designed to finance the federal government's own share of medicare, it displayed a determination to implement federal priorities with little concern for provincial priorities and financial capacities. Indeed, since the social development tax is the equivalent of an average increase of nine per cent in personal income taxes, it becomes that much more difficult for the provinces to follow responsibly the federal invitation to raise their own income tax rates, either for the purpose of financing their share of medicare or for meeting the demand of high-priority expenditure requirements.

This absence of co-operation in taxation has been underlined by other developments. For example, the new federal proposals for the taxation of gifts have effects similar to the social development tax in unilaterally securing increased tax revenues from the income-stream area. The federal proposals for changes in The Estate Tax Act were made without consultation concerning the effects on provincial succession duties or without regard for provincial views on the most effective treatment of this jointly-occupied tax field. Moreover, the federal government's new taxes on insurance companies have effectively forestalled provincial moves in that area and have ignored the question of how corporate

taxation should be developed by both levels of government in order to ensure the best possible economic effects. I might also add that, in respect of taxation reform generally, the provinces have not been apprised of other federal intentions despite the obvious need for intergovernmental consultation. Consequently, we welcome the federal government's decision to revert to the presentation of a white paper on tax reform, which is the practice we are following in Budget paper B.

Finally, the federal government's otherwise laudatory concern for budgetary restraint has resulted in reduction of payments under various shared-cost programmes without regard for the effects on provincial operations. Two examples are particularly important and illustrative. First, its drastic curtailment of funds for the construction of medical training facilities is at variance with the desire to enforce Medicare. Second, its decision to delay payments due to the provinces for costs already incurred under the vocational and technical training programmes is inconsistent with the spirit of shared-cost programmes.

I mention these developments, Mr. Speaker, not out of any feeling of rancour, but simply because of their significance for the manner in which we must now attend to the problems of public finance in Ontario. At federal-provincial conferences over the past three years, we have consistently maintained that the federal, provincial and municipal governments are merely parts of the total government sector, and that the orderly development of this sector depends on an integrated approach to taxation reform. Central to co-ordinated tax reform is the establishment of a viable basis of intergovernmental tax-sharing and agreement on a common set of expenditure priorities in order that total governmental resources may be rationed and applied with maximum economic and social benefit.

The fact that we have not been successful in establishing a basic federal-provincial framework within which we can rationalize provincial-municipal financial and operational structures does not diminish the necessity and urgency for reform within our own jurisdiction. However, the short-run budgetary plan and long-run fiscal reform programme, which I am outlining for you today, has been affected by two specific factors at the federal-provincial level. First, our inability to obtain a larger share of jointly occupied growth tax fields inevitably affects the speed and means by which we can move at the provincial-municipal level. For example, given the

limited range of other tax fields available to us, it directly affects our ability to provide for long-term expenditure growth at the provincial level and to increase our aid to the municipalities. Secondly, although there has not been sufficient progress in federal-provincial relations, we are still responsible for arranging the pattern of provincial-municipal tax reforms in a way that is compatible with interprovincial tax harmony and that allows scope for eventual reform at the federal-provincial level.

For these reasons, we are deliberately putting forward our proposals for tax reform in a manner designed to provide the federal government with an opportunity for co-ordination and joint implementation. Our own objective is simply to serve the best interests of the Canadian and the Ontario taxpayer. Our earnest hope is for the co-operation of the federal government in a joint and major reconstruction of taxation along the lines which I shall propose. The recent decision to revive the tax structure committee, with an urgent mandate for tax reform, is a source of satisfaction to us, particularly in view of the strong support by the Prime Minister of Canada for review of the spending and taxing powers. Our own tax reform programme will be placed in that forum in a spirit of producing tax reform on an intergovernmental basis to meet the needs of taxpayers first and governments second.

The structure of our fiscal policies must be related to the economic environment. The Ontario economy, at the present time, is prosperous and expanding. Incomes are at record levels, unemployment is relatively low and we have only a modest amount of surplus productive capacity in our industrial system.

Last year, the Ontario economy grew by 8.7 per cent and reached a total output of \$27.1 billion. However, price increases accounted for about 3.5 per cent out of the total 8.7 per cent expansion, and this inflationary pressure persisted into 1969. The major sources of growth last year were a notable acceleration in the demand for consumer goods and an extraordinary 50 per cent expansion in our exports of automobiles and parts to the United States. The housing sector picked up rapidly, and investments in new dwellings went ahead by nearly 18 per cent. Most sectors of demand in the economy expanded. The exception was investment by manufacturing and primary industries, which declined for the second year in a row. However, total private and public investment in Ontario still rose by 7 per cent. I am confident that the excess capacity in the indus-

trial sector has been reduced sufficiently in recent months to prepare the way for a new round of investment by manufacturing industries.

Productivity began to rise again during 1968 after showing little change in 1967. Real output per person was up by 2.1 per cent, and this increase no doubt helped to offset some of the strong inflationary currents in the economy. Although the number of jobs rose by 85,000, the labour force rose by 100,000 with a resulting small increase in unemployment. This increase in the labour force amounted to a 3.5 per cent growth rate—one of the largest to be found anywhere among industrial nations. Although such a condition places a constant pressure on our investment resources, both public and private, it is encouraging to see that our provincial economy has been able to meet the larger part of this extraordinary growth in job requirements and that unemployment, although still higher than we would like, has remained relatively low.

This year I am forecasting a further expansion in the provincial economy. Gross provincial product should rise by 7.8 per cent to reach a record level of \$29.2 billion. The volume of goods and services produced should increase by about 4.5 per cent, and we can expect that inflationary pressures will ease, if only slightly, dropping from last year's 3.5 per cent to 3.3 per cent. Per capita personal income is expected to rise from \$2,800 to just under \$3,000, a growth of 6.6 per cent, and there will be a small decrease in the level of unemployment as job opportunities increase by 105,000.

In the investment sector, there is every possibility that manufacturing investment will pick up again and show a considerable improvement over last year. In housing, we can look forward to gains in outlays of about 10 per cent. The public sector will probably not be as buoyant this year in its investment requirements, mainly because of the constraints imposed by governments to bring their revenues and expenditures into line. In total, however, these events will make for a more balanced growth in investment, with more emphasis on the private and less emphasis on the public sector. The outlook for productivity is reasonably encouraging although we cannot expect to repeat last year's gain of 2.1 per cent. Output per employed person will rise by about 0.8 per cent and, if the line can be held on prices, this should help to improve our competitive position in foreign markets.

Despite this healthy condition, there are some serious financial and monetary problems in the economy, which render it particularly sensitive to expansionary spending and tax politics by any of the three levels of government. Two of the most critical problems facing us today are the pressure of serious distortions and shortages in the country's capital markets, and the persistent and eroding force of inflation.

These facts are closely interrelated. As in the past, there are serious obstacles to provincial and municipal governments wishing to float new bond issues in the Canadian capital market. International and domestic monetary conditions have pushed up interest rates. These have fluctuated to such an extent, in response to various crises, that an atmosphere of great uncertainty has prevailed concerning bond prices and yields. To this uncertainty has been added the decline of investor confidence in long-term, fixed-income investments in an inflationary climate.

In Ontario, we have been successful in finding new capital markets abroad and we intend to continue this policy as the need arises, both for our own purposes and for the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission. By doing so, we will continue to relieve the pressure on domestic capital supplies and make room for other governments and private corporations. I should mention, in particular, that the development of power—so vital to the economy of Ontario—will involve massive capital financing by Ontario Hydro throughout the next decade.

There is little evidence that higher interest rates have significantly raised the level of net personal savings. In fact, at the same time as our capital markets have been drying up, institutional innovations have allowed consumers to acquire record levels of credit for personal consumption. This factor must be acknowledged as one of the many adverse pressures on interest rates and on the supply of capital available for investment purposes. This inflationary propensity has, of course, been reinforced by the continuing rise in wage and salary rates in both the private and public sectors of the economy.

The origins of inflation at the present time are complex and diffuse. There is no indication of any real shortage of productive facilities, despite shortages of certain social services and housing which tend to force up market prices. Recent price gains appear to have contained many elements of cost pressure, such as higher interest rates, wages and salaries, profit levels, import prices, and changes in the levels of various indirect taxes. However,

when inflation persists for long periods of time, there is a real risk that it will become psychologically institutionalized, and based on an erosion of monetary and financial confidence rather than on economic fact.

Expenditure and taxation policies in this Budget have been designed in the face of two factors. The first is the deadlock in federal-provincial financial relations and the consequent constraints on our short-run and long-run revenue-raising capacities. The second is the financial and the monetary distortions in the economic environment.

I have directed my efforts towards achieving a balanced budget or a small surplus, implying the sacrifice of some essential services in the short-run. In considering the economic impact of provincial taxation and spending policies, I have been aware that our gross cash outflows amount to about 12 per cent of the total level of economic activity in the province. This compels us to measure carefully the impact of our policies on the economy. If we, and other governments, chose to be over-expansionary in our fiscal policies at this time, then the provincial economy would be quickly pushed up against the limits of its productive capacity, and the problems of capital shortage, high interest rates, and inflation would be worsened and most of the expansionary impact lost.

I would strongly urge our municipal partners to follow our example in the exercise of voluntary restraint in spending programmes, particularly in the field of education. To the extent that this does not happen, the Ontario government may be obliged to consider the introduction of machinery such as a budget review board to ensure that the taxpayer is not overly burdened and to guarantee that any further financial aid from the province to the municipalities finds its way into the hands of the taxpayer.

Let me now turn to our budgetary proposals for 1969-70. On the expenditure side, our policy has been one of severe and deliberate restraint, aimed at cutting back the growth in expenditures in line with anticipated revenue growth. As I have already suggested, this policy is intended to achieve two main objectives. First, it will ensure that our government operations do not contribute to general inflationary pressure and to pressure on the capital market. Second, it will help to bring our provincial finances into a better balance in preparation for the major fiscal reform programme which we are about to undertake.

To achieve our prime objective of containing expenditure growth, we have undertaken

the most extensive and intensive examination of expenditure programmes in the history of this province.

As a first stage, all departments and agencies were instructed to prepare detailed expenditure forecasts for the five-year period 1968-69 to 1972-73. These forecasts covered expenditure increases for existing programmes, qualitative improvements to existing programmes, and new programmes, given assumptions for such variables as population change and price increases. The expenditure projections were matched to a comprehensive series of revenue forecasts, on the basis of existing tax rates and various rates of economic growth. Together, these projections provided a profile of the government's fiscal position over the next five years. I should add that these projections did not include the cost of financing the massive financial transfers to the municipalities which were advocated by the Smith and the select committees. As a very conservative estimate, over \$400 million would be required to implement the committees' recommendations over and above the cost of the reforms already implemented, principally, the basic shelter tax exemption and the take-over of the administration of justice.

The general result of this five-year fiscal forecast confirmed and underlined the problem revealed in the 1966 intergovernmental tax structure committee projections, the Smith committee's projections, as well as those presented in Budget paper B accompanying last year's Budget statement. Total expenditures for existing programmes and a limited range of necessary improvements were projected to increase by 74 per cent by 1972-73, while revenues would rise by 40 per cent over the same period. This would increase our budgetary deficits by more than 500 per cent over 1968-69 levels to roughly \$1,225 million a year.

Such deficits could only be offset by monumental debt and tax increases. On the debt side, if we accepted the Smith committee's suggestion that total net debt should be contained within nine per cent of provincial domestic product, we would be borrowing at a rate of about \$325 million a year by 1972-73. Even after increasing our borrowings to the maximum extent, we would still be faced by a residual deficit of nearly \$900 million—again this figure does not include the cost of any further aid to municipalities. To clear this gap would require tax increases equivalent to 24 additional points on the personal income tax or seven additional points of the retail sales tax. Clearly, tax increases of

such dimensions would be intolerable. There is simply no alternative to a severe curtailment of expenditure growth.

As a second stage, early last summer, explicit instructions were issued to all departments and agencies to review critically the objectives, priorities, performance and operational efficiency of all existing programmes, as well as new expenditure proposals. These instructions were in two parts. First, all departments were requested to achieve an efficiency improvement in general administrative costs of at least two per cent in 1969-1970. Second, a set of differential spending limits was devised to be used as guidelines in determining the allowable growth in expenditure for each department or agency. These targets were based on a system of priority rankings for the whole range of government programmes. The object of these efficiency targets and priority rankings was to restrain net general expenditures to \$3 billion or below.

The severity of this target and the difficulty of achieving it deserves some comment in terms of the structure of government expenditures and the forces determining expenditure growth. As shown in last last year's Budget paper B, there are strong limitations on our expenditure flexibility in the short run. The most controllable components of government spending, administrative and operational costs, constitute only 20 per cent of our total expenditure. The remaining 80 per cent represents statutory obligations and commitments to municipalities, school boards and institutions, as well as transfers to individuals. Significant expenditure reductions, therefore, must inevitably involve restrictions in this broader area and some sacrifice of our vital social objectives.

Given these constraints to flexibility, our austerity programme has been remarkably successful. This success must largely be attributed to the skill of Treasury Board and to the cooperative effort of all departments and agencies, many of whom suffered painful restrictions on their programmes. In the four departments of Public Works, Health, Energy and Resources Management, and Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, the approved spending for 1969-1970 has been cut below last year's level. In several others, including Highways, Attorney General, Lands and Forests, and Financial and Commercial Affairs, the increase allowed for 1969-1970 will barely enable them to meet normal increases in prices and costs. Almost without exception, new programmes and programme improvements have been deferred, capital ex-

penditures have been restrained, and large administrative reductions have been made. As a result, the expenditure package which I am presenting to you calls for total spending of \$2,996 million in 1969-1970.

This net general expenditure of \$2,996 million for 1969-1970 represents an increase of only \$209 million or 7.5 per cent over estimated spending for the current year. Let me illustrate how this compares with our expenditure growth in previous years. In 1966-1967, our net general expenditure rose by \$325 million or 22 per cent over the previous year, in 1967-1968 it increased by \$473 million or 27 per cent, and in 1968-1969 we estimate that spending will rise by \$533 million or 24 per cent. (See Appendix, Table A, page 1835.)

I would like to point out that our achievement in holding expenditures to a 7.5 per cent increase for 1969-70 is considerably better than the federal government's record of 9.5 per cent. Moreover, we have managed to achieve this more rigorous restraint even though our expenditure commitments are inherently faster growing than federal responsibilities and despite the fact that Ontario bears more of the total costs in such shared fields as post-secondary education and Canada Assistance Plan programmes than does the federal government. In terms of the expected growth in the economy, therefore, the federal government sector will continue to expand relatively while ours will contract.

In brief, the containment of our expenditures within the \$3 billion target will have several salutary and desirable effects. First, by holding the growth in our expenditures below the anticipated growth rate in the Ontario economy, the balance between the private and provincial sectors of the economy will be stabilized for the first time in several years. Second, it represents a positive contribution by Ontario to the combating of present inflationary pressure in the economy and to relief of pressure on the capital market. Finally, it will relieve the burden on our tax system and bring our finances into better balance in preparation for the long-run reform programme ahead.

While our primary objective for 1969-70 is to contain expenditure growth, we are also determined to allocate our limited spending in the most desirable way possible. This is not an easy task. In the first place, we have already subjected our lower priority programmes to restraint over the past several years. Insofar as they have been stabilized at minimal operating levels, the scope for

further savings in these areas, without jeopardizing the programmes themselves, is very limited. Secondly, our priority programmes—education, health and social services, housing and municipal aid—are the fastest-growing and largest segment of the total budget. In pursuing overall budgetary restraint, therefore, it is impossible to avoid cutting into the expansion and development of these priority areas.

First of all, let me place our spending allocations for the next year in some perspective. Over the past four years Ontario has given its high priority areas—education, health and social services, municipal aid and housing—a strong build-up. Between 1965-66 and 1968-69, our net general expenditures increased at the rate of 24 per cent per year, while annual outlays on education, health and aid to municipalities grew by 30 per cent, 25 per cent and 34 per cent respectively. The proportion of total expenditure going into these priority areas rose from 63 per cent to 71 per cent, while the proportion of spending in lower priority areas declined from 37 per cent to 29 per cent of the total budget. On the loan and investment side, this emphasis on priorities has been even more pronounced. Over the same four years our investment in housing, education and health facilities rose from 53 per cent to 83 per cent of total loans and investments. This deliberate and dramatic shift in the structure of our expenditures and investments over recent years is clearly shown in the accompanying tables. (See Appendix, Table B, page 1835.)

The emphasis on priorities has been continued in this Budget. Of the \$209 million increase in net general expenditures for 1969-70, some \$162 million is allocated to education, health and social services and municipal aid. At the same time, we have allowed lower priority programmes an increase of only \$47 million for next year. Thus, the growth rate in our priority areas is 8.2 per cent, as compared to 5.8 per cent in other areas and 7.5 per cent for net general expenditure as a whole. On the investment side as well, we have been reasonably successful in gearing our programme towards the priority areas. Of the \$37 million increase in loans and advances for next year, \$27 million will go into the priority areas, particularly housing. The accompanying profile of 1969-70 spending and investment illustrates this accomplishment. (See Appendix, Table C, page 1836.)

We recognize that these are very modest increases for our high-priority areas in comparison with past increases and the urgent

needs of this growing province and population. But in many areas we had to make cuts or provide no increases at all. For example, grants for the construction of hospitals were reduced by \$13 million, our public works construction programme was cut by \$4 million, funds for acquisition and development of park lands were cut \$2.6 million, grants for construction of community centres were reduced by \$250,000 and spending on tourism and information was cut by \$155,000. In many other programmes spending was virtually frozen at last year's level, including: Ontario Provincial Police, Ontario Water Resources Commission, vocational school construction, and capital grants to farmers. As well, we found it necessary to defer almost all improvements and extensions in existing programmes, including some in our high-priority areas. Let me list some programme improvements which we have been forced to postpone:

- Increase from 70 per cent to 80 per cent in maintenance subsidy for homes for the aged;

- Increased capital aid to universities and post-secondary institutions;

- Expansion of educational television;

- Increased research grants to hospitals;

- New health resources fund projects;

- Extension of youth, recreation and leadership training programmes;

- Additional capital grants for psychiatric hospitals and institutions for emotionally disturbed children;

- Intensification of timber management programme.

Altogether our rationing measures eliminated approximately \$400 million from expenditure estimates to come down to our final expenditure total of \$2,996 million. We believe that the final expenditure package that has emerged represents a wise and responsible allocation of our limited public funds.

To conclude my remarks on expenditure policy, let me summarize the major components of our programme for 1969-70.

Education—Our programme for next year allocates an additional \$149 million to education, or 71 per cent of the total increase in our 1969-70 budgetary expenditure. This includes increases of:

- \$53 million in assistance to school boards;

- \$53 million in support to universities, which includes an increase in the basic income unit from \$1,450 to \$1,530;

\$11 million for colleges of applied arts and technology, and Ryerson Polytechnical Institute;

\$5 million in student awards.

In addition we are budgeting for \$175 million in loans to school boards and \$170 million in loans to universities, the colleges of applied arts and technology, and Ryerson Polytechnical Institute.

Health and Social Services—the spending on health programmes will register a decline in 1969-70, as a result of two special factors. First, we have reduced our construction grants for hospitals and, second, we are budgeting a substantially lower amount in 1969-70 for our contribution to the Ontario Hospital Care Insurance Plan. I would point out that this reduced contribution is possible as a result of a greater measure of support in the current fiscal year under the stabilization process which we established in last year's Budget. On the other hand, spending under The Department of Social and Family Services will increase by 12 per cent to a total of \$134 million to sustain our present income maintenance, rehabilitation and child care programmes.

Housing—A total of \$56 million has been allocated for capital advances to the Ontario Housing Corporation and the Ontario Student Housing Corporation for 1969-70, or triple the volume of housing loans expected to materialize this year. The \$19 million advanced to the housing corporations in 1968-69 is well below the amount we provided in last year's Budget. As you will appreciate, however, our accomplishments here are not always directly obvious from the dollars and cents in the Budget. Because of time lags, and the pattern of financial flows into and out of the housing corporations, the financial resources actually put to work in housing in any year may be significantly higher than indicated by treasury advances. Moreover, the funds Ontario provides draw in a vast amount of CMHC financing to produce a very large overall housing programme in this province.

During recent months, we have been active in securing a greater flow of funds for mortgage purposes from financial institutions. I would like to announce that we are now studying the appropriate means and procedures for establishing a capital fund to help fortify the supply of mortgage money for home ownership. Such a fund could assume a form similar to our present Crown corporations which administer various non-budgetary loans and advances in other sectors of the economy. We expect to describe the details

of any such proposal at a later stage in this session of the Legislature.

Total general expenditures for support of municipalities will increase by some \$25 million or 7 per cent over the 1968-69 level. This relatively modest increase is largely a reflection of the extraordinary increases involved last year in implementing two of the recommendations of the Smith committee. The basic shelter tax exemption payments involved some \$111 million in additional expenditure in 1968-69 while the takeover of the administration of justice required \$33 million.

Let me recapitulate the overall magnitude of our spending and investment programme for next year. Net general expenditures are estimated at \$2,996 million, which is slightly below our \$3 billion target and only 7.5 per cent above the programme for the current year. Loans and advances will amount to \$520 million or \$37 million higher than our capital aid programme for this year.

To allow for even these modest increases in our priority spending areas, severe pruning has been necessary in all other areas. I have already indicated that some programmes have suffered absolute cuts, some have been held to no increase and many have been allowed minimal expansion. This stringency in net general expenditure has been matched by equal restraint on the loans and advances account. Having pressed our austerity measures to the maximum tolerable limit, we expect other governments and public agencies in this province to exercise similar restraint and husbandry.

I shall now turn to our proposals for financing the government's operations and commitments in 1969-70, and for laying the foundations for our long-run programme of taxation reform at the provincial-municipal levels.

Let me repeat that our restraint policies are becoming increasingly effective. We expect our final 1968-69 results to show considerable improvement over the interim forecast; as a result, we should enter the 1969-70 fiscal year with buoyant liquid reserves.

Total net general expenditures for 1969-70 as has been mentioned, are estimated at \$2,996 million, while our existing revenue sources are expected to yield \$2,817 million, if we include some \$30 million in delayed receipts due to us from the federal government in respect of post-secondary education adjustment payments for 1967-68. This would result in a budgetary deficit of \$179 million. Our non-budgetary sources of finance, including borrowings from the Canada Pension

Plan, are expected to yield about \$692 million. Total non-budgetary disbursements are estimated at \$617 million, leaving a non-budgetary surplus of only \$75 million, significantly less than in the three previous years. When allowance is made for net requirements for debt retirement of almost \$65 million, the overall cash requirement to be financed would approximate \$169 million in 1969-1970. (See Appendix, Table D, page 1836.)

In deciding how to finance our \$179 million budgetary deficit and to raise net cash requirements of \$169 million for 1969-1970, we have been influenced by four major considerations:

The state of economic conditions, persistent inflationary tendencies, and the need to avoid government-induced overheating of the economy;

Conditions in the capital market, including anticipated heavy demands, especially from Ontario Hydro and the federal government;

The state of our liquid reserves;

Our long-term reform plans and the need to start reform on a strong and consolidated basis.

These considerations, taken together, persuaded us to aim for a balanced budget or a small budgetary surplus to avoid the need for borrowing in the public capital market. Debt financing, of course, is appropriate under certain conditions and for certain purposes: for example, it is a means of stimulating the economy during periods of recession, or financing heavy demands for social capital formation to avoid increasing unduly the burden on present taxpayers. Our decision to stay out of the public capital market in 1969-1970 is based on two considerations. The first is the need to avoid inflationary demands on the capital markets. The second and most important consideration, however, is that borrowing is not an effective substitute for the steps we must take to strengthen our fundamental fiscal position. We feel strongly that we must immediately strengthen our tax base in order to proceed with our long-run programme of increasing the equity and productivity of our tax structure.

The objective of a balanced budget or a small budgetary surplus can only be reached by severe spending restraint as already described, combined with increased taxation. I am obliged, therefore, to introduce tax changes this year.

In determining what tax increases might best be contemplated, we had to allow for a number of important factors.

1. In its October budget, the federal government introduced some significant tax increases which will affect the people of this province during our budget year.

2. Various federal and provincial tax commissions have suggested extensive reforms in the overall tax structure of the country, including intergovernmental finance. As I will explain shortly, we are now ready to propose an extensive programme of long-run reform, which we have taken into account in designing our short-term measures.

3. In evaluating alternative tax changes, our objective was to select measures that were economically justifiable as well as equitable.

When considering tax changes it is convenient to think in terms of four different groups of taxes: personal income, corporations, commodities, and other taxation.

The personal income tax has a number of features which make it the most attractive tax to increase. As I shall indicate in my programme for long-term reform, we hope to make this tax field the core of our whole reform programme. In order to do so, it will be necessary to give greater relative weight to this particular tax field in the overall tax structure. Other important characteristics of this tax are its progressive nature and its superior growth potential. Inevitably, this tax will be the key to our ability to develop a more equitable and efficient tax structure.

The federal Minister of Finance pointed out in his October, 1968 budget that there are two provinces which have introduced a higher rate of personal income taxation by adding five more points to their 28 point abatement under the tax collection agreement. By implication, he suggests that provinces like Ontario should follow suit to solve their financial problems. Ontario has long argued that such increased provincial taxes are very much in order, not so much through an increased tax burden but rather by uniformly higher abatements. In addition, it is important to note that Saskatchewan and Manitoba introduced their higher rates in connection with the cost of hospital insurance, which in Ontario is financed through premiums—an effective drain on personal incomes.

I have rejected the idea of raising the personal income tax this year for two very important reasons. In the first place, I am very conscious of the substantial move made in this tax field by the federal government in its October Budget. As I indicated, the

two per cent social development tax in Ontario alone will involve an equivalent in income tax terms of \$225 million. The federal government has also imposed a temporary surtax of three per cent for the 1968 and 1969 taxation years, terminating at the end of 1969.

In the second place, I firmly believe that it is premature to contemplate rate changes in personal and corporation income tax when significant reforms are in prospect. I emphasized this point in last year's Budget statement because of my conviction of the need for co-ordinated reforms between the two levels of government. I would like to add that, in Ontario's long-term reform plans, we intend to combine major moves in the personal income tax in harmony with changes elsewhere in the tax structure. This is of the utmost importance if one of our objectives is to control the balance in our tax structure and the relative burden of individual and total taxes.

As I have already implied, I am equally reluctant to consider raising the rates on taxable corporate incomes. In this area, additional considerations such as interprovincial tax levels enter the picture, although some very limited scope might exist if one considers the many natural advantages and the progressive development programme of the province of Ontario. Furthermore, in this tax field, the federal government has also imposed a temporary three per cent surtax for the 1968 and 1969 taxation years. However, we do feel that we are fully justified in asking for a greater contribution from the corporate sector in three ways.

1. **Income Tax Acceleration**—The federal government has enacted a number of amendments to its legislation with the effect of speeding up payments of income tax by corporations. It is our opinion that Ontario's corporate income tax system should conform as closely as possible to that of the federal government, both for the sake of intergovernmental uniformity and corporate convenience.

We propose to introduce the necessary amendment to our Corporation Tax Act to bring us more closely into line with the federal legislation. However, we do not intend to go quite as far as the federal government. We will change our present system of four quarterly instalments to six bi-monthly instalments. This acceleration of instalment payments will apply to all corporations whose fiscal years commence after March 15, 1969. The result of this change will be a shift in liquidity between corporations and the On-

tario government, boosting our revenues in 1969-1970 by about \$42 million.

2. **Capital and Place of Business Taxes**—I propose to make a number of changes in the capital and place of business taxes. The rate of the capital tax will be raised from 1/20th to 1/10th of one per cent, with a minimum of \$50 per year. These changes will apply to all corporations whose fiscal years end after March 15, 1969. For the transitional period, special provisions will apply.

The new rate will still be relatively modest. I therefore propose that the tax be made payable over and above any obligations which may be incurred for corporation income tax. I would remind you that both the Smith and select committees agreed on the removal of the existing waiver provision. In addition, the burden of the above increases in the capital tax will be mitigated because the capital tax can be deducted from taxable income.

In view of these changes, I feel that this is an excellent time to abolish the place of business taxes. The abolition will be effective at the same time as the capital tax changes.

The net effect of these changes will be an increase of about \$17 million in our revenues for the coming fiscal year.

3. **Sales Tax**—The third contribution we will be asking from the corporate sector falls in the area of sales taxation. I will provide the details of the changes in this field under that general heading.

Another area in which we are introducing changes is the field of sales taxation. At the present time, we have a retail sales tax of five per cent on commodities, with rather generous exemptions compared to other jurisdictions. We have a 10 per cent hospitals tax relating to amusements, and to entertainment with a tax ceiling of \$1. In addition and in lieu of the retail sales tax, we have such special taxes as those on tobacco, gasoline and motor vehicle fuel.

Following the recommendations of the Smith and the select committees to make greater use of the retail sales tax field, we have undertaken much research in these areas. We seriously considered, but ultimately rejected, the idea of removing the exemption for food purchases which would have significantly broadened our tax base. As the select committee suggested, this would require offsetting credits in order to remove the regressive aspects of such a change; such a credit

mechanism would require a fully operational provincial personal income tax system.

We also gave consideration to the Smith proposal to increase the rate of the retail sales tax. As you know, the province of Quebec already has a rate of eight per cent, with many fewer exemptions than Ontario, while two other provinces have a rate of six per cent. However, we have decided to refrain from this option until such time as we have fully exploited other avenues in this tax area to which I will refer shortly. We also feel that a major move in the general tax rate in this field should be related directly to possible future offsetting benefits in other tax fields through our long-term reform programme.

I would like to speak now for a moment about differential tax rates. The approach to retail sales taxation that we have adopted has three parts. The first of these is possibly the most important. We will submit the necessary legislative changes to integrate the present hospitals tax and retail sales tax through the introduction of a system of differential rates under The Retail Sales Tax Act.

We already have differential rates at the present time, consisting of a zero rate for exempted transactions, a five per cent rate on all other transactions under The Retail Sales Tax Act, and a ten per cent rate under The Hospitals Tax Act. It is now our intention to recognize these distinctions more formally, and to expand the range of transactions to which the ten per cent rate will apply.

Allow me to illustrate for you how we propose to do this in practice:

a. effective April 1, 1969, The Hospitals Tax Act will be repealed and fully integrated with The Retail Sales Tax Act;

b. all transactions under The Hospitals Tax Act will become subject to the differential rate of ten per cent under The Retail Sales Tax Act;

c. The Retail Sales Tax Act will be amended to make the integration of the two taxes feasible and to introduce differential rates, thus simplifying the work for the vendors;

d. in addition to the transactions which fall presently under The Hospitals Tax Act, the differential rate of ten per cent will apply to: all consumption of liquor, wine and bottled beer, irrespective of entertainment; all retail sales of liquor, wine and bottled beer; and all meals, including take-out meals, over \$2.50, again regardless of entertainment;

e. under the amended Retail Sales Tax Act, there will be no \$1 limit on tax liability as is the case under the present Hospitals Tax Act;

f. in recognition of the rise in prices for meals over the past few years, we will simultaneously amend The Retail Sales Tax Act to remove the present five per cent tax on meals over \$1.50. In effect, therefore, we will have two rates on meals, a zero rate up to \$2.50 and a ten per cent rate for meals over \$2.50.

These changes in the hospitals and retail sales tax are anticipated to yield an additional \$42 million in 1969-70.

The second aspect of retail sales taxation concerns the existing schedule of exemptions. Again, we have studied this area thoroughly. We have reviewed the practices in other jurisdictions and examined the fairness of various options in terms of the overall equitable tax structure which we hope to develop. As a result I now propose to remove the existing exemptions for machinery and equipment used in the production of goods and the provision of taxable services. The existing exemption on machinery for use in farm production will be continued.

I am quite aware that the taxation of production machinery is a major move by this government, but I hope to explain why, after much consideration, we have decided to do so. We feel that the withdrawal of this exemption will remove a substantial grey area of doubt and administrative inconvenience both for the government and the private sector. We also consider this extension of the tax base a fair and equitable one. As you will realize, this additional tax on corporations will become an allowable expense under corporation income tax, which is automatically shared by the federal and provincial governments to the extent of some 40 per cent by the federal government and 12 per cent by the Ontario government. The effective date for the removal of the above exemption will be April 1, 1969. The tax will apply to all deliveries on or after that date. The expected yield in the next fiscal year is estimated at about \$38 million.

Now with respect to services. The third aspect of retail sales taxation, with which we were concerned this year, was the suggestion to extend the base to include services. As you know, the Smith and select committees made a number of suggestions on this point. The major source of revenue under this potential area would be in the installing, repairing, cleaning, painting, decorating, and

remodelling of tangible personal property. We have decided not to extend the base of the tax in this direction at this time. We feel that any such move must be accompanied by other moves incorporated in our long-term tax reform plans, because of the singular impact on homeowners.

However, we do propose to move into the area of services on a more modest scale by extending the five per cent sales tax to hotel and motel accommodation, effective April 1, 1969. In the taxation of transient accommodation, we expect to follow the approach of other jurisdictions. The expected yield in the 1969-70 fiscal year is estimated at \$13 million.

Now with respect to other taxes, I propose to make a number of small changes to the regulations under The Retail Sales Tax Act. A new regulation will clarify that exhibitors of motion picture films and video tapes are to pay sales tax on rentals, effective April 1, 1969. There will be no limitations with respect to the period of rental. In addition, the taxation on rentals of tangible personal property will be on the basis of the full rentals. The increase in revenue in 1969-70 on account of these changes is estimated at about \$2 million.

I would like to mention at this point that I propose to bring our tobacco tax rates on cigarettes directly into line with those already existing in Quebec and Manitoba. This would mean an increase in taxation of 2 cents per package of 20 cigarettes. At this time, we do not contemplate any changes in the tax on cigars and tobacco. The expected additional yield in 1969-70 will be about \$16.5 million. The effective date for this change in rates will be at 12.01 tomorrow morning, March 5, 1969.

No major changes are contemplated in the gasoline tax. Our tax rates in this field compare favourably with all provinces east of this province and are only slightly above those in the western provinces. The only change that I propose to make in this tax is the removal of refunds presently allowed for boats and snowmobiles.

This change will mean that the owners of boats, which are in part responsible for polluting our lakes, will contribute to our fight against pollution. The additional cost to the owners will be relatively minimal, and it will involve some administrative savings and additional revenue of almost \$1.5 million. The abolition of the rebates will be made effective with respect to gasoline on which the tax has been paid on or after April 1, 1969.

The mining tax field is the only other area in which we propose to make changes. An announcement has already been made that the processing operations of mines, previously not assessed for local taxes, will become subject to assessment and property taxation for the benefit of mining municipalities in 1970. The mining properties used mainly for obtaining minerals from the ground will remain exempt. The Province will continue to provide mining revenue payments out of the consolidated revenue fund.

My more immediate proposal is to change the present structure of rates under The Mining Tax Act. We feel that the present mining tax provides the Province with an inadequate return for the consumption of irreplaceable resources. I propose to replace the present rates, which vary up to 12 per cent, with a flat rate of 15 per cent and a total exemption if profits are less than \$50,000. Every mining company obtaining a profit in excess of \$50,000 will pay on the total profit, including the first \$50,000. I would also point out that the burden of this tax is considerably eased since the tax can be treated as an expense in computing taxable income for the corporation income tax.

We are also considering new approaches under The Mining Tax Act to encourage our mining companies to process minerals in Canada rather than in other countries. As a first step, we are introducing incentives in the form of allowances for pre-production expenses which may be written off against mining profits before taxation.

These changes will apply to all companies whose fiscal year ends after April 1, 1969. The anticipated increase in revenues is estimated at about \$8 million in 1969-70.

On balance, I believe that this package of tax adjustments is best described as a series of neutral changes in terms of equity and incidence. However, to the extent that the major impact will be felt in the corporate sector, greater balance has been achieved among the broad areas of personal income, corporation and commodity taxes.

The anticipated additional revenue from the preceding tax changes is estimated at about \$181 million in the 1969-70 fiscal year. As you will recall, I estimated our budgetary deficit before tax changes at \$179 million and our overall cash requirements at \$169 million. In other words, the additional revenue from tax changes will more than meet our overall cash requirements and produce a small surplus of almost \$2 million in our budgetary transactions.

As a result, our 1969-70 programme will be self-financing without any requirement for borrowing in the capital market. Moreover, we will finance the retirement of maturing debt issues without drawing down our liquid reserves.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget which meets many basic requirements. It exercises spending restraint to the utmost. Within this restraint, it recognizes the special needs in our priority areas. This budget faces existing inflationary pressures with determination and exerts a positive influence in the fight to overcome inflation. It keeps the Ontario government out of the capital market, thereby improving conditions for mortgage financing and for borrowing by the Ontario Hydro, municipalities, school boards and other institutions, both governmental and corporate. Most important, it will provide the sound basis from which to launch the fiscal reform programme to which I have already referred. I would now like to make a detailed presentation to the Legislature on this long-term reform programme which appears in Budget paper B.

The government of Ontario is convinced that fundamental fiscal and structural reforms are necessary and urgent in this province. Both the Ontario committee on taxation and the select committee on taxation proposed extensive reforms. After examining the reports of these committees and studying thoroughly their recommendations, this government is now prepared to present its own views in this Budget paper. In brief, this paper sets out the government's reform objectives and its long-run plan for achieving those objectives. The plan calls for complementary and concurrent reforms on four fronts: reform of the provincial tax system, reform of provincial aid to local governments, reform of local taxation, and reform of local government structure.

The government of Ontario is planning a major redesign and reform of the provincial tax system. This is necessary because the present system is demonstrably deficient in terms of its equity, efficiency, and capacity to raise necessary provincial funds in the years ahead. The programme of provincial tax reform will seek to achieve three broad objectives:

To establish a fairer, more balanced and more revenue-productive system of provincial taxation;

To connect, in a co-ordinated manner, the provincial and municipal tax systems to allow

control over the level and distribution of overall tax burdens;

To harmonize and rationalize provincial and federal taxation in Ontario to the maximum extent possible.

The reform plan, which is set out in this Budget paper, calls for extensive changes in existing provincial taxes. Some of these changes have already been implemented in this budget; others will be brought into effect over a number of years. The plan also suggests trade-offs between the province and Ottawa in the shared-tax fields. Realization of the intended realignments in the shared-tax fields will depend, of course, on positive reception and reaction by the federal government. The key element in the reform plan, however, is the establishment of a personal income tax system for Ontario. This fundamental departure from the present character of provincial taxation is the core around which Ontario's next tax system will be developed.

The Ontario government intends to establish its own personal income tax system within the next two years. This move to an independent income tax is necessary to preserve the province's fiscal integrity and to achieve meaningful tax reform in Ontario.

Three developments have led to this decision: the province's need for greater access to fast-growing revenue sources in order to maintain its existing programmes and undertake essential reforms; the impasse in federal-provincial tax sharing; and the inadequacy of the present income tax abatement system to serve Ontario's long-run finance and reform objectives.

The first two of these factors have been extensively studied and debated since 1966. Federal-provincial studies and the province's own projections provide ample documentation that Ontario needs additional tax room in the personal income tax field merely to carry on its existing programmes and existing level of support to municipalities. Ontario's responsibility to carry forward provincial programmes on the scale required and to increase municipal support magnifies this need for growth tax revenues. Similarly, the federal government's adamant refusal to contemplate a more realistic sharing of income tax revenues is now an accepted platitude. Third consideration, however, warrants more detailed explanation.

Public discussion has often appeared to suggest that the people of Ontario do not presently pay provincial income tax. In fact, the people of Ontario have been paying a provincial income tax for many years. The present

provincial income tax is equal to 28 per cent of the federal basic tax, and is collected by Ottawa and returned to the province. Moreover, if the federal government were willing to accept our offer whereby the province would assume complete responsibility for certain shared-cost programmes in exchange for an additional 20 points of personal income tax, the two governments would have virtually equal occupancy of this field.

In any event, under the present income tax abatement system, Ontario is severely limited in terms of the revenues it can realistically derive from the fast-growing and progressive personal income tax field. In the first place, the federal government has effectively preempted any significantly increased provincial effort by its own heavy use of this field in recent years. Secondly, the collection agreements which govern this shared-tax field restrict the provinces to across-the-board increases when they want to increase income tax revenues.

The federal government, meanwhile, reserves to itself all the scope for raising revenues through changes in the tax base and in the progressive rate structure. At a time when overall income tax rates are already very high, these latter avenues surely are superior to further across-the-board rate increases.

The present system also denies the province any role in determining the structure and method of income taxation appropriate for Ontario. In this government's view, the present system is grossly deficient in terms of equity and simplicity. The recent imposition of the retrograde social development tax has seriously compounded these defects. Judging by the federal government's unilateral approach to tax reform, there is no assurance, moreover, that Ontario will have any more of a voice in the upcoming reform of this vital tax area. The present income tax system, therefore, is clearly not working in Ontario's interests, either present or future.

The new personal income tax system, which the government plans to establish, will have the following features:

It will aim for greater simplicity and greater progressivity than the present system;

It will be structured to produce significantly increased revenues and thereby improve the growth potential and the progressivity of Ontario's overall tax mix;

It will be designed as an integrated personal income tax-tax credit system which coordinates provincial and municipal taxes and allows control over the level and distribution of overall tax burdens;

It will be both a collection and a payments mechanism, which could eventually be adapted to replace income maintenance programmes.

Integration will be achieved through provisions for the deduction of taxes paid by individuals in other provincial and municipal fields from their tax liability under the provincial personal income tax. For example, it will be possible to replace the present basic shelter tax exemption payments by property tax credits. Such an arrangement would be superior to the present practice in two respects. First, it would channel property tax relief directly back to all taxpayers—homeowners and tenants. Second, the tax credit system offers more scope for redistributing property tax burdens. For example, the property tax credits could be designed to vary with income and family size or could have an upper income cut-off point.

Eventually, this form of integration could be extended to incorporate tax credits against payments of retail sales taxes, health insurance premiums, and other provincial taxes which are regressive in impact. An essential adjunct of this integrated personal income tax-tax credit system would be a rebate mechanism to pay refunds to those taxpayers whose total credits exceed their total personal income tax liability. Such a procedure would represent a move toward a positive income supplement or guaranteed income scheme.

To sum up on the personal income tax, Ontario has decided to establish its own system of personal income taxation rather than continuing with the present abatement system. This course of action will allow the province to raise necessary provincial funds on a fair and efficient basis. It will open up new scope for the systematic integration of overall provincial-municipal taxation in Ontario and lessen the burden of property taxes on those least able to pay. Whether the federal government is willing to continue co-operation in collection under this new system will be a matter for negotiation. Obviously, a single collection agency for both levels of government would be desirable.

Recent events in Ottawa suggest that The Department of National Revenue may be replaced by a tax-collection commission. We would suggest that consideration be given to establishing a federal-provincial tax collection commission, as a joint body to serve both levels of government. On the other hand, the absence of such co-operation certainly will not inhibit the implementation of a new income tax system in Ontario.

The Ontario government intends to tax capital gains when it introduces its provincial income tax. The government believes that capital gains must be brought into the tax system in order to achieve greater equity between taxpayers with equal incomes and among taxpayers at different income levels. It is recognized that taxation of capital gains could reduce private savings and economic growth in Ontario. However, this potential economic disadvantage is far outweighed by the positive improvement in equity and consistency to be gained by taxing capital gains.

It is Ontario's view that capital gains should be taxed on a uniform basis all across Canada. This requires either a fully integrated system of provincial capital gains taxes, a system of federal and provincial capital gains taxes or a purely federal tax, the revenue of which is shared with the provinces. Ontario is prepared to discuss these options with the federal government and the other provinces to ensure that a harmonized overall system is developed. If the federal government is not prepared to tax capital gains—either in concert with the provinces or on behalf of the provinces as well as in its own right—Ontario, nevertheless, intends to go ahead in this field. In this eventuality, Ontario's rates would have to be nominal, at least until such time as other provinces entered the field.

Ontario believes that the United States capital gains tax provides a reasonable model for designing a capital gains tax appropriate to Ontario and to Canada. Thus, the kind of tax that is envisaged would have the following features:

Taxation of gains when they are realized and upon death or emigration;

Deductibility of losses as an offset against capital gains income;

No discounting of gains to allow for inflationary effects;

Exemption of gains on homes and other specific forms of real property, up to a lifetime limit, with periodic reassessment of this limit;

Distinction between short-run speculative gains and long-run investment gains;

Concessionary rates of tax on long-run gains and, certainly, rates that are no higher than in the United States;

Fair averaging provisions, both forward and backward.

A capital gains tax structured along these lines would minimize adverse economic effects and be administratively workable, while at the same time increasing government revenues

and making the overall tax system more equitable.

The new federal Estate Tax Act limits the range for modification and reform in Ontario's succession duties. Ontario strongly believes that these two taxes should remain as compatible and as harmonized as possible. If the province were to go its own way in developing the death tax field, as Ottawa already has done, the end result could be confiscatory total tax levels, capricious overall tax consequences and a disproportionate allocation of private resources devoted to compliance and evasion.

The responsible options left open to Ontario in respect of succession duties, therefore, narrow down to two: retain the provincial tax and bring it into conformity with the new federal tax, or relinquish this tax field to the federal government in exchange for equivalent revenue. Ontario proposes to relinquish its succession duties in exchange for 75 per cent of the revenues that will accrue in Ontario from full application of the new federal Estate Tax Act.

As capital gains taxation becomes fully mature in the years ahead, undue accumulations of wealth will be moderated. In Ontario's view, therefore, the need for taxation of estates will diminish and such taxation should be gradually eliminated. This could be achieved either by the federal government, through increases in its level of exemptions, or by the provinces through forgiveness or refund of their shares of estate tax revenues.

With a provincial income tax, it would be feasible for Ontario to establish a provincial gift tax. There is little rationale for such a gift tax, however, once the province moves out of the succession duties field. Moreover, a provincial gift tax on top of the new federal gift tax would push rates to punitive levels. Ontario, therefore, does not intend to establish its own gift tax.

The province strongly contends, however, that gift tax revenues should be shared with the provinces. Since the federal government views gifts primarily as reductions in the size of estates eligible for estate taxes, then it is only fair that the provinces share in gift tax revenues to the same extent that they share in estate tax revenues, which is 75 per cent.

Ontario's corporation income tax closely parallels Canada's corporation income tax in terms of structure and design. The province believes that this conformity must be maintained in future, both for reasons of neutrality and simplicity.

On the side of administration and collection, the province is considering a major change. The Carter commission, Smith committee and select committee all recommended that administration and collection of the corporation income tax be turned over to the federal government. This government is persuaded by the obvious merits of such a step. There is no question that administration and collection of corporation income taxes would be more efficient and certain if handled only by a central authority. Personnel from both the provincial corporation tax and succession duties areas would become available to launch the new provincial income tax administration. Before reaching any final decision to turn over corporation income tax collection to the federal government, however, Ontario must be assured that the interests of corporate taxpayers as well as its own interests, and particularly its revenues, will not suffer.

The sales tax on production machinery and the higher capital taxes announced in this budget will raise Ontario's overall level of taxation on corporations substantially. This increased burden was necessary because the business sector, like all other taxpayers, must carry its fair share of revenue-raising measures. Looking to the future, however, it is apparent that there is little remaining tolerance for further increases in corporate taxation, except perhaps in corporation income tax rates. It must also be recognized that Ontario's rates cannot move far out of line with those in other jurisdictions, both in Canada and abroad, if the province is to remain competitive. Moreover, various studies have supported the contention that such increases are ultimately reflected in the price paid by consumers for goods and services.

The government believes that the mining industry has been taxed too lightly in relation to the taxes borne by other industries and sectors of the Ontario economy. The increase in mining tax announced in this Budget aims to correct this defect and to secure for all the people of Ontario the revenues which should logically accrue to them from this province's natural resources.

In addition to establishing a proper level of provincial taxation on mines, the plan for reform in the field for municipal taxation of mining properties. Beginning in 1970, mining municipalities will be empowered to levy property tax on smelters and other processing facilities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Where did the Minister hear that suggestion before?

An hon. member: Right here!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. members will please allow the Minister to continue; it is an important subject. The hon. member for Sudbury and others will have a proper time to discuss it.

Mr. Sopha: We are not on TV now.

Mr. Speaker: Whether we are on TV or not, the hon. member will please observe the rules of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Assessment of these processing facilities is now under way and scheduled for completion before the end of 1969. When fully in effect, this change will add over \$10 million a year to the revenues of mining municipalities. Ultimately, many municipalities in the north will share in this additional fiscal capacity through the formation of regional school boards and regional governments. In the meantime, the province will continue to make payments to mining municipalities out of its general revenue, though at a reduced level and through a revised formula which includes mining workers engaged in extraction operations only. This new approach to mining taxation will result in net benefits to mining municipalities and in broad benefits to Ontario taxpayers in general.

Ontario's long-run financial needs dictate that the retail sales tax remain a major and growing source of revenue for the province. Both the Smith committee and the select committee recognized this inescapable reality. The thrust of reform in the sales tax area, therefore, must be to ensure that this additional revenue is raised in the most efficient and equitable manner.

Additional revenue from the retail sales tax can only be obtained by broadening the base and/or raising the rate. In this Budget, the retail sales tax base was expanded to include three previously exempt areas: production machinery, hotel and motel accommodation, and movie tape and video tape rentals. This leaves little scope for further expansion of the base except in the area of services and necessities such as food. The province does not intend to tax food, children's clothing and other necessities, at least until the regressive aspects of such taxation can be deliberately offset by tax credits and

refunds under the provincial income tax. Nor does the province envisage any great expansion in the area of services. The costs of proper administration and collection of the retail sales tax on many services would be high because of the number of vendors involved, while the additional revenues to be gained would be modest. To the extent that Ontario finds it necessary and desirable to derive additional revenue from sales taxation, therefore, it must come primarily through rate increases.

In the present budget the retail sales tax rate on liquor, bottled beer and wine, and meals over \$2.50 has been increased to ten per cent and taxation under The Hospitals Tax Act will be incorporated into The Retail Sales Tax Act. This represents a start in the direction of differential sales tax rates for selected commodities. The province will continue to explore and develop this avenue before contemplating any general rate increase.

The 1969 Budget has introduced significant changes in other areas of provincial taxation. The tax on tobacco will be increased, gasoline tax refunds narrowed, and numerous minor changes made to remove nuisance features, reduce collection costs and streamline administration. In the years ahead, Ontario will continue to review and improve its tax policies in these and other provincial fields.

The Ontario government recognizes that the local tax base carries too much of the financing burden for the provincial-municipal sector as a whole. This undue reliance on property taxation is clearly indicated by the continuing financial squeeze on municipalities and the increasing demands for provincial relief. In 1968 the province undertook two major relief measures suggested by the Smith committee, the basic shelter tax exemption payments and the takeover of the administration of justice, shifting approximately \$150 million of financing from the local tax base to the provincial tax base. These measures have relieved the pressure on mill rates but do not constitute adequate long-run support. A major reform objective of the province, therefore, is to increase its financial support for local governments in order to reduce the burden of financing which falls upon the slow-growing and oppressive property tax.

As a first step, Ontario intends to raise its average level of support for elementary and secondary education to 60 per cent over a three-year period, beginning in 1970-71. Presently, the province's legislative grants provide about 45 per cent of school board

finances. This increase in provincial support of education from 45 to 60 per cent will represent a permanent shift in financing from the local tax base to the provincial tax base. The cost of this shift is estimated to run from \$175 million to \$250 million annually, by the end of the phase-in period.

The primary purpose of the province in assuming this increased share of education financing is to permit some compensating reduction in school board levies. In other words, the increase in provincial taxation for school support is expected to be offset substantially by reduced local taxation for school financing. To realize this desirable reduction in local levies, it is imperative that the higher provincial grants be accompanied by restraint in school board spending. In the past, increased provincial grants have been translated almost entirely into higher total expenditures on schools. This need not be the end result in future, however, because enrolments will level off over the next few years. If school boards do not, as I mentioned in my budget statement, exercise voluntary restraint in spending, this government will consider establishing machinery, such as a budget review board, to ensure that increased financial aid from the province is passed on to the local taxpayer.

With increased provincial support of school board costs, there is the concomitant requirement of allocating the aggregate grant among the various school boards. Under present arrangements this is handled by the Ontario foundation tax plan formula. This formula will have to be revised in order to generate and distribute the higher level of provincial grants among the new school board units which were established this year.

The long-run goal of the province is to assume a larger share of the financing for other local services as well. This cannot be achieved immediately because the province simply does not have the financial resources to make increased transfers. As the new provincial tax system begins to produce additional revenues, however, some of these revenues will be transferred to local governments in the form of increased grants and payments. Again, if the end result is simply increased local spending, this will necessitate central review and control measures.

The government is undertaking a comprehensive review of its grants and aid policies. As the Smith committee pointed out, some grants are obsolete and others deserve new emphasis, while in aggregate the present

system lacks co-ordination. The province hopes to correct these imperfections and to develop a rationalized overall support policy. Two changes already mentioned are examples of the kind of improvements that will be sought. The basic shelter tax exemption payments will be replaced by some form of tax credits and refunds under the provincial personal income tax, and mining revenue payments will be reduced as some mining municipalities begin to collect their own revenues from mines. In redesigning its grants policies, the province also will seek to provide more of its total support in the form of unconditional grants, thereby allowing local governments greater autonomy in their budgetary allocations.

Reform of the provincial grants system must inevitably be a long-run process. This is particularly so when the province is working towards fundamental reforms in other related areas such as property assessment and regional government. The regional government programme will simplify and assist the reform of provincial grants in two main ways. First, it will reduce the number of grant-receiving units. Second, the equalization which will occur within regions will reduce the need for equalization components in particular provincial grants. Assessment reform will also have a major bearing on the development of an improved grants system. At present the Ontario government pays out to local governments approximately \$1 billion in grants which in one way or another are based on local assessment figures. Uniform and accurate assessment is vital, therefore, for an equitable distribution of these grants among local governments. Given these inter-relationships, some time will be required before a fully adequate and co-ordinated grants policy can be formulated.

Property taxation in Ontario stands in need of fundamental reform, perhaps more so than any other area. As the Smith committee and the select committee so clearly showed, the present property tax is grossly unfair and inefficient. The proposed provincial actions to reduce the burden of financing that falls on the property tax and to offset its regressivity via personal income tax credits will substantially ameliorate these shortcomings. But reform of property taxation is still necessary and desirable, both in its own right and in order to facilitate and complement reforms in government structure and provincial grants. Therefore, the government is determined to overhaul the entire system of property taxation and make it as equitable and efficient as possible.

There are four main trusts to the province's plan for reform:

Reassessing all real property at current value;

Broadening of the local tax base by removing exemptions;

Achieving a more neutral business assessment rate; and

Determining an appropriate distribution of tax burdens among classes of real property.

Of these, reform of assessment is the most crucial for it is the foundation upon which subsequent reforms in these other areas must be based.

Current property assessment in Ontario is riddled with inconsistencies and inequities. Many properties are underassessed, some are overassessed and some are not assessed at all. Like properties are assessed at different values both within the same municipality and between municipalities. Moreover, there is no consistency among municipalities in the assessment treatment of particular classes of property. A class of property which enjoys low assessment and therefore a tax advantage relative to other properties in one municipality may be at a relative disadvantage in another municipality. The Ontario government is convinced that the only way to remove these anomalies and inequities is to reassess all properties in Ontario at current value. It is the province's aim to bring about uniformity of assessment all across Ontario in order to achieve equity among property owners, among property categories and among municipalities.

To remedy the serious existing problems in assessment, the Smith committee recommended that Ontario provide more aid and incentives to the municipalities to improve their assessment practices. The government has doubts that this approach would succeed without a complete change in management practices. It also believes that province-wide reassessment can be achieved much sooner under provincial management than under local administration. Therefore, the Ontario government has decided to assume full responsibility for the administration of property assessment. This will be done in two stages. On July 1 of this year, the province will take over the assessment function in northern Ontario with the exception of the districts of Kenora, Rainy River and Sudbury and the cities of Sault Ste. Marie and Fort William. On January 1, 1970 the remainder of the province will come under provincial jurisdiction.

This changeover will mean the absorption of present municipal assessment personnel by The Department of Municipal Affairs and assumption of present assessment costs by the province. This will represent a saving to municipalities of approximately \$15 million, allowing a corresponding reduction in provincial grants. Following this immediate step, the province intends to devote increased resources to the assessment function in order to ensure that the administration and quality of assessment is brought up to a proper level by the end of 1975.

Apart from the equity and efficiency considerations, this assessment reform will produce one major benefit to local governments themselves. Proper and systematic assessment will bring onto the rolls many properties that at present are not assessed at all or assessed on only part of their value. This will increase the revenues of the municipal sector and broaden the tax base against which future levies can be raised.

As the process of reassessment proceeds, the province will consider the need for measures to cushion its impact. Present practices vary so widely that the move to a modern and equitable base is bound to involve financial hardships in some instances. While such hardships must eventually be borne if equality is to be achieved, temporary cushioning would smooth and ease these painful adjustments.

The government recognizes the desirability of broadening the property tax base by removing present exemptions and partial exemptions. Reform along these lines would have three very beneficial impacts on local finance. First, it would increase the revenue-raising capacity of the local government sector as a whole. Second, it would reduce intermunicipal fiscal disparities. Removal of exemptions would increase the assessment base of municipalities which presently have a high proportion of tax exempt properties much more than it would for municipalities with a low proportion of tax exempt properties. Third, it would shift some of the tax burden within each municipality from presently taxable to presently exempt properties.

The major classes of property that are presently exempt or partially exempt are private properties such as churches and YMCA's, institutional properties such as universities and hospitals, and government properties at the municipal, provincial and federal levels. The province has already announced that it does not intend to remove the exemption for churches. The status of other private properties is currently under review.

As for the other categories of exempt properties, the province believes it would be premature to eliminate exemptions before proper assessment of these properties has been undertaken all across the province.

In the long run, this government hopes to be able to pay full local taxes on all the properties of the province, its agencies and the institutions it supports. The province's recent move to pay full grants in lieu of taxes on senior citizen housing units represents a modest start in this direction. However, full realization of this objective will not be feasible until revenues become available to finance such reform. This delay, moreover, will permit the province to consider any relevant findings by the federal-provincial subcommittee on intergovernmental taxation.

At present, commercial and industrial properties pay a supplementary business tax as well as a realty tax on their assessed value. This business tax applies different rates of business assessment—that is, different proportions of taxable assessment to total assessment—against different kinds of business; hence, it penalizes some businesses and favours others. As well, the present schedule of rates is replete with categories and definitions which may have been relevant fifty years ago but are totally obsolete and inappropriate today. The government of Ontario believes that this discriminatory feature of local taxation should be removed. A major reform objective of the province, therefore, is to establish a more neutral business tax on all commercial and industrial property.

This long-run goal cannot be achieved until all properties, residential as well as commercial-industrial, have been reassessed at current value. Only then will the province be in a position to measure and evaluate the impact of business assessment rates on different businesses, on different municipalities and on municipal revenues in aggregate. As an interim measure, however, the province is considering a reduction in the present number of business assessment rates, a narrowing in the present range of rates and a general modernization of the business tax legislation. A transitional reform along these lines would maintain an adequate business tax base during the reassessment period and, at the same time, reduce discrimination between different kinds of business.

The local tax reforms already mentioned will work to redistribute property tax burdens in Ontario. For example:

Reassessment will generate major shifts in tax burdens among individual properties,

among classes of property and among municipalities;

To the extent that exemptions from property tax are narrowed, tax burdens will shift from presently taxed to presently exempt properties;

Movement towards a more neutral business tax will redistribute tax burdens among businesses, on a more equitable basis.

In addition, a number of the basic reforms in other areas will have significant impact on property tax burdens. Mine processing facilities will begin to bear property taxes. The increased provincial grants for education will reduce the tax burden on all properties. Regional school boards and regional governments will tend to even out property tax burdens within their respective boundaries. Finally, any personal income tax credits or refunds for property taxes paid will tend to reduce the ultimate burden of residential property taxes on those families and individuals who are least able to pay.

One remaining element of local taxation which affects the weight of tax between residential and commercial-industrial properties is the split mill rate. In principle, the government favours the abolition of the split mill rate, as was recommended by both the Smith committee and the select committee on taxation. The province is not contemplating such a change, however, until reassessment has been completed and the impact on municipal finances can be carefully examined.

Redistribution of property tax burdens could be brought about, of course, by prescribing new norms for various classes of property right from the outset. This is essentially what the Smith committee and the select committee did in setting out new ratios of taxable assessment to total assessment for various classes of property. The government is convinced, however, that such a policy would be premature and inappropriate. Given the chaotic and discriminatory state of assessment in this province, there can be no reasonable degree of certainty that any desired distribution among property classes would in fact work out in practice. Moreover, the effects in individual municipalities of applying prescribed ratios of taxable assessment to total assessment must be substantially different than the effects for the province as a whole. The province intends to push on with assessment reform, therefore, before attempting to establish any final distribution of tax burdens.

Within the overall field of property taxation there are some classes of property which merit special tax treatment. Transportation

and communication properties, for example, must be considered separately from properties in general. The tax treatment of these special properties is still under review by the province. Farm properties also require special treatment. Generally, the government believes that the property tax on working farms should be considerably lower than on non-farm properties, because of the limited ability of working farms to pay taxes out of current income. Therefore, if property taxes on working farms show any significant increase when reassessment is introduced, the province will consider interim measures to hold the line on farm tax burdens. This does not imply that the government favours continuous tax concessions to all farms. It simply reflects the government's view that a capital gains tax is a better means of deriving the appropriate taxation from such farms rather than penalizing working farms with impossible property tax burdens.

Ontario has embarked on a long-run programme to reorganize and reform its local government structure. This reform programme seeks to achieve five major objectives:

1. A strengthened and modernized system of local government;
2. Greater efficiency in the planning, administration and provision of local services;
3. Reduction of disparities among local governments in the level of services and taxation;
4. Return of powers to local governments from special-purpose boards and commissions;
5. Decentralization and regionalization of provincial programmes wherever feasible.

The province is working to realize these objectives by means of three interrelated and complementary policies: the creation of larger school board units, the consolidation of existing local municipalities, and the establishment of a comprehensive system of regional governments.

The school board policy has already been legislated and implemented. As the new county boards of education become fully operational, some very positive results should begin to emerge. Education services in poorer and more remote areas will be upgraded; the property tax burden of school financing will tend to equalize within counties; and there will be a gradual improvement in the planning and provision of elementary and secondary education across the province as a whole.

The province is also pursuing an active policy of municipal consolidation in order to

reduce the total number of municipalities. A large number of local municipalities in Ontario are far too small to be viable units, either on their own, or within the lower tier of a regional system. Therefore, the government is working towards a target of larger municipalities. This policy in itself will reduce tax imbalances and improve the efficiency of local governments. Normally, municipal consolidation will occur among lower-tier municipalities at the time of the establishment of a regional government. In areas where regional governments are not imminently planned, however, municipal consolidation will be encouraged on its own merits.

The key element in the structural reform programme is the establishment of a system of regional governments. These new units will be urban-based in character, to enable local government to cope more effectively with the problems and needs of Ontario's increasingly urban and urbanizing society and to provide a broader range of benefits to our rural areas. The new regional units will also operate on a much broader scale, thereby providing the strength and cohesion which is lacking in the present municipal structure. This strength of the new regional units has three dimensions:

A geographic area large enough for proper physical and economic planning;

A population large enough to achieve economies of scale in the provision of public services;

A financial base adequate and diversified enough to support a reasonable level and range of services.

As regional governments are established, the province expects to see major progress towards its structural reform objectives. Powers presently in the hands of special-purpose bodies can be turned over to the new regional governments or to constituent local municipalities. The overall efficiency of local government should improve. Intermunicipal fiscal disparities, both in terms of the level of services and of taxation, should tend to even out. This equalization will occur because each regional government will provide a standard level of required services within its boundaries and will draw upon the tax base of the region as a whole for its financing.

The regional government policy will complement and support Ontario's other reform programmes. Creation of regional governments and reduction in the number of municipalities, for example, will facilitate the

development of a rationalized system of provincial aid to local government. Reform of local taxation and the regional government programme will be mutually reinforcing; province-wide reassessment will ensure that regional governments are developed from a sound fiscal footing, while the improved assessment balance achieved through regionalization will allow a more equitable distribution of tax burdens among classes of property. In addition, the province intends to work towards common boundaries for school boards and regional governments.

Regional government will also assume growing significance for the achievement of Ontario's regional economic development policies. The Department of Treasury and Economics and The Department of Municipal Affairs are working closely together to ensure that the two programmes are coordinated, complementary, and mutually supporting. The broad provincial plans for orderly growth and development in all regions of the province will provide an umbrella for the land use and environmental planning responsibilities of regional governments. Regional government boundaries will be used as basic "building blocks" in drawing up more uniform administrative boundaries for provincial departments, which is one of the objectives of Ontario's "Design for Development".

Both the regional government and regional development programmes are based, essentially, on the concept of urban growth points. The concentration of provincial expenditures at these growth points as a means of encouraging economic growth and development in each region will result in an expansion of the local tax base of these growth centres. Regional governments will perform the key role of distributing these fiscal dividends throughout the region as a whole, thereby benefitting the rural areas as well as the urban centres. In addition, inter-regional equalization will occur through the discretionary regional allocation of the province's budgetary expenditures and the programme activities of provincial departments and agencies, under the regional development programme.

This government intends to implement the regional government programme on a staged basis, giving priority to those areas of the province where the need for regional government is most immediate. The first full-fledged regional government came into existence in Ottawa-Carleton on January 1, 1969. The second regional government will be established in Lincoln-Welland, effective January

1, 1970. Other areas where attention is being concentrated are: Halton-Peel; East and North of Metro Toronto; Kitchener-Waterloo; Hamilton; Sudbury; and Muskoka. The timing schedule for Ontario's regional development programme calls for definition of the growth points in all ten economic regions by the end of 1969 and the formulation of economic development plans throughout 1969 and 1970.

The four reform programmes set out in this paper constitute a complete restructuring of provincial and municipal finance in Ontario. The various reform thrusts are interdependent and complementary; they must be regarded as parts of a total plan, a total "fiscal framework for the future". The changes involved in moving towards Ontario's long-term objectives will be far-reaching and pervasive. The province intends to implement its reforms, therefore, in measured and co-ordinated steps, all the while retaining maximum flexibility to consider alternative methods and means.

The province is convinced that major benefits and improvements will result from its package of fiscal and structural reforms. Provincial and municipal taxation will become more equitable, more efficient and more capable of producing the revenues Ontario will need for development and expansion of essential public services in the years ahead. A major burden of financing will be lifted from the slow-growing and oppressive property tax. The strengthening and modernization of local governments will enable them to meet their present problems and to cope more effectively with the emerging needs of Ontario's urban society. Finally, existing disparities in levels of public services and taxation across the province should gradually be levelled out.

This white paper represents the framework of Ontario's reform programme. A large number of less prominent recommendations in the reports of the Smith and select committees have yet to be fully considered before all the details of the reform programme can be completed. These recommendations will continue to be reviewed by the taxation and fiscal policy branch of The Department of Treasury and Economics for possible implementation.

It must be recognized that this reform programme will not be costless or painless. As this Budget shows, the first step in the programme of fiscal reform must be to contain the growth in public expenditures. But even with continuing restraint, total taxation in Ontario must inevitably increase in the years ahead, unless the fiscal mismatch between the

federal and the provincial-municipal sectors is corrected. Redistribution of tax burdens also means additional taxes on some individuals, some properties and some businesses. The province is convinced, however, that the social and economic costs of maintaining our present system, with all its inequities and defects, would be higher still. Ontario must proceed with fundamental reforms, both because of the intrinsic merits of such reforms themselves, and to provide the basis for constructive and rational development of public finance in this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Treasurer—at least on his stamina—in presenting this lengthy Budget and its backing up White Paper, and I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side listened intently to his words and his ideas.

The interjections, I suppose, were more than anything else to add a certain sparkle to his presentation which I sensed somehow was lacking, but certainly the opportunity will come upon most of us in this House in the near future to discuss the many ideas that have been put before us this afternoon.

Mr. Nixon moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): If the Minister is going to bury the people, this shovel will help.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suppose it is fair to say there is a continuing need for shovels in certain areas now and maybe the hon. member is familiar with those. Maybe that is where he got this—from that stock. Thank you, I needed a shovel.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. members will recall that the suggestion was that after the Budget address we should return to the ordinary business of the afternoon. I think the members would like to know that during this presentation we did have present here in the galleries, in addition to the many visitors who are still with us, students from St. Theresa's Separate School, Kitchener; from Upper Canada College in Toronto; from Glenview Senior Public School, in Toronto; and from St. Jerome High School in Kitchener. They, of course, have departed.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East) from the standing private bills committee,

presented the committee's seventh report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment: Bill Pr26, An Act respecting The Tilbury Public School Board.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments: Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the City of Sarnia.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE TOBACCO TAX ACT, 1965

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITAL TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Hospital Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

The hon. Attorney General has a statement.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): **Mr. Speaker,** I have now received from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police force a copy of the report of The Department of National Health and Welfare respecting the chemical MACE.

I am satisfied from my perusal of this report that chemical MACE is a substance which, if improperly and carelessly used, may cause permanent injury to the eyes of the victim. This type of injury could possibly arise from the chemical reaction of the components of the substance with human tissues if it is discharged at a very close range, with excessive concentration and without thorough washing of the affected areas of the body.

As far as I am concerned, chemical MACE is a weapon that must be treated like a re-

volver or any other weapon and it will require the same degree of education and training in the police profession before it may be properly utilized by them. It is my personal opinion that chemical MACE should not be used unless those using it fully understand its nature and effect, unless they are fully trained in the proper use of the substance and unless they have all the necessary facilities available for immediate remedial action after its use.

Since a report was provided to me through the facilities of the RCMP, I am not at liberty to make copies of the report immediately available without the permission of that force. However, I have asked the Ontario Police Commission to discuss the matter further with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in order that copies of the report may be made available, if this meets with the approval of those who prepared the report for us.

I have also asked the Ontario Police Commission to consider, in further detail, the information which it has now on this substance, in order that it may pursue with the representatives of the police forces throughout Ontario the significance of the information and its relationship with the present views of some police forces. It is possible that, as with many other pieces of equipment, there is some useful purpose for this chemical substance which may be arrived at after appropriate consideration of the various factors which I have mentioned.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): **Mr. Speaker,** on a point of clarification. In view of what the Attorney General has said, is he not going to take any steps immediately to control its use?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): **Mr. Speaker,** on the same point of clarification, does the Attorney General intend to seek legislative authority in order that he can instruct the police boards throughout the province as to either the banning of its use, or at least, a severe restriction of its use?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: **Mr. Speaker,** this is a matter of policy and I would only say that the matter is being considered by the department, and in our legislation which we will be presenting.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): A question by way of clarification. Would the Attorney General consider that when the new Department of Justice Act is implemented and becomes law he would then have the power to direct the use of this substance?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think, Mr. Speaker, it is altogether likely that the necessary power will be either in that Act, or in The Police Act.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I, by way of clarification, ask the Attorney General whether or not he is familiar with the report that was made available in Washington just last week, indicating that chemical MACE has an adverse effect on the internal organs of the human body, other than the eyes, and whether he will take the steps to ban its sale altogether in the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have received at the moment, Mr. Speaker, only the material which the RCMP has furnished to us, and there is a considerable amount in that report. As I have just stated to the House, we are seeking permission to distribute that so hon. members will know what it does contain.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, on another point of clarification. Does not the Attorney General agree that by his own remarks this afternoon he is sanctioning permanent physical damage by the refusal to ban it outright? That, in effect, is what he prefaces his statement with.

An hon. member: The member is always like that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member misinterprets very badly what I have said.

Mr. Lewis: He misinterprets very well.

Mr. Speaker: There have been a considerable number of questions by way of clarification and I think that the matter should rest. Further questions should be placed in a proper way tomorrow. The hon. leader of the Opposition had two questions, and the hon. deputy leader will ask them.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my leader, I have a question in his name for the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister report any progress in negotiations with the Canadian Union of Public Employees, CLC, Ontario Hydro employees union local 1000?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question I would advise that the meetings proceeded yesterday and are continuing today—

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, I did not hear the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The meetings continued all day yesterday and continued this morning, and I cannot give any further information at this time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question standing in the name of my leader. This is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister received any requests or inquiries from municipalities around the province for the abolition of their boards of control following his announced agreement with the abolition of Toronto's board of control? And part 2, will the abolition be a model for other areas?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of the question, since my letter of February 27, we have not received any enquiries or requests. Perhaps we have received enquiries as to procedure, but certainly not since my letter.

In reply to the second part of the question, I would say the answer is, not necessarily.

Mr. Singer: As a supplementary question, does the Minister envisage bringing in legislation that will only apply to Metropolitan Toronto, to the city of Toronto or to all municipalities in the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the member is aware, that my letter of February 27 dealt with the private bill which the city of Toronto is bringing before the private bills committee. It is not in the form of general legislation.

Mr. Singer: It could be if the Minister wanted.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, everything could be.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing has a question of the Premier.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question of the Premier. What approval has the Cabinet given to the proposed application of the Abitibi Paper Company to extend its hardboard operations in Sturgeon Falls under the assistance of EIO's grants? Secondly, how many of the recently laid-off employees will be re-employed if the application is finally approved and accepted by the Ontario Development Corporation under the EIO programme?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This matter is presently being considered by the Ontario Development Corporation. It has not yet made a

recommendation to the Cabinet, therefore I am not in a position to give you a final answer to either the first or the second part of the question. As soon as it has been dealt with by the ODC this information will be available.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a question for the Minister of Correctional Services. We are going down the ministerial list today.

Mr. Lewis: I am pleased, on the Minister's behalf, that he has had this assent. Why did the supervisory officers of Burwash industrial farm call in the Ontario police detachment from Sudbury to investigate incidents at Burwash and to lay charges arising from those incidents? Second, when alleged deviant sexual behaviour in institutions occurs, does the department feel that police investigation is a desirable rehabilitation tool?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, the police were called in because an inmate alleged that he had been assaulted and wished to lay charges. I do not know whether this satisfies the hon. member in respect of the balance of the question, because actually I have already answered that part of the question. The answer to it is the same as that given the other day, on February 27, as recorded in *Hansard* on page 1616. The answer is the same, if the hon. member would look that up it would satisfy his question.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary question, if it is not *sub judice*; if the Minister will allow it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Go ahead.

Mr. Lewis: I simply want to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister realizes that it is usually the institutions which engender this sexual acting out and that the charges should be laid against the department instead of the offenders?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that is a complete abuse of the rules of the question period. It is a perfect example of why I hesitate to answer supplementary questions of certain members.

Mr. Lewis: If the Minister wants to answer, he is entitled to answer. I am putting it to him seriously.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will be able to discuss this during my estimates.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister is quite in order to decline to answer the question and that will end the matter.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, the question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is as follows:

In view of the most recent natural gas explosion in the Windsor area over the weekend, is the Minister satisfied that the regulations concerning the supply and use of this product were properly enforced?

Will the Minister undertake a review of the regulations to see what can be done to eliminate or prevent such explosions in the future?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, a preliminary investigation would indicate failure of a connection in the vicinity of the range. The exact location of this failure has not yet been pinpointed and likewise no contravention of regulations has been found.

And the second part of the question: There has been, in effect, a continuing review of regulations and new products relating to the natural gas industry.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask of the Minister a supplementary question. Is the Minister aware that this is the third natural gas explosion in the area within recent years? If he is, is he satisfied that there are enough safety inspectors in the area to enforce the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are satisfied that we have enough inspectors but it is very difficult to go and inspect every range or every heater, every hour in the day. Accidents can happen when you are dealing with very dangerous materials and we would have to find out what the problem was before we could say that it was inspection at fault.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question of the Attorney General?

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): A question of the Attorney General.

In the case of John Sheeley, who was acquitted of a charge of possession of marijuana by Judge Gardhouse, as reported by the *Telegram*, February 28, can the Attorney

General assure the House that marijuana was not "planted" in Mr. Sheeley's home by the police while searching the premises?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this particular prosecution was conducted by the federal government and not through the office of the Attorney General or The Department of the Attorney General. The question does not relate to any prosecution which would carry forward through The Department of the Attorney General. However, I did make enquiries from the Crown attorney and asked him to review the matter and the reports relating to it.

There is nothing to indicate the suggestion that the marijuana was placed in the premises in order to commence a prosecution. The indication is that the marijuana was discovered by chance when another examination was taking place for a separate, different purpose.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing has a question of this Minister?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

As stated by the Attorney General last year, will all areas of the province be serviced by a full-time judge in the provincial family courts on April 1 of this year?

When will the appointment for a full-time provincial family court judge be made in the Nipissing district?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, most areas of the province will be shortly served, I think, by full-time judges. There is a transitional period. It was our purpose to try to seek and obtain judges to serve full time in the short period of time we allowed. We hope we may accomplish this. I have not at the moment been able to obtain a full-time judge for the Nipissing district.

Mr. R. S. Smith: As a supplementary, would the Attorney General consider the appointment of a full-time judge to serve not only Nipissing but some of the adjoining districts where it is evident that a full-time judge is not needed in one district?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is our policy, Mr. Speaker. I think I outlined this very fully when we were introducing and debating the legislation of The Provincial Courts Act, to have particularly the judges of the juvenile and family courts serve more than one county or more than one area, perhaps two, three or more, depending on the amount of the work. This part of our policy and we have it always before us in seeking appointments.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question for the Minister of Labour?

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour:

Can the Minister explain the reason for the drastic increase in industrial injuries in 1968, as stated by a workmen's compensation board spokesman to the *Globe and Mail*, March 4, in spite of the much-publicized and costly programme of the accident prevention association?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, there has not been a drastic increase in industrial accidents in Ontario. Claims reported to the workmen's compensation board in 1968 totalled 379,228 compared with 374,670 in 1967. That is an increase of 1.2 per cent. The employed Ontario labour force covered by The Workmen's Compensation Act increased by 3.4 per cent during that same period.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have an answer to a question from the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), that I have had for about a week. I wonder if he has returned?

Mr. Speaker: Provided the member is in the House, there is no problem. What is the number?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Number 581, Mr. Speaker. The question was in two parts. The first part was: what are the terms of the contract of the new director of the centennial project? The answer to that is the new director general of the centennial centre of science and technology, Mr. Douglas Omand, is a member of the civil service of Ontario and the terms of his employment are governed by The Public Service Act and the regulations thereunder.

In answer to the second part, the salary for the position is established by the civil service commission with the approval of Treasury board. They have not as yet completed that process.

The second question: Why is it necessary to have a continuing consulting contract with the retiring director, who is now living in England, and what are the terms of his contract?

The retiring director general, Mr. O'Dea, has agreed to join the centre's staff as senior scientific advisor because of his long experience in this field, his intimate knowledge of the development of the centre and a special

knowledge of the international aspects of the science museum field.

At present, the centre has orders for artifacts and exhibits placed overseas in the following numbers: United Kingdom, 25; Netherlands, 19; Germany, 4. The services of the senior scientific advisor will be required in these countries for direct attention to the quality and specifications of this material and in addition he will travel elsewhere in Europe on special assignments, primarily to other scientific museums to consider the future adoption and acquisition of exhibits for the centre.

The terms of his contract provide for attendance at my direction either in Ontario, the United Kingdom or elsewhere and provides that during the term of the contract, he is an employee of the government of Ontario and will accept no other employment. Other arrangements, travelling expenses and so on, are the same as those of any member of the civil service.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, am I permitted to ask a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to answer it in my estimates.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has said he will answer in the estimates, which means he declines the question now.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to direct an inquiry to you most courteously in the light of your special and peculiar responsibilities for conduct of affairs in this House. And I should like to ask you because I genuinely would like to know from you what was the basis upon which the CBC came in to this Chamber today?

I have only rumour to go on and as far as I was made aware by rumour bouncing off the walls, they were to come here for a one-hour period. I observed that when the Treasurer sat down he had been on the camera for two hours and 15 minutes and I had assumed the reason they came in was to broadcast the Budget address throughout the length and breadth of Ontario. But then I carefully took note that even after he sat down the cameras ground away for quite an extensive period of time after that until you finally managed to get them to turn off the lights, under which we had suffered for a protracted period of time.

I take it that following the Budget address the further photography of the proceedings

of the House is meant for replay at some later time.

Very genuinely and very courteously, I direct this enquiry to you as the guardian of the affairs of this House. I only want to add that for a long time I have looked, with a very jaundiced eye, on their intrusion into the precincts of the House, into these lobbies out here which are set aside for the use of members, and their television cables and cameras, the portable machines can be found almost any day.

A library was set aside, a reading room right out here, and I point to this section of the appurtenances for the benefit of members. They have sequestered that room, day after day, for their television recording. Not only the CBC, but all sorts of electronic reproduction devices have been used. Their cables can be found a great personal risk in the lobbies on this side most days as they interview the member for High Park, on that side, the Attorney General on the other, at the same time, for two channels. And now, they have come into the House.

As I say, in addition to the original hour that they were to be in here to televise the address of the Treasurer, they were here a good deal longer. I would judge at an estimate, something like two hours and 30 or 45 minutes.

I am one, and I have no embarrassment in saying it whatsoever, who is very, very jealous of the rights, privileges and prerogatives of this House. I do not think, really, I extend or exaggerate my role as an elected member here, in saying to you that before drastic changes are made in the conduct of the business of the House, I would say most courteously, I am owed some explanation or some preview by you, as a member, as to just what is the basis for the change of the conduct of the affairs. Although I want to add finally, that—

Mr. Speaker: I am ruling that the hon. member has now made his point.

Mr. Sopha: In other words, you are going to interrupt me before I am finished?

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon member—

Mr. Sopha: I want you to know I treat that as consummate rudeness, and I will sit down.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member does not display towards the Speaker and other members of this House those attributes which he expects us to express.

Mr. Sopha: May I rise on a point of order? What right have you got to get up—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was on a point of order.

Mr. Sopha: To get up and predetermine my remarks made to you? By what right do you do that before I have finished my point? I am not going to go on for an hour.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: By what right does the hon. member get up when the Speaker is on his feet?

Mr. Sopha: I am not going to go on for an hour, but I was merely making my point to you, courteously asking you for an explanation to let me know under what basis this change was made.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. Minister is quite correct and the hon. member for Sudbury has, this afternoon, indicated that the rules of the House really do not apply in some places from my observations.

I would say to the hon. member that this would appear to be another case similar to the space matter in which the hon. member was so involved. If the hon. member would discuss the matter with his leader and perhaps with his caucus—I have only discussed it with his leader—he would know the basis upon which this arrangement was made and by agreement between the leaders of the three parties.

Now, if the hon. member does not wish to accept the arrangements made by his leader then, of course, I will be glad to protect his personal rights—his separate rights as a member of this Assembly. But until I am otherwise advised, I am certainly of the opinion that I have the right and duty to follow the determination of matters as made by the leaders of the three parties in this House. And that, I may say to the hon. member for Sudbury, is the answer to his question and to his point of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order? Am I correct in understanding then, in your reply to my colleague, that the leaders of the three parties of this House will dictate the actions and functions of this House? If so, I take strong issue with that.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it is obvious we are not talking about the same thing, or the same way.

What Mr. Speaker has been trying to say is, that this House is run in accordance with the rules of the House which can be changed any time by the members, and in accordance with the arrangements made by the members, which normally are made in their own caucuses and communicated in certain instances with respect to speeches to Mr. Speaker by the whips; in certain other instances to Mr. Speaker by the party leader.

Now, so far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, if it is not the desire to have the House operate on that basis then, of course, I suspect that we might have a considerable amount of chaos as is evidenced by what has been occurring this afternoon. On the other hand, it might be well that every member should be able to have the House operate in accordance with his wish, although 116 wishes would make it very difficult for Mr. Speaker or anyone else to operate the House or have it operated.

Now, I would say to the hon. member for Sarnia that certainly, so far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, he has no desire to operate the House on the basis of the agreement of the leaders of the parties if he has any reason to believe that the leaders of the parties do not represent their party caucus in these matters.

Mr. Deans: Maybe they need a change of leadership.

Mr. Sopha: I want to rise on another point of order, and I will make this one briefer than the last one.

As I understand, the operation of the mother of Parliaments at Westminster, one of the most sacred principles inhering in that great institution is that many things governing the conduct of affairs are done by unanimous consent of the members.

Because that takes account of the high prestige, the great respect shown for individual members of the House, I say to you, with great respect, sir, that if you change drastically as occurred this afternoon in the conduct of affairs in our House, then it is something of a distortion of your function if you do not do it from your Throne there, by making at clear and didactic statement of the nature of the change, so that we are all aware, and the approval of each and every one of us is in a position to be given at that time.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order—

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West had my eye first.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to second one aspect of those remarks in terms of your own prerogatives, sir. I have no doubt that the leaders met and came to a certain conclusion which was communicated to you, and I also have no doubt that the leaders had very little manoeuvrability as to the conclusion to which they could come. As one member of this House, I do not like to be dictated to by technology. I have no objection in the world to the television cameras being in this Chamber on a perpetual basis, or viewing the events in this House at various times and those events take place, whatever they may be.

But I do object to the fact that the House rearranges its business precisely to facilitate the requirements of the media. I do not want to, in any sense, jeopardize the experiment because I think it was important and I am glad it took place, and it took a great deal to have it intervened. I think the Provincial Treasurer, within the limitations of reading of the address, performed admirably. I think that we may have finally our foot in the door.

But I do not think, sir, that we should have our affairs ordered by external forces to this Legislature, and in that the members for Sudbury and Sarnia are entirely correct, that the members of this House might hereafter be collectively approached.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, they were, they were.

Mr. Lewis: Hereafter I said.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I think it should be said that the leader of our party speaks for our party, although that apparently is not the case for the parties opposite.

Mr. Sopha: Here is the trouble maker—

Hon. Mr. White: Now, this has been a most interesting experiment, sir, and I think it is entirely fitting that the people of Ontario should have the opportunity to enter into this Chamber and to participate, shall we say, in the deliberations and the considerations that take place here on a variety of issues. This was the first and perhaps imperfect experiment and one I hope that will be continued.

I am wondering, sir, if you yourself, or perhaps you with some member or representative from each party could not confer with the CBC to see if there is not a better way of handling it. I observed last night that there

were 70 lights positioned around this room. I notice four cameras. It contrasts so vividly with the most modern television technology which we see in operation on other settings.

I am just wondering if there is not a better and easier way to do it, where the mechanics would not intrude on the behaviour and the exchange of communication that is actually taking place here.

Another thing I would like to suggest to you, sir, is that some attempt be made to analyze this on a cost benefit relationship. I noticed in the *Canadian* magazine, the day before yesterday that it cost \$160,000 to send Canada's Olympic team to Mexico, and \$930,000 to send the CBC technicians and reporters.

I talked to a couple of those reporters, as a matter of fact, a couple of those newsmen, and they informed me that the 115 people sent by CBC constituted one of the largest delegations there, notwithstanding the—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): That still does not make it a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order! It is very hard for me to determine whether they are points of order or whether they are speeches, whether they come from this side of the House or that side of the House and I do my best.

May I say to the hon. members that I bow to their wishes as expressed, though presumably it is a wish of a small number of the members but their rights are just as important as anyone else's. While we are on the subject, I would like to ask whether it is the view of those in the House or whether we should wait until we have a full group here—and how we can be sure that 116 members will be here I do not know—but do the members wish Mr. Speaker to allow a continuation of the televising of the budget debate in order that the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the NDP have time on the CBC?

Now, if you do then that is fine. If the members do not, then I will certainly take steps to see that the cameras do not appear until we have a unanimous decision of the House as suggested.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, sir, I do not know whether the Speaker is being marginally facetious, I will take him at his word. There was not any suggestion in what was said that the televising should not go on. Obviously it should go on in terms that had been agreed to.

What one is saying that hereafter, in the televising process of this House, that it is not to be a series of set pieces.

Mr. Speaker: That was not the argument placed before Mr. Speaker by the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Lewis: I am not sure that it was not the argument of the member for Sudbury. I think the member for Sudbury can well explain himself, but I think he was saying that if—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think in terms of the point I wanted to make, that what the member for Sudbury is alluding to is that if one is going to have media in this Chamber, one that catches the flavour of the Chamber, the nature of the Chamber, without impeding the members and without intruding on the legislative process that that is entirely appropriate. A series of set piece mechanisms is not an accurate reflection of this Chamber. That hereafter, we hope, in the televising process that it might be done on a rather enlarged basis which would convey what occurs in this parliamentary chamber rather than a distortion of it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I really do not think this was the point that was raised by the hon. member for Sudbury. He spoke quite properly on the rights of an individual member, to speak up independently, and I recognize that right as I am sure every other member does. But, I do not know, sir, how else you could run a parliamentary system except by the method in which we are doing it and that is, the three leaders getting together and arriving at a conclusion, at a decision.

Now if any one of these leaders at such a meeting feels he does not have the complete support of his caucus when he sits down together with his counterparts, the other leaders, all he has to do is say, "I cannot give you the guarantee that my caucus will follow this agreement." Then we will follow from that to whatever agreement or disagreement will be arrived at. But, I do not know how else, Mr. Speaker, you could ever run the parliamentary system, under the method of parliament system that we operate, because obviously as you have said, sir, you cannot on every particular subject ask the view of

117 members. It would be impossible to operate.

Mr. Speaker: I was not, as the hon. member for Scarborough West claims, trying to be slightly facetious. I was merely trying to find out, following what the hon. member for Sudbury said—and I, as well as the Minister and the others—recognize his point whether under the circumstances particularly set out by the Minister of Correctional Services, Mr. Speaker is entirely as wrong as would appear. In any event I do wish to be sure that we do not have any repetition of this unfortunate aftermath. If there should be, as has been planned by the leaders of the parties, a further set piece TV Budget debate broadcast, then I would like to have the views of the hon. member for Sudbury on that.

Mr. Sopha: Well I can give them to you very briefly. Nothing I said this afternoon ought to be taken in any way as being any inhibition on any plans that have been made, and my question remains. I am still waiting to hear from you as a result of my courteous request as to what the basis is upon which this change is made in the conduct of the business of the House, and I still have not heard from you.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: It is all right if you do not choose to tell me.

Mr. Speaker: I will be glad to take the hon. member's question, which I do not quite understand, under advisement. I will be in touch with him, because this seems to be no place for it as there is not the necessary communication to enable me to know exactly what he is asking. I thought I had covered it, and perhaps now—have we done with this point?

Mr. Sargent: Would the Speaker advise who approached who? Did the government approach CBC or did the CBC approach the government?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid it is not either a point of order nor is this question one that—

Mr. Sargent: But it is very important that we know this—what was the motivation behind it?

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please allow me to complete the answer? I said in the first place that in my opinion it is not a point of order and in the second place—

as I was about to say—I do not know. That was not communicated to me. My communications were with the leaders of the parties and thereafter with the technicians of the CBC and the local people who look after things here as to the arrangements.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think it is associated with the hon. member for Sudbury's point of order. An observation would seem to me to be appropriate in that you will have to be put in a position, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether or not in these circumstances the leaders, in fact, speak for their caucuses.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Minister has missed the point.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No I have not, Mr. Speaker. Let me complete it. If that can be determined in each instance, presumably the problem is resolved but I suggest in deference to your own position, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that at that point in time when you cannot assume that the leaders are speaking for their caucuses, then I suggest you are put in a very difficult position.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to rise a few moments ago in reply to the hon. member for London South (Mr. White), but now that the Treasurer has made exactly the same point, I want to state just as firmly and as forcefully as I can that we will not stand for this kind of perversion from a logical and reasonable point of order raised by the hon. member for Sudbury and the member for Sarnia.

They were expressing certain questions that had arisen in their minds as is their right and by no right whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, can either the Treasurer or the hon. member for London South, pervert that into the kind of perversion that they are now perpetrating. I object most strenuously to that, Mr. Speaker, and if there is any doubt in the Treasurer's mind, I continue to say it is a deliberate perversion.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Sudbury, the hon. member for Sarnia, and the hon. member for Scarborough West, have all made the same point directed to Mr. Speaker, one that Mr. Speaker has not answered or dealt with yet. I have merely said that I would have to take it under

advisement, in view of the situation, and deal with it as I deem best after I consider it because it is an important point.

I agree—the hon. member for Sarnia was quite right, because he elucidated it in a manner that I could understand. I am afraid I was a little lost before that. So that matter, as far as I can see, is closed for the moment, it will not be forgotten and I have the views of the hon. members. I will, in the future of course, be very chary about making any arrangement by any agreement about anything no matter how it is made. Is there anything further on this point of order?

Mr. Sopha: I want to say one last thing so that you, sir, will be absolutely clear. There would not be a person in this House who would disagree with me in the enunciation of the principle that just nothing in relation to the conduct of the affairs of this House, the alteration of its business, can be done without your approval. No person in this chamber, be he Prime Minister, Minister, or member of the Opposition, has any jurisdiction in any way concerning the character of what goes on in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will realize that there is a rule against repetition. He is now repeating his original point. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a point?

Mr. Sargent: I just wanted to establish a point, Mr. Speaker, with the Treasurer, but he has left now so I will leave it.

Mr. Speaker: Is there anything further before we proceed to the orders of the day?

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming consideration of the propositions of the government of Ontario submitted to the continuing committee of officials on the constitution as of December, 1968, sessional paper number 83.

CONSTITUTION DEBATE

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, in February of 1968 I had the good fortune of being one of the three observers in the Opposition to attend the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa. I note that the other day when the hon. Minister of Family and Social Services was speaking in this debate, he said that when he attended the recent federal provincial Conference that he was overwhelmed with the idea of being there.

I was not overwhelmed; but it was certainly an occasion that I enjoyed and it has sharpened my interest in Canadian constitutional problems. Unquestionably, Mr. Speaker, the last number of years Canada has been in a cultural and in a constitutional crisis. It may well be said that throughout our entire history, we have always had some kind of a crisis involving our constitutional background and differences in our culture that exist in this country.

No doubt the quiet revolution in the province of Quebec has given a greater urgency to these problems. The quiet revolution in Quebec, Mr. Speaker, I believe, has been good, not only for the province of Quebec, but it has been good for Canada as a whole. Whatever differences may exist between Quebec on the one hand, and the rest of Canada on the other, I believe can be solved through goodwill and co-operation.

It is highly debatable whether Canada would have ever existed as a nation if Quebec was not a part of this country. We might very easily have been swallowed by that great giant to the south of us, and if it had not been for the determination of the people of Quebec to retain their own language, and institutions it is unlikely that we could have continued over the past 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what complaints the province may make about *les anglais*, as they call us, whether we are English or not, there is no doubt that in the fabric of what we call Canada, the people of Quebec have had far more opportunities to use their language and to use their culture than if they had been part of the United States.

In turn Canada, today as in the past, protects itself. The very fact that we have Quebec in Canada is a major reason why we are able to remain an independent country.

When I attended the federal-provincial conference in February 1968, I was very perturbed as to what the future might hold for this country, but the good luck that we have had over the years, continued to hold out. Many feared that Premier Daniel Johnson would be too extreme in his demands for the province of Quebec, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed with Premier Johnson. Having the opportunity to sit there and observe the various politicians from across Canada who attended, I must admit that Premier Johnson, even though I disagreed with him on many occasions, and Prime Minister Lester Pearson impressed me as being the two ablest politicians in that room in the Parliament Buildings in Ottawa.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was favourably impressed. In fact, at that time, and mind you this was February of 1968, I was almost enthusiastic about the excellent performance of the Premier of the province of Ontario. Mind you, he has done some backsliding since that time, but in February 1968, at least in dealing with the so-called French fact in Canada, he was cool, calm and he spoke common sense.

The province of Ontario, simply because of its size, the numbers of its people and the tremendous industrial and agricultural wealth, wields a tremendous influence in the affairs of Canada. Had the province of Ontario been represented by an Oliver Mowat or a Mitchell Hepburn or a George Drew or a Leslie Frost, it would have been a national disaster.

These men, in my view, represent a very narrow parochial viewpoint. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when one of your predecessors would hold the annual Speaker's dinner, he would have Mr. Frost (at that time the Premier) speak to the members of the Legislature at the Speaker's dinner. He would like to go on at length about what Oliver Mowat thought of the so-called constitution of Canada, and about the federation of the various provinces of Canada. It seems one of the surprising things in the history of this country that so many of us who are now Liberals and representing the Liberal Party, tend to repeat what Sir John A. Macdonald said and a man like Mr. Leslie Frost seemed to repeat, and often many of the Conservative members repeat what Oliver Mowat said. Oliver Mowat, as you know, in those days was probably the most successful Liberal in the history of the province of Ontario.

I, basically, and this is what I base my remarks on, would accept the viewpoint of Sir John A. Macdonald on confederation. I will let the Conservatives have Oliver Mowat. You can have all of him.

There is no doubt in my mind that the present Premier of Ontario, by sponsoring the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, and by his reasonable and co-operative approach at the federal provincial conference in February, 1968, made a very worthwhile and credible contribution to the history of this country. No doubt in the career of the present Premier of Ontario, it was a high-water mark. After having had the pleasure of witnessing the credible performance of our Premier in Ottawa, in February, 1968, Mr. Speaker, I was absolutely dumbfounded by his incredible performance at the recent Federal Provincial Constitutional Conference.

What a stupid and ridiculous remark to call Medicare, as advocated by the present federal administration, a Machiavellian fraud. Medical insurance has been a political issue for years. Surely, it is no secret that the endless years—in fact, it seems to me for the better part of the 20th century—the Liberal Party has been promising medical insurance.

In recent federal election campaigns it has been a major election promise. Finally, at long last and despite all the lobbying of the various colleges of physicians and surgeons across Canada; despite the combined efforts and lobbying of insurance companies and just about every mossback in the country, the Pearson government hammered through the medical insurance scheme, just as it had a few years previously hammered through a hospital insurance scheme. I might add to that, they also brought through the Canada Pension Plan, and if the election results of the last federal election are any indication, particularly in the province of Ontario, medical insurance is heartily endorsed by the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on the subject of health insurance on many occasions, and no doubt I will be speaking on the subject on many more occasions as I, along with others, attempted to drag the Tory Mule into the 20th century. So I do not intend to dwell on the subject in this debate. But let me say this, that medical insurance, or if you prefer to call it Medicare, is a much needed and long overdue reform.

No doubt OMSIP has helped a number of our citizens. It has also been very kind to the insurance companies and there is no question in my mind and in that of the public as a whole, that what we need in this country is a public plan that favours nobody, that we take the profit out of health insurance. This government has continued to drag its heels on this question. In fact, at one time, before the recent conference in Ottawa started, I gathered the impression from the Premier's speeches that he intended to do what he could and cause as much trouble as he could, unless there was a settlement of what he called the fiscal arrangements.

Neither the Premier of Ontario, nor Mr. Johnson have ever gone to the extremes that they were going to go to or that they hinted at. This is why I am grateful that at least common sense has prevailed.

Mr. Speaker, in closing on the medical insurance, believe me, this House is going to hear more about this subject in the not-too-distant future. Unquestionably, Mr. Speaker,

the medical scheme as advocated by the federal government is far superior to any of the provincial schemes enforced by the province of Ontario or any other provincial government with the exception of the province of Saskatchewan. I have said before whether or not we agree with some of the legislation of the Douglas administration in Saskatchewan, there is no doubt that the medical insurance that they introduced in that province was a pilot project that has been copied literally across the country. There is no question that what happened in the 1940's in Saskatchewan has become law from coast to coast, and I give his administration full credit for that.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how much I disagree with the Premier of this province and his attitude towards medical insurance and on some other matters, I am indeed grateful that there has been no backsliding on his part on the use of the French language. We have created political institutions in Canada of which we may well be proud. No doubt our institutions can be improved like almost anything else these days; they can certainly be updated. But in comparison with the rest of the world, we have been extremely fortunate in this country.

I think we can credit this good fortune in large part to English common law and political institutions which have been transplanted to this country, an aid to all of North America, at least the United States and Canada.

As I understand our democratic system, Mr. Speaker, I believe that our political institutions should create as much freedom as possible, and that our cultural institutions should use freedom as fully as possible. Freedom cannot be used as fully as possible in this country unless we respect and encourage the dual linguistic parentage of our country, one French-speaking and the other English-speaking. I unhesitatingly support propositions 11, 12 and 13 as set forth in a book entitled "Propositions of the Ontario government submitted to the continuing committee of officials on the constitution as of December, 1968. I am pleased that in proposition 11, the government mentions that although Canada is a bilingual country, it is of a multi-cultural character.

Too often in the major dialogue concerning English Canada and French Canada, the millions who are not of French or British extraction have not been given their due credit for their contribution to this country.

Proposition 12 of the government proposal states that all governments should provide,

wherever practical, public services in English and French languages. If Ontario and the rest of Canada is to live up to any hope for a Canadian Charter of Human Rights, this proposal is essential.

Just as essential is proposition 13, where it is stated all Canadian parents should, as a matter of equity, be able to have their children educated in either or both the official languages of this country. And for those of us who are English-speaking, it is not only an act of goodwill, but an endeavour in self improvement to learn to speak French.

Occasionally you will still hear the odd person who seems to be outraged because those children of other than French background may be taught French. To me such an attitude is asinine. Not only is an individual's knowledge of French helpful insofar as contributing to the unity of the country, but even in enjoying the world as it is today, it is a tremendous asset. And when we consider the ever-growing potential of tourism, the opportunities we have to travel, and even greater opportunities our children will have to travel, a knowledge of the French language is a tremendous asset.

Mr. Speaker, I belong to and I believe in a strong central government in this country. There is no question in my mind as I read Canadian history that Sir John A. Macdonald and the other Fathers of Confederation meant to have the central government as the real power in this country. In fact, one would gather, particularly from reading biographies of Sir John A. Macdonald and reading his personal papers, that he envisioned provincial legislatures as glorified county councils.

If this had happened, perhaps it would not have been in the best interests of Canada as a whole. Certainly, the Fathers of Confederation gave no thought to any two nations theory, or special status for anybody. I do not hold—

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): Why did they give a separate civil law to Quebec? They must have thought of it.

Mr. Trotter: They acknowledge that. But certainly, if I may take up that interjection, Mr. Speaker, there was no intention—this is my interpretation—that these provinces were virtually sovereignties unto themselves, almost what you might call a compact theory. I believe the Hon. Attorney General of this province at one time held what they call the compact theory, that four sovereign states got together and created something, a fifth entity, almost out of themselves.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is what he said.

Mr. Trotter: Now, there is no doubt that in various sections of The British North America Act we have allowed for the special privilege of the French language, and for the French civil law. We might say it is looked at not as a separate state, but as a different culture, and we are respecting that culture, but not two nations. It is one nation, and this is where there may be a cultural difference as to a nationalistic difference. I am not questioning for a moment that we should respect the differences in language. We should respect the differences in our culture, but in one nation.

I do not hold to the theory that the four original provinces entered into an irrevocable contract. In other words, "We may have a Canada today, I do not like it, let us quit, let us go home." I think that once that nation was formed it was here to stay. Lord Caernarvon, the British politician responsible for introducing The British North America Act into the House of Lords, said in the second reading of The British North America Act, on February 19, 1867, "We are laying the foundation of a great state, perhaps one which at a future date may even overshadow this country."

That was a pretty wild thing to say at that time, Mr. Speaker, when you compare Great Britain to what we now know as Canada. But, whatever differences we may have amongst ourselves, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Canada is one and indivisible. And perhaps when Lord Caernarvon said that they were laying the foundation of a great state that would overshadow Great Britain, he was just trying to please some of the colonial boys who were watching him up in the gallery. But it is a real possibility, Mr. Speaker, that with our land and with our resources, he spoke more truth than he realized.

Mr. Speaker, the world is yet young, and I think that this is a real possibility that this part of North America known as Canada will become a great power in the sense of having tremendous influence. I do not think that we may become a great power. In fact, I hope it will never be necessary nor do not think the possibility is there that we become a great power in what is known in a military sense. It is because I believe that Canada is one and indivisible, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to anything that will encourage regionalism in this country.

Because of economic and cultural differences there is bound to be a certain amount of regionalism, but why entrench it? Why entrench it, Mr. Speaker, by permitting the provinces to appoint senators and justices of the Supreme Court of Canada.

This is one major instance where I disagree with Mr. Trudeau and the federal Liberal Party, because this seems to be their policy. The power for such appointments should remain with the federal government. The Tower of Babel would be a monastery garden compared to a Canadian Senate that was loaded with appointees by Bible Bill Aberhart, W. A. C. Bennett, Ross Thatcher, Mitch Hepburn, Maurice Deplessis.

If any changes are to be made in the Senate there is only one reasonable change. Do away with it.

In recent years the Canadian Senate has done some good work. Its committee on aging has made possible better pensions for senior citizens. Its leadership on divorce reform has made possible far more liberal divorce laws. Its defence of James Coyne did much to protect the integrity of the Bank of Canada. Its committee on manpower has done much to improve the cause of retraining of adults and the improvement of wages.

All these things can be credited to two men. Senator Arthur W. Roebuck and Senator David Croll, both from Toronto and both former members of this House, and incidentally both members of the Liberal Party.

In spite of their tremendous personal efforts, it is very difficult to justify the indefinite existence of an institution that is essentially moribund. For the most part, the general public does not listen to what Canadian senators say, and, what is more, they do not care. But I would far rather see the Senate as it is and pray that we have a few Roebucks and Crolls, rather than turn it into a forum to intensify regional differences in this country.

And since Canada has done away with the appeal to the British Privy Council, our Supreme Court in Canada has become an increasingly outstanding institution in this country. At the present time when appointments are made, consideration is given to the French vs. the English-speaking backgrounds of this country. And please, Mr. Speaker, let us not move the court with some joker who may represent the way out views of some passing fancy of a provincial government.

Do you remember the days of Bible Bill Aberhart of Alberta and his funny money ideas? Had The Alberta Bank Act ever become law, the credit of this country and the

international money markets could have been greatly harmed. You may recall that Bible Bill even thought that it was a poor idea to pay interest on Alberta bonds until the federal government had to straighten him out. People outside of—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit me? If he is speaking of changing the personnel of the court, would he express a view as to the thought of creating another court to deal with constitutional matters? That idea has been put forward.

Mr. Trotter: What is wrong with the Supreme Court?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wanted the hon. member's views.

Mr. Trotter: In fact, I have been impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the individuals who have received appointments. I think they are of excellent calibre and independent minds. I will just give you an example.

You may have one man from Saskatchewan. We may have thought Mr. Justice Emmett Hall would be a conservative man, and yet his judgments and what he has done even outside the court, he is an outstanding man. Mr. Justice Cartwright we always believed may have a very conservative view of life in general. He again has turned out to be an outstanding justice.

These men are capable of dealing with constitutional problems. The American Supreme Court handles all types of cases that literally come within their jurisdiction. I for one would like to see a strong court built up, which we are now doing, but I think it would be a disaster if we encouraged regional differences. Then there is going to be a certain amount probably of political influence no matter what happens. They will always say they are the political strength of the party in power. The personal ideas and prejudices of anyone making the appointment are going to be reflected, in my view.

Mr. Speaker, this may be a good point for me to call it 6.00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: In order that the privileges of the members of the House are not impinged upon, it being 6.00 of the clock will be declared by the Speaker. I hope that meets with the approval of the hon. member.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

TABLE A

Net General Expenditure

	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>1969-70</u>
			(\$ Millions)		
Increase over Preceding Year	1,456	1,781	2,254	2,787	2,996
	—	22.3%	26.5%	23.7%	7.5%

TABLE B

Development of Ontario's Spending and Investment Priorities

Priority Areas	Percentage of Net General Expenditure				Average Annual Growth Rate
	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>1965-66 to 1968-69</u>
Education.....	35.2	37.3	40.4	40.4	30.0
Health and Social Services.....	17.1	17.1	18.5	17.5	25.1
Aid to Local Authorities.....	10.3	9.4	8.6	12.8	33.7
Total Budgetary Priority Areas.....	<u>62.6</u>	<u>63.8</u>	<u>67.5</u>	<u>70.7</u>	<u>29.3</u>
Non-Priority Areas.....	37.4	36.2	32.5	29.3	14.4
Total Net General Expenditure.....	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>24.2</u>

Priority Areas	Percentage of Loans and Advances				Average Annual Growth Rate
	<u>1965-66</u>	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>1965-66 to 1968-69</u>
Education.....	43.5	68.2	63.5	73.2	58.3
Health.....	4.6	3.4	5.1	5.6	41.8
Housing.....	4.5	3.3	8.0	4.0	27.8
Total Priority Areas.....	<u>52.6</u>	<u>74.9</u>	<u>76.6</u>	<u>82.8</u>	<u>54.8</u>
Non-Priority Areas.....	47.4	25.1	23.4	17.2	-5.1
Total Loans and Advances.....	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>33.0</u>

TABLE C

Profile of 1969-70 Spending and Investment

	Distribution of 1969-70 Increase	Growth Rate 1969-70 Over 1968-69
	(\$ Millions)	(%)
Net General Expenditure		
Priority Areas		
Education	149	13.2
Health and Social Services	-12	-2.5
Aid to Local Authorities	25	7.0
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total Budgetary Priority Areas	162	8.2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Non-Priority Areas	47	5.8
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total Net General Expenditure	<u>209</u>	<u>7.5</u>
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Loans and Advances		
Priority Areas		
Education	-9	-2.5
Health	-1	-3.7
Housing	37	188.7
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total Priority Areas	27	6.7
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Non-Priority Areas	10	12.4
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total Loans and Advances	<u>37</u>	<u>7.7</u>
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

TABLE D

	\$ Millions
Net General Revenue	2,817.4
Net General Expenditure	2,996.5
	<u> </u>
Budgetary Deficit	-179.1
Non-Budgetary Surplus	+ 74.8
Net Debt Retirements	- 64.6
	<u> </u>
Overall Cash Requirements	<u>-168.9</u>
	<u> </u>



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 4, 1969

Resumption of the debate on the constitution, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Ben, Mr. Deans	1839
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deans, agreed to	1858
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	1858

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1969

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

CONSTITUTIONAL DEBATE

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, before we rose at 6.00 of the clock this evening, I was speaking in regard to the constitutional debate that we have had in this House, and I was emphasizing that I was very much opposed to any changes in the Supreme Court of Canada or in the Senate of Canada, whereby regional differences would be emphasized.

I know that many of the provinces, and I understand the present government of Ontario and even the federal government in Ottawa—Mr. Trudeau's administration—are in favour of the proposal that Senators should be appointed on a regional basis, and also appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada should be made after consulting the various provincial governments across the country.

I think in my mind it would be a very grave error to emphasize, to underline the obvious regional differences that already exist in Canada; and therefore I think it of utmost importance that the federal government continue to make the appointments of the Senate. If they are going to reform the Senate—do away with it.

I am not going to repeat what I said earlier, before we left, but I think that really the public are not listening to what the Senators say, they pay no attention to the Senate. The obvious solution to any senatorial problems that we have in this country is to do away with it.

But most certainly I would not want to emphasize—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): What is the Tory government going to do if they want to kick half the Cabinet members over there upstairs?

Mr. Trotter: That is their problem. I think they may have to run government more on a business basis then, and quit kicking people upstairs.

But in any event, whether the Senate exists or not, the appointments should not be made at the provincial level where regional differences would be emphasized and underlined. Even more important, I think it is of the utmost importance that we see to it that the federal government does appoint the members of the Supreme Court of Canada.

As I mentioned earlier, can you imagine a strong provincial government being in a position where they could wield the influence to appoint an individual to the bench—let us say such as Bible Bill Aberhart from Alberta—who had a particular idea he wanted to emphasize, such as The Alberta Bank Act, which at one time was a very major item in the politics of Canada. Because such legislation through which Mr. Aberhart wanted to create provincial banks and do away with paying the interest on Alberta bonds—this type of thing would hurt the credit of Canada. A screwball any place, in any province of Canada, could hurt the credit of the country abroad.

Just as a practical example of what could happen to the government of a country if a federal government has no control or is hampered by the supreme court of a country: A number of years ago, back in 1934—and I am using what happened in the United States as an example, which could happen here, I am giving you this as an example—in 1934 when the Roosevelt administration was elected they introduced many reforms. But the members of the Supreme Court of the United States were men of a very conservative bent and they said that many of the laws—in fact such a law as that declaring any child over the age of 14 should not be allowed to work—the Supreme Court of the United States said this is interfering with free enterprise and so; and that law was declared invalid.

A whole procedure developed through which Mr. Roosevelt tried to change the make-up of the supreme court—it was what was called packing the supreme court. He wanted more appointments made. There was a great uproar in the United States; he could not change the legislation. Fortunately, in many

respects, the older members of the bench died off and he was able to make new appointments.

You may say, Mr. Speaker, here is a government being able to influence legislation by making appointments to a supreme court. Well in truth they do. But is it not far more democratic that a government that is elected by the people to introduce certain reforms can carry out those reforms? And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if today in Canada we had a government elected to carry out certain reforms hamstrung by the Supreme Court that depended on provincial politics for its administration—and if you look across the myriad of regions and differences across this country you could have one joker or two jokers on the Supreme Court of Canada that could really hamstring a federal administration—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Trotter: I admit this, Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that there is a certain amount of partisan politics in appointments to the bench. I am not denying that for one moment. But—

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Old Liberals never die, they put them in the Senate.

Mr. Trotter: No, no! There is no question about it.

But what happens, Mr. Speaker, if you allow what so many of the provincial administrations are asking for today in this country, and what the Trudeau administration seems to favour at this time, is that they listen to what the various provincial governments want in the Supreme Court.

If you get the Duplessis', the Mitch Hepburns, the Aberharts, the W. A. C. Bennetts—

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): They are all dead!

Mr. Trotter: Well W. A. C. Bennett is not dead and you would get Conservative men no matter what their party label like Ross Thatcher. You just do not know what will be appointed.

So that I say to the hon. members.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I agree with that.

Mr. Trotter: I do not care what you call them, but I think when a government is elected in Ottawa from across this country,

that the unity of the country will be protected if the power of appointment rests with that administration, both in the Supreme Court of Canada and the Senate.

Certainly there should be consultation, but if you let all these various groups, these pressure groups across this country—and certainly they have existed from time to time—then there is danger to the unity of the country if we make the changes that are now suggested.

Mr. Winkler: The hon. member is wrong.

Mr. Trotter: The hon. member may think so; but I do not expect to convert any old-time Tories over there.

Mr. Speaker, in this book of propositions of the government of Ontario submitted to the continuing committee of officials on the Constitution as of December, 1968, there is a proposal, No. 19 on page 25 of the propositions, that simply astounds me. The first part of it says this:

The Monarch's representative should be appointed for ten years.

Well now by way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, the government says this:

At present, the Monarch's representative is appointed for five years with the option of a renewable term, and since the five-year period gives the holder of the office a transient character, and since renewals have been the practice, a ten-year term is suggested.

They state, Mr. Speaker, that the Monarch's representative is a transient character. In my mind this is quite true. I think, and I am quite concerned and certainly believe, that the Monarch's representative is a transient character.

Why in the world should we saddle ourselves with an individual who at best is a distinguished patron of the arts, like Vincent Massey; or a gracious and kindly man like the late Governor General Vanier, who no doubt did much to foster goodwill between English and French-speaking segments of the Canadian population. But why should we put them there legally for ten years.

When you look at the record of Governors General you may point with pride at men like Vincent Massey or Governor General Vanier; or at the time of Confederation, Lord Monck, a very outstanding individual. We had Lord Alexander after World War II, a distinguished soldier. We had Lord Tweedsmuir, the literary genius of his time.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I am glad that he passed over Bessborough.

Mr. Trotter: But if you look at the rest of them you will find, sir, if you look at the record, that, literally, the appointments to the position of Governor General has been used by the British government as a dignified dumping ground for royalty's relatives and for high born aristocrats who had nothing particularly worthwhile to offer. Now that is the history of that office.

Mr. Sopha: They sent some pretty bad people.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): What about Lord Alexander?

Mr. Trotter: I mentioned Lord Alexander; I mentioned Lord Tweedsmuir, unquestionably a distinguished man; and Lord Monck.

Mr. Sopha: How about Sir Francis Bond Head?

Mr. Trotter: Or Roy Willingdon or Athlone or Bessborough; let us not go into details of those. The office of the Governor General, Mr. Speaker, for all practical purposes is the same as that of the Lieutenant-Governor. He is there, primarily, to go to work on the tea and cookie circuit. When I read proposal 19, that the Monarch's representative should be appointed for ten years, when I read that I just stare in disbelief. This Tory government is even more antidiluvian than I thought it was!

Now Mr. Speaker, I well realize that under The British North America Act vast powers are given to the Governor General; which powers in fact are given to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. We all know that the Prime Minister is not even mentioned in The British North America Act. But despite the fact that the Governor General is prominently mentioned in The British North America Act he is, in truth, a glorified social convenor. To put him there arbitrarily for ten years is ridiculous.

In my mind his main function is to save the time of the Prime Minister and the major federal Cabinet Ministers so that they do not need to go about the country, except at election time, patting little children on the head and shaking hands with senior citizens. The PM's time, and the Cabinet Ministers' time, are better spent looking after the government of the country. Why in the world the province of Ontario should want to make it arbitrary that a Governor General should be appointed for ten years is utterly beyond belief.

Mr. Speaker, proposition 28 of the provincial government's proposal concerns the Lieutenant-Governor. That proposal says:

The titular head of the executive branch of the provincial government should be appointed by the Monarch's representative on the advice of the Prime Minister of the province and the name of the office changed to conform with this new situation.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant-Governor is now appointed by the federal government, and not on the advice of the Prime Minister of Ontario. What the Lieutenant-Governor was supposed to do when his job was originally conceived has aroused a great deal of debate. My understanding was that the Lieutenant-Governor was to represent the federal government in the province. Others say that he is to represent the Monarch when the Governor General is not available. In my view, the office today is utterly redundant.

Surely the Chief Justice of Ontario could attend the opening of the Legislature and nod his head and say: "Pray be seated". It is just as easy for him to do it.

Most certainly, Mr. Speaker, such individuals as Mr. Keiller Mackay, a man with an outstanding legal and literary background as well as having almost as much personal charm as his wife; or again the present incumbent, the Hon. Ross Macdonald, who has a very distinguished public career as member of Parliament, a Cabinet Minister, a Senator; these men saved the office of Lieutenant-Governor from falling into completely low estate.

But the office of Lieutenant-Governor, in my view, serves no real useful purpose in modern democratic government in this country. If such an office relieves government leaders of onerous tasks on the tea and cookie circuit, then possibly the office is worth retaining; but if any change is to be made—do not reform it, do away with it.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with proposition 9 of the provincial government's brief, wherein it recommends that the reservation of provincial legislation by the Lieutenant-Governor and its disallowance by the Governor General-in-Council are incompatible with the principles and practices of contemporary federalism. These powers should be removed from the constitution. This is what the provincial government said and this I certainly agree with. But in my mind, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it; the office of

Governor General and that of the Lieutenant-Governor, represent the dried, shrivelled husks of an outworn tradition and in our day and age inhibit the development of a meaningful Canadian nationalism.

Mr. Speaker, just about everybody in Canada agrees with proposition 39 of the provincial government's proposals, and that is, an amending formula for a constitution must be a written part of Canada's constitution and that any amendments, or anything else having to do with the government of Canada, should be completely taken out of the hands of the Parliament of Great Britain.

You know, it is a fantastic thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have been able to go for 100 years and yet even at this late date, if we want to change our constitution, or change The British North America Act, we still have to take a trip over to England.

Mind you, we cannot blame the Parliament of Westminster for this, it is simply because we ourselves have not requested any change. And the members of Parliament at Westminster must think that we are really a strange people that, after all this period of time, despite the accomplishments of the Canadian people in numerous fields of endeavour, we are still unable to amend our own constitution.

Mr. Lawlor: The member skated over that disallowance part. Is he serious about that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Trotter: In answer to the question of the hon. member for Lakeshore, Mr. Speaker, I think in practice the power of disallowance of the federal government has really become outmoded. I think it has been used only a total of 112 times, 100 times before 1924. Even since 1924 it has been used only 12 times.

For practical politics, a federal government today does not disallow provincial legislation, it usually challenges it in the Supreme Court of Canada. I would rather take something like The Alberta Bank Act, which seemed to be completely *ultra vires* to The BNA Act. I would rather, instead of disallowing it, even as a matter of practical politics, I would give it to the Supreme Court of Canada in order for it to be decided.

So that I really would take away from both the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governor any power of disallowance. And I would agree with the provincial government in their proposals in that matter.

But, Mr. Speaker, because we have been so unsuccessful in agreeing among ourselves on the simple point of being able to amend our own constitution, I hold little hope in the immediate future—I emphasize the immediate future—that we are going to be able to rewrite The British North America Act.

I would agree with a number of the propositions of the provincial government—such as proposition number 2, where it is advocated that the language in terms of The British North America Act should be changed and obsolete clauses repealed. You know, Mr. Speaker, if you go through that Act it is obvious that so many of the sections are completely obsolete. They do not mention the word Cabinet, or the Prime Minister.

The real administrative and political power in this country is with your Prime Minister and your Cabinet, and yet it is not even mentioned in The British North America Act. This may seem ridiculous, but the only thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, as a practical politician, is that it works. It is very obvious that a great many sections of the Act are completely inconsistent with the character of Canadian democracy as it is today, but at this point in our history, I would be opposed to scrapping The British North America Act and attempting to rewrite it completely.

During the 20th century there have been a number of revolutions in Latin American republics and, after each revolution, a glorious new constitution is written giving rights and freedom to everybody. To read some of these constitutions you would think that the banana republics in Latin America were lands of milk and honey. But when you read what actually goes on in some of these countries, you are mighty glad to be able to live in Canada, and more particularly in the province of Ontario.

One of the guiding principles in democratic politics is to work with what one has and, at the same time, work for what one hopes to have. Despite all the criticisms that may be made of Canadian politics and Canadian politicians, and despite all the problems, arguments, dialogues and debates that we may have with each other and among ourselves, our ingrained traditions and customs have taught us that we profit both economically and in the quality of our living by harmony rather than by conflict.

I would like to see our constitution brought up to date, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that some Canadian politician or civil servant would have the inspiration of a Thomas Jefferson, or a Tom Payne, to write an in-

spiring preamble to our constitution. I know the provincial government, in one of their proposals, said we should have a preamble to our constitution.

This I would agree with, and I hope this is your aim; for this is our aim and the sooner it is done the better. But my own personal opinion, as of this moment, is that the present breed of politician in Canada, although able and practical in many ways, will not produce it. Too many provincial politicians in Canada want to be big frogs in small puddles.

Mr. Speaker, I support a Canadian charter of human rights. I think the vast majority of Canadians do. In fact, Mr. Speaker, to be against a bill of rights, as I have said on a number of occasions before, is to be against motherhood; and frankly, I think that the rights, probably with the exception of linguistic rights under Mr. Trudeau's proposed bill of rights, are really entrenched in the English common law.

There is, Mr. Speaker, a great difference, in some respects, between the history of our law in Canada and that in the United States. When the Americans started back in 1776, or after they had had their various pre-constitutional meetings—I believe it would be in 1783 when they actually got under way—they had literally broken away from the past completely and had started anew, and as a result they wrote their bill of rights.

We, in this country, have more or less evolved; we have taken the laws of England as of 1792, and, of course, with those laws of 1792 we took *habeas corpus* and freedom of speech and many of the other laws and traditions and moves that had been part of the history of the British Isles.

Mr. Speaker, I support a charter of human rights—I think the vast majority of Canadians do—and I think that in this day and age, even though we may feel that we have inherited a bill of rights, that our freedom of speech, our freedom of expression, trial by jury, the freedom of the secret vote—these are all with us—but in this day and age, everything we can do to emphasize these vital rights is of importance, because we must be vigilant in order to protect them.

In too many countries in the world today, the rights and freedoms that have been taken for granted, have disappeared or have been severely hampered.

John Diefenbaker's much touted Bill of Rights has little practical use in our courts of law, but it most certainly is a most useful document from the point of view of attempt-

ing to propagate and instill the great principles of freedom in oncoming generations.

All that Mr. Diefenbaker's Bill of Rights has said is that it helped to advertise and instill in the general public the rights that we already have. To my mind, a bill such as that introducing legal aid into the province of Ontario, sponsored by the present Attorney General, has more practical effect in protecting the freedom of the individual in his equality before the law, than Mr. Diefenbaker's Bill of Rights.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Trotter: Surely.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am interested to hear him say that he supports the Bill of Rights, the charter of rights, but what I would like him to indicate is his view as to protecting those rights. I am thinking of many constitutions of various countries, many of them outside the western world, as well as emerging colonies of the Commonwealth—formerly the British Commonwealth—who have charters of human rights. But is this an effective way to protect rights or is something like our legal aid programme or the expropriation bill or other particular Acts? Is this the better method to make those rights effective and enforceable and useful to the people you are trying to protect? That is the question.

Mr. Trotter: In my view, looking at this practically and considering our situation in Canada, and what we have, I feel that the practical legislation, such as the legal aid bill, protects the individual more than this thing, the Bill of Rights. I do not think a Bill of Rights as proposed by Mr. Trudeau will get much more effective, insofar as the law is concerned than the Bill of Rights that Mr. John Diefenbaker brought down.

I do not oppose it. I think there are good things in this, and for two reasons. You must be eternally vigilant over what we take for granted—for example, for maybe having the advantage of going to law school. I take for granted some of the things done back in the reign of Charles II, or which go back into the various Toleration Acts that have been passed in Britain and improved upon here. I think of the giving of women the right to vote, which was passed in Manitoba—one of the first Acts in the British Empire.

These things we take for granted, and it does no harm at all to emphasize the Bill of Rights.

Then, going abroad—I will be shortly at the end of my address, Mr. Speaker, but what I want to emphasize is the importance of Canada in the world today. What we take for granted, the rest of the world does not. It is good for us to have a Bill of Rights, because it is very important to so many other people. In their country it is the law.

There is no question in this country. The tradition, the custom, the mores, are almost more important than the law. We just take these things for granted. So that I think they should be emphasized in a Bill of Rights, whether or not they are necessarily arguable in a court of law today.

I do not think John Diefenbaker's Bill of Rights means much in front of the magistrate, or a provincial judge, or any judge, today. It is more or less a statement of what we believe in. But it does no harm, and so I would hope that the Attorney General, who I thought, kind of sloughed this off back in February, 1968—he gave that impression—that we really should emphasize this, more or less, on the basis of the principle and the importance of it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it most unfortunate that Mr. Trudeau, in his Bill of Rights, does not go further and include economic rights, and unfortunately the province of Ontario shows even less interest in economic rights. Now I know that when they drew up the Bill of Rights, it was suggested, in discussing the matter before the federal-provincial conference, that this matter be mentioned and they said it was too involved. But, Mr. Speaker, today people are concerned with their economic rights.

The universal declaration of human rights in the United Nations included such rights as the right to work, the right to protection against unemployment, the right to social security, the right to education, and the right to participate in the cultural life of the community, and there are many rights in this field.

It may be that the right to vote, the right to trial by jury and all these things we take for granted, are in many respects, repetitious. The right to our economic rights really is a thrust forward, and I think that this should be ingrained in any constitution or in any Bill of Rights that we are going to rewrite, or propose, in this province.

It is of prime importance, Mr. Speaker, to protect the hard earned rights, such as the freedom of expression, and the freedom from arbitrary arrest, that were won for us many years ago. These must be retained, but at

the same time we cannot jump into the future unless we see to it that the mass of the people in this country have minimum social security. It is a small comfort to an individual standing in a bread line, or to a family without a roof over its head, if they are told when they are 21 they have the right to vote.

Abstract rights are small comfort in the face of concrete wrongs, and this is something that we in this country have failed to measure up to and to come up with the answers that we should have.

Mr. Speaker, I would in conclusion, like to say this. Years ago, back in 1889—now that is when the Canadian confederation would be only 21 years old; it would have just become a man. John A. Macdonald wrote in a private letter to a gentleman in England, and he said this:

A great opportunity was lost in 1867 where the Dominion was formed out of the several provinces. This remarkable event in the history of the British Empire passed all those without notice.

And this is the truth; this is what happened. It really changed the British Empire. In many respects it made a contribution in changing the governments throughout the world, because we, in Canada, for the most part go unnoticed. We cause little trouble. We tend to analyze ourselves, find fault with ourselves, and perhaps ignore the tremendous contribution that this country has made for the people that have been able to live in peace and quiet for 100 years, and have also made contributions throughout the world.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when we discuss our problems among ourselves—the federal-provincial struggle that we seem to have, and have been going on for 100 years—I think we should be optimistic, for the simple reason that we have been able to exist throughout the 100 years.

I think we should be grateful for the fact that this country has been free of war. It has been free of violence. I think it is an example that we should keep in mind that other people will learn from us. And, as our debate goes on about what our federalism should be, or what the rights of the provinces should be, I believe, as time goes by, what has happened in this country will be an example to the many nations that are forming abroad, and will largely depend on the contribution that we make to world peace.

There is no question in my mind Mr. Speaker, that the theory of federalism is going to spread, and that, if Canada is going to be able to live at peace with the world,

and the world is going to be able to live at peace with itself, you are going to see world government spread. And I would hope in the long run that what we now call the United Nations will some day become a federal union of the people throughout the world.

Now this may be some long way in the future. I hope it is not so far in the future, because events happen more quickly than we anticipate. I know a number of years ago, during World War II, a man named Clarence Drake was discussing the question of union with the United States, and Great Britain. But these principles that we discuss between the federal government and the provincial government are certainly going to involve any type of federalism that will take place in the world in the future.

As we have grown from the British Empire, and as the United States has grown through the British Empire and made tremendous contributions, we, in Canada, are in a unique position, because we have grown to a wealthy country, to a prosperous country. We have had the good fortune that we have never been an empire. We have been part of an empire; we have been a colony that has grown to be a nation.

As a result, nobody has any reason to fear us, only respect us and to learn from us. And I think that from what we can learn from ourselves, and what other people can learn from us, that the debate that goes on in this country can be of tremendous importance to us and to the world in the years that lie ahead.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this province would keep calm and cool, as I said earlier, and speak common sense, all he has done on many occasions. Because we have had the good luck in this country—no matter how difficult or how conflicting the various quarrels and dialogues seem to have been—we have always come through.

We do not have, in our legislation, such as The British North America Act, everything set out as maybe I, for one, would like to see it set out—but I would rather have an atmosphere of goodwill and co-operation than just have an airtight statute that has become too rigid. It would seem to me that our success, as a nation, has been that we have had mutual respect, not only for French Canadians, as those of us who are English speaking have respect for French speaking, but for many people that have come to Canada. They have been able to feel part of Canada without completely losing their identity of back-

ground. We have had this flexibility, this atmosphere of co-operation, which is far more important than a rigid statute.

I think that as long as we continue to carry on in the traditions that we have, there is a tremendous future for this country, not only for ourselves, but for the contribution that our example can be throughout the world.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, it is with some sadness that I enter this debate this evening, because I think that something has happened over the past number of months in regard to the thrust and direction that the province of Ontario has given to the formulation of some new relationship between both English and French speaking people in this country.

Two years ago, the Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Robarts), I think, took an important role. At that time, both English and French speaking people in this country were deeply concerned. It looked as though we were heading for the chasm of disunity. And at a time when the federal government refused to provide any real leadership, the Prime Minister of Ontario grasped the nettle, and called the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference.

He gathered together a committee of scholars, an advisory committee. That committee produced a number of important papers which provided channels through which men of good will of both English and French speaking origin, could find means by which they could come closer together. And then, of course, perhaps one of the most important conferences in the history of this country took place on the top floors of the Toronto-Dominion Centre.

I think the people of Canada were greatly heartened by what took place in those few days. They saw for the first time a degree of involvement, and as I said before, a degree of thrust towards some kind of resolution.

That is why I was somewhat disconcerted by the Prime Minister's remarks in this Legislature a few days ago. Because, certainly as he began his remarks, he indicated that there seemed to be lots of time, in fact, he used the term—that there was "lots of time." He commented on the "good atmosphere" which emanated from the conference at Ottawa a few weeks ago.

He certainly gave, in his opening remarks, the feeling that there really was no great urgency in these matters; that we could wait, five, seven, ten years until a new constitution might be written; that we would have intermittent meetings; and that eventually we

would either blunder or stagger to some kind of a resolution.

Now, I must be honest, and I must be fair, Mr. Speaker, because in the last few paragraphs, I think, of this speech he did recover his ground somewhat, and I did get the feeling in those last few moments of his comments, that, indeed, he was conscious of the need for structure, of the need for committees, and for the continuing emphasis of finding some path to future Canadian unity.

Nonetheless, the total mountain of his comments, I think, were not particularly hopeful. And I could not help feeling that it was somewhat ironic that 102 years ago, the Fathers of Confederation, whom the Prime Minister mentioned, were able to create a constitution in two short months. It was really all over in Canada very early in the fall of 1867.

They met, I think, in July, and John A. Macdonald, of course, and the group from Canada west, went down to Charlottetown; they imposed themselves on the Maritime Conference; they convinced the Maritimers that they really did not want Maritime union at all; that they should listen to the Canadians.

They were carried off on the Victoria, on the boat which the Canadians had brought to Halifax and St. John's and, as the member for London South (Mr. White) mentioned last night, there was a camaraderie. Out of this camaraderie came the decision to go to Quebec, and at Quebec the major resolutions were hammered out. Now, all members will realize that this was not the end of the constitutional story.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): I was wondering though, it was not the beginning either.

Mr. Pitman: It was not the beginning either, the hon. Minister is quite right. But I think it is fair to say that most of the decisions that were to become the constitution of this nation were hammered out in a very short time in the year 1864. The London conference did not add, immeasurably, I think, to what was done at the Quebec conference, and I think it is only fair to say that in spite of the fact that, in those days, things moved much more slowly, politicians apparently were able to move much more quickly.

The Prime Minister, of course, indicated the reason for this when he said that there was a very important matter of urgency before the Fathers of Confederation in the year 1864. There was every possibility that there

might be American soldiers marching across the border, and that the Canadians of Upper and Lower Canada, I should say, Canada East and Canada West, and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, might very well have to defend themselves. It was this kind of urgency that convinced the Fathers that something drastic had to be accomplished. And it was this sense of urgency which created the kind of constitution that we have.

I do suggest to you, sir, that we do have a measure of urgency in the affairs of Canada today, and this was what I thought was missing from most of the remarks of the Prime Minister in this Legislature a few days ago.

I think that what we have in place of the involvement and the concern of two years ago is a kind of almost dilettantism. We shall throw in a few propositions and then, of course, most important of all, we shall try and worry the federal government about financial matters. I think this has taken the place of the very real pathway to progress which was exhibited just a few years ago.

The Prime Minister did come to the point in his speech that what we are really talking about here is the nature of the federal system and I do feel though, that he tried to avoid the main point which is what the role of Quebec will be within that federal system, and what Ontario's views are as to what that role can and should be.

Because this constitution is the result of circumstance, I want to suggest to the hon. members tonight that circumstances have tremendous power in relation to federal constitutions because federal constitutions are very fluid documents and power goes from the centre to the parts and back to the centre again, as the Prime Minister himself intimated.

The Fathers of Confederation were concerned that it should be a very strong central union. They made sure of this by placing virtually all the real power in the hands of the central government. In fact, John A. Macdonald said that the provinces would be mere municipalities. John A. Macdonald would have been quite happy having a unitary form of government; in fact, if it had not been for the fact of Quebec at that time or, at least, Canada east at that time, he would have been quite willing to see a single government.

They made sure that the powers of taxation which were recounted at that time—that is the indirect taxes because, of course, income taxes and the direct taxes that we

talked about so much this afternoon were not a part of the fabric of taxation in those days—and largely it was customs duties and indirect taxes which counted—were placed along with direct taxes in the hands of the federal government.

Every effort was made to ensure that the federal government would have control over the province—the power of disallowance; the fact that the Lieutenant-Governor was appointed by the federal government; the fact, indeed, that the Senate did not represent the provinces but rather represented regions. At no point does the compact theory which was mentioned this afternoon hold any water in the constitutional development of this country.

The most obvious point is that the provinces had no right to form a union. They were mere British colonies, and as British colonies, the only one which could create a union was the British parliament at Westminster. The men who sat in Charlottetown and in Quebec and in London realized that fact as well as we should here, as we talk about it at this time.

But the power of circumstances changed this constitution. By the 1880s and 1890s, the power was moving from the centre out to the parts. They were moving out to the parts essentially because the great national objective had been achieved. The CPR had been built.

The national policy had created some degree of national economic unity and, because we in Canada could not deal with the interpretation of our constitution, the Privy Council at Westminster decided on the kind of constitution we should have.

We found ourselves losing control at the centre as power went from the centre to the parts. But circumstances again took over and the first world war came along and the power flowed back once again to the centre, as it became obvious that the nation could not carry on the war effort unless it had these powers of taxation and these powers of carrying out certain activities which were necessary if the full weight of the Canadian people was to be mobilized in that heroic struggle of 1914-1918.

But the power of circumstance again took over in 1920, because here again the power or regionalism, which is so strong in this country, which is made strong indeed by geographic factors and by many other factors, came into play. It came into play so strongly, that by 1930 we found ourselves facing the national horror of a depression, unable to deal with the needs of the people.

We had the strange dichotomy of the provinces having the power to deal with such matters as unemployment and social welfare needs and dealing with municipalities, while the federal government was the only government which had the financial power. We saw those terrible number of years, which eventually resulted, of course, in the Rowell Sirois report, perhaps the most profound and searching analysis of the Canadian constitution and the problems of that constitution which have never been undertaken in this country.

Then, of course, the second world war solved that problem for us. It ended the need for the Rowell Sirois report and the rather drastic measures suggested by that document. We had, once again, the power centering at the Ottawa level.

In the years following the war, from 1945 to 1950, the force of circumstances took hold, with the great national projects of the Seaway, and the post-war difficulties we faced of putting men to work and, of course, the effect of the cold war itself and the emphasis on our defence.

Once again, circumstance created a very strong and viable central government. But then, in 1960 and since 1960, the powers of circumstance have been ones of disruption rather than one of centralization. I suppose there are a number of factors—the factor of the weak central government, the disillusionment of the Diefenbaker years, the minority governments in Ottawa, the fact that so many areas, because of the rather strange patterns of electoral success at the federal level, meant that a number of regions were unrepresented in the government.

At some points in time Quebec was unrepresented and, at other points, western provinces were unrepresented and of course, perhaps most of all, you have a development of nationalism among the French-speaking people of this country.

The reason for this, of course, is well known. We saw the development of a quiet revolution and out of the desire of the French-Canadian people to be, you might say, a “modern” people there came as well the desire to have control over their destiny—to be masters in their own house.

It was at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, that I thought the Prime Minister of Ontario took circumstances into his hands and decided that circumstances were not going to direct what was taking place in this country, that men would have some role to play.

And this is why I find it unfortunate at this point of time, in 1969, that that direction has been lost, that we no longer have that sense of urgency. Because indeed we can become a part of circumstance. We may very well lose the mastery of our own affairs. And it is not, I do not think, within us to know that we may very well be facing the last few years of Canadian unity.

I do say to you, sir, that circumstances in the twentieth century move much more quickly than they have ever done in the past and they move with a ferocity which perhaps is unknown in the past.

I think that today we stand on the threshold of the decision whether this is to be one country, whether this is to be a single Canada which we can pass on to our children, or whether we will spend the next half century trying to heal the breaches which have been created by the circumstances of the 1960s.

It is an unfortunate and sad thing that the Prime Minister of Ontario became so obsessed with financial affairs. One cannot, and one would not wish to, divorce the financial problems of the province of Ontario from the constitutional matters—but one would suggest that this was not the only thing that mattered, that there was something even more important in that conference in Ottawa, that the Prime Minister of Ontario had a higher calling than simply the defence of the financial viability of the province of Ontario.

We saw the rather distressing picture of the Prime Minister of Ontario seeming to appear as the "fat cat" trying to ward off the appeals for assistance of other regions. In place of the leadership of English Canada, one could not help but feel there was a degree of divisiveness created by this particular kind of obsession. I am not going to place all the blame on the—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): The hon. member does not believe that.

An hon. member: Absolute rot.

Mr. Pitman: Indeed I do believe that. I believe in a very real way that we have seen the Prime Minister of Ontario lose the kind of inner concern and the real concern that he had for the needs of this nation when he became so concerned when we talked about finances here this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is a majority of one who believes that.

Mr. Pitman: Well that is not a very intelligent comment, Mr. Speaker, from the other side, but I do want to get down to the aspect of circumstances under which we operate in this country. You know we really do pay for elections, do we not?

An hon. member: What are you suggesting?

Mr. Pitman: I am suggesting at this point in time that we may very well be in an area of drift in which we may very well lose the kind of unity which we hope to retain and, indeed, to strengthen during this period of the 1960s.

I do not think this is a very difficult concept to suggest to you. You may have a different opinion. You are welcome to that opinion. I am simply stating it as I see it at this point in time. I suggest to you, sir, that a part of this emanates out of the election that took place last June, when one of the most important things took place—when the now Prime Minister of this country used the election campaign to exacerbate the situation.

I would say that he misrepresented the interests of French Canada before the people of this nation. He provided a simplistic view of the desires of French Canadians. There is not a single French Canadian leader leading a single French Canadian party in the province of Quebec who could possibly view, with any sympathy, the interpretation of the Canadian constitution which is put forward by the Prime Minister of Canada.

An hon. member: Including Lesage.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): He should have talked about a special status like Douglas did.

Mr. Pitman: I think if we are going to get into a discussion on special status, the suggestions of the leader of the Opposition in the federal House for the Conservative Party were attempting to find some kind of a reasonable relationship and I congratulate him for this—but the people of Canada did not give him very many votes for it. Nonetheless, I think that there was there an attempt to find what was a rational, reasonable and acceptable kind of Canada for the Quebec people.

I would suggest, sir, on this question of the Prime Minister of Ontario's responsibility, that since the last election in June, the Prime Minister of Ontario had an opportunity; it was an opportunity to give new

leadership at a point in time when English-speaking Canada needed that leadership to give purpose to English Canadians within this country and to give them some idea of what they wanted as a nation.

So often one feels that the French-speaking people of this nation know what they want, but it is very weakly and poorly articulated as to what English-speaking Canada wants, and I think that is the special role which the Prime Minister of Ontario, who is the leader of the largest, richest and most prosperous province in this nation, can properly provide.

This, I think, was an opportunity to show that we have imagination, that we have wit, that we have an ability to find innovations in describing and analyzing and determining what shall be the relationship of Quebec to the federal government of *vis-à-vis* English-speaking Canadian provinces to the federal government.

I do not care what you want to call it; I call it the need for recognizing a special relationship on the part of French-speaking Canadians. But the recognition that English-speaking Canadians should have some forum of opinions of what their relationship should be with English-speaking provinces I think was lost, and I am very sorry that it was.

I think that the Prime Minister of Ontario gave very real leadership in his development of French-speaking schools, in his efforts to find a place for French-speaking people in this province, and in his efforts to find ways of making French-speaking people at home in the province of Ontario. I think it must have been very debilitating for the Prime Minister of Canada to find that a French-Canadian leader would say that this did not matter any more; that, so far as leadership in the province of Quebec was concerned, they did not care whether there was any French-speaking schools for the minorities in other provinces.

I appeal to the Prime Minister at this time that perhaps it is now an opportunity to change the emphasis.

We are not providing the French-speaking schools in Ontario as a sop, as some kind of a means to keep French-speaking people in Canada. We are providing them because it is necessary; it is a need for Ontario; because we as English Canadians are richer, because French-speaking Canadians feel at home in this province.

I would hope that that position would find some acceptance on those benches and that the Prime Minister of Ontario will not begin to back up on that particular emphasis which,

indeed, he has continued throughout these significant months.

Might I get down to some of the specifics that I would like to comment on in relation to this debate. The real crunch comes in dealing with the powers in sections 91 and 92. This is the crunch and this is where I think the Prime Minister could have provided that kind of leadership. French-speaking people are concerned about preserving French culture in North America, and that is no mean task.

It is no mean task, without the tremendous power of the media which you have on every side, to be able to preserve this minority, this language, this culture, and I think that we have nothing but the greatest honour to pay to those French Canadians who are so concerned. Could we, as English Canadians, have that same kind of concern about preserving ourselves as Canadians with that same kind of pressure?

I am going to bring up a particular matter to perhaps illustrate what I mean in the kind of difficulty which we have on this side of the fence, so to speak, Mr. Speaker. We went to give the French-speaking people of the province of Quebec an opportunity to, as young people say, "do their own thing." I would hope that Ontario would begin to find a pattern whereby English-speaking people and all other provinces could find a way to "do their own thing" within that same pattern.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East):
Dean Cohen.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I am very flattered if Dean Cohen has made these comments before. I am sorry I have not read Dean Cohen's speech but if the hon. member would send it over to me—I would be most happy to read it. He is a very intelligent man who is saying a great many important things and I would be very delighted.

Mr. Trotter: He is a Liberal.

Mr. Pitman: Well, that does not ingratiate him to me, but nonetheless—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: At least he says something convincing.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to suggest that there are three or four things I would like to put forward. There have been matters that have been put forward by other members in the House.

The first thing I think we have to recognize is that the rewriting of sections 91 and 92 is simply not enough. I think we have to

begin with a preamble, a preamble to our constitution which gives us these goals; which sets these goals; which shows what both we, as English-speaking Canadians and as French-speaking Canadians, want to remain as the essence of the Canadian fact, the Canadian "thing".

I think both Andrew Brewin and Claude Ryan have made this point. I think Claude Ryan has stated he wished to see a preamble which "states clearly a Canadian political society's pattern, the principle of cultural duality".

Secondly we need a constitution which is set out in modern language. I was very pleased to see in these propositions that the government of Ontario does not rule out the necessity for a newly written constitution. It does not set itself up as being the only way by which we can maintain unity, or can strengthen that unity, but at least there is a recognition that we need some rewriting of parts of this constitution. Surely that is an obvious need.

One only has to read The British North America Act—it would be good for all of us if we were to reread The British North America Act—to see just how far out of touch this document is with the twentieth century. After all, it is the oldest constitution in the world which has, as a part of it, the system of responsible government. That is no mean thing, I think, to say about a constitution, but nonetheless, we live in an age when being old does not necessarily mean being relevant.

I think it is desperately important that we rephrase, that we revise, indeed that we rewrite, section 91 and 92 to bring the constitution out of its obsolete and meaningless phraseology, put it into the twentieth century, and ensure within those two sections that the safeguards of the French-Canadian minority's wish—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: What powers does the member want to change?

Mr. Pitman: All right, let us get down to the nub—the powers I would like to see changed. I would like to see English-speaking Canada and French-speaking Canada have those things they feel are necessary for maintaining themselves as cultures. Now, for the French-speaking people it may be important to them that housing, for example, should be provincial in order that a certain kind of urban development takes place—also with education.

Section 93, you would agree, is an area

which has a special significance and where loans to universities and where federal activity in education at the university level, in the manpower level, may very well be quite acceptable to us as English Canadians but is not acceptable to French Canadians in the province of Quebec. Is that an acceptable proposition?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: What powers is the hon. member going to change?

Mr. Pitman: I am trying to suggest that housing may very well be one thing that we in English-speaking Canada would be quite happy to turn over to the federal government. Perhaps the Minister in the corner may not be too happy with that proposition, but I would suggest that that is something which we would certainly consider as a viable position, which would not be considered as viable by any responsible political party in French-speaking Canada today. Those are two examples. Universities are another example.

There are many areas in the cultural field, in the arts, where I think we need a national thrust, and we in English-speaking Canada are quite happy to have that kind of development.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): The hon. member has mentioned three things, just as an example. They were housing, education and what was the other one?

Mr. Pitman: University affairs and education.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, but I think there was a third field he covered.

Mr. Pitman: Culture.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, all right. All of these things, I presume, are part of property and civil rights.

Mr. Pitman: This is in one of these areas.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am interested to know why he thinks—assuming provincial attitudes where housing might be a federal field—why would it not be available to Quebec as well as to the English oriented province? I wonder why the difference in that particular field? I can see it in education; I can see it particularly in education, certainly, because of the language; but why housing, why would that be a distinction?

Mr. Pitman: I am very pleased to have this discussion with the Attorney General. I think that housing is so closely related to the kind

of society and to urban renewal and to urban development, to industrialization, that there are very particular patterns of urban renewal and particular reactions to industrialization in the new Quebec. Let us take, for example, Mr. Hellyer who has been saying a great deal about housing and indeed, I think it has very greatly worried the hon. Minister, and rightly so, about some of the things that he suggested about housing as it affects Ontario's culture.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is because we think that power, which is now provincial, should be left provincial and the means to implement that power should be given to the province.

Mr. Pitman: But I would suggest that it might very well be that we in English-speaking Canada could consider the possibility of a certain kind of urban development which suits English-Canadian culture. I would hope that it would be different from American culture, I would hope we would find new patterns. But nevertheless it would be different.

I would suggest that it might very well be true, for the people of the province of Quebec, that you might say, "pulling apart the city orientation would be the only way they could effectively defend their culture." They may well feel that this continuing urbanization and the whole effect of industrialization—this kind of industrial development—should be decentralized.

If Mr. Hellyer's views are to prevail, it might very well be a matter of some concern to the people in Quebec, if this power was left at the centre. But that does not mean that we in English-speaking Canada could not see some viability in handing over a function such as that to the federal government.

What I am suggesting is the assumption of leadership on the part of the province of Ontario to find those things, which we in English-speaking Canada feel should be a part of the federal fabric.

Now, let us take the guaranteed annual income—

Mr. Kerr: But the member will not criticize us if we agree with Quebec—if we insist on exercising our provincial responsibility in Ontario—

Mr. Pitman: I would have no concern. It is not a matter of agreeing with Quebec, it is a matter of deciding—I am sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Kerr: —as a provincial right, provincial responsibility and jurisdiction. If Ontario says

and Quebec says, "We should have that power and that responsibility." The member will not criticize that, I hope.

Mr. Pitman: I would say no. If the province of Ontario—and I would hope, as I say, giving leadership to all other English-speaking provinces—feels that this is important for us as our means, as a province, of expressing ourselves as English Canadians, yes.

Let us take the guaranteed annual income; now there has been a good deal of talk about this in this Legislature in the last day or two.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well, it is a Conservative device.

Mr. Kerr: He is agreeing with it.

Mr. Pitman: I want to suggest to you that this might be something which we English-speaking Canadians might find as a way by which we can provide equality and equity throughout English-speaking Canada. And we might decide rather than having the province of Ontario and The Department of Social and Family Services trying to provide that kind of a thrust, we might find it better to place this at the federal level, in the department—

Mr. Kerr: Like we did with the pension plan.

Mr. Pitman: Could I just finish my point and I would be very pleased to give the member the floor.

I would suggest that this might very well be something that we as English-speaking Canadians could accept at the federal level; but for the French-speaking Canadian that would not be acceptable. He would feel that this is an area of jurisdiction which very closely relates to the French-speaking culture and the way he wants to provide help and to provide equalization might be a very different pattern.

Now, you see, we should not say, "no," that "we in Ontario are going to look after a guaranteed annual income in Ontario because Quebec is going to look after it in Quebec." Surely we can give leadership to English-speaking Canadians in English-speaking provinces; to find a way of dividing these functions in a way which provides an opportunity for both to be viable; to do their own thing.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: If I might ask a question of the hon. member? Am I correct in understanding that the burden of his argument is that the shift in powers, as it might

involve amendments in sections 91 and 92, relate only to the province of Quebec?

Mr. Pitman: No, I am sorry if I have given that impression, I did not mean to. I would suggest that looking at this constitution again in 1969 we might very well find that there are powers which would be better, functions which would be better to move to the higher level, that as English Canadians it would be better to move to the higher level.

Now, I think there is one area which we have to be very conscious of—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Oh, the member is kidding us if he thinks that Quebec is going to give up the powers it has now.

Mr. Pitman: That does not necessarily mean that Ontario has to hold all of its powers, does it?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, but therefore the member's argument on powers comes back to nine provinces and one province, insofar as a change in powers is concerned under 91 and 92.

Mr. Pitman: That may happen. I am willing to concede that point, but I am suggesting to you that it may very well be that some of the powers which Quebec has now, under The British North America Act, it might be willing to pass to the federal level. It may not be a financial power, it might seem like a peripheral power, but it might not be one which particularly relates to the existence and the strengthening of the French Canadian culture in Canada.

Mr. Sopha: The member might name one. He might help us by hinting at one.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I do not think this is a matter that an English Canadian should comment on but I shall try to comment on it. In fact I would like to comment on it. I would suggest, sir, that at present, at this point in time, Quebec is very much concerned about education. It is these educational and cultural terms. It might very well find that if our economy does begin to slow down, if unemployment rates do begin to rise, and if it appears that a very necessary definition of education includes the manpower, then it might be better to have manpower, that one particular area, in the hands of the federal government. As I say, it might. You see, the hon. member is cooking the books. He is suggesting that as things are right now, is the only way that they may be. I suggest to

you that there may be other ways. One of the most obvious ways—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Even your succession duties this afternoon, why should not they?

Mr. Pitman: Well I would like to go on, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sopha: This is a very cynical view of the relationship of Quebec—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is a very practical view.

Mr. Sopha: It is a very hardened view.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Who are you kidding. What are they going to give up anyhow?

Mr. Pitman: The third area I would like to discuss is the whole area of our unwritten constitution. The member for Parkdale talked about the whole question of putting into the constitution the question of the Cabinet and the way in which we actually operate. But I think it would be a very dangerous thing to do, Mr. Speaker. I think this part of the unwritten constitution is valuable in the sense that we cannot change this part of the constitution very easily. However I do agree with him very much that we should get rid of some of the anachronisms.

Any individual reading The British North America Act comes away with the most completely distorted view of how things really take place in this country. The continuous mention of the Queen; the fact that the Queen does this and the Queen does that, I think, gives an area of distortion and an area of real concern to anyone reading the document. I think this is one aspect of our unwritten constitution that should be clarified.

I have already spoken in my discussion with the member for Ottawa of this other question, but I would like to comment on the words of Marceau Ferribeau who, I think, outlined the degree to which The British North America Act is completely out of date.

As he pointed out, it has been changed by 22 Acts in the British Parliament, 4 orders-in-council, 52 federal Acts which involved provincial matters, 27 federal laws on constitutional matters, 11 laws on the Governor-General and a couple on the Lieutenant-Governor. There are 105 consolidated Acts or orders-in-council. There are 60 amendments which are unconsolidated and his comment, which I think we can accept tonight, is this:

In this day and age there is no other government, public institution, or private company, able to afford the luxury of such a proliferation and such a jungle.

And I would agree with that point in relation to this constitution.

I think the constitution that we need is one which shows that within a national fabric there can be diversity. Now we can find new patterns of government relationship, for we have the wit and the imagination, and this is what I am appealing to the Prime Minister of Ontario to provide—that kind of leadership, which provides these new patterns. We can do it; other countries are doing it. There are other countries who have different kinds of federal systems and I think that this is the kind of unique thinking which we would come to expect from this government in this area.

In closing, I would like to deal with one particular aspect of the constitution. That is to remind the hon. members that is not just a matter of writing a constitution. It is a matter of making sure there is something to write a constitution for. Other members of this party are going to deal with other aspects of this problem, but I want to deal with one particular aspect. That aspect is one which I think this government should be concerned about as it worries about the writing of the constitution because if this kind of development continues, the constitution will no longer represent the interests, desires and the will of the people. It will represent something which no longer exists if it is a constitution for a free and united Canada.

I refer to one area—the Americanization of our universities which has taken place over the last number of years. I would like just to read one or two paragraphs from the article by Pauline Jewett in *Maclean's Magazine* for March, 1969:

In recent years though the emphasis seems to have shifted to sheer numbers of non-Canadians, our universities have reached the point where close to three-quarters of their new recruits each year are non-Canadians. The proportion has gone up from approximately 45 per cent in 1961-1963, to 58 per cent in 1963-1965, to 72 per cent in 1965-1967, with the figures for 1967-1969 not available, but probably even higher. Now how can we talk about having a Canadian nation when we are putting the guidance of the young people who are going into the leadership roles of our nation continually in the hands of American minds?

Furthermore, increasing numbers each year are drawn not from many lands, but from just one, the United States. The explanation usually given for this ever increasing reliance on outsiders, particularly on Americans, to staff and run our universities, is that the supply of qualified Canadians simply has not kept pace with the demand.

The supply of qualified Americans, on the other hand, or at any rate that part of the supply available to us, has grown very rapidly.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): How about American unions?

Mr. Pitman: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member over here asked about American unions. I wish he would read the report which is written by his own leadership candidate, Walter Gordon, about American unions, and we could settle that problem and get it out of this Chamber.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You did not learn anything from it then.

Mr. Pitman: Oh, Mr. Speaker, Walter Gordon said exactly the opposite to what the member for Humber is discussing here tonight.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Do not allow yourself to be distorted—

Mr. Pitman: To continue:

These statistics show that though the supply of qualified Canadians has not grown as rapidly as it would have with greater governmental assistance, it has nevertheless grown substantially in recent years.

Indeed it has grown much more than the use that has been made of it by Canadian universities. Between 1963 and 1965 and 1965-1967, Steel and Matthews—

these are two individuals who were doing a study at Carleton University:

Steel and Matthews estimate the number of Canadians taking higher degrees—MA's and PhD's in Canada and abroad, rose from 9,785 to 14,151, a sizeable increase in the pool of Canadian talent. Between the same two periods, the additional faculty taken on by Canadian universities rose from 3,040 to 4,716.

Now one might have expected that at least in the last year a fair number of this additional faculty would have been Canadian. This was as far from being the case

as to be ludicrous. The increase in the number of Canadians taken on in our universities in 1965-1967 was exactly 36—36 across the whole Dominion. The figures show 1,284 Canadians recruited in 1963-1965, 1,320 in 1965-1967, a growth of three per cent. The non-Canadians recruited on the other hand went up from 1,756 in 1963-1965 to 3,000 in 1965-1967, a growth rate of 93 per cent.

This is going on when we are talking about writing a new constitution for Canada.

Mr. Ben: Is that the end of the quote?

Mr. Pitman: That is the end of my quotation, Mr. Speaker.

If I might go on to another area, Mr. Speaker this is an article which was in the *Ottawa Citizen*, November 13, 1968. I will quote very briefly from it and it shows I think in stark reality what we face:

There are 15 Americans on York University sociology faculty and one Canadian.

Many departments at York are 30 to 50 per cent American staff. The political economy, or political science departments at Glendon College, York, McMaster, and University of Toronto all have American chairmen.

Now I think that there is something very significant about these figures because it means that the young people who are taking courses in sociology are doing so largely from an American point of view. Those who are taking politics are seeing it from an American point of view. What is the point of us writing a constitution for a unique kind of Canada when the young people who will take over the leadership will have a completely different attitude towards the institutions which we hold so dear?

Glendon College does not have a single Canadian teacher full time in its political science department and McMaster has only one. The University of Western Ontario's economics department, 19 staff members who have ranks of assistant professor and above, have 27 U.S. degrees and only 13 Canadian degrees. Of 13 fully qualified professors hired by the Loyola College in Montreal English department during the past three years, 11 were Americans, one was a Canadian with a degree from the United States, and one was a European.

Mr. Ben: This has all been recorded, what does the member suggest be done about it now?

Mr. Pitman: If I might go on with this—

Mr. Ben: What does he suggest be done about it?

Mr. Pitman: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Humber make his own speech at the appropriate time in this debate?

Mr. Ben: Well, this is not the appropriate time to discuss education unless it—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Humber is quite out of order and the hon. member for Peterborough is quite correct and will please carry on.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to suggest to you that some of the main reasons for this are quite obvious. Americans have been brought up from major universities which have a tremendous prestige. What takes place, of course, is very simple. Those who come up from these prestigious universities tend to go back to those universities to find their colleagues. There is nothing evil or pernicious about what takes place, but I suggest it is something which we as a Legislature should be particularly concerned about.

The hon. member for Humber asked me what suggestions I would make. Possibly there are ways by which we might support Canadian studies, taught by Canadians, in Ontario universities which would encourage Canadian universities to hire Canadian staff. There are many ways to encourage universities to do what we think are socially acceptable things in this province and that may very well be one of the things that we must do.

I think we have to be concerned about the fact that the textbooks that are brought by these American professors into the classrooms are simply American textbooks. So, once again, you have another dimension of the Americanization of young people in our universities. I think that in many cases you have a situation where new studies, computer instruction, packaged materials, or many subjects, are coming directly from the United States. Many of the teachers in Ontario high schools find that they have to go to American sources to get the kind of materials which will allow them to carry on the kind of studies in a modern manner in the Ontario of 1969. Even the Ontario Institute for Studies and Education—which surely is a body responsible to this Legislature—is heavily, very heavily staffed with Americans. Up to 50 per cent at one point come from American sources. In the beginning this per-

haps was necessary because in many cases graduates in the subjects taught at the OISE were not to be found in Canada. It was a new direction to be found in our thinking, but I suggest that this is the kind of a problem which has particular relevance.

I want to suggest to you just one or two areas by which we might maintain a Canada for which we can probably write a constitution. Two weeks ago, there gathered in a hotel of this city, 100 scholars from the universities across this country. They gathered to discuss a report which was prepared by the Ontario Institute for Studies and Education, called "What culture? What heritage?"

I would suggest to any member in this House who has not read this document—and I know the member for Sudbury has read it, and I am sure there are others who have read it—that it should be almost necessary reading for those of us who sit here. It indicates the level at which we have taught Canadian history in the high schools in this country. It is not a critique of Ontario high schools; it is a critique of the teaching of Canadian history right across this country, from Vancouver to Saint John. And it is a devastating document.

It was done, however—and this is an area in which Ontario has provided some service—it was done by an Ontario teacher, Mr. A. B. Hodges from Trinity College.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that printed by OISE?

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry, it is printed by the Ontario Institute for Studies and Education.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do they not provide us all with a copy?

Mr. Sopha: It is \$2 a copy.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is your institute, why do you not ask them?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that, perhaps at the next Cabinet meeting, this might be a subject of concern by those on the front benches across the other side.

Mr. Singer: It is not really an underground NDP group.

Mr. Sopha: Have you got change for a five?

Mr. Pitman: I want to complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by just reading one or two of the suggestions—one or two things that were said in this document. Perhaps this reveals some of the reasons for the mess we

are in, because what it states, what Mr. Hodges and his assistants discovered, was that we have really been teaching the history of two countries in this Canada of ours. That if one read the textbooks and worked and sat in the classrooms in Quebec, one would get the history of a completely different country than if one sat in the classrooms and read the textbooks here in the province of Ontario.

There you have, I think, the dichotomy; the problem we face now. We wonder why we have different views as to what kind of Canada we support, and want to see in the future. But not only have we created that kind of a situation, we have also managed to completely bore the young people of our country by the way we have taught Canadian history.

The men who carried out this study not only read the texts; they not only read the examination papers and read the courses and looked at the classrooms; they went into the classrooms and sat at the back of those classrooms and saw what happened to the young people who are taking Canadian history.

I will just read you a few lines:

Granted that the difficulties are great. The findings of the national history project suggests that most administrators, inspectors and far too many teachers have not given serious consideration to the teaching of Canadian studies, nor do they have a philosophical frame of reference on which to base their thinking. It is understandable, therefore, that answers pulled off the cuff should fail to yield any coherent pattern. Yet, despite this continuing criticism, and despite this evidence of deep dissatisfaction with the state of Canadian studies in our schools, no major reforms have been introduced in many, many years.

Some provinces—Imagine, this is the twentieth century. We have moved ahead so quickly in so many other subject areas, and yet we teach Canadian history the same way as we taught it 20 years ago—in some cases from the same books.

We have provided no indication of the drama, no indication of the colour, of Canadian history. No indication that there are people and Canadians who are just as exciting—the Louis Riels and so on—as the American heroes we hear so much about.

Some provinces have changed the scope and sequence of their history courses and introduced new textbooks. Many schools have provided generous supplies of audio-visual equipment, Some faculties of

education have climbed aboard various bandwagons rolling up from the United States. And some professors of Canadian history are beginning to write no longer as chroniclers, but as historians. Yet, none of these reforms, as will be shown later, has made any fundamental change in what goes on in the Canadian studies classroom.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we can talk a great deal about writing a constitution, but if we allow this to continue we are in serious trouble.

Those scholars, who came from all across Canada, agreed with the statements that were made in this book. Strangely enough, they have not gone to the government asking for money. This may come as quite a surprise to those on the other side. They have gone out asking for support from other sources. They are going out to try to find money.

They have set up—what did they call it—a Canadian studies foundation. They are going to try to encourage every province to support this foundation. They want private enterprise to support this foundation. They hope that it will be able to remain independent of government resources for the first stage.

They want to try to provide materials for teachers across this whole nation to teach Canadian history in an exciting and a relevant fashion. They want to provide strategies, they want to provide means, by which English literature, English art, as well as English history, can become a part of the living tissue of Canadians in this country.

To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker—and this may not seem to be a relevant thing to be talking about in a constitutional debate, and I intend to sit down in just a moment, but I would suggest that, by supporting a project such as this, we in Canada can ensure that there is a Canada to provide a constitution for within the next few years.

And so, in closing, I would say that the Prime Minister of Ontario and his government have a number of responsibilities. First, to provide leadership for English Canadians to find their way to exhibit themselves as English Canadians in the future. To provide the guidelines within the constitution which allow for both sides to find their place in this society of ours. To continue the policies they have already begun of providing French schools and the French language in various parts of Ontario, and to take a stand, Mr. Speaker, against this growing Americanization of our universities and the growing boredom among young people in regard to Canadian history.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, this evening it was not my intention to rise, frankly, because I felt that the whole debate had been kind of overdone. I think that when we continue to cry that our nation is in dire jeopardy, we are not giving enough credit to the people in Quebec, the majority of whom are just as anxious if not more anxious than we in English-speaking Canada, to maintain Canada. We have paid too much—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): When did Nostradamus discover that?

Mr. Ben: We have paid too much attention to the separatists, or those who are called separatists, and not enough to the people who feel that their roots are so deep in French Canada that they could not call it any land that did not have Canada in it.

Now it is true, that the cries of the people in Quebec for a greater interest, a greater share, in the resources of this country should not go unheeded. One of the justifiable complaints that they do have is one of regional or economic disparity. There is no doubt that the land to the east of Ontario—and I use that phrase advisedly—has not shared in the growth of Canada as have provinces like Ontario, British Columbia, and now, even the Prairies. I use the expression “east of Ontario” because the same could apply to the Maritimes, to Newfoundland, as it can to Quebec.

A lot of it is, perhaps, the fault of those who led Quebec during the greater part of the first half of this century, but a great deal has also been the fault of the rest of Canada. Insofar as Quebec is concerned, for a long time she was very insular.

I recall, as a youngster, glancing through international magazines, such as the *National Geographic*, and finding therein advertisements published by the province of Quebec, La Belle Province, inviting people to come to La Belle Province, to rural Quebec. The inducements they offered were photographs of those one-horse chaises, and the view of bread being baked in an outdoor oven. This was the way that Quebec was sold—as the land of Madeleine Champlain.

While the rest of Canada, English-speaking Canada, was producing professors and engineers and chemists, Quebec was also producing professors—but not of engineering—and priests and notary publics. Their education was geared towards the arts, while the rest of Canada's education was geared towards technology. This is the way the leaders, especially as typified by Duplessis, chose to lead the French of that time.

But I do not, Mr. Speaker, believe that the sins of the parents should devolve on the children. I do not believe the present generation should be compelled to pay for what their ancestors, or their parents, chose to impose upon them. Just as I do not think that Indians on reservations have a right to compel their children to live on the reservation and to make their living by hunting and fishing.

I do not believe that anyone had the right in Quebec to compel their offspring to lead an agrarian existence.

They are right in asking to catch up with the rest of Canada and join the twentieth century; to fall into it with both feet, and stand on those feet. It is our duty as brothers, as fellow citizens, to give them an opportunity to do that; to be standing by to make sure that they do land on their feet and that they do not fall. And if they fall, to pick them up and offer them assistance. This is what we must do.

One of the troubles in English-speaking Canada, and it is a trait that is universal, Mr. Speaker, is that if we have a reluctance to do something, we pick on any excuse that is to hand to justify our not doing it. Now many claims that are made by French-speaking Canadians in the eyes of the English-speaking Canadians are not legitimate. But many other claims, the majority of them, are legitimate.

There is too great a tendency on the part of too many English speakers to find some claim made by the French speakers, which perhaps does not hold as much water as it should—it is not as solid as it could be—and say, “This is not so, you are making this claim and it is not justified, it is wrong. Your facts are wrong, and therefore, accordingly, everything else that you claim, everything else that you say, is also wrong”. And that, to me, is a lot of nonsense.

This could apply insofar as culture is concerned. There are certain people in French-speaking Canada, a minority, who claim that the English speakers are trying to wipe out either the French language or French culture. Well, in many areas in English-speaking Canada, the residents have never heard a word of French spoken, and the last thing in their mind is to wipe out the French language.

As far as French culture is concerned, to those people French culture consists of a flat-chested, skinny wench, in a distorted posture, displaying some dress by Dior. That, to them, is French culture, and just try to convince them that they are trying to wipe

out that type of French culture. So, naturally, they say, “They are wrong in saying I am trying to wipe out their culture. They are wrong in saying I am trying to wipe out their language, and per se, they are wrong in everything else that they say.” And this is too bad, but it is a natural trait as I say.

I am reminded of a little anecdote, Mr. Speaker. A man knocked on the door of his neighbour and he said, “Joe, can I borrow your axe”. And Joe said, “No, I am sorry, Pete, but I need my axe to shave with.” So after Pete leaves, Joe’s wife says to him, “Joe, how could you tell Pete such a nasty lie? You have never shaved with your axe in your life.” He said, “I know I haven’t, and so does Pete, but when you don’t want to do something, one excuse is as good as another.”

And I imagine this is the excuse that they offer with reference to this matter, by saying that, “everything the French desire is not justified because we have found them making an unfounded claim here.” And it is unfortunate that we have not spent more time in the past trying to let each other know something about our own past.

I think we, this generation at least, have been fortunate, in that we have been living, or have been around, on our Centennial, because I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, that we would have been any more aware today of the habits and the traditions or the customs of the people, say, in Quebec, or New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, or elsewhere in this country, than we were five years ago, or three years ago, had Centennial and Expo not intervened. So I say again, Mr. Speaker, that we have indeed been fortunate to have been living at precisely this period of time.

Now we can perhaps pass on to our children something that they cannot pick up in books and they cannot pick up in the schools—the knowledge gained from our own participation in the celebration of the Centennial of this country. And we would be foolish, Mr. Speaker, if we did not try to learn more about each other, if we did not try to continuously accentuate the positive, stress the good parts, the great contributions that have been made to the advancement of this country.

I do not quarrel with what the hon. member for Peterborough had to say, except that perhaps I am a little more consistent than he is. I am against American ownership of our resources. I am against Americans coming into our schools and indoctrinating our children. But, sir, to maintain that consist-

ency, as I am against American ownership of Canadian capital, I am against American ownership of Canadian labour.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They do not own them.

Mr. Ben: That is what is said over there. And I can see what is meant by these teachers coming in. My older boy came to me and he was quite enthused. He wanted my help on the project that he wanted to engage in, and I regret to say that, in the first instance, this project was going to involve American history, namely, the war of the revolution.

I suggested to him that there were sufficient factors in our own history that would make a wonderful research project, and I am happy to say he decided to do just that.

But he himself had been brainwashed, not just by textbooks, but by radio and television, to the American point of view. And this is another consideration that we must give insofar as protecting and safeguarding our entity is concerned. It is about time that we started giving consideration to giving more money—to developing and broadcasting and showing Canadian talent on our television. When you think of 50 per cent Canadian content, it is almost an insult to Canada. Why cannot it be 99.4 per cent, with 60 per cent consisting of news items?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): How about bringing Juliette back? Would the member go for that?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): How about Don Messer?

Mr. Ben: Blonde or brunette?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): How about the Robarts-MacNaughton Laugh-in?

Mr. Ben: You know, I daresay that this House will indeed be honoured if, for all the time that those three or four cameras stayed in here this afternoon filming the Budget presentation, it will result in five minutes on any one television programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The whole thing was broadcast. It was broadcast live.

Mr. T. P. Reid: A lot of cameras were on that side.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They were behind me on my bald spot.

Mr. Ben: The point is there are many things we have to do to preserve a Canadian entity. Most of them we have to do hand-in-

hand with our brothers in Quebec, otherwise we cannot succeed. We cannot pull in different directions.

Mr. Speaker, I say I apologize to the House for getting up and speaking extemporaneously like this, but I was moved to do so because I do think perhaps we may be treating the whole matter a little too frivolously. Thank you.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset that I resent the manner in which the Tory Ministers have opted out of this debate. It appears to me that they have decided that today being Budget day, the opportunity for press coverage at this time is not in their best interests and they feel that it would be better to wait until a more suitable time in order to ensure—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What has this to do with debate on Constitution?

Mr. Deans: The Minister is about to find out if he will sit and listen for a change.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): As usual, we are talking in a vacuum.

Mr. Deans: It might be very interesting if the Minister would just listen instead of talking. He does a lot of talking and very little listening,

So in view of the poor attendance in the House at the moment, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, we will continue this debate tomorrow.

At this time I should like to indicate to the House the order of the estimates as the Prime Minister said yesterday he would. We will commence estimates on Thursday, starting with the estimates of the Treasurer.

Estimate No. 2 will be The Department of Correctional Services; No. 3 will be The Department of Tourism and Information; next, The Department of Mines; next The Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship and then The Department of Social and Family Services. Those will be the first six.

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

Mr. T Reid: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the House leader when bills might be coming in?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not imagine that we will do many bills until the first of the week.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 5, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 5, 1969

Assumption of administration of assessment, statement by Mr McKeough	1862
Teacher shortage, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Pitman	1863
Medical insurance, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald	1868
Humane Society, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. MacDonald	1869
Postage meter imprint, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. MacDonald	1869
Provincial takeover of assessment, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. MacDonald	1869
Provincial takeover of assessment, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Gaunt	1870
Price of cigarettes, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Knight	1870
ARDA, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Ruston	1871
Educational facilities at Armstrong, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Brown	1871
Highway 144, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Ferrier	1872
Map showing underwater mineral rights, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier ..	1872
Fanshaw public school, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Shulman	1872
Doctor shortage in northern Ontario, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Stokes	1873
Imprisonment of offenders, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent	1873
Spadina expressway, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Sargent	1874
Ontario Building Material Ltd., questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Lawlor	1874
Guidelines on highways, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Lawlor	1874
Municipal welfare department at Brantford, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Makarchuk	1874
ETV, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid	1875
Chemical MACE, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Lewis	1877
Resumption of the debate on the Constitution, Mr. Deans, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. White, Mr. Wishart	1878
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wishart, agreed to	1899
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1899
Erratum	1899
Appendix	1900

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests this afternoon in the east gallery are students from Emery Junior High School in Weston and Lyndwood Public School in Port Credit. In the west gallery we have students from Glenview Senior Public School in Toronto and from Strathroy District Collegiate Institute in Strathroy.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Before the orders of the day Mr. Speaker has a statement.

Yesterday the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) raised what in effect were several points of privilege in which he was joined by the hon. members for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) and Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis). Since then, the hon. member for Sudbury has clarified in writing to me his point of privilege as follows:

You alone are the custodian of this House and its appointments and appurtenances and you cannot surrender them to leaders of parties or anyone else. You determine the conditions under which the CBC comes in here and with respect, you must do so with the consent of the members.

However, the hon. member's submission was originally in much wider terms and I would propose to deal with both the general proposition originally expounded by him in the House and with his specific submission quoted above.

As the hon. members have rightfully pointed out, the position in the British Parliamentary institution upon which our Ontario Parliament is patterned has changed, even been reversed, as the centuries have passed. From his first position as the Sovereign's appointed "watch dog," Mr. Speaker has now become Parliament's elected chairman and the arbiter and defender of the rights and

privileges of the members, being also charged with ensuring that the members' responsibilities are by them properly accepted. In this latter capacity, he acts with the consent and approval of the members or a majority of them and it is interesting to note here that in such capacity his responsibility also extends to protecting either individual members or the majority of the members from improper exercise or abuse of privileges and rights by any individual member. The reverse, of course, is also his duty.

In the performance of his duties as chairman of the assembly, Mr. Speaker necessarily follows the rules and precedents of the House and rulings of previous Speakers. The arrangement of the government business on any day is governed by the House leader. When a radical departure from the existing practice of the House is announced by the government House leader, Mr. Speaker is entitled to assume that such arrangement has been discussed with the party leaders or party caucus leaders and represents the view of the members or a majority thereof. It is, of course, open to any member to question the House leader or to urge another course of action.

This brings me to the written submission of the hon. member for Sudbury quoted above.

A perusal of the record of the proceedings of this House on Monday evening last indicates that the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), then acting as government House leader, advised the House of arrangements for televising the Budget address of the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) on the following afternoon.

At that time, of course, it would have been quite proper for the hon. member for Sudbury, who I believe was then in the House, to rise on the point of privilege raised by him yesterday. At that time the matter could have been settled by the members. No such point was raised by any member, and Mr. Speaker, therefore, was then, and still remains, of the opinion that the members or a majority of them were agreeable to this radical change in the proceedings of the House.

Finally, it is my opinion that the rearrangement of which the hon. member complains did not infringe or interfere with the rights and privileges, as such member, of any member of this assembly.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer announced yesterday in that great Budget which he brought down for the benefit of all the people of Ontario, that the government will assume responsibility for the administration of assessment, and this vital function will come under the jurisdiction of The Department of Municipal Affairs. In a change such as this, Mr. Speaker, we are aware that the attitudes of the people directly involved are of paramount importance and their support is essential in achieving our long-range goals.

I would like to take this opportunity to assure all assessment employees at this time that their needs and well-being are receiving the fullest consideration in our planning. Surveys are now under way on personnel, equipment and accommodation in the various municipalities. Until these surveys are complete, we will not know just how each individual will fit into the new assessment organization.

However, I assure you that the participation of all assessment staff will be needed in order to put the new measures into effect. To illustrate, I need only point out that the total number of licenced assessors in this province is 1,250. To bring assessment to what we consider the proper level and maintain it, we require at least 1,900 assessors.

Therefore, not only do we expect to employ all of our present full-time personnel, but also we will through our programmes attract additional competent, qualified people into this field to fill our requirements.

I cannot deny, Mr. Speaker, that there will be changes. When a new organization is being built, when operations are being redefined, when more than 160 assessment jurisdictions are being merged into a third of that number, there are bound to be changes.

Officials of my department are working with representatives of Treasury Board and The Department of Civil Service to build a sound organizational structure that will provide career progression for professional staff and greater opportunities for all employees.

All persons presently employed full-time in the assessment offices will be given the opportunity of appointment to staff and assignment to classified positions within the

Ontario public service, commensurate with their qualifications, experience and competence. Appointments to such positions will be at existing salaries, exclusive of premiums, bonuses and allowances, which employees are actually receiving on March 4, 1969. Where this rate is less than the minimum for the classification to which they are appointed in the Ontario public service, the rate will be raised to that minimum, effective as of the date of their appointment. In no case will salaries for persons appointed to such positions be less than that at March 4, 1969.

Fringe benefits will be in accordance with The Public Service Act with recognition of previous service in their present employment. With respect to each group of employees affected, every effort will be made to ensure that over-all compensation, including fringe benefits, will be equitable in relation to existing conditions of employment.

On the question of premises, The Department of Public Works has a survey under way to determine our requirements. In some instances, the municipalities may need the space presently occupied by assessment personnel, which will necessitate relocation to other quarters.

On the other hand, some municipalities may not need the space, in which case agreements can be negotiated for the rental of those quarters. Compensation will be paid to the municipalities for equipment and furniture in use in assessment offices on March 4, based on market value of the items.

Throughout this undertaking, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to be as fair as possible to the assessment personnel and to the municipalities involved, bearing in mind the overall objective of creating the most efficient assessment system possible.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Would the Minister answer a question in this regard?

Mr. Speaker: The only questions that are to be asked at this time are for clarification.

Mr. Sargent: Do I take it, Mr. Speaker, that every employee in assessment in Ontario will be a civil servant from here on?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think if the hon. member will refer to the Treasurer's Budget statement of yesterday—

Mr. Sargent: I am asking the Minister the question; does he know the answer?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, read yesterday's Budget.

That is not clarifying what I said today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has answered it in the terms of—

Mr. Sargent: That shows their incompetence, when he does not even know the answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education, left over from two or three days ago.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have a point of clarification from the hon. Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Indeed, yes.

Mr. Pilkey: Would not the proposal that the employees in the assessment department will become part of the civil service mean an erosion of the bargaining unit, as far as the Canadian Union of Public Employees are concerned?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member would check he will find that his leader has a question of the Prime Minister along the same lines. Perhaps it would be answered then.

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

Mr. Nixon: Of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. How many teachers entered the profession in Ontario in September, 1968? If a similar number of teachers were to be required in September, 1969, and only 2,000 are presently in the colleges of education, why is the Minister not responding to plans for secondary school teacher training put forward by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation in January of 1968?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the member for Peterborough has a question that is not unrelated. If he would like to ask that I will endeavour to answer both of them at the same time.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister indicate the reasons behind his decision to reject the OSSTF's internship scheme to alleviate the teacher shortage in the secondary schools, and the decision to enlarge the college of education of the University of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in reply to this question. I apologize at the outset that the answer is fairly lengthy, but I thought we

might touch all the bases while we do this so that there will be no misunderstanding.

The total number of teachers entering the profession in September of 1968 was 12,280. It is assumed from the remainder of the question that particular reference to the secondary school level is intended and the total in this area was 4,792.

It will be recalled that, in 1967, the Department received representations from a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. T. D. Boone, the director of education for the Etobicoke board, which had on it members from various organizations interested in teacher education. That committee recommended the discontinuance of the summer courses for the training of secondary school teachers, and the recommendation was adopted in 1967. The Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation had also conducted some studies under its teacher training supply committee, of which Mr. N. J. Hill was the chairman.

The first report was dated April, 1967, and was received at the department in January of 1968. The second report was dated November, 1967. Under the date of June 21, 1968, Mr. Robb, who was then the general secretary of OSSTF, wrote to me and set out certain recommendations of his own organization. I replied to that letter under date of July 3, 1968, acknowledging his letter and stating that the recommendations had been sent to the committee studying this particular area.

The latter reference was to a committee which I appointed in the summer of 1968 to consider various ways in which provision could be made for new and additional programmes for the training of secondary school teachers. Because of his earlier involvement and knowledge of the situation, Mr. Boone was invited to chair the new committee. This committee included representatives of the Ontario Secondary School Headmasters' Council, the Ontario School Trustees' Council, the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, and the then association of Ontario Directors of Education, the deans of the three colleges, the department itself and the Ontario Teachers Federation, which was represented by Mr. Hill, chairman, teacher training and supply committee, OSSTF, whose report on programmes for internship training were referred to earlier.

Mr. Boone's committee, in its report to me, stated that it had access to the following reports and proposals previously submitted by various organizations interested in teacher education in Ontario.

1. Resolutions re teacher training, prepared by the Ontario Secondary Schools Headmasters' Council.

2. The report of the study of internship in the training of secondary school teachers in Ontario, prepared by the OSSTF.

3. Proposals for the early termination of the emergency programme for the preparation of secondary school teachers in Ontario. This was prepared by an *ad hoc* committee of educators concerned with the education and engagement of qualified teachers for provincial schools.

It will be seen, Mr. Speaker, from this, shall we say, chronological order, that these suggestions were considered by the committee who made their final recommendations to me.

In its report, Mr. Boone's committee made a number of recommendations, but the report did not include an endorsement of the internship programme. It said, in part:

The committee gave full consideration to a number of the teacher training programmes. Several interested groups advocated the introduction of a variety of internship plans, some of which do have considerable merit, but certain major difficulties were anticipated by the committee. The committee was not prepared to recommend them at this time, although they should be considered in the future.

The reasons were spelled out in the report itself.

After the receipt of the report from Mr. Boone, the recommendations were discussed in detail with the deans of the colleges in the fall of 1968. I think for the interest of the members of the House I will just, very briefly, give some of the recommendations and just what has happened to them.

The first recommendation: Retain for a period of time the summer courses of teacher training for mature students. This recommendation was accepted.

Second: Maintain the existing regular session of teacher training in the colleges of education, September to May. This recommendation was accepted.

Third: Maintain admission requirements of forty-five university credits, with a minimum of six credits for each of two subjects taught in the secondary schools. This was also accepted.

Fourth: Appoint additional staff to colleges of education to meet the increased programmes and enrolments. This recommendation, Mr. Speaker, will be implemented to the extent that the enrolments justify.

Fifth: Give recognition to the full year of professional training in the form of a second degree, such as a bachelor of education. Queen's University, Mr. Speaker, has adopted this recommendation; that is the students going to McArthur College will move through that institution and receive a bachelor of education from Queen's. It is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that comes within the jurisdiction of each university and senate, so that the other universities will have to decide whether they wish to adopt this recommendation.

Sixth: Stabilize, during the period of teacher shortage, the pupil-teacher ratio at its present provincial average of 17.1. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out here that a number of studies have been conducted in this area and there are presently others underway, and over the last few years a very favourable student-staff ratio has been developing. It is felt unnecessary to lower the figure at the present time, and indeed some reversal in certain areas, and I emphasize certain areas, might be justified in the light of the present supply of teachers.

Seventh: Endorse the appointment of lay and technical assistants as administrative staff. The department has sent out a memorandum endorsing the use of teachers' aides in certain areas.

Eighth: Renovate and enlarge the college of education, Toronto. Endorsement has been given to the renovation and the enlargement of the college of education, at the University of Toronto; but there are still some unresolved problems in the terms of specific size, because it relates to the total programme of development here in the Metro area for both elementary and secondary schools. We cannot treat them in isolation.

That leads, of course, to the ninth recommendation: To establish a second college of education in this area, preferably at York University. The acceptance of this recommendation is contingent on the development of an overall provision for the education of teachers at both the elementary and secondary levels. Mr. Speaker, we have made significant progress in the elementary area in the past few days, and I anticipate I will have more to say about this, hopefully in the next two weeks.

Tenth: Establish residential facilities to accommodate the growing enrolment. Special provision is being made for a residence for McArthur College at Queen's, and the plans are well advanced. The residence is to be built by the Ontario Student Housing Cor-

poration. Residences at the other institutions are open to students enrolled in the colleges.

The 11th recommendation: Proceed with negotiations at the University of Ottawa for the training of French-speaking teachers. Negotiations have proceeded for the establishment of a college of education at the University of Ottawa to train secondary school teachers for the French schools within the public system. The university has a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Harry Pullen, the former superintendent of secondary schools for the collegiate institute board, working on the development of a functional plan for a new college of education which will also incorporate the present University of Ottawa teachers' college. We are trying to build the two in together, which will also incorporate, as I say, the teachers' college that trains teachers for the bilingual elementary schools of the province.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am just endeavouring to give the hon. members—because it is a very important subject at this particular time of the year—a clear picture. It is my understanding that an associate dean has been selected and that it is planned to begin operation in September of this year, that is this coming September.

12th: To encourage universities to open negotiations leading to provisions for teacher training.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The negotiations, as I said just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, to transfer the teachers' colleges to the universities, have been conducted now for some months and I hope to have something further to say on this within the next two or three weeks.

13th: Proceed immediately to set up a programme of teacher recruitment under the leadership of the Minister and the prestige of his office—which some across the way might debate, Mr. Speaker—using all media of communication. The recruitment practice has assisted in the substantial increase in enrolment in 1968 and it is our intention to intensify this programme for 1969.

14th: Appoint to the staffs of the colleges of education, on a full-time basis, special personnel to carry out the recruitment programme. This recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is under the control of the universities where the colleges of education are located and it is my understanding that visits are being made by representatives of the colleges to the uni-

versities to meet with graduates who are prospective recruits to the profession.

15th: To appoint persons familiar with Ontario certification standards to provide information to prospective immigrant teachers. Encouragement here, Mr. Speaker, is given to persons who are qualified as teachers in other jurisdictions. Each college of education has staff knowledgeable in this area and, of course, the department adds some service in this regard as well.

16th: To encourage colleges of education to admit as special students in selected courses, those whose teacher education is deficient by Ontario standards.

The department, Mr. Speaker, is willing to grant certification to special students in selected courses providing the university is willing to admit such students, and provided there is no lowering of certification standards for those who teach in our school system.

17th: To inaugurate, at one or more colleges of education, a teacher training course from January to August equivalent to the present full-year course. There was consideration given to this, Mr. Speaker, but there are uncertainties at the present time about whether there will be an adequate number of persons wishing to enroll in such a course at the time indicated. It has not been rejected but there will have to be further consideration of this recommendation.

18th (which is tied into it): To inaugurate a similar type of course from May to December equivalent to the full year course—and the same suggestion applies to that.

19th: Permit boards to offer a two-year contract to university graduates, one year at a college of education and one year in the classroom. This recommendation, Mr. Speaker, has a number of difficulties which boards may not wish to accept, since it involves payment of salary for a year where no service is received. There has been no specific action taken on this proposal to date.

20th: Extend to teachers holding the EST 3 certificate and 30 university credits, the provision of a two-year contract as outlined above.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that teachers who hold these qualifications can be engaged by letter of permission, but the limitations referred to in the previous recommendation also apply here insofar as the two-year contract is concerned.

21st: Introduce if necessary a shift arrangement for the September-to-May session at colleges of education. Consideration will be

given by the colleges to shift arrangements, if necessary, but we are hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this can be avoided.

It is possible that a college might decide to conduct a programme for two groups of students, one in the college while the other is out doing practice teaching in the schools. All possible alternatives will be considered.

22nd—We are near the end of the recommendations, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Thank God.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is regrettable that the member for Sudbury is not particularly interested in teacher education, because the northern areas of the province have some very real problems—

Mr. Sopha: That is not the point. I am more bothered about the Minister's gross abuse of this House—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really do not want to get into a debate with the hon. member for Sudbury—

Mr. Sopha: Apparently if the Prime Minister says it is all right, it is okay.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —about the rules of the House, because I have sensed certain abuses on his part over the past number of years.

22nd: Encourage colleges of education to make arrangements whereby the full teacher-training programme may be taken over the period of more than one year. Now if the dean of a college recommends this procedure for a student, the department is willing to accept it for certification requirements. This is another change taking place in teacher education.

23rd: Adhere strictly to the present regulations and limitations on granting letters of permission. These are being continued.

24th: Require persons employed on the letter of permission to complete an orientation programme offered by a local board or the regional office of The Department of Education. As I indicated a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, the department has no objection to local boards conducting an orientation programme for persons employed on letters of permission, as long as it is clearly understood—and this must be emphasized—that such courses are not in lieu of the regular certification requirements.

25th: Remove Canadian citizenship restriction as a requirement for certification. This recommendation has also been adopted.

26th: Encourage boards to employ teachers on the regular staff on less than a full time basis. The boards, Mr. Speaker, are free to employ teachers on less than a full time basis and the department endorses this action.

27th—there are only 30 and the member for Sudbury will realize we only have three more to go after the 27th—Request the super-annuation commission to allow retired teachers on type "A" pension to teach for one full school year without reduction of pension. The number of days a teacher on a type "A" pension can be employed in one school year has now been extended to 100 days.

28th: Remove, during the present emergency, the existing restrictions relating to the dates of engaging qualified teachers or persons who are proceeding to qualifications under one of the plans recommended in this report. If it is found necessary to make this change, Mr. Speaker, consideration will be given to it.

29th and 30th relate to economic recommendations—to extend the Ontario government fellowship programme to \$1,500 for graduates taking a full year teacher training course at a college of education. As the members know, an enrolled student is entitled now to a bursary of \$500. We have determined that, because of economic limitations, we cannot extend this to the \$1,500. The final recommendation is to provide an amount of \$1,000 for mature students to attend the initial summer course. Once again, because of economic limitations—and I would think perhaps other reasons as well, which I will not burden the House with at this particular moment—this recommendation was not accepted either.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the question was asked on a matter of considerable urgency. I do not believe the answer, which reviews government policy in the training of teachers, answers the question. If I might put it again, Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question if the Minister will permit.

By his own figures we are going to require 4,792 teachers this September. His colleges of education have enrolled this year about 2,100. It appears then that the prediction of a 2,000 teacher shortage is conservative and we can expect it to be 2,700. I cannot see how his answer is going to accommodate the serious nature of this shortage when school time rolls around next September.

Now I am concerned as to the possibility of the Minister issuing letters of permission to

some 2,700 applicants without endeavouring to give them even the rudiments of teacher training that could be provided if in fact, along with the letter of permission, some sort of indoctrination course at the departmental level were offered.

I would ask the Minister if he is considering this as an emergency situation and a possible accommodation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I answered this question some three or four days ago on this specific point. I indicated very clearly that the department supports, or does not object to, local boards offering the orientation courses. I referred to it in the answer, if the hon. leader of the Opposition was listening carefully today, when I said—

Mr. Nixon: I was listening.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —we do not object to this. If the boards wish to develop an orientation course of three or four weeks during the summer months for those who will be going on letters of permission in September, we have no objection to this whatsoever.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will permit a further supplementary question.

He was unwilling a week ago to predict what the teacher shortage would be. His own figures that he put before us now would indicate that the shortage, at the secondary level, is going to be in excess of 2,000 teachers and not less than that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it does not. With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I did not say this. The hon. leader of the Opposition has asked either two or three questions relating to the shortage of secondary school teachers. There is a reference made, as I recall his question, as I read it here: "Why did the Minister not respond to plans for secondary school teachers put forward by the OSSTF?"

I have related, in my answer, the recommendations from the OSSTF, how they were considered by the committee chaired by Mr. Boone—

Mr. Nixon: I did not ask that. It is quite all right for the Minister to give us that information; I asked him about the internship programme. He did not deal with that at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right. And I have indicated the reasons for not accepting and the alternatives that have been accepted. We think they will come very close to resolving the problem. The hon. member—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I think we should get this in perspective. The hon. leader's question says:

Why has the Minister not responded to plans for secondary school teacher training put forward by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation in January of 1968?

My understanding of the answer is that the hon. Minister has been answering this question by setting out the recommendations by this federation and what has happened to them, just as the hon. leader has asked. And, therefore, the question and answer, although long, were right on the point of the question as asked by the hon. leader.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a supplementary question?

First I would say that I am delighted to see that my Throne Debate remarks had such immediate effect upon the Minister in regards to this priority teacher education. But there was one comment he made which I would like to have clarified. He mentioned that Ontario had moved to a very favourable teacher-student ratio.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In some areas.

Mr. Pitman: The Minister also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that there was to be a reversal of this trend in certain areas. I wonder if he would clarify in what areas he feels there might be a reversal of the favourable trend.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is very complicated and I do not want it to be misunderstood. Our studies indicate—and some of the studies being undertaken by the new county board would indicate—that there are certain areas where the teacher-student ratio is substantially lower than in other areas.

All I am saying is that where it is lower obviously there is no need to lower it further, and some consideration must be given to increasing that student-teacher ratio.

For instance, if you have it at 12 to 1 or 13 to 1, then I think with the concept of the regional board they can bring this up to 16 or 17 to 1, which in itself could help resolve the problem of the number of teachers that are required. This was not possible under the multitude of educational jurisdiction we had prior to January 1.

We think this is now possible in some geographic areas at least; and this is why, Mr. Speaker, one cannot identify specifically for the leader of the Opposition as yet, what the total shortage will be, because we do not

know just what effect this type of programme will have on the needs for teachers in the secondary school field in the province.

Mr. Nixon: Waiting for September will be too late.

Mr. Pitman: Would the Minister accept a short supplementary question?

Would the Minister not agree that implementing the Hall-Dennis report would indeed demand a lower student-teacher ratio than we have at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong these discussions. I do not think there is anything inherent in the Hall-Dennis report that makes it necessary to reduce the student-teacher ratio. I think there is a relocation of total resource, no question about this; but with the possibility of team teaching, and other matters that I will be discussing over the next two or three weeks. I think that the student-teacher ratio can remain relatively constant and we can still implement many of the recommendations within the report.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has a question.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions from previous days.

First, from Monday of this week, questions 794 and 795 to the Minister of Health.

I have a question of the Minister designed to reconcile conflicting figures with regard to the percentage of our population whose medical insurance does not cover them for home and office calls.

The 1967 survey of voluntary health insurance in Canada indicates that 194,000 of Ontario's population have no coverage at all. The Minister's reply earlier in this session revealed that there were 103,000 people in the PSI Brown Plan, and some 7.1 per cent, or 168,000, have private insurance that provides no coverage for home and office calls. Finally, there are 154,000 with surgical coverage alone.

These figures add up to 619,000 persons with no coverage for home and office calls, which represent 8.5 per cent of our total population. How does the Minister reconcile this figure with his reply to my question on December 20, 1968, that 95 per cent of the population is covered for home and office calls?

Mr. Speaker: Before the Minister replies to that question, I would just like to point out

to the members the difficulty of asking questions and of the Speaker dealing with them. The rules of the House state that no facts are to be stated in a question.

This question is replete with facts, as are most of them. I would urge the hon. members that if we are to follow the rules in some respects, we endeavour to ask questions and not state facts other than those that are absolutely essential, even though the rules say we may not state facts for the asking of the question.

The hon. Minister has the floor.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Without going into a lengthy detailed answer, I can only say that I have submitted this again to my statistical experts and they state to me that 6,747,000 persons, or 95.6 per cent of the 7,015,000 covered population have coverage for home and office calls.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Speaker, the Minister's own figures at varying times are in conflict.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with you. I was painfully aware of the problem of that question but I thought in terms of your final comments that only those facts that were necessary to ask the question were relevant. I tried to reduce it, but could not.

Mr. Speaker: And I accepted it on that basis, but I thought it should be called to the attention of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you.

My second question to the Minister of Health. Has the Minister received a request from the international vice-president of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphide and Paper Workers for an investigation of the 46 per cent in rate increase by PSI? If so, will the Minister act on the request?

I notice the word "increase" has been dropped there but I am sure the import of the question was conveyed to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. I have replied to the letter which I received, but I pointed out several things to the correspondents: That I have neither power nor authority to conduct or order such an investigation; and that PSI is an organization chartered under the laws of the province of Ontario and is subject to the law administered by the insurance branch of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs. I have recommended that their request be directed to PSI or that I would be prepared

to do so for them as soon as I have the consent so to do.

Mr. MacDonald: Two questions from yesterday, Mr. Speaker, numbers 802 and 811. The first is to the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Has the Minister received a request for an interview from representatives of the affiliated societies of the Ontario Humane Society regarding Bills 73 and 74?

Second, would the Minister meet with representatives of these affiliated bodies from outside the Toronto area prior to the second reading of the bills?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I have received such a request. I have a letter from one of the affiliated organizations suggesting that they would like to meet with me but the letter does not specifically say that the group wants to come in and meet. I would welcome the opportunity to meet with them and if they decide to ask to come in and send a representative from each group I would be more than pleased to see them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Treasurer.

The November-December issue of the *Co-Ordinator*, official publication of the regional development branch, arrived at my office today and carried beside the postage meter stamp the words: "Peas Are Plentiful".

Would the Minister explain what this message means? Is it a successor to the slogan "Province of Opportunity"? And what relationship it has to regional development?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the "Peas Are Plentiful" message is part of a campaign sponsored by the Ontario Food Council to encourage the sale of frozen canned peas. There is a surplus in Canada. The regional development branch is pleased to co-operate in any promotional programme which will benefit the farm community in Ontario, and consequently was happy to use the postage meter imprint provided by the food council. This is an example of how the departments of the government are co-operating to ensure that Ontario will continue to be the "Province of Opportunity".

Mr. MacDonald: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this little vignette of our political life is going to be greeted with great acclaim across the province.

I have a question for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister give assurance of full consultation with those unions through which municipal assessment personnel now have collective bargaining rights so that in the process of the proposed provincial takeover of assessment we may avoid the kind of difficulties experienced at the Don Jail and elsewhere during the switch of the administration of justice to the province?

Second, in view of the government's decision to take over municipal assessment, can the Prime Minister advise the House when Judge Little's report might be expected?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The Minister of Municipal Affairs dealt with at least some aspects of this in his statement, and I can assure the member we will examine the status of these people. It is difficult to know at this stage of the game just what their status is. There are unions in some areas, I suppose, and not in others, but a survey is being made of the personnel involved and we will see that they are dealt with fairly and equitably when the time comes. It is a little premature to say what we are going to do, but the point the member makes is well taken. I can assure him that it will be given consideration.

Mr. Sargent: As long as we have complete control of the province, that is what counts.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is right! That is precisely right.

Now, sir, the member mentioned Judge Little's report. Any statement of mine would be pure speculation, although I understand that the work connected with the report has been completed and the report is presently being written. I am as interested in seeing it as the hon. member is, and as soon as it is available we will have a look at it and see where it leads.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, could I ask the Prime Minister if the survey will cover personnel in the broad sense, not just assessment officers but all other office staff who work with assessment officers?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can not answer that. I do not know whether the member is now referring to stenographic help and things of that nature.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I believe The Department of Municipal Affairs is asking various municipalities — the present employers of

people engaged in assessment—who they are, what their status is and who is on their staff. I would not know, they may be people out of a general pool of stenographers. There is a lot of detail involved in this that will come along as we develop the programme.

Mr. Speaker: This might be an appropriate place for the member for Huron-Bruce to deal with his question which has been transferred to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and which perhaps was answered by the Minister's statement earlier today. If not, and he feels he should place it again, now would be a good time.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, if I may, my question has been partly answered by the statement of the Minister, but perhaps the Minister would like to have the opportunity to make a further statement. In that case I will read my question.

In view of the Treasurer's statement yesterday concerning the takeover by the province of assessment, will the Minister give assurance that municipalities which have embarked upon the county system will be fully compensated for money expended on the programme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit uncertain as to what the hon. member is aiming at. It is obviously impractical to fully compensate the municipalities for their efforts in this area when assessment until now has traditionally been a municipal responsibility.

We have, in fact, already reimbursed municipalities operating under the county and district assessment system. Subsidies have been paid since the inception of these centralized systems. The subsidies ranged up to \$12,500 towards the salary of the assessment commissioner and his staff, 50 per cent of the cost of office equipment used in processing assessment data up to \$2,500, and 50 per cent of the rental costs for such equipment.

Now, if that is the sort of thing that the member is referring to, I indicated in my statement that we are prepared to purchase the interest of any municipality in such property at the currently appraised value.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on a point of clarification—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right!

Mr. Gaunt: I had Huron in mind in putting the question, sir. Huron has built a brand new assessment building and I think it is

fair to say that they are concerned about what will happen to that building. Will they be paid off at a dollar per square foot as happened in the case of the take over of administration of justice and so on?

This is very important to them and they are concerned about it. The Minister says market value—well, this certainly would not compensate them for the costs involved in building that building.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think it is a little different situation than the administration of justice. This is a building which is owned, presumably, by the county of Huron. We are not taking over that physical asset. We tried to make it clear. The first thing we have to determine is whether the municipality wants that building for any other purpose. Many of the county buildings and city halls throughout the province are crowded. I think they would be quite happy to get the assessors out—some will, some will not.

Now in the case of Huron, if they do not have another use for that building, presumably we will enter into an equitable rental arrangement with them. But it is different from the administration of justice, because we are not taking over the assets. It will be a matter of negotiation on a fair rental price—if we want to rent there, and they want to rent to us.

Mr. Gaunt: The Minister just opened the building two months ago.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They did not ask me to cut the ribbon.

Mr. Nixon: If the Minister was there he would have thought about that.

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

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Treasurer. Why has the tobacco counter at the Royal York Hotel increased the price of a pack of cigarettes overnight by five cents?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would almost have to propose to the hon. member that he ask the Royal York Hotel. We have no control over the prices charged by vendors. The additional tax is two cents, but what merchants charge for a package of cigarettes is entirely their own business.

Mr. Knight: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): It's competition! Does the member want price control?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Does the member want price control?

Mr. Sargent: Talk about rent controls—they have complete control.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Port Arthur is endeavouring to address a supplementary question.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to know whether private business and private industry would be allowed by this government to take advantage of yesterday's tax increases in order to increase their own prices over and above the tax increase.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the obvious answer is that there is no price control. There is no question about the fact that the market places take care of this situation in due course. Nobody is going to pay an excessive price for cigarettes if they can get them for less elsewhere. Competition will take care of it.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): I have a question I placed with the Minister of Agriculture and Food last Friday, and I wonder if he would answer it now. The question I placed last Friday was number 787.

Mr. Speaker: As far as my records are concerned, it has not been asked yet, so perhaps the hon. member would ask it now.

Mr. Ruston: To the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food: Has the federal government carried out its ARDA agreement with the province as to its maximum commitment in the amount of \$5,058,000 a year?

If it has not, how much money did it cancel or withdraw from the ARDA funds in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question reached me some time ago. I do not have it with me. Speaking completely from memory, I have to advise the House, and I am pleased to do this, through you Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Mr. Marchand addressed a letter to me which arrived just recently, in which he agreed to make good the total amount of the ARDA agreement drafted for 1965-1970. We would receive the full amount of the \$25 million, plus whatever number of thousands the hon. member referred to but it would be spread out over a period of time, in which in no year would we receive more than \$5 million and a few thousand.

Now this means that, contrary to the agreement that had been reached with his pre-

decessor in which it was agreed that we would reach a greater amount of expenditure as the agreement progressed towards the final date of 1970, and would receive more than the \$5 million a year during that time, we will now have to wait beyond 1970 to get the full amount of the agreement. But we have been promised that.

It will mean that, to use as an illustration, for the fiscal year 1968-1969, where we spent \$14 million in ARDA in the province of Ontario, we will only be able to recover, under what he has agreed to, the \$5 million. I believe about \$1 million or more was paid on accounts that had been carried over from previous years. Now the Treasurer of Ontario will have to carry that account forward to the time when the federal department will reimburse the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine has a question.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Yes. From time to time, Mr. Speaker, in a fit of weakness I address a question to the Minister of Education.

What is the department doing to provide proper educational facilities for the Indian children in Armstrong? Would the Minister outline the difference between the educational facilities provided by his department for Indian children and non-Indian children in the Armstrong area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the public school board of SS No. 1, Armstrong, is a locally elected body which, under The School Acts, is responsible for the provision of education for the children within its jurisdiction. The board has operated a three-room school for some time, present enrolment roughly 109 students, of which only a few are Indians.

This accommodation is adequate for the responsibility of the board for its own particular students. There are, in addition, to the people within the school section of SS No. 1, Armstrong, a number of Indian families who live on Crown land, outside the jurisdiction of the local board. These are registered Indians, Indians who are not on a reservation.

The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development of the federal government is responsible for the provision of education for the children of these families. That department has made provision for a number of these children to attend a residential school in the Lakehead and elsewhere. Negotiations have been going on between the trustees of the board of SS No. 1,

Armstrong, and the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, whereby additional accommodation would be provided by the local board with financial assistance from the federal authority.

A proposal was put forward by the board in 1968, and I am advised that considerable progress has been made towards agreement this year. Officials of The Department of Education have assisted in the negotiations between the two groups, and it is hoped that by next fall new accommodation will be available in Armstrong.

Mr. Brown: In the meantime, is it true that the treaty Indian children living on Crown land will not be able to attend school in their home community?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the hon. member wishes to pursue this with The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development he would get a more appropriate answer. As I say, they have made arrangements for some of the students to have facilities available to them in the Lakehead and elsewhere, and I am sure these arrangements could be extended.

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

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Highways. Can the Minister assure the House that there will be no curtailment of the construction programme on Highway 144, between Timmins and Sudbury? When will Highway 144 be opened to through traffic between Timmins and Sudbury?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is yes; and to the second part, we hope in the fall of 1970.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Some of the member's people think they should.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): In the south!

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines. Will the Minister table the map dividing Hudson and James Bay for underwater mineral rights among Ontario, Manitoba, Quebec and the Northwest Territories?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): No, Mr. Speaker, I will not table the map. If it is the map that was referred to in the press today or yesterday, in the news

despatches from Ottawa, I cannot table it, I have not seen it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask the Minister of Social and Family Services, which comes in two parts:

1. Does The Department of Social and Family Services set the admission policy to the homes for the aged?

2. Is an individual refused admission to homes for the aged, if he has a convalescent hip fracture, heart disease, or diagnosis of cancer?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I had the question yesterday, and I am looking into the matter so that I may have a proper answer. I will have it in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Could the Minister inform the House how many accidents have been reported on the Governors Road between Woodstock and Thamesford in the last two years? How many fatalities were there?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, the answer to part one is that this road is under the jurisdiction of the county and we will contact the county and ascertain whether they have these statistics. And the answer to the second part will be the same as above.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question from the other day.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education, in three parts.

Did the London Township School Board privately sell Fanshaw Public School for \$5,000 to the Salem United Church, even though the school had cost \$45,000 and there is still \$23,000 owing on that?

2. Is it true that the secretary treasurer of the school board, and one other school board member, are also members of Salem United Church?

3. Does the department intend to intervene in this transaction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the board sold the school for \$5,000 to the church mentioned in the question from the hon. member, and that the

former secretary treasurer, who is a member of the church, had no part in the sale of the building.

One board member was a member; but the five-man board, in total, agreed to sell the building. Of course under The Schools Administration Act, the board had the right to dispose of property no longer required for school purposes without authorization from the department.

In response to question three, I am referring this to The Department of the Attorney General for some legal guidance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A question of the Minister of Health: Is the Minister aware that the town of Schreiber, with a population of over 2,200, will be without a physician after April 1, 1969?

Will the Minister prevail upon graduating medical students to spend some time in northern Ontario communities before setting up permanent practice in urban areas?

And will the Minister attempt to prevail upon the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons to provide medical services for northern Ontario communities, and seek the services of retiring doctors from the armed services?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, officers from my department have been advised by the Thunder Bay health unit that there is a shortage of physicians in the area; we are aware of it. We have actively under consideration a variety of plans aimed at trying to provide a better distribution of health manpower throughout the province. The Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons has absolutely no power or authority to allocate doctors, to order them to practise in certain areas.

All of us are doing all we can to encourage the young graduates to take a tour of duty in the distant reaches of our province. Retiring doctors, those particularly from the armed services, are constantly being contacted and being encouraged to settle in these various areas and serve where their services can be utilized.

Mr. Stokes: Would the Minister indicate if there has been any favourable response to the kind of programme that has been initiated by his department in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: To the one that has been in vogue for some years now, Mr. Speaker, I can only report a very limited

favourable response. That is the bursary system where we provide a bursary to undergraduates on the understanding that they will give a return in service for a stated period of time in a designated area.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a question from another day of the Minister of Highways and two questions today.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker:

According to the *Journal of Corrections*, it was stated that Canada was imprisoning 240 people per 100,000 population—20 per cent more than the United States and 500 per cent more than Norway.

Will the Minister advise:

1. What the Ontario average is per 100,000 population?
2. Why a work release programme cannot be instituted in Ontario?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this question was asked some months ago and partially answered, I think, by my colleague, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman).

I have a fairly complete answer today: In Ontario in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, a total of 33,062 sentences of imprisonment were handed down by the courts, which works out to 462 per 100,000 of population.

This, of course, does not involve 33,062 different people. Many receive a number of short sentences during the course of a year. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the ratio is lower than 462 and cannot be calculated accurately because we do not fingerprint non-indictable offenders and some of these use different aliases.

If the hon. member is actually referring to prisoners transferred to correctional institutions, which incidentally, accounts by and large for those serving sentences of over 30 days, then the rate is 145 per 100,000 of population.

And I would warn the hon. member that it is very difficult to arrive at figures which accurately reflect crime related to population in different countries due to different customs, different laws and different methods of compiling and securing statistics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the second part of the question, I would refer the hon. member to *Hansard*, May 27, 1968, pages 3385 and 3386; also to July 3, 1968,

pages 5119, 5120, where the statements of the hon. Minister of Correctional Services, have been recorded regarding the work release programme.

Mr. Sargent: A question of the hon. Minister of Health. This was asked before but never answered. Mr. Speaker.

What consents are sought before electric shock treatment is administered to patients in provincially-operated hospitals? What observation procedures apply in the recovery room and wards after such treatment?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have to correct the hon. member: The question was asked and it was answered. The answer and the question will be found on page 769 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a question of the Minister of Highways from February 20? Has he it there?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Minister of Highways: Will the Minister advise how many millions of dollars the city of Toronto will receive from the province in the \$136 million Spadina Expressway approved by the Ontario municipal board?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, the Spadina Expressway will be built by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the total approval by the Ontario municipal board received and pending of \$136 million for the period ending 1975. The expenditure to date has been \$46 million and The Department of Highways subsidy to date has been \$23 million. The balance to the end of 1975 would be \$90 million, and our estimated subsidy at 50 per cent would be \$45 million.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore has two questions from yesterday.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): My question to the Minister of Health:

Is the Minister aware that the air pollution problem directly attributable to the Ontario Building Material Limited plant on Grand Avenue, Etobicoke, has not only not been rectified, despite my protests of over a year ago, but of recent date has actually worsened?

Will the Minister investigate immediately and put the screws on the offender and see that action is taken?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the things that the hon. member has

stated. Indeed those of my staff who are constantly in contact with this are impressed with the amount of progress that has been made by this company in their attempts to improve their operation.

A very great deal has been accomplished in the last month and other improvements are presently under way with a scheduled completion time of three months. During our investigation of recent complaints, we were impressed by the number of residents who felt there was very great improvement in the area.

Mr. Lawlor: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: When was the last date on which an inspector of the department attended?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give him an exact date, but it was very recent because they are in contact with this programme which is going on and, as I have stated, is scheduled for completion in three months.

Mr. Lawlor: A question to the Minister of Highways:

What is the policy of The Department of Highways as to laying down white guidelines on the public highways during the winter, particularly at and in the environs of hazardous construction sites such as the junction of Highway 27 and the Queen Elizabeth Way?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, weather conditions allow very little opportunity for winter painting. Experience has shown that paint applied in cold winter temperatures has an extremely short life, making an expensive winter painting programme impractical.

However, the department has, over the past few years, applied paint during the winter on the more heavily travelled sections of the freeway system, particularly areas under construction. Sections of Highway 27 and the Queen Elizabeth area have been painted several times this winter. However, in some cases the paint only lasted a matter of a few days.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford has a question from the other day.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): It is a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

Will the Minister consider appointing, under section 320 of The Municipal Act,

a commission to investigate the allegations regarding the operations of the municipal welfare department at Brantford as requested by 50 ratepayers?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer would probably be no, inasmuch as the judge of Haldimand county, Judge W. W. Leach has been requested to conduct an inquiry into the matter under section 241 of The Municipal Act.

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

Mr. T. Reid: A question of the Minister of Education:

Will the Minister now state, in general terms, his view of the future of the educational television branch of his department:

(a) In view of the Budget comment that capital expenditures for ETV have been deferred indefinitely.

(b) In view of the strong switch in interest of the federal government's communications task force from educational television to a broader, "unifying" concept for the Canadian communications satellite.

(c) In view of the fact that electronic video tape recording will now be available before a broadcast network is established.

(d) Since this will demand a rationalization of the ETV and audio-visual functions now operating separately and quite independently to the taxpayer's disadvantage.

(e) Since the public accounts committee lacks this perspective in its current attempt to evaluate the past expenditures of the ETV branch.

Mr. Speaker: Before the Minister answers that question, I would like to draw to the attention of the House again that this is the type of question which causes difficulty and which, in future, will not be accepted.

The question itself should have ended at the beginning—at the end of the question. It should have ended thus: "Will the Minister now state, in general terms, his view of the future of the educational television branch?"

All the member is doing after that is stating facts which are not proper and not applicable. And I would draw to the attention of all members that in future I shall endeavour to confine the questions to questions, and not lengthy statements of fact.

We had this difficulty with the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight), with a question the other day and it has been my practice to allow these to be so asked be-

cause I feel a certain amount of explanation is necessary.

But in this case as well as in the former one, there was far too much statement of fact. The hon. Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would go one step further and say that not only are they statements of fact, they are not necessarily accurate statements of fact.

Mr. Sopha: How many pages has the Minister got?

An hon. member: Does the hon. member want a long answer or short one on this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer this question as briefly as I can. Obviously it is the kind of question that to answer in detail would take a very substantial length of time. I shall try to confine my observations.

As I recall the statement yesterday of the Treasurer of the province of Ontario, he made reference to a number of capital projects that were postponed. I do not recall the term "deferred", nor do I recall the term "indefinitely". There was, however, the term "postponement". This related, of course, to the economic resources or the lack of availability for capital purposes.

But with respect to ETV, there are also other considerations. These relate to: (a) the possibility of what federal participation there will be with respect to the provision of capital for transmission and what form this may take and what charges, if any, will be incurred by the provinces. This relates very directly to the amount of capital that the provincial jurisdiction may or may not need.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we could really deal with this question more appropriately under the consideration of the estimates or perhaps upon the introduction of the bill related to the establishment of a communications authority for the province of Ontario.

I was somewhat confused by the enumerated facts in the question. Fact (e) I consider to be a *non-sequitur*, the way it is related.

And about, (b), we had some discussions with the task force from the federal government some very few days ago. My impression from those discussions, the same group that I think the hon. member is referring to here, would indicate that our plans in this province really were "on all fours" or certainly very close to it with respect to the task force consideration. Therefore, I find the (b) part of

the factual part of the question somewhat confusing.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) also asked a question, No. 765, which he has already read to the House so there is no need to repeat it. I have the answer available for him now.

I think one can assume that the question was asked—

Mr. T. Reid: Does the Minister mean the member for Scarborough West or for Scarborough East?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry, Scarborough East.

One can assume that the questions relate to the recently announced feasibility study conducted by the META association of Toronto with the support of The Department of Education. This report examined the cost of multi-channel redistribution systems in schools in Metro Toronto and in Peel county using various methods of distribution such as cable and, of course, the 2500 megahertz system. The report recommended the use of this cable system as being the most economic and flexible, considering the channel capacity required.

It is assumed that the word "superior", and I am taking this from the hon. member's question, refers to channel capacity alone and not to the proposal to use UHF television for educational broadcasts. There is a distinction. It should also be noted that the proposal for an educational UHF television station would serve an area of approximately 60 miles in radius. I am sure this is known to the hon. member and would be available to all homes and schools, not just confined to schools within that area.

The proposed cable system, as we understand it, would be limited to schools and other institutions in the Metropolitan Toronto area. In other words, shall we say, the scope or area it can cover would be somewhat less than through the use of the UHF transmitter.

Now dealing with one or two of the specifics. The proposal of META is based on the use of standard VHF channels as is outlined in the feasibility study which was announced some seven or eight days ago. I think there are copies of this report available. Perhaps the hon. member already has one. The proposal is to use ten standard UHF channels requiring no modification of ETV receivers. There would not have to be any modification of the existing receivers.

With respect to the second part of the question which said: "Are we to accept the

Bell Cable monopoly as a fact of life or will the government challenge it in the courts?"

As I try to interpret this as concisely as I can, there are two aspects to ETV; that is the production and the availability of material; and second, the transmission, whether it takes form in cable, megahertz, UHF, VHF, or what have you. The Bell Telephone Company, as I understand it, really can be classified as a common carrier not involved in production, quality or anything else. It transmits through cable the programmes that are available.

I think really, Mr. Speaker, this should be a matter of federal interest, if the hon. member feels there is, in fact, a monopoly here. As I understand it, there is nothing to prevent anybody else becoming a common carrier related to the transmission in this form of ETV or other types of programming.

I think Mr. Speaker, there might be some reaction from the general public if there were several firms involved digging up sidewalks and peoples' front lawns and so on, to provide this type of cable service. But I think, in fairness, this really must relate to any federal responsibility with respect to any monopoly situation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the proposal for educational television in our own jurisdiction really, and I have said this many times in the House, is based on the most efficient and economical combination of distribution facilities available. Once again, you break them down into the two areas; production or the material that is available; and the transmission whether it is cable, UHF, VHF, megahertz or what have you.

In the case of the Toronto area it is proposed to use UHF television as a primary means of distribution to both the homes and to the schools. The use of local multiple channel redistribution systems in the schools will greatly enhance utilization of ETV, no question about it. Consequently, UHF TV and local redistribution systems are complementary. In no sense is either of them redundant?

With respect to section (d): The subject of ETV is presently being studied by a special federal task force under the chairmanship of the Under-Secretary of State which is the group we met with just a few days ago. Legislation in this area has been promised by the federal government in the relatively near future. Discussions have taken place between the task force and our own officials; in fact I was involved very briefly in some of the discussions myself. I think out of this

will flow the type of system that will make the greatest sense with respect to ETV.

Mr. T. Reid: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Would he take as notice, the questions implied in parts (c) and (d) of the question I placed to him today, and answer them as soon as possible?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to take anything as notice. However, I do not really see the implications in (c) and (d) cannot be discussed elsewhere. I see no reason why we cannot discuss them with respect to the legislation on the broadcasting authority or during the estimates. I do not think they need relate to notice; it is a matter, I think, that requires some discussion. I do not think you can answer it in a specific situation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a question.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you for retrieving my integrity, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Attorney General. Respecting the Minister's statement yesterday on the chemical, Mace, and his assertion that he is satisfied that it:

Is a substance which if improperly and carelessly used may cause permanent injury to the eyes of the victim.

Under what circumstances can the Minister envisage its use by the police where they would have, again to quote the Minister,

All the necessary facilities available for immediate remedial action after its use?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, after the skin or other tissue has come in contact with Mace, it should be washed promptly and thoroughly with quantities of water. That is the treatment which is effective. Therefore any facilities which will provide thorough and prompt washing will be generally considered adequate.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Like a watering can.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If exposure had been severe I should think that one would expect that the subject would be treated by a doctor or at the facilities of a hospital. That would be what I would consider as being reasonably adequate. As I say facilities to give prompt and thorough washing with quantities of water and where there had been severe exposure, treatment from a doctor or in a hospital.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Does the Minister contend that a civil disturbance sufficient to engender the use of Mace would be conducted in a laboratory environment and that one would always be certain that facilities were available given the dangers that he sees inherent in its use?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows the views I have expressed about the use of Mace, which were pretty firm and pretty definite. I think the question is somewhat facetious, put in that form of language—

Mr. Lewis: Why does the Minister not ban it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could perhaps answer in the same tone, but I do not propose to do so.

Mace, as I think I have indicated throughout my statements with respect to it, was not to be used first of all, in my view, until it had been established beyond all doubt that it did not cause serious permanent effects. The reports which we have so far received indicate that it is a weapon which can have quite serious effects; it indicates the treatment which can be used to nullify, modify or reduce the discomfort, and prevent permanent ill effects. We are doing further studies, as I indicated yesterday, and getting further reports. I think I also indicated yesterday that we are contemplating legislation to control or prevent its use if that becomes necessary. That is as full an answer as I could give at the moment.

Mr. Nixon: Has the Minister given any orders to the police force not to use it?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Health has a statement or the answer to a question, or something?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct an error on page 1434 of *Hansard*. I quoted a figure 18,000. It should have been 1,800. This may very well have been a slip of my tongue, which I did not catch on correcting *Hansard*. Will you therefore direct, sir, that where the error is published this will be noted?

I would like to bring to your attention, sir, a matter of very great interest to me and I believe it will be to you and to the hon. members of the House. It concerns a member of the staff of the Department of Health, Dr. John L. Johnson, the chief claims officer in OMSIP. I have just learned that Dr. Johnson has been named as Colonel Commandant of the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association Bisley team for 1969.

This is indeed a signal honour bestowed on very few men, and the opportunity occurs only once in any man's lifetime to accept this honour of taking the Canadian team to the oldest of the British Empire—I believe it still goes under that name—sporting events held annually at the Bisley ranges in England.

The event takes place in July and the team consisting of Dr. Johnson and 21 members will be transported to the United Kingdom in Canadian Forces aircraft from the Canadian Forces Base in Trenton.

I am sure, sir, that you would join with me and all members of the House would join with me in congratulating one of my staff members being so selected and so singled out. The good wishes of the House, I am sure, will go with him and his team on this outstanding annual event.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to table answers to questions 815 and 816. (See appendix page 1900).

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, sir—it is not a terribly serious matter—but it has to do with *Hansard* and it could save, I believe, considerable money this year. I have received a report from a constituent at the post office with reference to the mailing of *Hansard*. It presently is being mailed under third class mail at the rate of five cents for the first two ounces and three cents for the next two ounces. I am informed it could be mailed under a second class label with a permit, which would cost only one cent for the first two ounces and one cent for the next two ounces. I believe it would save some thousands of dollars.

Mr. Speaker: I am pleased to have that, but it is the type of thing I think should be dealt with directly between the hon. member and the Speaker rather than taking up the time of the House. I will be glad to look into it.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming consideration of the propositions of the government of Ontario submitted to the continuing committee of officials on the Constitution as of December, 1968, sessional paper number 83.

CONSTITUTION DEBATE (continued)

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I want first to say that I do not intend to dig

into the history of the Constitution of Canada. I think that those who spoke prior to me in this debate have indicated quite clearly those people who are responsible for the document and the manner in which they are to be lauded by those of us who are still here.

I do believe, though, that the matter of the Constitution of this country is not something that is of such great concern to the people of this country as one in this House might tend to believe. I sense in the people of this country—and particularly the people of my riding and in this province—a frustration because they feel we are ignoring the real issues of today. They feel we are inflicting or injecting into the debates—between the federal and provincial governments—superficial issues that really do not do anything at all to ease the lot of the average individual as he attempts to go about providing a living for himself and his family.

We have heard much discussion in the past number of years about the need to look into the matter of French-English relations. Much has been done to assure that the French and English tongues are available in all quarters of this land. We have heard much said about the relationship between Ontario and Quebec and Quebec and the rest of Canada. Much has been said about the need to take a look at some method of dealing directly with the problems of Quebec and the problems of other portions of this country—perhaps one apart from the other. The unfortunate part is that we could spend many weeks, months or years perhaps, debating whether or not we ought to speak French, debating whether or not we should have some kind of special consideration for this or that area—without ever coming to grips with the immediate problems that confront our people.

In my opinion, if the people of this country were to be properly fed, properly housed, and were to have medical coverage available to them at the cost they could afford—and in areas of this province certainly there is no medical coverage available—we would go a long way toward eliminating the need to continue this dialogue between the various provinces and the federal government. There is no question in my mind that the matter of the Constitution of this country is related directly to the constitution of the people who live in it. At the moment neither the federal nor the provincial governments are taking any of the necessary actions to ensure that housing, cost of living and health are properly and adequately taken care of.

One need only look at the recent report of the federal government—the report that was

handed down by the travelling circus of Paul Hellyer—in order to understand that in actual fact the Liberal government in Ottawa is totally incapable of meeting the problems of housing. And they are not alone, not nearly alone, because the government here in Ontario has shown that it has exactly the same abilities—and perhaps even less. The unfortunate thing is that we seem to use the conflict between province and federal government as a wedge, as a lever, to deny the people of this country those things which they must have out of necessity.

We seem continually to be attempting to place the onus of responsibility that we have abdicated as a provincial government on another level of government.

In the field of housing it is not uncommon to hear the provincial government cry that while they would love to build more homes, while they would like to meet the needs of the people of this country, they cannot, because the federal government will not provide the money. We hear the federal government cry that they would like to provide the money but the municipalities have to do the servicing for this, and the municipalities tell us that they cannot possibly raise that type of revenue from their tax sources. We thereby leave the whole problem of housing up in the air continuously. We never come to grips with the basic problem of making sure that every person in this country is afforded a decent place to live—at a cost that he can afford.

It seems to me that one of the main areas of concern is to put the necessities of life within the ambit of responsibility of one level of government. It seems to me that we must get away from this type of buck passing that has gone on over the years and in order to do this, we have got to ensure that one or other level of government has the full responsibility for looking after whatever this particular problem may be.

At the moment, since the matter of raising capital seems to be the main problem in providing accommodation for the people of this country, it seems necessary that we should transfer the responsibility for building and developing from the provincial to the federal government. I would suggest that one thing that might be done to meet the problem of providing accommodation would be that this government might be prepared to say today that they will give over the responsibility of the building and providing of accommodation for people to the federal government in order that they get on with the job. We will then eliminate this continuous buck passing. We

will then eliminate the housing shortage, hopefully.

Another area of deep concern is, of course, the cost of living. We have raised in this House, on a number of occasions, the need to have a cost of living review board in order to ensure that every person in this country can, out of the meagre allowance that he has left after his payment of taxes, provide for himself adequate food and other amenities that are required in order to sustain life.

Unfortunately, again we come on the same hang-up. When you start to discuss this matter in this House it is quickly pointed out that in actual fact for the most part it is a federal responsibility—and it is. It is much easier, much more economical and much more practical for the federal government to ensure that the cost of living is maintained because they have the resources and the facilities to do this. As in the case of housing, it is a necessity of life; it is a necessity to every person right across this country, not only to those living in Ontario. Therefore, we should, with great haste, move towards assuring that the federal government will take over the entire responsibility for assuring that the people of the province, and the people of the country, can afford to purchase what they must have in order to live.

The third area, and an area that I intend to take a little more time on, concerns health services. I listened, with great interest, to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts)—and, I might say, I read with some considerable interest after he had finished—all his remarks about Ontario moving, or not moving, into the government Medicare programme.

It seems to me that there is no question that the reason that the Premier has used to stay out of Medicare is based on a false premise. The Premier of this province has indicated that it is not that he does not want the people of Ontario in Medicare; it is not that he is trying to keep for the insurance companies, the great profits they make out of gouging the public in the field of medical services; it is not for those reasons—or so he says. You can believe that if you like. It is because it is economically impractical for this province to be involved.

Yesterday, we listened to the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) bring down a Budget in which something in the neighbourhood of \$178 million needed to be raised, and we raised it by changing the taxes on some of the things that the average individual in this

province happens to enjoy. It is indeed unfortunate that the Prime Minister of this province did not take it upon himself to enter Medicare. Had he done so, he would have had, at his fingertips, \$170 million which would have offset—or almost, at least—offset the increase in expenditures for the province of Ontario in this coming fiscal year. But then again, he chose not to do that for some reason that is known only to himself. It is certainly not obvious to anyone else.

I would say that had the Treasurer just taken his scissors one more time and clipped \$80 million out of the Highways budget, instead of a small surplus, we could have come out of this with a much larger surplus in this province and thereby we would not have to have raised the taxes at all.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There is not a Cabinet Minister in the House.

Mr. Deans: The member is right.

Now I want to take a look, a rather critical look, at the statements of the Prime Minister in regard to the cost of Medicare. The Prime Minister indicated in his constitutional speech that it would cost \$54.15 per capita if Ontario were to be part of the federal Medicare scheme. This was for the year 1970-71, not 1969. This is twice what it costs in the province of Saskatchewan to operate the plan that is operating extremely well in that province.

This is 52 per cent higher than the figure of \$35.50 which was published in August of 1968 and was applicable to the year 1966. It allows for a ten per cent increase for each year from 1966 to 1969, an increase which I suggest is considerably higher than that which actually took place. And if it is not considerably higher then we need an investigation into the fees of doctors in this province.

The Prime Minister indicated that there were 97 per cent of the people in this province covered by comprehensive medical coverage and yet we, in our investigations, discover that there are 154,000 people who have only surgical coverage. There are 103,000 people who have only the PSI brown plan which covers only those in hospital care services. There are 169,000 people who are under private insurance plans and are not covered for home or office calls. There are many, many thousands more who have deductibles and who have limitations and exclusions placed upon them by the insurance company who happens to be the carrier for the plan which they are in.

And there is one other area, an area that

the Prime Minister does not assume to take into consideration. There are a great many people who are covered only at their place of work. If, for some reason or other they are no longer able to be employed there, their coverage terminates—which means in actual fact that their coverage is only for as long as they are able to be employed. When they retire coverage stops. When they are laid off, coverage stops and if they should, for some reason or other, be forced to leave their employment, coverage stops. So when the Premier says, as he did, that more than 97 per cent of our population can and obviously do obtain complete medical care, this is not true. It is not true here at all.

The Premier also stated during the discussion in the House that the government policy—and he is talking about his friends over there—is that medical services insurance would be available to all the people of Ontario, regardless of age, state of health and their capacity to pay. Again, this is just not true.

PSI and hospitalization for a family with children will cost \$365 a year after April 1 of this year. And I ask anyone in this House if they believe that a family earning \$5,000 a year, and that happens to be about 29 per cent of the families in Ontario, can afford to pay this kind of premium—\$365 out of \$5,000 a year? Right there, you eliminate a great many people from the category of medical coverage within their ability to pay.

I also wanted to say that OMSIP and hospitalization now cost \$309 a year for a family, and even at that level it is not possible for people earning \$5,000 or below to make those kind of payments out of what they have left after taxation. A family of four, and this is about the norm in this province, gets no premium assistance under OMSIP unless the income is below \$4,000; and then he can only get \$106 a year maximum payment by the province out of the \$309 cost, if he has absolutely no taxable income at all. And I might say that if he has \$1 taxable income, it costs him \$10, which is a ludicrous situation.

I must point out that a person earning \$1,600 a year, if he is single, does not qualify for any type of subsidy at all, and it bursts the myth, in my opinion, of the Premier's statement that every one in Ontario can receive medical coverage at a cost that he can afford within his ability to pay. It is not true.

I would also point out that as incomes creep up to keep pace with the cost of

living, more and more people become ineligible for premium assistance. Despite this fact, they still do not change the basis for assistance.

Incomes rise but, generally speaking, they only rise in accordance with the increased cost of living, and while an income may rise to the allotted amount of \$4,000 at which level you can collect premium assistance, it is not reflected in the amount of money that is left for those families that are earning that kind of money to pay for hospital or medical coverage.

It is eaten up by the increases in taxes at the municipal, provincial and federal level. It is eaten up by the increases in the cost of accommodation and the cost of food, and the cost of all of the necessary commodities.

The Premier has tried, in the way that only he can, and I think that that is fair to say because he has that uncanny ability of making it appear that everything he says must truly be the gospel truth. He has tried to prove that Medicare would cost more than the present hodge-podge of plans in this province.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): The member does not question that the Prime Minister tells the truth, does he?

Mr. Deans: He compares the present OMSIP premiums established June 1, 1968, with the cost estimates of 1970 to 1971.

I am sure that members would agree if he had used the new PSI rates, which become effective on April 1 of this year, the case that he put forward to stay out of Medicare would have been considerably weaker. Because those particular increases account for a 31.5 per cent increase over the present cost of OMSIP.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I think he has.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Put it to all those empty seats over there.

Mr. Deans: I am doing that. My colleague suggests that I put it to the empty seats.

Mr. Lawlor: Maybe the member can move their hearts.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): On a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Carleton East has a point of order.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Is not the speaker out of order completely? Has he not been

out of order for a considerable time? I thought we were dealing with proposals put forward in the book.

Mr. Speaker: Well, after listening to the lead-off speech in this particular debate some days ago, I do not think that the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, nothing is out of order in this debate.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): I think he is referring to his front row.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your interjection on my behalf.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): There is not one Cabinet Minister in the House.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, who would want to listen to this anyway?

Mr. Lewis: That is a little unfair—just a little unfair. The member should enter the debate himself.

Mr. Jessiman: His deputy leader gave up in disgust.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): The deputy is in the library.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: —as tabled by the Prime Minister in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will please proceed with his discourse.

Mr. Gisborn: Complete arrogance on this subject is obvious by the absence of government members.

Mr. Deans: I am amused, Mr. Speaker, by the interjections of the few members from the other side of the House. When one stands to answer to the statements from their leader, it appears you are always out of order, while the statements of their leader, even on the same subject are in order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will please continue with the address.

Mr. Deans: The Prime Minister stated in his address that the employers of this province would not be able to contribute premiums under the federal plan. Now, I would suggest to anyone that this is at least a false premise—that there is absolutely no prohibition in the Act.

The only difference between what now exists and what would exist then is that contributions would not be considered as tax

free benefits to the employee, as they are now. Even this is somewhat vague. They would likely be treated the same as the employer payment of hospital insurance, which is considered an addition to the employees' income.

I would also suggest, for the Prime Minister's edification, that he does not understand the purposes and the ways of collective bargaining, if he thinks that, were employers forced to pay into this programme at federal level, the employee would suffer in some way. I am quite sure that the collective bargaining process would assure that that money would go back into the employee's pocket.

The Prime Minister ignores the potential savings in the universal government-operated plan which could come if group practice, community clinics and other cost-saving approaches were adopted. No doubt under a Tory government they would not be, but with a little bit of effort they could be.

The Prime Minister does not deal, in any place in his remarks, although he ought to have done, with the question of whether the medical profession should be made to justify fee increases to a public body. It seems to me, as we view the increases that have taken place over the past number of years, and the cost of medical services, that we definitely need some kind of an investigation into the cost of medical services to the average individual in this province.

If I may, for a moment, just take the calculations put forward by the Prime Minister on the day that he opened this particular debate; the Prime Minister has suggested a *per capita* cost of \$54.15, in this province.

I question that this is even close to the actual *per capita* cost—that it is grossly inflated and that it has no foundation.

He suggested that 90 per cent of the people in this province—in excess of 90 per cent—were covered. This is just not true.

He has indicated, in his programme, that it would be cheaper to remain in OMSIP, or PSI, than go into a federal Medicare scheme. He justifies it by saying that it would cost, for a family, \$244.80 inclusive of the taxes that were paid, and he stated that PSI would be considerably cheaper, which is not true.

The present programme would cost \$232.80, plus the \$120 social development tax, which would be \$352.80. This is over \$100 more per year than would be paid by anyone participating in the federal Medicare pro-

gramme. And at the present rate of OMSIP—at \$177 per year for a family—plus the \$120 development tax, we have a sum of \$297 per year, which is considerably more than the cost of a Medicare programme.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if the Prime Minister's objection to Ontario's inclusion in federal Medicare is based at all on the cost to the people in this province. I personally believe that it is based on a close working relationship with a group of people who benefit considerably from the sale of medical coverage to the people in this province. It would take more than just a statement in this House, indicating figures, which I do not find to jibe with the figures that I have, to convince me otherwise.

So if I may reiterate, I would say that yesterday's Budget would have been unnecessary, in terms that the taxation increases would have been unnecessary for this province had the Prime Minister decided, at that time, to enter the federal Medicare scheme, and take full benefit of the taxes which the people of this province are paying to the federal government, in order to pay their share of the cost of federal Medicare.

I would turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of the Senate, if I may. It was stated in this House by my friend, the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), that the provincial Liberal Party—and I assume he is speaking for the provincial Liberal Party—would agree with the elimination of the Senate in this country. This is certainly in conflict with the statements of the federal Liberal Party.

It must be very pleasant to be able to speak out of both sides of one's mouth and to confuse the Canadian electorate on a continuous basis as to where one really stands in terms of the elimination of the Senate and anything else that comes up at the federal level.

We, in the New Democratic Party, have long fought for the elimination of the Senate. We have done so at the federal level on a continuous basis and the hon. member of the party, Stanley Knowles, has raised in the House of Commons almost every year over the last ten years the need to abolish this archaic and unnecessary body.

If we are going to have truly democratic representative government, we surely cannot have a body sitting which is appointed by the governments in power, either provincial or federal, and who are, in effect, party bagmen, party hacks, party supporters, and who

are not there serving the best interests of the people.

As I look at the Senate, I see nothing but people who have for a long time had an association with the two major political parties in this country and who are there strictly because of their service to those parties and not because of their service to the public, who are there only to ensure that the legislation, good or bad, passed by their parties or adopted by their parties, gets a hearing publicly.

As was stated in the Confederation of Tomorrow conference papers, in which this government stated that, whatever the role the Fathers of Confederation envisaged for the Senate, critics today argue that this body does little useful work and asks what role an upper House can play in a modern, democratic parliamentary Cabinet system of government, in which power is concentrated in the lower House.

I suggest respectfully it has no role to play, that the Trudeau government has indicated that they may undertake some Senate reform—Senate reform which will not play any meaningful part in assuring a truly democratic society in this country.

If we had undertaken many years ago the suggestions of the hon. member I referred to earlier, Stanley Knowles, we would not now be forced to debate the matter of whether or not the Senate is of any value.

And it is not only in this country that this is being debated. In Great Britain they are debating the value of the House of Lords; Quebec has eliminated their Upper House. It does not appear to me there is any justification whatsoever for an appointed group of people to sit and pass judgement on the efforts of the elected representatives of a country, a province or a state.

I would say that we in this House should take the position that the Senate should be eliminated. We should accept no other role for it. It has played no useful part in the democratic process of this country. We should not accept any change, any reform. It must be total elimination, if the interests of the people are to be served.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): In rising to talk on the constitution issue and issues of Confederation, I would like to restrict my remarks to one aspect of constitutional change or consideration of change. That is the area of education and manpower training, and retraining, as well as adult educa-

And who should finance it? How should the definition of education, as well as the definition of training, best be looked at to make sure that the national priorities in education and our provincial priorities in education and manpower training are in fact met?

I believe, sir, that today there is a conflict of opinion concerning the priorities in education in Canada. It is a conflict of opinion that has now hardened by the October, 1966, federal-provincial "entente" that adult manpower training and retraining is a federal government responsibility while education, sir, defined as the imparting of knowledge through a standard curriculum during the period of childhood, adolescence and youth, is a provincial government responsibility.

The federal government, then, has reasserted its concern with national and regional manpower requirements and is giving this concern priority by backing it up with large expenditures.

What has happened, in my opinion sir, since 1965, is that the federal government has shifted upwards to an entirely new level in its manpower programmes such as initiative was essential if Canada was serious about maintaining its place in the world as a highly-productive and competitive economic system.

Now the provincial governments continue to state that one of the most important goals of their formal education system is the provision of full opportunity for the development of individual potential. Yet since 1965, they have not matched the federal shift in the federal government's financing of manpower retraining programmes.

As a result, we have a new structure of national priorities in education and training. This has been established by independent decisions at the federal and provincial government levels.

And it may also set the pattern for the rest of the 1960s and for the 1970s and, indeed, into the 1980s.

The new national priorities are these, sir: First of all, adult training and retraining for the world of work has been given a much higher value relative to child and youth education for the development of the individual as an individual rather than as a factor of production.

Second, adult training and retraining for the world of work has been given a new higher value relative to adult education for the sake of continuing to learn—that is, as an end in itself and a contribution to how we live as civilized human beings.

I would simply note here, sir, that this latter shift in national priorities in education and manpower training has taken place. My basic concern is with the first shift in priorities.

It is my opinion that the dichotomy between the definitions of education, which is a provincial government responsibility and manpower training, which has been defined to be a federal government responsibility, is a false dichotomy, when judged in terms of the crisis in education and manpower training in Canada today.

I would like to isolate my remarks to make this point by discussing primary and pre-primary school education and ought to be responsible for that type of education, particularly with what I call pre-primary school education.

It is my opinion that pre-primary and primary school education is the area in which a substantial upward shift in expenditures could have the greatest long-run individual, social, economic and political return in Canada.

On the one hand, there is the question of preparing individuals for the world of work and of maximizing their contribution to economic growth in this era of a permanent scientific and technological revolution, commonly called the age of automation.

For this goal, which is both a provincial and a national goal, an additional \$1 million invested today in pre-primary school education could reduce by at least several million dollars the expenditures that will be necessary to train and retrain many of today's four and five year olds 15 years from now for the radically different world of work of 1984.

If, in other words, the approach to preparing individuals for the world of work had a deeper and longer-run perspective in decision-making than it has at present, Canada would have a much more rational and efficient allocation of funds today in the field of education.

On the other hand, there is the belief that it is good for an individual, however gifted, to be able to develop and use the gifts with which he was born. Related to this is the belief that social and economic barriers which stand between a child and the development of his inherited, creative, intellectual and physical gifts, ought to be eliminated.

For this second goal, sir—an additional \$1 million spent today in pre-primary and primary school education could reduce by several million dollars the amount that will be spent

in programmes to counteract alienated teenagers ten years from now in 1979.

The conclusion regarding these two goals is that there is no valid dichotomy between training individuals to be productive factors of production, and their education as unique human beings with unique gifts at the pre-primary school level.

There is, therefore, sir, no valid dichotomy between federal and provincial institutional and financial responsibilities for the financing of pre-primary school education. This, sir, as some members of the House know, is a constitutional justification for the federal government becoming involved in the financing and the programmes of pre-primary school education, particularly of a type known as "Head-Start" programmes.

Just to underline my point, sir, in that area, in the area of training children before they enter the primary school system to use the English language, to have communication skills—that that type of training is a type of manpower training. It also coincides with the need for education. One must have "words" to be successful in the educational field and, therefore, education and training for the world-of-work come together, I believe, at the pre-primary school education level. Constitutionally, therefore, I think it is an area of joint federal-provincial responsibility that must be recognized if we are to have a meaningful "War on Poverty" on a national scale in Canada.

If, sir, for reasons of national unity, Canada cannot have a federal Minister of Education, the least that can be done now is for the federal and provincial governments to recognize that adult manpower training for jobs in 1985 has a basic relationship with, and is highly dependent on, the need for pre-primary school education.

To put that another way, sir, training people to work in the labour force in 1985 depends fundamentally on what happens to those young people by the way of training and education at the pre-primary school level today. What is then needed is a federal ministry of manpower and anti-poverty, which would have, as one of its cornerstones, a massive programme of pre-primary school training for disadvantaged children in our society—children which number, I believe, over 20 per cent of all the children of any given age group.

A real, combined War on Poverty and a manpower training programme in Canada would have many other objectives but the pre-primary school front would be the major one

and would have the greatest effect on economic and social benefits.

In summary of this argument, it is my opinion that the first public policy principle that must be accepted in Canada jointly between the federal government and the provincial governments, is that of universal accessibility to education. The first programme to achieve genuine accessibility to education is one that makes it possible for children born into low income homes to have as good a set of initial communications skills as children of equal inherited ability from homes of the well-to-do. And Canada's kindergartens are certainly not even attempting this.

Many children from low income homes have been born into a poverty syndrome and they need preferential treatment in education, not simply equal treatment. This is not happening, particularly in the rural areas of Canada and in the downtown core slums of the cities of Canada.

Furthermore, Canada's nursery schools have children who are mainly from well-to-do homes where the exact opposite ought to be true. Quite simply, without universal opportunity before kindergarten and grade I, it is impossible to have universal accessibility to education that will enable a child to develop the gifts with which he was born. The hard fact, which has been recognized in the United States as national policy, but not in Canada, is that five years old is too late for the underprivileged child to begin schooling.

Therefore, sir, I believe that one of the items on the agenda of this government with the federal government, ought to be the question of the relationship of education and manpower training before grade 1 and formal kindergarten in our education system.

I suggest that the federal government would have to accept the logic of my argument because without a heavier relative investment at the pre-primary school level in education, it is impossible to train people for the world of work of 1985. If the federal government really believes in the War on Poverty, and if the government of this province of so-called "opportunity and a place to stand" really believe in creating that opportunity, then I suggest, sir, that at the top of its agenda must be a consideration of a national programme of anti-poverty, combining federal and provincial resources and responsibilities under a constitution that would make it possible for the children of the poor to begin grade 1 in competition with the kids from the middle classes of Canada so

that they, too, can have their chance to have a place to stand and a place to grow in this province.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, in rising to join this debate under a good deal of jockeying among the whips, I would like to renew a plea I made a couple of weeks ago in an afternoon in which the discussions between the Prime Ministers were going on in Ottawa. At that time, I sought to prevail upon the Premier of the province (Mr. Robarts) to set up in this body a constitutional committee. The Premier has seen fit thus far not to accede to that request.

I am not quite sure of his grounds; I listened carefully. He seemed to indicate he did not quite know what we would do. Well, for a single member who perhaps would sit on that committee, let me assure him there is a good deal to do among the documents that have been distributed to members of this Legislature over the past year and a half.

There is at least pile two feet high at this time on my study floor, just emanating from this source apart from anything else one might have dug up over the years—touching constitutional matters; the articles from *Le Devoir*; the administrative committee's various recommendations; Lord help me, there is a plethora of material, there is no difficulty there.

Secondly, if this debate is to take on any great meaning and purpose, Mr. Speaker, after the experience I had two weeks ago in discussing it, it is impossible, in my opinion, in the atmosphere of this Chamber—curiously enough—to really get to the tricky problems, to the guts of the debate.

What you can do in a Chamber this size with as many members as we contend with, is deal with broad outlines and sweeping policies, as I hope to do today, but when you seek to get down to—and this is where constitutional issues become really interesting and vital—the niceties of the situation, you simply cannot convey that sort of thing in this atmosphere and in this House.

It falls like a dead hand on the House, and everybody tunes himself off; so you do not have to be too sensitive to the House in order to recognize that. In other words my contention is that the only place in which we can come to grips with this issue in a reasonable and solid way, and in a way which will lead to some kind of consequences and the education of the members in this area, is through the committee system.

That is where the vitality comes, you can give and take there; you can set forth positions and counter-positions. Here you cannot do that, and certainly this is the wrong medium in which to really come to grips with the areas of the constitution where we simply have to get down to it if we are not to lose the lure of this country, and to see the country disintegrate around us.

As I say, in the assembly here a debate on the level that I want to conduct, or the kind of subject that I want to discuss, is deadly dull. And curiously, it often takes on life and becomes interesting in committee. This would be as true about this as about the taxation committee. If the members of this House went through the niceties and subtleties and whatnot that are involved in coming out with a policy on taxation, they would all die of asphyxiation, if it had to do it in this particular medium. It is a curious thing, but it is a question of the sensibility of the House.

In recommending, therefore, that we call expert witnesses before us—and there are certainly enough men in various areas, particularly of university life, and in the legal profession to give us real insights—I think it is the only way in which to establish an immediacy of insight. You can learn more in half an hour listening to a learned man than you could possibly do reading for weeks on end, because he can take you to the heart of the matter. He can give you guidance as to the possibilities, pro and con, touching the situation. And you can ask questions, quite informally and bring out the highlights.

And in this way, gradually there will form in our minds a decisive and determinate policy with respect to what we feel would be the best thing for this country in the role that Ontario really should play in fitting into the picture.

I am sure that from the Premier down at the present time, there are the most illusory, the most inchoate concepts as to precisely what consideration the shape and size of it ought to be. This is evident from the ambivalence displayed by the Premier and other members of this Cabinet in the House where they come down on one emphasis on one matter which is divisive, which is destructive to our constitutional unity, and on the other hand they make overtures and open-handed gestures—and bless them for it—towards an overall sense of that unity.

They are men who have not resolved, or even begun in any great measure to resolve; the issues that we face and must resolve—and must resolve with alacrity if we are to

save the situation. The Premier himself indicated that in his speech of a few days ago.

I want to put an extra spoke in the wheel in this regard. I am going to suggest that—instead of a committee of this Legislature studying the Constitution—some thought be given to establishing a select committee of the Legislature to study the Constitution, so that these studies may be ongoing after this Legislature rises.

They could get going in a tentative way while we are sitting, without burdening the members. Lord knows we have enough committees already, but nevertheless this is of vital import. It is such a necessity for us to know what we are talking about in this area, with any great degree of assurance, that it seems to me that a select committee is very much in order.

In this Legislature it is fortunate that we have enough skilled, and I am sure, interested people coming from all sides of the House to constitute such a committee.

We would hear experts. We would hold discussions among ourselves on propositions. We would wrangle about the possibilities of each consequence and alternative. We would also act in a better capacity.

To my mind, this would be an extension of goodwill and a gesture towards, not just Quebec, but to the federal government, to this this whole country. It would be an added quiver in our arsenal to have such a committee, that we would act as ambassadors plenipotentiary to the rest of the country—the province so vitally concerned about this matter that it set up, in this Legislature, a group of interested, elected representatives who would appear, for instance, in Quebec as a body.

We come from Ontario. We come, not bearing gifts. We come to learn, and we want to know what your stand on these various issues are by word of mouth and in the living context of Quebec.

We would possibly even go to British Columbia and find out what the climate of opinion was there. We would study other constitutions. I think this country has an enormous amount to learn from the constitution of Australia, which has faced the same problems, although not the same aggravation. Basically, regional jealousies are the same all the world over, and they have been able to resolve through their inter-relationship with the ministerial level, a number of areas which we have not even begun to really tackle yet.

In their loans programme—there is an area that we might very well inspect as to the

interdelegation of monetary and fiscal policies. I cannot seek to prevail too much upon the government, and upon the Treasury benches, to give these possibilities of a committee—either in the alternative or in continual—some role to play here.

And under this heading, Mr. Speaker, may I take a moment to quote from the hon. Prime Minister the other day, he says:

On the other hand, there was the feeling by some of the provincial leaders at any rate that we should not leave too much of this detailed work to non-elected officials. In other words the actual work that is being done should be undertaken to the greatest possible degree by those who represent our people directly.

I accord with that and I say, in order to give that meaning, that a select committee, or a committee, is crucial and necessary. At the present time we have delegated to a group of officials, the whole task of arriving at some kind of accommodation—some kind of insight into our future constitutional structure.

That, so far as it goes, is, I suppose, beneficial. But if the fruit of that are the proposals that sit before us today, then I am thankful that the task has not been well carried out.

In any event, it has not been carried out—certainly not in the area where the whole weight of this debate must eventually fall. My intention does not involve areas like the Senate and the Supreme Court—all these peripheral matters.

The real problem here and one the province utterly fails to deal with, is in the area of the division of powers, under 91 and 92 obviously.

Whatever contribution anybody can make to that solution, would seem to be a palm leaf given to this country—something upon which we can try our strength. People who are in public life are simply under an obligation to throw out as many sparks and ideas into this head as possible, because on that depends the whole future of this country. It's the way that we will be sitting here in the legislative assembly ten years hence, which under the present insouciance I rather doubt.

So I do call upon the Prime Minister, in his own wording, to initiate this committee. He goes on in another column to say:

The initial stage of what might be termed a broad analysis of the problems have been completed, and we are now moving ahead.

Well, of course, that does not apply to the crucial points in the whole problem, a very broad analysis that leaves out the assets, you know. We are then moving ahead into the areas that are going to require much deeper study and a much greater examination in very fine detail.

Again, I agree. But where are you going to do it? Not of the floor of this assembly. If you are not going to delegate it off to a group of people who are not beholden directly to us, I can suggest that the only other place must be a committee of some kind.

Now in this business of the Constitution; since it is not possible, I claim, to discuss the nitty-gritty in this Legislature, let us take a pervasive view of what constitutions—federal or unitary—are doing in the modern world. Let us take a look first at what might be called a paradigm case that always has been the nub up against which we rub in this country—the whole case of the United States.

As everyone knows, in the history of that country, they set their residual powers in the states. The curious reversals of history—irrespective of how they may thump on the desk—have been such as to cause the residual power and the paramountcy to fall into the hands of the federal government.

There are many reasons for this—but in any case, a reversal has taken place. Now they have emerged on to a new plateau in the United States, into a new relationship among federal, state and municipal governments. The federal government has found out that it cannot administer all the programmes adequately, efficiently or to the good of the overall population without the instant and necessary co-operation of both the state—and particularly—local or municipal governments.

I would like to read one paragraph from the *Time* essay of May, 1968, titled: "The Marble Cake Government—Washington's New Partnership With the States". This is one possibility as to the direction in which we might go:

In Lydon Johnson's Washington there is a growing awareness that such problems can be solved only by fostering more creative interplay among the different levels of government. Usually, government is compared to a neatly tiered three-layer cake composed of national, state and local levels. In fact, as the late University of Chicago professor, Morton Gradschens, put it in a 1960 report of the President's commission on national goals: "It is more

like a marble cake, full of unexpected whirls and inescapable blendings, as colours are mixed in the marble cake, so functions are mixed in the American federal systems," said Gradschens. From abattoirs and accounting, through zoning and zoo administration, any government activity is almost certain to involve the influence, if not the formal administration of all three planes of government.

I would ask that this marble cake theory be taken very much into account because, curiously enough, the drive of economics is precisely that. It is precisely that in every federal administration in the world and not least in our own country. More and more—some people may regret it, some people may applaud it—the federal government is penetrating into areas of municipal concern and the interest of the municipality seems to penetrate into levels which have been administered under the head of the federal government.

But, somewhere in between, the provincial government is dabbling in by way of subversion. Our taxation powers—strictly speaking under our constitution—are only direct. But on any analysis, economic or otherwise, we are taxing indirectly all the time. It is quite wrong. Our provincial court judges have not got the jurisdiction under The British North America Act to perform the functions they do perform. They have no authority. They just exercise it at the present time. Someone, somewhere along the road, is going to question this and call some judgments very seriously into question.

In the United States, because of the smallness of the state and because of the division of powers that the various states have, the federal government has been able to make this penetration in a very overt and honest way. In Canada—for a number of reasons which have come to your mind—because the potency of the Ontario government is very great and particularly because of the French fact, we are simply not going to be able to bring about the marble cake theory. But we cannot bide or live with the three-layer cake, either. Therefore, you cannot eat your cake and have it too, I suppose.

But ours is certain to be an unique experiment in federal structure which has only begun. The intransigence at the present time in Ontario of the Ontario government *vis-à-vis* the French fact is what I am talking about. The political fact runs counter to the economic fact and I am trying to believe that in the long run the economics will conquer. But in

the long run, as somebody said, we are all dead.

We cannot be prepared to abide by the event.

Mr. E. W. Sôpha (Sudbury): That was John Maynard Keynes.

Mr. Lawlor: John Maynard Keynes. In the area of electronics for instance—hardly known, if at all, in 1867—and the whole area of communications policy, transportation policy and the national level of housing and welfare and how they are administered locally, the internal relationships and external relationships, should be handled this way: we must accept a far more subtle and suave interpretation of the constitution than anything we have had up to now.

It is a far more inter-related and interpenetrated thing that we are prepared to accept. It comes to this: there is no head of government that is sacrosanct to any jurisdiction. This we already have the basis for arguing on. Deep in our interpretation of our Constitution is a Privy Council judgment—one of the few that had any sense and the Supreme Court judgments on constitutional matters that have come since the Privy Council deserted the field, have not been much better. I am thinking of delegate legislation. But we will come to that. In any case, we have already, in the Hodges case of 1894, a theory on our constitution—the idea of what is called "aspects". Within a whole group of subjects it said, one aspect belongs to this government but the same subject matter and the same head of power, has another aspect which belongs to the federal government. This has occurred over and over again in marketing legislation, where the Criminal Code comes in against civil rights in the provincial area and in liquor legislation.

All the way along we have this double or triple aspect theory and it is the aspect theory that has to be developed. It is the aspect theory in development that will meet the contemporary needs of the Canadian people and weld us together or, at least, hold us together.

Any other theory—the divisive theory, the heads of power theory, the unilateral theory, the theory that we have exclusive jurisdiction—will divide us, whatever the area might be. Arising out of this, too, the concept of special status takes on a provocative aspect. It is not just special status for Quebec. Other regions may find it just as important because of regional differentiations, peculiarities or idiosyncrasies. For one reason or another, they would want special status, or want to exercise

powers that others do not exercise in a particular regard, in a particular sphere.

In working into this marble cake theory, I say we cannot completely have our cake here because of our historical and sociological situation. My contention is that our drive and our intent ought to be in that direction—complete inter-penetration of powers. Nobody has any special status but everybody may have a special status. It comes to this in terms of the delegation of powers: Under our constitutional law the federal government may not delegate legislation to the provincial government or *vice versa*. But, there may be an inter-delegation of power of an administrative nature.

They have used this device in the Prince Edward Island potato case and a number of other cases in order to get around the business of delegation. But why on earth is delegation not written directly into our Constitution, to take care of crucial situations where a particular problem calls out for the administration other than where the administration happens to lie in that archaic statute?

Now, the difficulty in this country at this moment in time is that most influential people seem to be thinking unimaginatively with respect to our constitution. They are going to have to become somewhat more visionary if they are going to maintain any sort of constitution at all.

In this regard, I would again like to cite the words of the Premier of this province the other day. The fault with all these men, the fault with Lederman, a professor of constitutional affairs, whom I will quote in a moment, the fault, in my opinion, with Trudeau is precisely the same as that of the Premier of the province.

They are all heads-of-power men. They all say that you can divide this thing up neatly in the modern times, you can isolate one from the other, and that the pie is a three-layer cake.

That simply will not work. It will lead to the gravest disruption in the next three or four years if it continues to go on. They are going to have to reverse themselves and approach the whole issue anew, with new tenets, as the Americans have been forced to do under the impact of their own internal growth and expansion of power that goes on in that very dynamic country.

I just want to give some evidence. Of course, all three men, Lederman, Trudeau and Robarts, are ambivalent about this thing.

I mean they are in states of doubt, so that while the great weight of their argument falls

one way, there is always a little arcanum over here and they can always point to the moment of truth or the moment of doubt—they are sometimes the same thing—and say: “Oh, no, but I didn’t say that we must have two heads of power, I always left room in there for co-operation, for the utmost inter-weaving of powers.”

They can always say that, but let us look at the text and, seeking to reverse the mind of the Prime Minister in this matter as the best hope for this country, let us see what he himself says.

I do not think he said the other day that the spending responsibility, the distribution of powers in The British North America Act of 1867, require any very large change. “I think that we could live very nicely with it.” Well, I do not. You are not living very nicely with it now. You spend your whole time hectoring about it because of the division as it is.

It is because the division is as it is, that problems have arisen with Quebec. They had better make up their minds to change it. You cannot live with it.

And curiously enough, Trudeau—I should not say curious enough, because he is a small “c” conservative in many ways and has throughout his book on federalism, abided by and held for the same policy time after time. And I would like particularly to substantiate that by reference to an article some years ago called “Quebec and Constitutional Power”. He says:

If we look at all aspects of the problem, therefore I think we shall find the general spirit of Canadian federalism quite acceptable.

I mean, a mixture of complacency and insouciance, I suppose. Yet you would be very surprised if real statesmen, given the facts of the problem, arrived at the conclusion that our constitution needs drastic revision.

If you continue to read on through the thing and see what is happening in our midst, if you continue to read on, I say, through the book here, he gives instance after instance in which drastic revision is necessary and he himself then swings to a different argument, which I think is a conflicting position, contradictory to what he is saying there. The words are detached and pragmatic. By detached and pragmatic, he means you undo the Constitution without saying so. You turn the whole thing inside out to bring about the disposition of powers and where the weight in modern economic theory falls, and who has the functional aspect in this matter.

And this is where our own Premier seems to swing around for a moment, as I said. I hope it is a moment of strength and not his moment of weakness, because it is in contradiction to what he says all the rest of the time.

The other day again he said:

I think powers must be allocated according to the functional criteria, that the government most capable of doing the job efficiently should have the responsibility.

That is fine. That is exactly what the criterion ought to be, and any particular power, nevertheless, may have a whole host of functions to be exercised by different jurisdictions in different ways. And just that little expansion of mind might be our salvation, I suggest.

Let me quote from Lederman on this, too, because it shows how deeply entrenched the acceptance of the existing state of affairs is, and we cannot crash the ice on this particular thing, bring in a bit of a thaw. Spring time will never come.

Lederman says: "Ideally the federal and provincial list of powers should be crystal clear and mutually exclusive."

Ideally! Well, in all the platonic heavens anybody would want to inhabit, I cannot think that would be an ideal at all. Quite the contrary. That is not the nature of the beast. The animal has spots and it has stripes and the sooner that you do not get this pure-bred creature threatening to throw you around the country, the sooner we get rid of it, the more close we will come to attaining a constitution meeting the viable needs.

He goes on, he wants them crystal clear, is that not professional now? Does that not meet the logical mentality perfectly? But the more you are strong and logical in these things, the weaker you are in imagination. And being weak in imagination means that you are weak in the actual constitution, the actual ongoing life of the citizenry of the country. They do not live by logic.

But as we shall see later, such perfection is not attainable in power distribution systems. And he weeps. I can see the tears on the page. And the exigencies of imperfection are the roots of many of the problems of federal-provincial relations. You are telling me! This is a total failure to face up to the actual issues we are confronted with.

I am saying that Trudeau and Robarts and Lederman are all tarred with the same brush. And by being so incarcerated in their own thinking, of being so addicted to the water-

tight compartment theory of the constitution, of talking and thinking in terms of exclusive powers, I can almost forgive the Premier if he is actually in his office and day-to-day has to deal with frustrating problems where personalities enter into it and a Minister like Benson will say: "Go collect your own dough."

That sort of aggravation somewhat blinds you to the more sovereign issues involved in a case of this kind. And I think maybe it is the habituation of day-to-day life. He does not stand back far enough from the issue to see in which direction Ontario ought to be going and give that leadership, as no one can possibly do it in this time of our history, in the direction in which I am suggesting in these remarks.

What it comes down to is this—that they are holding two contradictory concepts in their minds at the same time. When they are thinking of the day-to-day running of government and of getting the money to do so, they think in terms of a watertight compartment: "Give me the dough to run this particular area and I will be utterly happy"—irrespective of whether or not that undermines the whole basis of the federal structure or irrespective of it recognizing the functional.

The Prime Minister's own words, "the functional necessities of contemporary government" as to where the weight of power falls. Who has offered the power in certain areas? It is a total failure to recognize that particular dimension of the problem. It is simply latching on to the Act of 1867, saying that it has some kind of eternal rectitude when the thing is so outmoded and has to be completely revamped. Otherwise, we will not have anything to revamp.

Trudeau, in his book, quotes from the Rowell-Sirois report and it is too bad that we did not latch on to this years ago when we had the opportunity. Our history passes us by like an express train.

Under the Rowell-Sirois report, that was the golden day, and the golden opportunity. We would not be talking about provincial income taxes today. But Trudeau, I say, quotes from this document to this intent.

Insofar as matters requiring concerted action can be dealt with by co-operation among the provinces, and between the dominion and the provinces, the case for additional centralization to promote efficiency or uniformity will not arise.

And in the matters of taxation, the text goes on as follows—and there is a good deal of

truth in this which is seldom mentioned in this House:

Finally, the financing of the respective administrations was established as an area of indispensable co-operation.

I wish the man would speak to Benson today.

By confederation, the provinces gave up the bulk of their sources of revenue, retaining only direct taxes and various fees. In exchange, the federal government pledged itself to make the four different types of payment referred to in 111, 118 and 119 of The British North America Act.

That is where we stood at Confederation. Oh, what an advance was there, after listening to yesterday's Budget. That Budget may be, you know, detrimental to our ongoing future interests. I am sure the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) and others headed into that course only with the utmost reluctance. A most unhappy eventuality that you should have your hands forced, and I do accord with you that their hands were forced in this matter. I hope that however regrettable it is to impose your own personal income tax, that the federal government will now see the light and will pull back from their former categorical position, in the interests of the overall unity of this country. They might even adopt a credit policy by way of tax rebates. Such has been suggested.

I will not give the Minister of Revenue full credit for all of that. If there is credit there, let us spread it around a bit. In any event, Trudeau goes on at page 144, setting *nostrums* which I wish he would follow now that he has the power to follow them.

Mr. Sopha: He is in town tonight, do you not want to go and dine with him?

Mr. Lawlor: I would not mind.

Mr. Sopha: \$50 a plate.

Mr. Lawlor: \$50 a plate? I cannot even afford that for Tommy Douglas.

It is quite conceivable that Canadian fiscal policy could be considered from month to month, and year to year by a joint continuing committee of federal and provincial officials and experts. Confronted with comprehensive sets of statistical material and forecasting data, such a committee—if it were immunized against all forms of political interference—could make policy recommendations as well as any body of purely central officials.

Perhaps they could do even better be-

cause they would take greater cognizance of problems such as regional bottlenecks, local unemployment and immobility of labour. The hitherto purely federal control over money and banking would then be examined in the light of provincial budgetary needs. That is what the Treasurer has been calling for day after day, for months, to the complete purblind insouciance of the federal government under this head which has brought about this present situation.

But there are Trudeau's own words—quote them back to him on occasion and see what kind of response you get.

So, what has happened with all three men—but particularly with the Prime Minister of this province and he with Trudeau himself—under their present construction or what they have offered us in interpretation or as their dream child touching the constitution, has been a continuation of old outworn nostrums. They will not solve the difficulty—but aggravate and exacerbate it—because it is precisely these clauses of the constitution, these exclusive heads of power concept, that have brought us to our present pass. And that must be seen, obviated and overcome. The way to do it is to launch along the paths which we have been trying to outline.

It falls into the *status quo* completely, and the *status quo* will no longer do after 102 years. This miasma even permeates through to the areas where the province is somewhat openhanded and has a certain generosity: They turn into equalization payments. There is a smell even there because they say that these equalization payments must be handled in a particular way. They must be done by lump sum, they must not be taken off averages. We want supervision over these things, we want to direct it away into determined areas.

That is all niggling. That seems to me to pull back from the full intent of what equalization can do and support. We ought not to take that grudging attitude. It is this grudging attitude that enters into the heart of the debate on Confederation, instead of an attitude of splendid co-operation—the only thing that will save us.

I will not dwell on the attitude on medicare. I have had it *ad nauseam*. But in this particular instance, just one word. Here is a man who has the possibilities in his hands and is looked up to by the people in this province and the whole country, I am sure, as possibly being the curer of our ills—to the degree that any man can do that. He had the expanse of mind, he had the bearing, he had

the objectivity and the kind of wisdom that goes into these things—and he then allows his reasoning to be so coloured, and so twisted by a single issue that it colours the whole sky of his intent.

If this has any strength, if the thrust of the Ontario government is to carry leadership and is to preserve the union—and I say that it is in our hands largely—in my opinion it will emanate from here. Quebec has her position to defend. Her position is not a leading one. Her position is not one of seeking accommodation. Her position is to preserve a certain cultural value—that is her intent and her right.

It is up to us, the only people who seem to be able to transcend the narrowness of issues throughout the country, and then we fail in a crux situation so to do. What a lamentation is there. What a dereliction from our own duty. Medicare will pass; it will be here in five years, ten years, you name it. These things are in the veins of the times. But the Constitution will not pass. You face up to it, or you do not face up to it at all.

The time is now, and it would do a great disservice to get off on some cloudy secondary or tertiary issue, like Medicare, and destroy the whole image—destroy the whole crust so he can no longer concentrate his mind on the big issues, but is down here grubbling about some money over here in a particular programme. I said so the other day. I cannot oversay that enough.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): That is symptomatic.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, it is only to his own hurt that he really does it, as far as I can see, but whatever the Prime Minister does at this level hurts every citizen of his province. He must rise above the peculiar political and narrow intents of provincialism which beggar them all.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): His interest is the London Life.

Mr. Lawlor: I have said a word or two on the income tax situation, that it is a regrettable step, but intrinsic to that step too, I would want to say just a word or two further. The people of this country, or this province, ought not to be taken in by the shibboleth or public relations text that says we are actually guaranteed an actual annual wage in this regard. This is the usual use of language thoroughly designed to mislead. If the kind of thing that is in the back of the minds of the gentlemen over there is a

guaranteed annual wage in the manner of Professor Friedman of Chicago, the friend of Mr. Barry Goldwater—and we have no reason to think otherwise—it was a Republican manoeuvre to undermine the whole welfare situation in the United States. That was one of the most vicious pieces of business masquerading under the guise of virtue that man has ever seen.

I hope that you are not falling into that trap. I would like to be assured some day, when you are on this budget debate that such would not be the case. I would want to know precisely what you do have in mind with respect to the credit policy, the rebate policy. These are all to the good. All these things depend upon what their intent is—what are you really trying to do—and secondly, how you do it. You can do as much harm, you can undermine as many social welfare schemes as easily as you can benefit the population at large. I would ask you very seriously, to give consideration on that head.

I had a number of general principles written out which should guide us on the Constitution and I think you can work out what those principles are in terms of utmost flexibility. One is that no head of power belongs to any one sector and that each one applies to defence, applies within the realms of expedition, getting things done and reaching decisions to the realm of monetary and fiscal policy.

We have to prevail upon the federal government to recognize, even as I am seeking to prevail upon you now, their mutual benefit and their mutual responsibility in this on-going disclosure—this on-going almost day-to-day contact. Somewhere in this book, Trudeau goes as far as to say that one of the things that really may be necessary to have this whole thing work at all is to implement a secretary of state for the provinces at the federal level and a Department of Federal Relations in each province. In this way, the consultation, the degree of unanimity, degree of understanding, degree of participation will be given accord, he says. I think there is and I think the members can understand from the Cabinet Ministers over there, constant breakdowns in communication at this time that, I suppose, are partially based on the men who are seeking to speak to each other, but they cannot be wholly so. If it were written right into the constitution that ongoing certain bodies, etc. were instructed, and given the power to continue the most vital relationships at all times, in a multitude of areas—that is what the constitution lacks.

The constitution, as it originally was set up, was to divide, separate off, to segregate away, to keep them in their separate cubby-holes. I say the new world has brought an intertwining, and an inter-relationship, and a sense of communication and that we are living in global villages and what not. If we do not recognize that degree of inter-relationship and the need for ongoing discourse in communication, then the whole thing is going to fall apart anyway. But it is the intent of a new constitution which must be brought into being to obviate those difficulties, to give full accord to the kind of communications that men accord each other in the modern world. Only in this way will our country be saved.

Just to finish up, in order to explore and to clarify what appears to be conflicting and seemingly incompatible positions, it is necessary to have a constitutional committee of this Legislature and if the Prime Minister would so consider it, a select committee, *a la White* if you will, a task force, a group that will sit down together.

The purposes would be totally different but what would be arrived at under the "White" light of continued discussion and debate, hearing experts, consulting with them, cross examining, getting all the possible information before it, would be the committee emerging next fall with a list of recommendations which, of course, are not binding upon the government.

But in terms of education; in terms of knowing what we have been talking about; in terms of being able to make a single and salutary contribution to the life of this country among a group of legislators who would be more aware of the problems of Confederation than any in the country and to give leadership in this regard and to have an ambassadorial staff at our immediate hand, this government, they will say, is so interested in the affairs of the country and in holding this country together, that it appointed a select committee that is going about the country seeking the way to salve up our wounds and to regress the ills of the past.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Well, Mr. Speaker, I had not planned on intervening in this debate and my intervention, in fact, today will be *ad hoc* and very brief. And in no way would I challenge the bulk of the remarks that have been made by the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor).

In particular, I have been intrigued, as many of us have been, by the switchover in residual powers that occurred in practice in the United States—from the states to the

federal government—and the converse which occurred in Canada, wherein we found the central power being pulled away, or endeavours being made to pull it away to the provinces.

To me, and I suggest this, as I say, quite briefly, the two problems or the basis of the problem is that nine out of our ten provinces organically, I feel, in this day and age, desire to co-operate with one another and co-ordinate their activities in a vast number of fields—in education, particularly in higher education, with regard to such matters as pensions and in the field of medicine and health care. I feel I could also include the field of welfare, perhaps transportation and certainly in the field of law enforcement.

In nine of the provinces, there is a very special kind of dream of Canada and when all these considerations are put together, I think that you can find in Canada today, certain centripetal forces which have, as I have suggested, been referred to by the last speaker.

On the other hand, we have the province of Quebec. Quite understandably, when one reads its history and tries to understand its people, you have a period of assertion—not only culturally but financially—and in the total field of its self respect. Here, we have something which I think must be recognized—from a constitutional point of view, as being centrifugal in its application.

It then seems to me that the Liberal Party federally, and we have not had the benefit yet of hearing from the Liberal Party provincially on this subject in this debate, really is endeavouring to do nothing more than paper over the cracks without coming to any forthright offers or proposals as to solutions.

I really feel that the Trudeau campaign of last year, certainly insofar as the manner in which he conducted it in the western provinces, was essentially fraudulent. I think also, Mr. Speaker, that a problem arises if we wish to contemplate in detail the NDP proposals with regard to associate statehood. The fundamental problem with either opting out, or the permission to opt out proposed by Liberal policy, or the NDP associated statehood policies is, I would suggest, this—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is Rene Levesque.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well this is another argument. I will not assume to interpret your policies.

Mr. Lawlor: If the member prevails upon the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) to set up a committee, he and I will argue.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: The point is still the same I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and it is that to the extent that either the province of Quebec opts out or assumes some position of associate statehood, it cannot be denied that, to that extent, the role, and the moral right of the members of the federal Parliament from the province of Quebec to influence policy, is diminished and undermined.

Now in these brief remarks the only point I wish to make, and it is not dogmatic, nor is it spoken by one who is an expert in this field, is that I do feel the Prime Minister of this province, the government of this province, should particularly direct its attention to what I would call a dynamic inter-provincialism.

The Confederation of Tomorrow Conference has been referred to in this debate, and generally by the public, in glowing terms. The atmosphere has been spoken of as being "healthy, invigorating and hopeful", and Quebec as you will recall, was a full, useful participant in that particular conference.

Such a conference does not in any way conflict, whether we agree with it or not, with the theory being expounded in Quebec that they are, so long as they stay within their jurisdiction, a sovereign state.

Therefore, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should canvass—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well that does not apply to Quebec only.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: This is the point I am making; that essentially the other matters of regional interest are minor, capable of compromise, negotiation, and of acceptance. And in no way, I feel strongly, in no way of the magnitude involved in the fundamental assertions and purposes of the people of the province of Quebec.

I think that it takes us off on a sidetrack to suggest for one minute that the "essential thrust" of the differences that we find, whether it be in Newfoundland or B.C. is of anything like the range or in any degree of the quality or importance of the problems for Confederation that arise out of the hopes and aspirations of the people of the province of Quebec.

Therefore, I would suggest—and this is, as I said earlier, only a suggestion—we should canvass more fully and with more dynamism,

the possibility of interprovincial co-operation. I do not think this need be negative. I do not think it need be jealous. I do not think it need be destructive, insofar as it relates to the proper application and future uses of the federal powers.

I do think, though, from a practical point of view, that we have room in the inter-provincial field to do things, I feel, at this particular time, we should not wait for all the legal drafting to be done. Drafting that will be required by the constitutional approach, as brought forward by the present federal Liberal administration. Nor should we be bogged down by waiting, and I think we must wait, if a total constitution is to be written, for the political winds, the political direction and the political decisions that are required and will be made, during the next few years in the province of Quebec.

That is my suggestion, Mr. Speaker—that the spirit, not necessarily the pomp and circumstance, but certainly the spirit, of the Confederation for Tomorrow conference be carried forward, either as a conference or as a conference plus ministerial committees, at the provincial level.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in his book, "Man and People", Ortega Y. Gasset concludes chapter I with these words:

It is the root of these concepts—state, nation, law, freedom, authority, collectivity, justice and the rest—that today put mortals into a frenzy. Without light on this theme, all these words represent nothing but myths. We are going to look for a little of that light. You must expect nothing more, of course. I can only give what I have. Let others who can do more, do their more, as I do my little.

Now that idea appeals to me, and I think it is rather appropriate here, because we are engaged in this debate on this very important subject. Speakers have confessed, as I do now, that we do not bring infinite wisdom to the complexities of the matter. Nonetheless, we exchange these ideas, and in the process we shed a little light on the problem.

I cannot bring very much expertise to the matter, but I have a couple of tentative ideas which I should like to express, in the hope that those members of this Legislature who are deeply concerned, and who are, perhaps, more knowledgeable than I am in this area, can give the ideas some thought, and perhaps take those ideas forward.

The other night, when I was having trouble going to sleep, I wondered if we

could not present this proposition with more rigorousness. Then I wondered if we could not formulate it in a mathematical presentation in an effort to eliminate the emotional overtones, and in an effort to maximise the intellectual consideration the existing situation—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): It is all those numbers going through the Minister's head which are keeping him awake.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I do not wonder you have difficulty sleeping.

Hon. Mr. White: —and of possible alternatives.

I did, I must say, come up with a series of equations to express the division of power between the public sector and the private sector, and within the public sector between the federal government on the one hand, and the provincial governments on the other.

If, in this series of equations, the amount of political power now in the hands of, and entrusted to the care of the provincial government of Quebec were expressed by the mathematical symbol "Q", I am going to suggest that this amount, "Q", will be in no way diminished after whatever number of conferences or discussions, or negotiations take place during the next year, or the next decade.

I think that the government of the province of Quebec will find it impossible to diminish in aggregate the power which they themselves now have, and the power which they think is essential to the perpetuation of their language and their culture.

This being the case, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we should turn our attention to a rationalization of the responsibilities and revenues apportioned to these levels of government in The British North America Act, and that we should attempt to come up with a new division of responsibilities on the one hand, and with some re-arrangement, shall I say, of revenues on the other hand.

Mr. Sopha: The Premier (Mr. Robarts) never talks that way, as far as I can—

Hon. Mr. White: I will go a little farther on this and say, if we recognize this quantity "Q" is not going to be diminished, and that the province of Quebec will retain at least the power it has today, would the provinces other than Quebec, not be wise to equate themselves with that particular level of power, *vis-à-vis* the federal government, as an alternative to opting into a variety of programmes

—co-operating in a variety of undertakings—in a way that Quebec finds impossible? In other words, are we in danger of making Quebec progressively more unique, and in the process progressively more isolated if we do things that Quebec finds impossible to do?

I am not worried, as a matter of fact, about leaving substantial amounts of power at the provincial level. I am not an expert on the subject, as is my friend from Lakeshore, but it seems to me that this does tie in with the Jeffersonian concept of democracy. It seems to me that, in a technological age with enormous governmental responsibilities and power the freedom of our people—thinking not about next year, not about 1984, but thinking about 50 or 100 years from now—I am wondering if the freedom and the liberty of our people might not best be ensured, for as far as we can see, by diversifying power throughout the ten provincial governments.

Mr. Sopha: The Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has found an ally—centralists.

Hon. Mr. White: I do not know if I understood the hon. member for Lakeshore properly or not, but I interpreted his remarks to mean that we are oversimplifying the function of government if we attempt to compartmentalize responsibilities. I quite understand that idea, and, as a matter of fact, it relates to the changes in budgeting that we are attempting here, going from a structural presentation of the estimates to a functional or programme approach to the estimates. This is *de facto* recognition that we, on this side, are aware of that aspect of the problem.

On the other hand, it must be confessed that certain of these responsibilities do fall into a vertical structure. I could give a number of examples, but let us take parks, for instance. Let us take parks, which is a relatively simple function of government. We have parks at the municipal level; parks at the provincial level; parks at the federal level. So that is a compartment, even though we recognize the imperfections of that particular approach.

In looking at that particular compartment, it may be entirely appropriate for each level of government to be providing this particular service, or it may be that this particular function should be attempted, not by three governments, but by one or two. It does seem to me to be foolish to turn Victoria park in London over to the federal government and I am not suggesting that. So my illustration probably is not well chosen.

But one must wonder if it is necessary to have provincial parks and national parks. And if it is necessary for both of these levels of government to be in this particular, very simple, provision of service. Perhaps while maintaining the aggregate amount we should shift certain responsibilities from the provincial level to the federal level and certain other federal responsibilities downwards to the provincial level.

Mr. Sopha: Which one? Name us some!

Hon. Mr. White: I am glad the member asked me that, because that brings me the second of the two ideas that I want to put before the members now.

Sorting out these responsibilities is going to be a very intricate and very complicated matter. It is one to which I think we should bring all of the ideas and all of the intellect that we can muster. That is why I join with other speakers in supporting the idea that the legislative members here be utilized in the future in a way that perhaps they have not been used in the past.

I do not know whether it should be a standing committee or a select committee, or a task force including civil servants. I just do not know what form that should take, but I do think that we legislators should be giving a great deal of thought to this and that we should attempt to make a decision before this House prorogues.

If such a committee were established, certainly those serving on it would have the opportunity of educating themselves in the legislative area in a way not unlike the educational process that took place in the select committee on taxation. And those members in turn—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A sort of *cum laude*.

An hon. member: Very *laude*.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister wants to be chairman.

Hon. Mr. White: No, I do not, I was hoping you might take that on. The members of the committee could, in turn, educate the rest of the members of the Legislature, and, indeed, the members of the public at large.

I am wondering if we should not go a step farther and try to engage the wisdom available to us from municipal councillors. I am going back once again to my imperfect illustration. I wonder if they should not be asked to express their views to us, or with us, or with us to the federal government—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Let the member do that on the local level.

Hon. Mr. White: —as to whether parks should be administered by the three levels of government, or by one or by two.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the Premier might get that advisory committee to even speak to us.

Hon. Mr. White: That idea crossed through my mind. I think it would be a tremendous source of strength to a legislative committee if one can be created.

Mr. Sopha: It is the only source he draws on.

Hon. Mr. White: But I point out, Mr. Speaker, that it cannot be done quickly, and it cannot be done without being done well. Mr. Trudeau expressed the same idea exactly in the House of Commons just a week or two ago.

Mr. Sopha: Back then it took them three years, 1864 to 1867.

Hon. Mr. White: We do run the risk of giving offence to the federal and municipal levels of government if we try to assess the role that they should be playing. This is Mr. Trudeau's concern about such a committee at the federal level—that in dealing with provincial matters they may do more harm than good.

Now here is the final thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker. We have had a continuing debate for an extended period of time, not just in this Legislature, but on podiums and platforms all over the country, and in this debate there has been some feeling of rancour develop. I think that was unavoidable, and, as a matter of fact, may have been very wise, because it has sharpened the issues and it has brought the problem to the attention—I think one could say—of every thinking Canadian. So the heat in the debate to date may have been very worth while.

We are living in a world very different from 1867 and it may be that we are going to have to adapt our attitudes to this modern world, with its instantaneous communication and enormous mobility.

I remember very well Tom Kennedy saying that politics was ever so much easier in the old days because you could tell different lies in every village in your riding. Now if the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) gives a speech in London we know right away when he says something offensive, and if I say something rude now in my place, our

federal counterparts will know this evening, no doubt, that these rude remarks have been said.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister should not give himself airs. They would never take notice of him.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I do not know. I think I am not exalting myself. I am simply saying that, with communications so instantaneous, and with the impact of television so great, I think that we in politics should exercise great personal restraint in this very difficult and very dangerous matter.

It may be that my remarks, if they were rude, would never come to the attention of the federal people. On the other hand, I think we understate our own importance in the scheme of things if we do not recognize that we have some influence and that we can do some damage if we speak thoughtlessly, or if we express antagonism which we may not feel in our heart of hearts.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I confessed when I started these brief remarks that I have not got any particular special knowledge in the field, but these are a few of the ideas that have come to me in recent months. It may be that some of the other members will be able to move those thoughts forward.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I have a question.

Does the rudeness you were talking about contemplate such phrases as "political fraud" and "Machiavellian scheme?"

Hon. Mr. White: I was thinking, Mr. Speaker, of a more recent rudeness which Mr. Munro expressed in London the day before yesterday.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, I see. It all depends on which side it comes from whether it is rude or not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): What difference does it make; the member says they do not want it?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the present Prime Minister of Canada, when he was Minister of Justice, speaking to the Canadian Bar Association on September 4, 1967, on "The Constitutional Declaration of Rights", used these words as the opening part of his address. He said:

Of all the problems that Canadian public opinion is currently concerned with, the one that is most frequently debated,

the one that brings forth the strongest expressions of view, is that of constitutional reform.

Those remarks were true then. They are just as true today. In offering a few thoughts on the matter of constitutional reform, I should like to devote my comments particularly to the entrenchment of a Bill of Rights, or a charter of human rights—a subject on which I had the privilege of speaking at the federal-provincial conference this year and last year. Perhaps I might be allowed, in opening these remarks, to set the record straight as to—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Was the Minister confused or was I?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): We are well aware of—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well the members do not have it straight apparently, from some of the comments they have made.

Mr. Sopha: I heard him too, read him in the paper.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Then the member seems to be very confused about it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well perhaps it will fill some of the vacuum that seems to exist.

Mr. Sopha: The monkeys bang their desks, but the Minister was wrong a year ago and he is wrong now.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, the hon. member is always right.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Great guy to debate with.

Mr. Sopha: I am not always right but I am never wrong.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Shades—

Mr. Sopha: Figure of speech.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Shades of Lord Haldane, I think.

In February 1968, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on that occasion and I would like to quote them very briefly, or at least a portion of them; I said:

The problems inherent in the consideration of a bill of rights for a federal system are not adapted to ease solutions. The definition and enforcement of the rights of man have been a responsibility of democratic government in every organized

society known to history and the manners of definition and enforcement are as varied as the forms of government which develop them. There are principles however, which must be considered in any analysis of any proposal for a bill of rights.

After discussing the various kinds of rights and pointing out that there were certain rights which are fundamental, which all societies, all civilized societies accept, we did go on to point out that in considering the entrenchment of rights in the constitution as an entrenched basic part of our federal in the constitution as an entrenched basic part of our federal constitution, our attitude was expressed this way:

A proposed bill of rights must be considered in the light of our system of jurisprudence and we have two in Canada, and the principles that have been demonstrated. If an entrenched bill then seems necessary and desirable, there are specific effects upon Ontario and indeed, on all provinces which must be considered.

Then, we concluded by saying:

The soul searching question of an entrenched Bill of Rights is one of the most fundamental matters which may be served to the greater advantage of Canada within the perimeter of the dialogue to which I refer, that is, the discussion of our constitution, and we look forward to pursuing a Bill of Rights by such a process, a full discussion.

And we ended by saying:

In considering a Bill of Rights it might therefore be submitted that, such a bill should be considered in the light of constitutional reform generally. Such a bill should be dealt with in the light of provincial situations with consideration for existing powers. The declaratory or other nature of such a bill should be revised in the context of the existing constitution and the important relationship between a Bill of Rights and the constitution.

And I would like to point out that gentleman, whose opening remarks in 1967 were my opening remarks today, had said something very similar to that in his discussion of the constitutional Bill of Rights. I am reading from his text entitled "Federalism and the French-Canadians" and the remarks he made about the constitution and the entrenched Bill of Rights apply not only to the province of Quebec and the French-Canadians but to all of Canada and this is what he said on that

occasion when he addressed the Canadian Bar Association:

If we agree on the general content of a constitutional Bill of Rights, a number of important questions will remain to be resolved. These will be important for everyone, but from a technical point of view, they will be of special concern to those who are trained in the law.

He was speaking to lawyers.

Should the rights be declared generally, or defined precisely with exceptions clearly specified. For example, if we guarantee freedom of speech, without qualification will this invalidate some of our laws which deal with obscenity, sedition, defamation or film censorship.

Surely one can see immediately that to simply spell out in a general statement every citizen, every person is entitled to freedom of speech, and to say nothing more, makes no provision for restraint upon defamation, slander, obscenity, the putting forward of the idea of violent destruction of systems of government, so that Mr. Trudeau, Prime Minister—then the Minister of Justice—has said, and was quite definite in saying:

You just cannot simply set forth rights without taking into account, and giving some consideration to the restraint you put upon them—

And he went on to say:

—is freedom of religion compatible with compulsory Sunday closing legislation?

That is a simple example of there being complete freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, freedom of worship. If someone chooses not to observe any restrictions on a Sunday or a sabbath, does that mean that none of our Sunday laws have any effect?

Can you put that in the charter of the constitution and say that all citizens are free to observe their religion, even to the extent of no observance of any day of rest, of any sabbath or any Sunday?

What of a constitutional guarantee of due process of law? That would be a fundamental freedom perhaps. Mr. Trudeau says that in the United States—and they have this in their constitution:

This phrase has, in the past, created many problems because of its vagueness. At times the courts have construed it so broadly as to invalidate some social legislation which we would now accept as essential. Should we avoid the possibility of such an interpretation of due process

in Canada by using a more precise term to guarantee the rule of law.

What of the right to counsel? Should the individual have a right to counsel when he is brought before the courts, before the bar of justice—is that a fundamental right? Should that be entrenched in our constitution?

Mr. Trudeau asked the question, should this right impose a duty on the government to provide counsel for those who cannot afford it? I note, from a newspaper article that I read recently, that the present Minister of Justice is considering the question as to whether the federal government should undertake to provide a right of counsel to all citizens, something which I think we may say we have largely done through our legal aid programme in Ontario for the citizens of this province.

Mr. Sopha: That is not what he means.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well it is not exactly, but it is very close to what he says.

Mr. Speaker, I observe that it is the hour of six, and I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Mr. Speaker, we will resume this debate and I am anxious that any member of the House wishing to speak in this debate has an opportunity. I think there are several other speakers who will not be called until next week, but we will pick a convenient time, and give the members notice of when it will be resumed.

Tomorrow I want to deal with the estimates of The Department of Treasury, and if they are completed in one day we have certain bills on the order paper which I would like to turn to. Perhaps we can do some legislation, too, on Friday.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

(February 21, 1969)

<i>Page</i>	<i>Column</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
1434	2	6	Change to read: question 684. The answer: 1,800 contracep-

APPENDIX

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

Question No. 8. *Mr. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) Who were the 20 persons with the highest salaries (or highest monthly payments) in the educational television branch of The Department of Education, as of May 1, 1968. What were their "titles". What was the salary of each of these persons. What were the academic, educational, and professional qualifications of each of these persons. Were the positions each of these persons occupied, advertised publicly. How many were classified as "casual employees" and who were they and how long had they been employed by The Department of Education prior to May 1, 1968. (b) Who were the 20 persons with the highest salaries (or highest monthly payments) in the curriculum division of the programme branch of The Department of Education, as of May 1, 1968. What were their "titles". What was the salary of each of these persons. What were the academic, educational and professional qualifications of each of these persons. Were the positions each of these persons occupied, advertised publicly. How many were classified as "casual employees" and who were they and how long had they been employed by The Department of Education, prior to May 1, 1968?

Answer by the Minister of Education:

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
T. R. Ide	Director	\$23,141.	Graduate, Ontario College of Education. B.A., Mount Allison University. Former Superintendent of Secondary Schools, Port Arthur. District Inspector of Secondary Schools, North Western Ontario. Teacher and Principal of the Port Arthur Collegiate Institute. Member of the Board of Governors, Ontario Teachers' Federation. Vice-Chairman, Ontario Educational Television Association. Chairman of the Ontario Teachers' Federation, Audio-Visual Committee. Member of the Canadian Teachers' Federation Advisory Committee Audio-Visual Education. Member of the Planning Committee on the Scope and Organization of the Ontario Curriculum Institute. Director of Courses on Educational Television, Ryerson Institute.	—Position not advertised. —Regular staff.

—Position not advertised since appointment was an internal promotion.

—Regular staff.

Bachelor of Education, Ontario College of Education. B.A., University of Toronto. Formerly Director of Personnel, Department of Education. Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Division, Department of Education. Director, Physical and Health Education Branch. Inspector, Department of Education. Principal, Carleton Place High School. Teacher, Bowmanville High School. Member, Strathcona Trust Committee. Executive member of the newly established Canadian Educational Television and Radio Association of Canada.

—Position not advertised.

—Employed on annual contact basis commencing February, 1965.

Educated in Worcester, England. Producer-Director, CFTO Channel 9. Executive Producer CTV's network coverage of 1963 election; Telepoll, Focus and other Public Affairs programmes. Production Assistant, CBC Toronto, including such series as Essays on Immortality, Open House, Background. Other background as actor, assistant cameraman, assistant director and director. Winner of an Ohio State Award and a Beaver award.

—Position not advertised. —appointment was an internal promotion.

—Regular staff.

M. Ed., University of Toronto. B. Ed., University of Toronto. B.A. (Hon.), University of Ottawa. B.A., University of Montreal. Founder of Elementary School Principals' Course, Queen's University. Assistant Superintendent Teacher Training, Ontario Department of Education. Superintendent of Elementary Schools in Chatham, Plantagenet, and Belle River. Principal, Casselman-Cambridge District High School. Teacher, Ottawa, Sturgeon Falls, Cornwall.

Superintendent, Education

\$22,045.

J. Ross

Superintendent, Development and Creative Services.

\$21,002.

D. J. Cook

Assistant Superintendent, Education

\$21,002.

L. F. Lacroix

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
A. M. Fotheringham	Assistant Superintendent, Education	\$19,802.	Bachelor of Education, Ontario College of Education. Academic Teaching Certificate, University of British Columbia. B.A., University of British Columbia. Education Liaison Officer, School Broadcasting Department, CBC Programme Organizer (Television), School Broadcasts Department, CBC Toronto. Programme Organizer (Radio), School Broadcasts Department, CBC Toronto. Assistant Director of School Broadcasts, British Columbia Department of Education. Teacher at Kelowna Junior-Senior High School. Principal at Dawson Creek Elementary High School.	—Position not advertised. —Regular staff.
Vera M. Good	Assistant Superintendent, Education	\$19,802.	Education Doctorate, Columbia University. M.A. (Education), Northwestern University. B.A. (Sociology), Goshen College, Indiana, and University of Western Ontario. Staff Inspector, Ontario Department of Education. Education Division, Goshen College: Teacher Education. Teacher and principal, in suburban and rural Ontario schools. Social Work in India and Pakistan. Instructor, Ontario Department of Education Summer Courses.	—Position not advertised. —appointment was an internal promotion. —Regular staff.
J. H. Syrett	Assistant Superintendent, Education	\$19,802.	Graduate of Ontario College of Education. M.A., University of Toronto. B.A., University of British Columbia. Teacher, Head of History Department, Vice-Principal and Principal at Prince Edward Collegiate Institute, Picton.	—Position not advertised. —Regular staff.

<p>Introduced television camera and closed-circuit television to this school in 1962, and video-taping in 1965. Resource person at Summer School Course for Secondary School Principals.</p>	<p>\$19,802.</p>	<p>Assistant Superintendent, Education</p>	<p>R. F. Thomas</p>	<p>—Position not advertised —appointment was an internal promotion. —Regular staff.</p>
<p>M. Ed., Ontario College of Education. B.A., Victoria College, University of Toronto. Inspector of Schools, Ontario Department of Education. Principal, RCAF Dependents' School, Marville, France, on loan from Mississauga Board of Education. Principal, Mississauga Board of Education. Teacher, elementary schools in rural Ontario and Leaside. Co-author, "Creative English Grade Seven".</p>	<p>\$18,680.</p>	<p>Superintendent, Administration and Operations</p>	<p>K. J. Holen</p>	<p>—Position not advertised. —Employed on an annual contract commencing May, 1965.</p>
<p>Bachelor of Applied Science (Engineering Physics), University of Toronto. Registered Professional Engineer. Sales Manager Educational and Broadcast Equipment, Canadian General Electric Company.</p>	<p>\$17,793.</p>	<p>Assistant Superintendent, Engineering</p>	<p>P. Bowers</p>	<p>—Position advertised. —Regular staff.</p>
<p>Educated Columbia University. Script Writer in films, television and radio for the National Film Board, Ontario Teachers' Federation, United Church of Canada, and CBC-TV. Consultant on CBC series on Canada's Far North, radio adaptations for School Broadcast Department.</p>	<p>\$17,610.</p>	<p>Assistant Superintendent, Creative Services</p>	<p>E. Moser</p>	<p>—Position not advertised. —appointment was an internal promotion. —Employed on an annual contract commencing April, 1967.</p>

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
E. Moser—Continued			Executive Producer for "GM Presents", "Show of the Week", and "Playdate". Story Editor for Matinee Theatre, and Kraft Television Theatre, NBC, New York. Script Editor for major motion picture companies and on Broadway productions.	
F. W. Hyder	General Co-ordinator Utilization	\$17,036.	Graduate, Hamilton Teachers' College. B.A., McMaster University. Acting Superintendent, Port Arthur Public School System. Vice-Principal, Lakehead Teachers' College. Master, Hamilton Teachers' College. Teacher in Hamilton. Established Reserve Technical Training Plan for High School Students, R.C.A.F. Auxiliary.	—Position advertised. —Regular staff.
D. C. Torney	Education Supervisor	\$16,620.	Working towards B.A. at Carleton and York Universities. Vocational Specialists' Certificate (Type A). Taught Type B Vocational Course at VOFT OCE Summer School. Technical Director of Bell High School, Ottawa. Teacher, Rideau High School, Ottawa. Design Draftsman, Applied Physics Laboratory of National Research Council. Acting, directing and lighting experience with Canadian Repertory Theatre, Ottawa Little Theatre, Lakeside Theatre Productions, Ottawa.	—Position not advertised. —seconded from municipal system.
D. K. Crowdis	Assistant Superintendent, Education	\$16,071.	B. Sc., Dip. Ed., B.A., Dalhousie University. Graduate work, Columbia University Teachers' College. Dip. Museum Administration, Buffalo Museum of Science.	—Position not advertised. —Regular staff.

Associate Director, Centennial Centre of Science and Technology.
 Director, Nova Scotia Museum.
 Curator, Provincial Museum of Nova Scotia.
 Teacher and Vice-Principal, Junior High School, Halifax.
 Host, writer and performer on CBC radio and television shows.
 Consultant for two pavilions at Expo '67 and for several museums in Nova Scotia.

—Position advertised.
 —Regular staff.

Permanent Secondary School Principal's Certificate.
 Graduate, Ontario College of Education.
 B.A., University of Toronto.
 Principal, Metz Senior School, France, on loan to Department of National Defence.
 Principal, Schreiber High School.
 Teacher and Assistant Principal, Kirkland Lake College and Vocational Institute.

—Position not advertised.
 —appointment was an internal promotion.
 —Regular staff.

Inspector of Public Schools Certificate.
 Master of Education, University of Toronto.
 B.A. (Modern History), University of Toronto.
 High School Assistant Type A (History).
 Elementary Teaching Certificate, North Bay Teachers' College.
 Master at Toronto Teachers' College and Lakeshore Teachers' College.
 History Teacher, North Bay.
 Teacher and Principal in Ontario elementary schools.
 Principal of Primary Methods, Summer Courses.

—Position not advertised.
 —secondment from municipal system.

B.A., University of Manitoba and one year graduate work in History.
 Department Head of History, Central Peel Secondary School, Brampton.
 Teacher, Hammarskjold High School, Port Arthur.

\$14,571.

Education Supervisor

O. B. Fasan

\$14,500.

Education Supervisor

T. L. Bamford

\$14,450.

Education Supervisor

J. Hanley

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
F. Ebos	Education Supervisor	\$13,440.	Master of Science, (Pure Mathematics and Computer Science), McMaster University. Bachelor of Science, McMaster University. High School Specialists Certificate in Mathematics. Head of Mathematics, Delta Secondary School, Hamilton. Teacher at Barton Secondary School, Hamilton, and Experimental Grade 13, Hamilton. Winner of a number of awards including a National Research Council Scholarship.	—Position not advertised. —secondment from municipal system.
P. Larose	Supervising Producer (French)	\$13,000.	Bachelor of Sciences, University of Ottawa. Post Graduate Courses, in Climatology and Anthropology. Producer, CBC Ottawa, Public Affairs and News. Production Assistant, CBC Ottawa and 2 years Government of Canada.	—Position advertised. —Employed on an annual contract commencing March, 1968.
R. G. Dexter	Operations Manager	\$13,050.	Working toward B. Comm. Assistant Director, Assistant to Supervisor of Production, Company Auditor with Seaway Films. Administrator of Neptune Theatre, Halifax. Production Manager and Construction Supervisor, Neptune Theatre, Halifax. Technical and production operations, CBC, Toronto.	—Position advertised. —Employed on an annual contract commencing July, 1967.

CURRICULUM SECTION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
I. J. F. Kinlin	Superintendent of Curriculum	\$23,141.	B.A. (Honours Maths and Physics). B. Paed. (Honours). Elementary School Teaching Certificate. High School Specialist Certificate in Maths and Physics.	—Not advertised —filled from within Department. —Regular staff.

High School Principal's Certificate.
 Elementary School Inspector's Certificate.
 Teacher and principal in rural elementary schools.
 Secondary school teacher and Department Head at
 Ottawa Technical High School.
 Elementary and secondary school inspector, Department of Education.
 Master, London Teachers' College.
 Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Section.
 Member, Minister's Policy and Development Council.
 Regional Superintendent, Department of Education.
 President, Ontario School Inspectors' Association.
 Executive member, Ontario Mathematics Commission.

2. A. T. Carnahan

Group Chairman,
 Curriculum Section

\$22,045.

B.A. (Honours Geography).
 B.Ed., University of Toronto.
 M.A., University of Western Ontario.
 Elementary School Teaching Certificate.
 High School Specialist Certificate in Geography.
 Audio-Visual Certificate.
 Elementary school teacher, Oxford and Grey Counties.
 Secondary school teacher, Sarnia, Owen Sound.
 Department Head, Etobicoke Collegiate.
 Master, London Teachers' College.
 Secondary School Inspector, Department of Education.
 Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Section.
 Chairman, Education Committee of Canadian Association of Geographers.
 Member, Ontario Geography Teachers' Association.

—Not advertised—filled internally by promotion.

—Regular staff.

3. J. K. Crossley

Group Chairman,
 Curriculum Section

\$22,045.

B.A., McMaster University.
 M.Ed., University of Toronto.
 Elementary School Teaching Certificate.
 Elementary Certificate in Agriculture.

—Not advertised—filled internally by promotion.

CURRICULUM SECTION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
3. J. K. Crossley—Continued			Elementary School Inspector's Certificate. Teacher and principal of elementary schools in Thessalon, Port Colborne and St. Catharines. Elementary school inspector, Department of Education. Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Section. Member, Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education.	—Regular staff.
4. G. A. Kaye	Group Chairman, Curriculum Section	\$22,045.	B.A. (Honours Maths), University of Toronto. High School Specialist Certificate, Mathematics. High School Specialist Certificate, Physical Education. Secondary School Principal's Certificate. Secondary school teacher and Department Head, Walkerton D. H. S. and Downsview Collegiate. Secondary school inspector, Department of Education. Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum Section. Lecturer, Ontario College of Education. President, Ontario Association of Teachers' of Mathematics.	—Not advertised—filled internally by promotion. —Regular staff.
5. C. H. Williams	Group Chairman, Curriculum Section	\$22,045.	B.A. (Honours English), McMaster University. High School Specialist Certificate in English. Secondary School Principal's Certificate. Secondary school teacher in Brantford, Toronto and Etobicoke. Co-ordinator of English, Forest Hill Village. Director, Information Branch, Department of Education. Member, Minister's Policy and Development Council. Consultant to C.B.C. in educational television. Member of Board of Governors of Ontario Educational Association.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.

6. F. J. Clute	Assistant Superintendent, of Curriculum	\$21,002.	B.A. (Honours English and Psychology), University of Western Ontario. Elementary and Secondary School Teachers' Certificates. Auxiliary Education Certificate. Specialist in Guidance. Secondary School Principal's Certificate. Elementary and secondary school teacher. Director of Guidance Services, Welland. Curriculum Specialist, Department of Education.	—Not advertised—filled internally by promotion. —Regular staff.
7. W. W. Coulthard	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002.	B.A. (Honours History), University of Western Ontario. B.Ed., University of Toronto. M.Ed., University of Toronto. High School Specialist Certificate in History. Secondary School Principal's Certificate. Type B, Certificate in Guidance. Foreign Service Officer, Government of Canada. Secondary school teacher, Department Head, and Vice-Principal, Woodstock, North York, Etobicoke. Secondary school inspector.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.
8. Dorothy D. Dunn	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002.	B.A. (Ottawa). M.A. (England). B.Paed. (Toronto). Elementary and Secondary School Teaching Certificates. Primary Certificate. High School Principal's Certificate. Elementary School Inspector's Certificate. Elementary and secondary school teacher, Ottawa. Lecturer, Carleton College. Inspector, Department of Education.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.
9. H. W. Cyr	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002.	B.A. and M.A., University of Ottawa (History). B.Paed., University of Montreal and University of Toronto. Elementary and Secondary School Teaching Certificates.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.

CURRICULUM SECTION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
9. H. W. Cry—Continued			Specialist Certificate in Guidance. Elementary School Inspector's Certificate. Elementary and secondary school teacher. Elementary school inspector, Department of Education. Lecturer, University of Ottawa. Advisor to Hall-Dennis Committee. Member of the Minister's Committee on the French-language secondary schools. Member, Association canadienne des Educateurs de langue française.	
10. L. J. Dupuis	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002.	B. Comm. M.A. (English and History). M.Ed., University of Toronto. Elementary and Secondary School Teaching Certificates. Elementary School Inspector's Certificate. Elementary and secondary school teacher, Ottawa. Department Head. Elementary school inspector, Department of Education.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.
11. R. C. Fobert	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002.	B.A., Ottawa. Elementary and Secondary School Teacher's Certificates. Specialist Certificate in Guidance. Secondary school teacher, Ottawa, Cornwall. Separate school inspector.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.
12. C. D. Gaitskell	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002.	B.A. and M.A., University of British Columbia. D.Paed., University of Toronto. Elementary and Secondary School Teacher's Certificate. Specialist in Art Education. High School Principal's Certificate.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.

- Teacher, principal and Supervisor of Art in British Columbia.
 Director of Art, Department of Education.
 Editor, Curriculum Bulletin.
 Director of UNESCO Seminar on Visual Art Education.
 Founding President, Canadian Society for Education Through Art.
 Winner of Centennial Metal.
13. R. A. Jackman Assistant Superintendent \$21,002.
 B.A. (Honours Modern Languages), University of Toronto.
 M.A., University of Toronto.
 High School Specialist Certificate in French and German.
 Type B Certificate in Art.
 Secondary school teacher and Department Head, North York.
 Lecturer, Ontario College of Education.
 —Not advertised.
 —Regular staff.
14. A. M. Lawson Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum \$21,002.
 B.A. (Honours Household Economics), University of Toronto.
 M.Sc., Iowa State University.
 High School Specialist Certificate in Home Economics.
 Supervisor of Nutrition, Ontario Department of Agriculture.
 Secondary school teacher, Fort Frances, Fort William Burlington.
 Master, London Teachers' College.
 Secondary school inspector, Department of Education.
 —Not advertised—filled internally.
 —Regular staff.
15. G. M. MacMartin Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum \$21,002
 B.A., Queen's University.
 B.P.E., McMaster University.
 B.Ed., University of Toronto.
 Elementary and Secondary School Teacher's Certificates.
 Specialist Certificate in Physical Education.
 Secondary School Principal's Certificate.
 —Not advertised.
 —Regular staff.

CURRICULUM SECTION

Name	Title	Salary	Academic, educational and professional qualifications	Remarks
15. G. M. MacMartin—Continued			Secondary school teacher, Department Head, Vice-Principal, and Co-ordinator of Physical Education, Etobicoke. Lecturer at O.C.E. and McArthur College summer school.	
16. W. D. A. McCuaig	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002	B.A., Queen's University. M.Ed., University of Toronto. Elementary and Secondary School Teacher's Certificates. Elementary School Principal's Certificate. Elementary school teacher and principal, Red Lake. Teacher, University of Toronto Schools. Inspector of Public Schools, Cochrane and Owen Sound. Master, Pre Teachers' College Summer Course.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.
17. I. G. McHaffie	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002	B.A. and M.A. (Classics), University of Toronto. High School Specialist Certificate in Classics. Secondary School Principal's Certificate. Secondary school teacher and Department Head, Etobicoke and Scarborough. Inspector of Schools, Department of Education. Program Consultant, Department of Education.	—Not advertised—filled internally, by promotion. —Regular staff
18. L. W. Steele	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002	B.Sc. (Honours Chemistry) Carleton University. High School Specialist Certificate in Physics and Chemistry. High School Specialist in Physical Education. Secondary School Principal's Certificate. Secondary school teacher and Department Head, Hamilton and North York. Secondary school inspector, Department of Education. Member, National Science Teachers' Association. Councillor, Science Teachers' Association of Ontario.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.

19. J.-M. Tessier	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002	B.A., University of Ottawa. Elementary and Secondary School Teacher's Certificates. Specialist in French Language and Literature. Elementary and secondary school teacher, Head of Department, Vice-Principal. Master, University of Ottawa Teacher's College. Secondary school inspector, Department of Educa- tion. Member, Association des Enseignants Franco- Ontariens (Past President).	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.
20. P. F. Wiseman	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum	\$21,002	B.A., University of Western Ontario. B.Ed. and M.Ed., University of Toronto. Elementary School Teacher's Certificate. Elementary School Inspector's Certificate. Elementary school teacher, vice-principal and principal. Inspector of Schools, Department of Education. Instructor, Elementary School Principal's Course.	—Not advertised—filled internally. —Regular staff.

N.B. "Position not advertised"

Prior to October, 1967, the department adhered to a policy of selecting officers from among qualified educationists teaching in the Province. This procedure provided that professional educators in Ontario were considered for positions for which they were eligible. Beginning in October 1967 it was decided that the growing complexity and number of specialties in the education system might cause suitable candidates to be overlooked, and the policy was changed to provide for public advertisement of all opportunities.

Question No. 15. *Mr. De Monte*—Enquiry of the Ministry—1, (a) How many claims were appealed by claimants to the Review Committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968; (b) How many claims were appealed by claimants to the Appeal Tribunals of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968; (c) How many claims were appealed by claimants to the Full Board of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968. 2. (a) How many appeals were allowed by the Review Committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968; (b) How many appeals were allowed by the Appeal Tribunals of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968; (c) How many appeals were allowed by the Full Board of the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968. 3. What is the average waiting time of the claimant to proceed through the full appeal structure of the Workmen's Compensation Board. 4. What is the percentage relationship between administrative cost and compensation paid by the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Answer by the Minister of Labour:—There were 379,227 claims reported to The Workmen's Compensation Board in 1968.

1. (a) During 1968 the review committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board considered 4,757 appeals.

It must be pointed out that less than 50 per cent of the appeals before the review committee were appeals with respect to the original allowance of a claim.

(b) During the same period the appeal tribunal dealt with 1,381 cases.

(c) The board during 1968 held 301 hearings.

2. (a) The review committee wholly allowed 1,020 appeals, and partially allowed 66.

(b) The appeal tribunal wholly allowed 561 and partially allowed 50.

(c) The board wholly allowed 133; partially allowed 15.

3. To proceed through the appeal structure of the board, providing nothing intervened such as postponements at the request of the parties appealing, it would take on the average approximately eight weeks; one week for the Review Committee, three weeks for the Appeal Tribunal to hear the further appeal, and four weeks for the Board.

4. The administrative cost of the Workmen's Compensation Board according to our latest figures was 7 per cent. The injured workman in compensation and medical aid costs received 89.2 per cent of every dollar received by the Board; 3.8 per cent was spent on safety education, and 7 per cent on administration.

Question No. 16. *Mr. Shulman*—Enquiry of the Ministry—How many aluminum poles have been erected by The Department of Highways since April 23, 1968. How many concrete poles have been erected by The Department of Highways since April 23, 1968.

Answer by the Minister of Highways:—Since April 23, 1968, The Department of Highways has erected 268 aluminum poles and 215 steel poles. All the steel and aluminum poles have break-away base designs.

Since the same date 745 concrete poles have been erected. Of this number, 412 are located well away from traffic or are in urban areas with low speeds. 307 of the concrete poles are protected by a flex-beam guard rail system. 26 poles have been placed with no protection in such areas as channelizations and are to be protected during the coming summer.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 6, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 6, 1969

Presenting reports, Mr. MacNaughton and Mr. Welch	1917
Eighth report, standing private bills committee	1917
Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading	1917
Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968, statement by Mr. McKeough	1917
Local construction union, questions to Mr. Wishart and Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Reilly	1917
Offshore mineral resources, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. MacDonald	1921
Helicopter rescues of fishermen, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Burr	1921
Assessors of Ontario government, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Pilkey	1921
Smelt fishing, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Knight	1921
Export of raw materials, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Stokes	1922
Town of Trenton, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Pitman	1922
Estimates, Department of Treasury and Economics, Mr. MacNaughton	1922
Recess, 6 o'clock	1955

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1969

The House met today at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.
Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests in the galleries today are, in the east gallery, students from Norwood Park Public School, Hamilton; and in both galleries, from Weston Collegiate Institute, Weston.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) presented the reports of the ten regional development councils.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) presented the following reports:

1. The annual report for 1968 of the Ontario Energy Board.
2. The annual report for 1968 of The Ontario Department of Public Works.
3. The report of the Minister of The Department of Correctional Services for the year ending March 31, 1968.
4. The annual report of 1968 of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East), from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's eighth report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Carlton University.

Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Banks Alignment Limited.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Co-ordinated Arts Services.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TAX REDUCTION ACT, 1968

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill in-

titled, An Act to amend The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) announced in his most progressive and forward-looking Budget—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that residential property tax reduction would be continued in 1969, as a short-run measure to relieve the pressure of local taxation on the individual shareholder—

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): That is right, shareholder!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The system will continue in the same manner—

An hon. member: Shareholder in Ontario!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that is the way we look at it—shareholders in Ontario.

The system will continue in the same manner as in 1968, with the exception of the amendments I am proposing today. There are two main amendments. One confirms the eligibility of Crown properties, and the other introduces a requirement for a minimum payment of 50 per cent of the taxes on each eligible property.

The amendment concerning Crown properties covers eligibility for 1968 as well as for 1969. This follows consultation with the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) and with the federal Minister of Finance. The eligibility of these properties is in accord with their wishes as well as my own.

Ontario Housing Corporation tenants were given the benefit of tax reduction at the end of 1968, in conjunction with the decision to introduce this amendment.

Throughout Ontario, there are about 20,000 households under provincial ownership and about 10,000 under federal ownership. The amendment to provide a minimum payment

of 50 per cent is in accord with the suggestions of the Ontario committee on taxation which report read as follows:

A residence of any value does create demands for local services. Although we want to prevent undue taxation on modest properties, we would not like to give anyone complete tax relief.

It did not seem practical to consider this qualification at the time the tax reduction system was introduced in the spring of 1968. We were proposing then a completely new system without precedent anywhere, and we were asking the co-operation of municipalities in passing the benefits of the system from the province to the individual taxpayer.

In our view, it would have been unreasonable at that stage—and probably detrimental to the system as a whole—to require municipalities to take on the task of administering a 50 per cent minimum.

Once the system became operative, however, it was practical to consider a minimum. We endorse the principle of participation by every household in paying for local services. Therefore, since it is now feasible to administer a minimum, I am proposing this amendment. It means that no property will be totally exempt from local taxation on account of the tax reduction system.

On the other hand, the principle is maintained of providing a substantial measure of relief from the regressive burden of the property tax. In each case, the tax reduction shall not exceed 50 per cent of the tax levied. To cite an obvious example, this will apply to a large number of summer cottages some of which were totally exempted in 1968.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Including Governor Romney?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The same equalization factor will be used in 1969 as in 1968, with certain exceptions such as municipalities that have just been reassessed. In other words, if a municipality were to have the same mill rate in 1969 as it had last year, the amount of tax reduction applying to an individual household will be the same. If the mill rate goes up, the amount of tax reduction will also go up.

A thorough examination of the operation of the tax reduction system in 1968 has demonstrated that its other provisions should continue without changes.

The difficulties that were encountered by a number of tenants and landlords at the end of the year have been widely publicized, and some individuals have tended to exaggerate

the significance of these cases in the overall picture. These complications were anticipated from the beginning, and I would be totally irresponsible as a Minister of the Crown if I permitted them to overshadow the fact that more than \$100 million is being provided to some two million Ontario householders in order to ease the burden of property taxation.

The system has proved in practice to be what we intended it to be—the best available method of easing the burden of property taxes on both owned and rented households, and of attacking the regressive nature of the property tax.

There were bound to be a number of misunderstandings and difficulties in the first year. There will be fewer in 1969. No other method now available could do the job as well as this system. In the future, as the Treasurer has indicated, another method will become available. It will be possible to achieve the desired benefits in a more direct manner.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It is available now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The new personal income tax system, which the provincial government plans to establish, will have the flexibility to channel property tax relief directly back to all taxpayers, including both home owners and tenants.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder, since you have permitted the Minister to give us an introductory statement considerably beyond explaining the provisions of the bill, if you would permit me to ask, by way of clarification, whether or not the Minister considered abolishing the second payment to those people who are receiving the payment on summer properties, as well as their basic shelter.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The leader of the Opposition is referring to cottages, and I think we have explained this on a number of occasions. If he would go to his county of Brant and consult with the local assessment commissioner, he will find that the local assessment roll, which is the most practical vehicle that can be used, both last year and this year, does not indicate that your house, for example, is your permanent residence or whether your permanent residence is at the Royal York Hotel. Or in my case, that my permanent residence is in Chatham or here, or at some cottage which I do not own.

That vehicle, that method of administration of deciding what is a cottage, what is a

permanent residence, what is your primary residence, is simply not available. I explained that to the hon. leader of the Opposition last year, but perhaps he has forgotten.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. Minister would permit me, by way of further clarification, to draw to his attention that the method is available if in fact, we were going to do it by way of tax credit.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is entitled to ask for clarification from the Minister, not endeavour himself to clarify the Minister's statement.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask, Mr. Speaker, would you not say in your judgment that his statement on first reading was considerably more than just a clarification of the principles introduced?

Mr. T. Reid: Right, let us have equal fair play.

Mr. Speaker: I would say this, that I believe it is in the interests of all the members to have a proper statement from a member or a Minister introducing a bill. At the moment I must say that while some of the statements included in the Minister's statement might have been unnecessary, by and large I think the statement was a good one for the information of the members, even if it did not clear up the controversial parts which will be debated, I presume, on second reading and later this session.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. Minister a question? Did he say this 50 per cent applied to hunting lodges on Crown land as well?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the property were on Crown land they would not be paying municipal taxes. Presumably that is the burden of the member's question I think what the member is driving at is properties in unorganized territories, which do not pay municipal taxes.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He is number four now, he does not try at all. If he were number three—

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, will the amendment provide the grant to the owners of properties that were purchased from Hydro, which they did not receive last year? Will this amendment encompass that property?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Minister has answered the member.

Before the orders of the day I would like to draw to the members' attention that we have further guests, of whose presence I was not previously advised, and we are always delighted to welcome the ladies. We have ladies from the Scarborough East Provincial Liberal Association in Mr. Speaker's gallery, and I am sure we are glad to see the girls here.

Before the orders of the day, I regret to advise the members that the chairman of the committee of the whole House has been suddenly taken ill and he has requested, and I have concurred in it, that with the concurrence of the members of the House, the hon. member for Carleton East (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) take his place as chairman of the committee for today or until the hon. member returns; to be spelled as usual by some other member. Would this receive the approval of the members of the House?

Thank you.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General:

Is the Attorney General going to institute an investigation into charges made by Metro Police Chief James Mackey concerning a local construction union, allegedly headed by criminals, using arson and sabotage to force contractors to sign agreements and compel their employees to join the union?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a related question.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a two-part question:

Can the Attorney General report to the House on the allegation made yesterday by Police Chief Mackey regarding alleged arson and sabotage against building contractors by an unnamed union?

What explanation, or justification, is there for the chief law enforcement officer of Metro Toronto sounding off in this fashion instead of laying charges against those whom he believes to be responsible for illegal acts?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Eglinton has a similar question, which he will now place please.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I have actually addressed it to the Minister of Labour.

Is the Minister of Labour aware of the conditions reported by Wilfred List in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* this morning, involving a local construction union, reportedly headed by criminals who use arson and sabotage to force contractors to sign collective agreements and compel their employees to join the union? If so, is he planning to take necessary action to prevent these violations of law? Does he plan a formal investigation or enquiry into these allegations?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Attorney General might answer, so far as he can, the questions directed to him and then the Minister of Labour might perhaps wish to comment.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there were several questions, I prepared one answer, which I think may cover them all.

Chief Mackey made his comments upon information which is known to him but which had not been drawn to my attention. From his public comment, it is obvious that this is a matter which is under a thorough investigation in Metropolitan Toronto by his own police force. If it has any implication to areas outside the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Toronto police force, I am sure that the appropriate law enforcement agency will be fully informed by police officers in the usual way in order that exhaustive police investigations may be pursued.

The Crown Attorney for Metropolitan Toronto is available to Chief Mackey and his force, for any assistance and advice that may be required.

I do not propose instituting any further investigations at this time because I have every confidence that the Metropolitan force is entirely competent to pursue the investigation in Toronto.

If the ramifications of the subject matter extend beyond that force, and require some intervention by my department, then the local force will certainly notify my advisors so that we may take any necessary action at that time.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that I have made arrangements through my department to ensure that I will be advised on the matter as it progresses, although I am not instituting any special investigation.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Attorney General if in fact he is aware that this matter is under careful investigation, or is he just assuming that it is?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am aware that it is.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General could be persuaded to reply to my second question, as to what explanation or justification there is for the chief law officer sounding off in this fashion, rather than laying charges in the normal way?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I did not discuss the matter with Chief Mackey. I would not propose to give his reasons for giving such publicity to this matter as he did. I have noticed, however, that since this publicity, since his announcement and information which he gave as published, a good many people have started to talk. Perhaps he had reasons. But I do not think it is for me to say what those reasons were. Certainly a good number of people have started to talk about this matter and perhaps there is some merit in that.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the Attorney General, if this is the way the police normally get the evidence in a case?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member is awfully sensitive.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I am not sensitive. If I may preface my comments, Mr. Speaker. Many times we have had it decried in this House about innuendoes—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Instead of specific charges—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has asked a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The question, as I recall, was: "Is this the normal way the police get their information?" No one has suggested that that is all the information that is at hand or that the chief of police has. I would not say that this is a normal way to get information but perhaps this is one way that some information may come to light.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Would the hon. Minister of Labour care to enlarge on the question addressed to him in connection with this matter?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think this matter has been properly dealt with by the Attorney General. I had prepared a simple statement along the same line, that the information had apparently been reported to the police since it involved matters that came under The Criminal Code. This is the appropriate procedure and their

investigation properly lies within the jurisdiction of the police. I would not want to say anything further at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has further questions?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Was the recent decision of Prime Minister Trudeau regarding offshore mineral resources administration lines, the result of consultation with the provinces or unilateral action by the federal government?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, these proposals for administrative lines were put forward by the federal government last November. It is just recently that we have received the detailed information of what is involved. These details are presently under study by the province and by the provinces concerned, so that it was not a unilateral action, but we will make our comments about them in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has a question of the Prime Minister?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Prime Minister.

Who pays the costs involved in the annual helicopter rescues of fishermen stranded on ice in Ontario lakes and rivers?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any detailed information as to who pays these costs. I do not know how many annual helicopter rescues there are. I think it would be fair to say that the first reaction is to do the rescue and then I suppose the payment comes after that.

Very often the air rescue crews are used from Trenton. These are aircraft and helicopters supplied by The Department of National Defence and I really could not tell you whether or not the costs are charged to those people involved. We do not operate helicopters other than by charter in The Department of Lands and Forests and I do not think they have ever been used for winter operations. They have occasionally in the summer time.

If the provincial police request a helicopter from a commercial service, then they would assume that cost themselves. My information is that they would deal with it in terms of what use was made of the machine. If there was an opportunity to charge it back they would do so. In some cases there might not be an opportunity so to do.

Sometimes these helicopters are provided by news services and how they charge them, or who eventually pays for them under those circumstances, I do not know. There is a wide variety of circumstances under which these rescues are handled. As there is no fixed procedure by this government to take part in such rescues, it is rather difficult to give any more precise answer than that.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary? I wonder if the Prime Minister is aware that on Monday afternoon for about five hours near Point Pelee there were 40 fishermen stranded. Eventually, aircraft came from about 200 miles away in Michigan and helped, Trenton too was considering sending help. Would the aircraft from Michigan perhaps bill the OPP? Is that possible?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am not aware of this incident. If the member had asked me about it specifically I could have got some information. But I cannot see any responsibility on the OPP to pay for the aircraft. I do not know who ordered them, how they got there, or under what circumstances they were there—whether they were chartered or who took the responsibility in asking them to take part. I simply do not have any information. But as a matter of course, I cannot see that the OPP would accept any responsibility for it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer.

What are the salary scales applicable to assessors working for the Ontario government?

Two, what fringe benefits do the assessors employed by the provincial government receive?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the Ontario government does not at present employ anyone in the position of assessor. Qualified assessors working for the government are employed in a supervisory capacity and do not perform general assessment duties.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur has a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Is a licence required for smelt fishing in the province?

Second, if so, what is the cost of the licence and third, how much revenue does the Minister expect to receive from the cost of the licences during 1969?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, yes a licence is required. The present \$3 angling licence covers fishing for smelts, provided the net used is less than 6 ft. by 6 ft. If a net is larger than 6 ft. by 6 ft., the licence fee is \$1 for residents and \$5 for non-residents.

A person who is fishing for smelts only and has one of the special licences does not require the \$3 angling licence.

It is assumed that the revenue from these special licences will be about the same as last year—\$21,766.50 for the non-resident licence and \$3,493.50 for the resident's licence.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has a question of this Minister.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

How many suspensions of timber licences have been imposed during the period 1900 to 1969, under the legislation enacted in the year 1900 and continued to date in The Crown Timber Act providing for the embargo on export of raw materials?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, our department has no record of any breach of the requirements of that legislation.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary?

In view of the legislation that was passed in 1900, it seems that any shipment of raw material out of the country was in violation of this Act until 1952, when it could have been permitted by an Order in Council. Would the Minister not agree that any shipment of raw material from the forest products industries up to the year 1952 was in violation of this statute?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we have checked our records and for the last 20 years we have no knowledge, as I just mentioned, of any breach or violations. Prior to that time, we have not been able to find anything in our records.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary then, it is quite obvious that there were some violations. Would the Minister not agree that from the year 1900, at which time this legis-

lation was passed, until the change in 1952, that there were violations under this Act?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, as I have just told the hon. member, we have no record of any breach or violations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. W. A. Pitman (Peterborough): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Has the Minister decided what appropriate action he will take in regard to the purported legal actions by the town of Trenton under section 248 (a) of The Municipal Act, as described by the Minister on December 20, 1968, *Hansard*, page 942, and admitted in the press by responsible officials?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, no, I have not decided. I hope to be able to make a statement in the House in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Pitman: In view of the statement of the mayor that, "what we have been doing to attract industry has been illegal"; and in the same statement, "I would do the same thing tomorrow"; would the Minister not agree that indeed illegal actions are taking place, have been taking place and that some action is probably appropriate?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that the hon. member is not a rate-payer in Trenton because then he could lay charges rather than just make accusations.

Mr. Pitman: They are self-accused.

Mr. MacDonald: They are waiting for yet another violation.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 23rd order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND ECONOMICS

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of the estimates of The Department of Treasury and Economics in the last session of the Legislature, less than eight months ago, we spent a considerable part of the first day debating the momentous question as to whether the traditions of the House permitted

hon. members to shed their jackets. Today I am pleased that our discussion will take place in a decorous atmosphere with conventional dress and without television lights to add heat to our surroundings.

I would also imagine that the presentation of the budget this week will have clarified for the hon. members the heavy programme that will face my department and the Treasury board secretariat in implementing our fiscal framework for the future. These estimates reflect the professional requirements to carry out this programme.

I will forego the opportunity of commenting today on the economic situation and outlook which I believe has been dealt with adequately in Budget paper "A" among the papers tabled earlier. Similarly, I believe that I need say little about the government's overall financial situation and programme of tax structure reform. Rather, I should like to speak briefly about the organization and some of the recent major activities of The Department of Treasury and Economics. I will then deal with the activities of the Treasury board and its secretariat.

The Department of Treasury and Economics was created only seven and one half months ago on July 23, 1968, when Royal assent was given to An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act. This legislation formally joined, in a single department, the central finance and economics functions of the Ontario government. Since that time, we have exerted great efforts towards making this marriage a fruitful one. One of the results to date has been the Budget statement papers for 1969.

The preparation of this Budget was the result of the new department functioning as it should, with other departments of government providing valuable contributions to the total budgetary process. The prior decisions taken, which were essential to the major outlines of the Budget, were in a very real sense the product of the new organization and its input to the Cabinet committee on policy development.

During the late summer and the autumn, the Cabinet committee put in long hours discussing the aggregate constraints and guidelines for budgetary expenditures, in a global and a particular sense, and the options available for taxation reform. The statement of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) on regional government in December was one result of this process, the approach taken by the government during the federal-provincial fiscal discussions in the

autumn was another, the contributions of Ontario to the federal-provincial constitutional review yet another, and this year's Budget statement and papers a fourth result.

During the coming year, the Cabinet committee will be kept increasingly busy by the activities of my department as position papers are sent to it regarding economic policy, priorities and guidelines—matters which are inter-related with the work of virtually every department of government—regional development plans, and approaches to the complex world of federal-provincial-municipal relationships, particularly as they concern the distribution of powers. Increasingly, in the years to come, the Budget and the expenditures which it portrays will be the instrument, both in timing and location, through which a co-ordinated government programme for the economic and social development of the province will be translated into specific action.

Presiding over the pre-natal period and, more recently, the first months in the development of a new organization has been an enormously stimulating experience for me. I have watched the intellectual interaction and contrasting approaches in method of the economists and social scientists who came to us from The Department of Economics and Development, the accountants and financial management staff from the former Treasury Department, and the systems and programme analysts and others who form the staff of the Treasury board secretariat.

I have been extremely happy about the creative manner in which relationships have developed. In the sphere of financial information and management, we have been developing accounting systems which are geared to the needs of the planning-programming-budgeting system, the financial community, and the economists.

Proposals have arisen from a series of meetings which will enable us to arrive at a system combining the long-range requirements of "programme budgeting and management by objective" with the need to maintain short-run flexibility, in order that our financial affairs can be sensitive to the changing requirements of the economic situation and the federal-provincial framework.

At times, it is not always easy to separate my responsibilities as Treasurer and Minister of Economics with those as chairman of the Treasury board. This, however, merely confirms the close relationship that should exist between those functions and, I am happy to say, we are heading in the same direction in both realms.

Since the appointment of the Minister of Revenue, an effective set of relationships has been worked out between The Department of Revenue, responsible for tax administration, and The Department of Treasury and Economics, responsible for tax policy. The technical expertise and knowledge of tax collection and tax administration in The Department of Revenue have resulted in many valuable proposals for tax changes, which have then been evaluated in The Department of Treasury and Economics and brought in, where desirable, to the overall taxation policy package.

Similarly, close relations have been developed with other departments in dealing with problems affecting economic or budgetary policy. During the course of the year, there have been countless meetings with The Department of Municipal Affairs on such varied subjects as provincial-municipal relations, municipal finance, assessment procedures, regional government, community planning and regional development, bilingualism in the municipalities, federal-provincial relations on matters of urban planning and housing, the designation of growth points and many other subjects.

At one point during the year, certain members of the staff of Municipal Affairs were heard to say that they spent more time in the offices of The Department of Treasury and Economics than they did in their own building.

Turning more specifically to the estimates, may I sketch, very briefly, for the hon. members the organization of the department. Traditionally, the broad term "Treasury" in the Ontario government has referred to the tax collection operations of the government, expenditure control and co-ordinating functions of the Treasury board and Treasury board secretariat, and overall financial policy, taxation policy, money management and central accounting.

With The Department of Revenue assuming responsibility for tax collection and tax administration, the economic research and planning function, federal-provincial affairs, the regional development programmes, and statistical affairs were brought together with the responsibilities of the former Treasury Department for taxation policy, management of debt and finances, and accounting policy and practice.

Meanwhile, the Treasury board continued its responsibility for expenditure control, administrative policy, programme co-ordination and employer-staff relations. Four divisions were created in the department as follows:

The policy planning division; the finance division; the government accounts division; and, the economic and statistical services division.

In essence, the functional role of the department can best be described in terms of the first three divisions with the economic and statistical services division designed to provide basic services to the other divisions and other departments. Attached administratively to the department, as a ministerial agency, is the computer services centre which provides, under the policy guidance of an interdepartmental computer services board chaired by the deputy Treasurer, computer services to five government departments and several other agencies, including Treasury and Economics and Revenue.

The basic administrative services for the department, as well as for the Treasury board secretariat, are provided by the administrative division of The Department of Revenue.

I need say nothing about the vote for general departmental administration, other than to mention that the grant to the St. John Ambulance Association has been increased by \$10,000 in recognition of the great voluntary services rendered to the people of the province. The overall vote for departmental administration has been decreased somewhat because of a phasing out of funds for the Royal commission on civil rights, which is expected to publish its final report this year.

Under economic and statistical research and policy planning, provision is made for the continuing implementation of the new organization, particularly in the regional development, economic planning and taxation and fiscal policy branches.

Some of these changes took place during the year on the authority of a Treasury board order, as the initial allotment in last year's estimates was clearly insufficient to handle the increased responsibilities resulting from the changes in departmental structure. The apparent increase in charges for data processing services is due to a transfer of costs for the computerization of the provincial government payroll from the administrative division to the systems and programming branch.

There has been a substantial decrease in the amount allotted under publications due to the fact that the *Ontario Economic Atlas*, which has been financially supported by the province, will be published in June of this year. In fact, it is expected that revenue from

sales of the atlas will approach \$100,000 during the coming year.

An increase has been provided under federal-provincial conferences and committees to permit the Ontario government to pay a share of the expenses of the secretariat to the constitutional conference in Ottawa, which is becoming a genuine servant of all 11 governments.

In the field of regional development, the year 1969-70 will largely be devoted to the preparation of meaningful development plans for each economic region, as I indicated recently in Budget paper "B".

The first two stages of the regional development process—inventory of all existing regional development programmes and evaluation of 63 different indicators of economic activity by county and, where possible by township—have been almost completed so that projects and plans can be based on a solid foundation of information.

During this last year, particular effort was devoted to the northwestern economic region, where a special ARDA-financed study of the economic potential of the region is being carried out. Special attention has also been devoted to the central Ontario economic region as a result of the Goals Plan, which was produced as a part of the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Transportation Study. A report is expected shortly from the advisory committee on regional development in this region.

As an input to the planning operation, each of the regional development councils and the regional advisory boards has submitted proposals for recommended solutions to regional problems over the next five years. I have already taken the opportunity today of tabling a copy of each of the reports of the councils. I will arrange to have copies available in the regional development branch for the members, on request. They will also be released publicly today by each of the regional development councils.

These reports represent the results of a massive grass roots approach to regional development during 1968 whereby, through a series of public meetings in each economic region and with the assistance of a professional consultant, each regional development council has come up with its own approach to regional development. Some of the work in these reports is truly first-rate and all of them, taken together, represent the arrival of a new stage in the regional development process.

I shall also be tabling, later in the session,

several of the university research studies completed during the last year. Studies on various aspects of regional development in Ontario in this series have now been contracted to each of Ontario's 14 provincially supported universities.

Under Vote 2403, the major change is our intention to strengthen the finance management branch. At the present time, we are actively seeking a director for this branch, who will be responsible for maintaining a sophisticated information system on the evolving cash position of the government. Under the supervision of the comptroller of finances, he will also be responsible for the administration and accounting of the Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation, the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation, the Universities Capital Aid Corporation and other such agencies.

Under Vote 2404, government accounting, I might mention that an item for \$80,000 appears for the first time. This represents an insurance premium paid to Fidelity Insurance of Canada in respect of all the employees of the government of Ontario for bonding purposes. This item has been transferred from the administrative division of The Department of Revenue. The Government Accounts Division is working towards the development of an accounting service, providing a centralized source of accounting expertise and directed towards the establishment of new forms of financial accounting for the government as a whole and as a support and advisory service to operating departments in accounting matters. This is the particular responsibility of the government accounting methods branch.

Under Vote 2405, the main increases are due to an increase in the maximum contribution payable on behalf of Ontario civil servants to the Canada Pension Plan and an increase in the contribution to the employees' insurance plan, resulting from growth in the numbers in the civil service and an increase in the Ontario Medical Association fee schedules.

The shared computer facilities have been operating well since I reported last. The computer service centre is currently equipped with two IBM 360 Model 40 computers. The centre reports to a board comprising the five deputy Ministers representing the main departments which share the facility. In 1969-70, it is expected that The Department of Treasury and Economics and The Department of Revenue will account for slightly over one-third of the computer work, with the remaining activity being spread among eight

other departments. It is estimated that, as a result of a recently completed purchase-leaseback arrangement, \$194,000 will be saved in the operations of the computer facility this coming year.

The Pension Commission of Ontario has registered 2,289 new pension plans since its inception in 1965, as opposed to 1,708 that have been terminated. New plans have been submitted at the rate of about three a day. This year an economist is being added to the staff of the commission to assist in the development of a comprehensive development programme pertaining to the collection and analysis of pension statistics and to undertake research on the socio-economic impact and the deployment of pension funds.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, at the appropriate time I will have a short statement to make with respect to the Treasury board secretariat.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Chairman, in its wisdom, the government has seen fit to bring down the estimates of The Department of Treasury and Economics in the period between the Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton), presenting his Budget and the reply of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon). I am wondering if, perhaps, by this means the Treasurer feels that he will be able to escape, to some extent, the impact of criticism in the general review of his department to which this estimate pertains. If so, let me disabuse him of that impression.

Since we are so much earlier in the year in our consideration of these particular estimates, the Treasurer will no doubt notice that all hon. members are wearing their jackets and that any heat that may be generated during this particular estimate will, I can assure him, be subservient to the light that will be cast upon the workings of his department. By the time we are through, perhaps all our eyes will have been opened.

Now that the Treasurer has cast off the revenue responsibility—if he will pardon the simile—like a garter snake shucking off its skin, we are afforded the vision of a new and pristine exterior that will doubtless wither as the year proceeds, and as the significance of the Budget proposals really begins to be understood by the people of Ontario. When the rhetoric fades away, the reality will remain.

Mr. Chairman, we are now deeply involved in the planning-programming-budgetting experience and, quite frankly, we are expecting it to deliver. It is now quite clear that the frills are a thing of the past, and the Treasurer who has even yet fought shy of a totally

disinterested review of government expenditures, preferring instead a hybrid affair, must assert himself and make his authority known throughout the proliferating cells of government. We must know the benefit of every move, and we must know its cost.

For example, we heard a great deal last year about the great expectations that had been raised by the rationalization of computer services and the aborting of computer programmes that would not yield precise results relevant to the government's purposes. We shall want to know how well this programme of computer programme rationalization has proceeded in the intervening 12 months. What kinds of programme have been deemed unworthy of the robot's attention? What are the criteria of relevance?

How far are we ahead with acknowledging the federal contribution in respect of each of our shared-cost programmes? How many such programmes are there today? Are we now going to give the figures, as the municipalities are required to do in respect of provincial contributions, or are we going to continue to pretend that the federal government is the harsh landlord of the rental agreement, taking all our taxes and giving little in return? It is important that we appreciate—and that the general public appreciates—the fact that our major source of revenue is still channelled through Ottawa, and that Finance Minister Benson does not pocket every penny, which is the impression the members of the government like to give on every public occasion, including that of only two days ago.

Our economic forecasts are pliable, in that they can reflect the gloom or joy of the Premier (Mr. Robarts), and the Treasurer as these alternate, depending on whether these gentlemen are putting on a good face in Bonn or a gloomy one in the Chateau Laurier. The cry is still heard, however, "How could they be so wrong?" of the back-room boys whose slide-rules predict disaster one minute and the millenium the next. Eventually, I prophesy, they will form a professional association and not allow themselves and their predictions to be bandied about for narrow political ends.

This will be particularly important as this government nears the end of its tether and casts caution to the winds in the face of the shrinking potential mandate in 1971 that the polls will all to rapidly forecast. Will the gentlemen of the Treasury then become the counterparts of Lou Harris and George Gallup, as they are called upon to counter the public reaction? Or will they assert

themselves in the dignity of their calling and allow the *Ontario Economic Review* to become something more objective than *The Adventures of Pollyanna*?

We are hearing a lot about the productivity improvement project—PIP for short. This is the half-an-half study, neither internal nor independent, that has been called for, following what one can only conclude is the failure of the earlier "Ontario's House in Order" review, so graphically described, by the Honourable Treasurer, to the captive audience at the tenth national conference of the Chartered Institute of Secretaries in London, on September 20 last, less than half a year ago.

Let me recall the promise of that earlier review. It was to have been, and I quote, "full-scale" and "critical". This "intensive examination" was to cover the activities of every department and agency, and to encompass the full range of operational areas, including staff, organization, equipment and accommodation. Sophisticated techniques of policy setting would establish priorities and direct restraints. Stringent criteria would be applied to new programmes. "We are bearing down," the Treasurer proclaimed, "on government costs in an exercise which I believe to be the most exhaustive and thorough economy drive ever undertaken by an administration of this province."

We were made privy to the special meeting of all Cabinet Ministers, deputy Ministers and senior financial officials, which took place in the Treasury building on July 22 last, where the Premier ordered a "total examination." It was a powerful and dramatic confrontation, by all accounts, of which, unfortunately, posterity has to make do with one. The synoptic versions, I am sure, would have made good reading as tales told from different viewpoints often do. But all that remains when memory dies is the official, authorized version, in which the Premier leaned forward in his seat and earnestly asked the Treasury board to work with all phases of the government to ensure that every tax dollar would be put to its most effective use.

Since the membership of the board at that time consisted of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), and the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Guindon)—two of whom appeared to be engaged in a feverish competition as to who could spend the most public

money in the shortest possible time—this demand must have come somewhat as a shock.

One can imagine the realization by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management that he might have to draw back at Pickering before the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information retrenched at the Centennial Science Centre, and that neither of them would ever again feel that first, fine careless rapture of another million being added to the estimates for work in progress. I am told that the handsome television profile of the Minister of Tourism on Tuesday reflected the sad realization that the Treasurer meant what he said, and that not only the Centennial centre, but the whole business of tourism was now the shorn lamb before the ill-wind of austerity.

From lambs to lions is but a leap, and I could not help but feel, as I listened to the Treasurer tell it like it was, and come up with a flourish with the columns of his Budget balanced, that we had, indeed, paid the cost in the past 24 years and will continue to do so in the future. As they used to say while keeping score in the Coliseum: "Lions 24, Christians 1."

The Premier went on to exhort those assembled in the Frost building to greater austerities, and the Treasurer was pleased to amplify the agony in London by saying:

We are examining every facet of our operations, from mailing rooms to management, from warehouse facilities to welfare programmes, from utilization practices to university projects.

He might have added, "from alliteration to zeugma," so full of figures of speech was his London effort.

One of the fancy words he didn't use was zetetic, which means "proceeding by inquiry," which is exactly what we are doing now in the public accounts committee. As chairman of that committee, I, of course, do not want to anticipate the report at this time in the House, but even as we look backward in that committee, we can also look forward here. We note that the Treasurer's optimism is not justified, certainly in relation to the speed with which the economies inherent in centralized purchasing are being put into effect. Only furniture and stationery are really responding to this supposedly cost-saving technique. We will have to do better than that.

However, let us return to London, where the Treasurer was telling the chartered secretaries that there would be a branch-by-branch review of existing programmes, concentrated

on a critical assessment of goals and on achievement of maximum efficiency in administration.

As I contemplated the branch-by-branch review which he promised, my mind went back to a scene in that other London, across the waves, some 328 years before, where a similar exhortation culminated in the petition of London of December 11, 1640. In that petition, which was to become the Root and Branch Bill, it was demanded that "the said government, with all its dependencies, roots and branches, be abolished."

Well, we would like to abolish the government and replace it with a better one. This government has not got very far. Ontario still has its dependencies, its Indian ghettos that only yesterday the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) was loath to acknowledge. We certainly have branches proliferating in every department, and at least one Root, whose lineage and tradition have recently been promulgated in an official OWRC press release.

Faced with such a remarkable parallel, perhaps we ought to return to the source of it all, the Scriptures, where, in the Book of Malachi, chapter 4, verse 1, we read:

For behold, the day cometh that shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts. It shall leave them neither root nor branch.

Now let us become serious for a moment, Mr. Chairman, and look at the questions asked by the Treasury board. I want to read them into the record at this time, so that, as the estimates proceed, members can conveniently refer to them, as the Opposition proposes to dig into the administrative shortfall that has turned these probing queries into little more than pious hopes. That they are pious hopes can be seen by examining the figures in the Budget papers and the estimates for the coming year. If there are cutbacks, they are in programmes rather than in administration, and this fact makes the questions ironic in the extreme, although they were intended seriously enough.

I think that what we are up against here is simply Parkinson's law and there is no better example than the educational television branch, which has grown in three years from two men sitting in a corridor in an Eglinton west building, to a formidable establishment with a salary call alone in excess of \$1.5 million. That figure doesn't include programmes or maintenance. That is up to \$7.5 million in total now. This before they even have a transmitter of their own! Just watch tumescence take over when chan-

nel 19 or some other form of distribution becomes available!

So, having glanced through the upcoming estimates, especially the main office and administrative items, and noting how they have swollen, listen to these questions from the Treasury board directive. It is almost laughable in view of what we know now, less than half a year later. Here are some of the questions:

Has the original objective of the programme been met?

Can the programme be discontinued or curtailed?

Is there a more economical way of achieving or maintaining the same result?

If the objective has not been achievable within present programme structure, is it worth continuing?

Can present vacancies be left unfilled through reassignment of duties, elimination of non-essential procedures and/or improved techniques?

Can expenditure on temporary help be reduced by greater inter-branch, inter-office co-operation?

Are staff, equipment and supplies properly controlled and correctly utilized?

In regard to proposed, improved or new programmes, the branches were asked these questions:

Is the change essential at this time? Is it the most efficient way of achieving the improvement having regard to both the costs and the anticipated benefits?

Have the proposals been tested on a pilot basis to ensure that the expected results will be achieved?

Can the additional costs be offset by a cut-back on an existing programme or activity?

Can the additional costs be restricted by making greater use of existing facilities and/or personnel?

You can see why we of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, want a totally independent review by outside consultants of the operations of government, rather than this internal farce or the hybrid farce called PIP.

And I suppose the readers of English literature are with us. We have a character called Master Pip in "Great Expectations", and perhaps the great expectations that the Treasury has from this programme will probably not be realized.

As we review the estimates, of which this is the first, I want to remind my colleagues

of a further request made last September by the Treasury board, of the departments of government. They were asked to achieve a minimum improvement in productivity of two per cent over 1968-1969 levels in their estimates for 1960-1970. Now, how do you measure that? Certainly, the book does not reflect it. We must all give this matter further analysis, because you will recall that, since there is no way to measure the output of government departments, except perhaps by weighing the garbage and scrap paper, it was to be registered as a reduction in administrative expense of two per cent in current monetary values, rather than in absolute terms.

The Treasurer said that an anticipated price increase of three per cent over the fiscal year which, by the way, is an admission that inflation does indeed plague us in spite of later protestations to the contrary by others, would mean a saving in real terms of about five per cent, but for the purpose of our estimate book comparisons, year to year, we can be content if we can discover a two per cent saving in the columns of figures concerned with administration. If these estimates reflect that saving, then improved productivity, as expressed in these terms, will have proved to be more than a pious hope.

Not that the Treasurer wants any credit for this achievement if, in fact, it proves to have been realized. For in London he said:

I emphasize that this productivity improvement target is in addition to, not part of, our critical review of programmes and operations.

The Treasurer was still complacent last fall in London. Again I quote:

The administrative and operations costs of the government itself account for only 20 per cent of the total budget.

Only 20 per cent!

Yet where did the axe fall two days ago? Not here, in administration, but on the balance, on the statutory payments, on the helpless victims of Ontario's succour in various forms.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): On the people.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): They are happy about it.

Mr. Sopha: Always strike at the people first.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Treasurer said:

The remaining 80 per cent is made up of major statutory obligations, including grants to school boards, municipalities and hospitals, major transfer payments to people, including family allowances and premium assistance for health insurance plans, and major transfer payments to institutions, primarily universities and colleges of applied arts and technology.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Treasurer has interjected, "the people are happy". This noon I spoke to approximately 100 social workers in Kitchener. I can assure you that in the programmes that they have to implement and in the difficulties which they are facing in the interest that this government places in projects before people, they are not happy, nor are the people that they have to deal with.

Mr. Sopha: They said the member should be Treasurer and I agree.

Mr. Breithaupt: One ought not to have needed a crystal ball, Mr. Chairman, to predict where the blow would fall. It fell, not on administration, but on the people programmes.

This is the kind of thing that makes me wary of the rhetoric of the white paper, so much at variance with the plodding pedestrianism of the Budget itself. But let us leave that for another day. We have enough of the Treasurer's rhetoric from these earlier occasions to make us think twice before accepting, with naivete, his later propositions. Regardless of our constituencies, we of the Opposition are all from Missouri in this regard. Don't just tell us, show us! Then, maybe, we'll believe you.

The Treasurer told his London audience that The Department of Treasury and Economics had devised a priority rating for all the government's activities, to serve as the master guide for the budget he has now presented. The Cabinet committee on policy development had put out guidelines to departments, following meetings which the Premier had again chaired. While the Treasurer was commendably modest about taking the credit, he took care in all of his speeches that whatever blame might be laid subsequently would be well and truly shared.

If programme budgeting focusses on objectives rather than operations, then it fails if the government is getting nowhere. For example, an army unit that went through the war maintaining itself would fare well under an operational analysis but not under one based on objectives and goals. Thus it is

with this government. It is costing us an awful lot to get nowhere. We are paying a lot of money to be frustrated, and the small businessman, whose concern was expressed by the hon. members for Halton East (Mr. Snow) and for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), is not the only one who is frustrated these days.

We are considered by our colleagues in the United States and in other governments to be among the leaders in the field of progressive budgeting, says the Treasurer. In other words, we are leaders in scanning the horizon, as the white paper, one of the fruits of this exercise, proves. But if we are not moving along the trail towards that horizon, if we are getting nowhere at all, how futile all this talk is!

The Treasurer is fond of saying that he is in search of a viable federalism. Mr. Chairman, we of the Opposition are rather more concerned with our search for a viable provincialism, which is a goal more elusive than federalism. Now that it is assertive, federalism seems to be working very well. It is therefore totally appropriate in this, the first of the many lead-in speeches to the estimates of the government departments, that I should reiterate that we are here to do Ontario's business.

The Department of Treasury and Economics is supposed to give leadership to other departments of government. That's the theory. It isn't working. The reason it isn't working is that up to now, nobody in the other departments has taken the Treasurer seriously. The estimates are the best he could do with his big stick, but the bruises hardly show. Most of the departments appear to have thrived on punishment, even in real terms. While some of this is attributable to the growth in our population, it can't all be explained away so easily. Some of it is fat, and it has got to come off.

We cannot do less for the taxpayers of Ontario than to examine estimate after estimate with the sharp and critical eye that even previous years have not seen in action. The Treasury estimates are the first. As we get down to the nuts and bolts of voting supply, let us realize that this is our prime function. This is where we earn our indemnity. If we, through our perception and acuity, can better your best, nobody loses. The people of Ontario are the winners in the end.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I want to divide my opening remarks into two parts. I want to speak, first of all, about what we are going to do as we embark on this long course of dealing with the esti-

mates for the upcoming fiscal year of the government.

I have been concerned that we have talked from time to time—and I have heard rumours of discussions and advice that perhaps consideration is going to be given to clarify—the purposes that we are intended to serve in the course of going through these estimates.

I think it is most important that the government gives consideration to the appointment of a select committee on the procedures of the House in committee of supply and in committee of ways and means to see whether or not it is possible to devise a method which will allow us to perform a meaningful role as we stand up to question the ministry on the items of their expenditures.

We cannot here—and I am not making any plea for any special provision of services for those of us in Opposition—but we cannot possibly and conceivably match the resources available to the government. Therefore, what we ask must of necessity be somewhat amateurish and, in many cases, quite naive about many areas of government.

What of course has happened is that this committee, instead of being involved in an intense scrutiny of the estimates in any meaningful way, in fact is dealing with matters which are going to be unchanged. We start out with the premise that we will discuss the estimates for the next three or four months in this Legislature. But not one single item in this estimate book will be changed by anything that we here on this side of the House can say.

The result is that we tend to lose the purpose of the committee, and we tend to use this as a subterfuge method of discussing policy. I happen to think that if you confuse functions without knowing what you are doing, you do not accomplish either one part or the other of the operation that we are designed to carry out.

We are tempted always to talk about policy, partly because we think that we must, in the course of the estimates, speak to those outside the House through the media in the press gallery because the actual intense scrutiny of government expenditure is not an exciting pastime. With proper accounting procedure and proper auditing procedure we are certainly not going to uncover any scandal in the government's financial operation. If there was one existing amongst the government operations, in all likelihood it would be found outside the House not in anything that we are going to do here.

I, for one, do not think this is the proper forum in which to discuss the policies of the government. I think there are other forums in this Legislature for that purpose. There are the major debates and there are, on occasion, the special orders which are put on the order paper, such as the confederation debate which is now in progress.

But that part of the government's operations, and that part of the function of this House cannot be performed unless the ministry is prepared to come and listen to the debates which take place on those general occasions. At least, we have the Minister that we are dealing with in this particular department available in the House. This is a perennial problem, in the general debates, as to whether or not the Ministers are going to be in attendance.

It may well be that we would have to, in such a select committee, work out a method by which those members in opposition who are going to speak on matters relating to particular Ministers, would so advise, through the Whips, the Ministers concerned so that they would have an opportunity to so order their affairs that they could be available in the House at the time these matters were discussed.

So, while I do not think that the procedures in the House can be dealt with in isolation, one from the other, I think a very wise start could be made if we did have a select committee of the House, but not to deal with all the procedures of the House. I think there is too much for that purpose. I think a select committee of this Legislature could deal with the questions of the House in committee of supply, and the House in committee of ways and means, to see what method can be devised by which we can perform a meaningful role.

I, therefore, do not intend to embark on policy matters. I might make a few introductory comments that might be termed comments of mine on policy matters, but I have tried to set out what I believe the function of this committee is, and it is within that framework that I, at least in these estimates, am going to restrain myself, much as I would like to talk about many other matters in the course of the Treasurer's estimates.

I jotted these down, and I think they are at least a basis of discussion as to what I am going to do in this committee:

1. Examine the estimates presented to the House and ascertain if the policy implied in those estimates may be carried out more economically;

2. Are the managerial arrangements under which expenditures take place fully effective?

3. What specific economies may be made?

That, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, connotes what I am about in this committee, and I think provides the framework within which I would suggest that you, as Chairman, could perhaps contain the discussion which will take place on these particular estimates.

The first one: Examine the estimates presented to this House and to ascertain if the policy implied in those estimates may be carried out more economically.

The second one: Are the managerial arrangements under which expenditures take place fully effective?

The third one: What specific economies may be made?

But even having stated those, Mr. Chairman, you will recognize that the third one is not really within our control. As I stated just a few minutes ago, there just is not going to be any change in this estimate book between now and the time we adjourn in June or July, or whenever the government business of the province for this year is completed.

So my first comment to the Treasurer (Mr. McNaughton)—indeed, the appropriate time for me to have intervened with these comments would have been when he made the motion for the House to go into committee of ways and means but it seemed to me that I would leave them to this point so that he would give consideration to them—is to ask that he convey this to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and the other members of the government to see whether or not they would give consideration to the appointment of a select committee on the operations of these two vital committees of the House which in fact take up, I suppose, the majority of the time of the House, certainly a very substantial part of the time of the House.

The other area which concerns me is, of course, what role we can play in Opposition when the government is embarked on long-term planning. I might say, Mr. Chairman, we had a perfect example of it this afternoon, and that is that the Treasurer put on the table of the House ten reports of the regional development councils of the province which are final reports of five-year studies which have been conducted.

Under the second vote in these estimates we are supposed to discuss that particular area of operation in his department. Well, I need only say how nonsensical it is. But of course that is the state to which the government has reduced us in the Opposition. They

do not think it important that we have those studies and have an opportunity to give consideration to them. There are men in this caucus who are intensely interested in that field. We have followed the meagre information which has been available from the government for some time, while these studies have been going on, and now we are faced with the proposition of not being able to study them for useful comment when the vote comes up under which those studies took place.

I do not think, in this particular instance, it makes sense for the Treasurer to say, "Oh, yes, there will be another occasion during the Budget debate to discuss those reports." There is a very important aspect of those reports which has to be discussed during his estimates. I, of course, await those in this caucus, who are intensely interested in that particular field, when they have had an opportunity in a hurried way, to look at them to decide whether or not we will ask that that particular item of the Treasurer's estimates be stood down until such time as we in this party, and I am sure the members of the Liberal Party who are interested, have an opportunity to consider those matters. Those members from the various regions that have these reports have an opportunity on their part to study.

I think the government is going to have to recognize that we are here, that we have a role to perform and that we intend to perform it. We intend to press for the procedural arrangements in this House which will permit us to perform it.

I want to come back to this question of how we participate in the economic planning of this province as a representative body, when you are now talking about five-year projections in practically all the studies which you are going to make. Again I suggest to the Treasurer that we have a role to play. I do not intend to suggest that I know all the aspects of the solution to the problem. I do not.

I think we have a role to play in the preparation of the options which are presented to the government before they decide what their policy will be. I think it would be quite possible, quite possible, using the latest Budget as an example, for the Treasurer to have brought to the House the options which were under consideration by the government for debate.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): The member has to be kidding.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Treasurer may comment afterwards. I do not quite know the

import of the Treasurer's remark. I am going to take it to assume that in some way or other the alternatives available to the government are not matters which can be debated prior to the decision being made, when we are in effect faced with the *fait accompli* as to the choice which the government has made.

I think it would be quite feasible for the Assembly, as such, to discuss and consider and debate the alternatives, the options, which are open. I am not talking about the fine option of whether you impose the two-cent tax on cigarettes or five per cent additional tax on liquor. I am not talking in those terms. I am talking in terms of the broad question, which the Treasurer decided in his wisdom, that required this government (a) to have a balanced budget; (b) not to borrow on the capital markets during the forthcoming period of time, and (c) to restrain the expenditure programme.

If I could just emphasize that point, I will come back to it later. I think that we have a role to play in the consideration of the opinions available to government, to debate with them, for whatever advantage the government may derive from those comments which we make. Otherwise, we abdicate to the technocrats of The Department of the Treasurer, and I do not think that that is our role.

I think that somewhere or other there are four other aspects to it. There is a choice to be made among the options—that is the role of government, obviously. I think there is a preparation of the plans which are to be made by the department. I think there is an area and a time during which those plans are being prepared during which they could well be subject to debate in the Legislature.

I think the debate in the Legislature could well precede the actual discussion and final adoption by the government of any particular plan. And again, of course, there is a role which we have to play in the control of the implementation of any plan.

I simply put those forward because otherwise as the government is required, by the force of planning in the province of Ontario, to project many years ahead. The projections will be made and the decisions will be made and our role here will be seriously affected if we do not have an opportunity to participate at some point in the formulation of those long-range plans.

Well, those, Mr. Chairman, are what I would say are my preliminary remarks, not related specifically and directly to the

Treasurer, but of general application to the role which we on this side of the House can usefully play and must usefully play in the course of the revision and revamping of the procedures of the assembly, which I hope will take place in not too distant time.

Now, turning directly to the Treasurer's estimates, strangely enough I feel compelled to congratulate the Treasurer on the Budget. I enjoyed the presentation of the Budget. Within the limits in which the Conservative Party operates in viewing the problems of the province, I think it was the best solution which could be found to the problems with which the Treasurer was faced.

I am not suggesting for a moment that we agree either with the quality of the decisions or the programmes which have been curtailed or cut. We have not, as yet, been able to discover all the ones which have been curtailed or cut. But I think I would be remiss in opening these remarks without conveying a sense of gratitude to the Treasurer for a lucid statement of what the government's position is on the present budget and certainly, the rudimentary parts, in any event, of the massive work which will have to be done in order to implement the taxation reform programme which the government outlined, when he read the second paper to the budget.

The matters that I would now like to deal with are specifically related to his department and perhaps the Treasurer would make a note of them. We can pick them up at whatever point appears useful. The programming, planning and budgeting system, which has become so much part of the rhetoric of government administration, causes me some concern when I see it in the way in which it has been translated into the estimates this year.

I had expected that there would have been a very substantial difference in the presentation of the estimates this year over the estimates of prior years. But when you actually analyze them, there has been a re-ordering of the Treasurer's department in terms of the internal re-organization which he outlined a few minutes ago. And there has been a short statement at the commencement of each vote stating what the programme of that particular branch of The Department of the Treasurer is. That, in substance, seems to be the Treasurer's conception of programming.

I do not, sir, think it is sufficient. I think it makes it again extremely difficult for us because when we look through them we

find the same listings; salaries, travelling expenses, maintenance and then a few minor items such as, under the first vote, the grant to the St. John Ambulance, and similar items which are worth about a moment or two of comment and that is about all.

We do not really, either from the head note or from anything which the Treasurer has said, have any real understanding of just what this programme of the office of the Treasurer and the Minister of Economics and the office of the deputy Treasurer and the deputy Minister is.

We do not know whether it is one programme; whether there are many programmes that come under that heading and similarly, under the various other votes of the Treasurer's department. We do not know whether the so-called omnibus programme stated in a few lines at the top of the vote encompasses a large number of other programmes.

If I could turn again to that question of the salaries and of the travelling expenses, the maintenance and other similar repetitive items that run through the estimates; I simply ask the Treasurer how long it is going to be before we have an opportunity to have standard objects as they do in the estimates of the federal House.

It would seem to me that the time has passed when we need to add up all the items scattered through his estimates and the other estimates, to find out what is the total salary bill of the province; what is the total travelling in and out of the province; what is the total travelling expense; what is the maintenance in total that the province is charged with. We have made some preliminary calculations. I cannot vouch for their accuracy but I think they are probably reasonably accurate on this point.

We found in the preceding estimates that the salary account accounted for about 12.3 per cent of the ordinary expenditures. We found that the travel expenses accounted for about 1.3 per cent and maintenance accounted for about 2.3 per cent. The salary figure was \$336 million; the travelling expense figure was \$35 million to \$36 million; the maintenance figure, \$64 million. In the course of this, we found that certain salaries in highways and public works are charged against capital account and not against ordinary account. We do not particularly know why. But the totals for those three items—salaries, travel and maintenance—while they may be quite reasonable, it seems to us should be comprised in the standard objects compilation which would be available with the estimates,

separate and distinct from the estimate book itself.

The maintenance heading, necessarily from our point of view to the extent that we have a remnant of purpose in scrutinizing the expenditures, should be broken down. Again, I suggest the method by which the federal parliament breaks down the items which come under maintenance.

Instead of having the one omnibus heading, they break down, as I see it, maintenance into travelling and removal expenses, freight, express and cartage, postage, telephones and telegrams, publications, films, exhibits and advertising, office stationery supplies, equipment and furnishings, materials and supplies, acquisition of equipment, repairs and upkeep of equipment. At least a presentation of maintenance broken down, perhaps not into those precise headings or necessarily into that number of headings, would be much more informative as far as our consideration of the estimates goes.

The next matter that I would like to deal with in the form of the estimates as they have been presented to us, is that we have asked and the public accounts committee has for a number of years requested, that there be the insertion in the estimates of the separate columns showing the comparable figure for the preceding fiscal year of the government. I do not know what the problem is in providing at least the column matching the figures to the extent that it is possible to do so, bearing in mind that there is a certain transition going on by the government in the presentation of the estimates which may not make it possible to match all figures.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Especially when they change the format.

Mr. J. Renwick Particularly when they change the format. I think that some work could be devoted to that and I hope that this is the last year that we will have to fumble through a second book in order to correlate what is happening in one year compared with the preceding year.

Then in the public accounts report—I might say, Mr. Chairman, that that particular remark has been in the public accounts report for some time. I happen to have the June 13, 1967, report of the standing committee on public accounts. Item three on page two is that question of providing the information about the preceding year.

Item two has this, and I think I will read it because this is confusing for us. Again, I

do not know why the estimates are not presented in the method suggested in the public accounts report.

In the development of a new format for the estimates we urge a consistent and standard treatment of reimbursement of expenditures.

Recommendation 10 of the 1966 report of the public accounts committee and the provincial auditors' report for 1965-66 both recommend that consideration be given to standardizing the voting of funds for programmes for which reimbursements are available.

Funds could be voted on a gross basis and recovery shown as revenue until the end of the fiscal year, and then transferred as reimbursements of expenditure to the related vote and item. This should standardize the presentation in the estimates, the public accounts, and eliminate the need for Treasury board orders for temporary finance.

I would like the Treasurer's comments as to why it is not possible to implement that recommendation of the standing committee on public accounts. I have not checked the other particular recommendations; those are ones which came to my mind as I looked at the new estimate book.

The member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt), has spoken about PIP and I am going to constrain my remarks into very brief compass. I do not think there is any validity (as a study of the proceedings of the Glassco report on the federal government study of administration) in the proposition that, in some way or other, a Royal commission would grind to a halt the implementation of recommendations until the committee had reported.

The Glassco report very clearly shows that during the course of their meetings and discussions with the civil servants of the federal government many improvements were implemented as they went along. Many recommendations which the commission knew they were going to make were put in train during the course of that work. The commission also, on many occasions, sat in public session so that interested parties could attend before the commission and listen to what was going on.

I find it surprising that when the report was finally issued two years after the commission was appointed, the report would say that they anticipated savings to the federal government in administration running into the tens of millions of dollars, and to think, on the other hand, in this government on a much smaller scale, it would not be possible by a properly

constituted commission to save many dollars in the administration costs of this government.

I do not think that is a criticism of the party that happens to be in power, I think it is something that just happens to government as their administration grows.

In this time of stringency and curtailment of programmes, we have seen that the very act of spinning off the revenue branch into a separate department has already, under Parkinson's law, created additional expense to the government. It would seem to me that this must of necessity happen time and time again as the government activities have expanded over the last quarter of a century.

Yet the Minister persists, when he makes his statement in the House, that he is going to invite persons from the management consulting firms downtown to meet to form a steering committee, as I understand it, with, I am quoting from page 1390 of *Hansard*.

Our productivity improvement project will be directed by a senior steering committee, composed of a combination of outstanding leaders from the private sector of the Ontario economy and senior public servants. I believe this co-ordination of internal and external expertise offers significant advantages over a Royal commission or a completely independent review.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That does not embody the use of consultants does it?

Mr. J. Renwick: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. It is at the next level under the various projects that the management consultants will be used under the project.

I am simply asking, Mr. Chairman, if the Treasurer would reconsider constituting, in a rather more formal way, the steering committee to provide some method by which the public can be involved in what is going on, and some understanding can be gained of the immensity and complexity of the administrative procedures of the government, and the methods by which economies can be fashioned, rather than to have it done in the way in which the Treasurer appears to want to have it done; that is by more or less a closed operation in a way in which we have no indication that there will be reports or interim reports, or a final report, tabled in this House, or made available publicly—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Except you have my word for it, my statement.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, all right, but you may not be around at that time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Somebody else will.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, somebody else may be. The point I want to make is the involve-

ment of people and their opportunity to know that there is such a commission; what its terms of reference are; where its hearings will be held so that those people who are interested can come and at least listen to the proceedings of the commission as it conducts its inquiry.

We got the impression that in some way or other the Treasurer decided that this should be an in-government operation, and that as all in-government operations under the system that this government operates there is a substantial cloak of secrecy as to the information which is available and as to the proceedings which have taken place. I do not think that this particular project will satisfy, in our minds, the purpose which the Treasurer wants it to satisfy, unless he is prepared to formalize it to some extent in order to provide a forum in which the public can have some participation and gain some knowledge of the government's operations.

I would ask the Treasurer if he is in a position during the course of these estimates to name the members of the steering committee, or could he give us some indication when he anticipates that he will be in a position to name the members of the steering committee; when this project will get off the ground; and will he elaborate on his prepared statement as to the extent to which the public will be able to come and view the proceedings of the steering committee, and view the proceedings of the various projects when they are under study to the extent that it involves the questioning of the civil service of the province of Ontario.

I think it is a most important point on which the Treasurer should comment during his estimates. I think it would be also worth his while to comment as to what the anticipated costs will be. It may be that it is provided in these estimates, but I could not find it. Perhaps he would indicate whether it is provided in the estimates and what the estimate is if it is not provided in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I mentioned it in the statement, you will see it there—

Mr. J. Renwick: You mentioned it in the statement? Is it in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is provision in the estimates.

Mr. J. Renwick: Provision in the estimates for it? Well, at the point when we reach

that particular provision, perhaps the Treasurer would comment again about it.

The next matter, Mr. Chairman, that I want to speak about is the question of the task force which advised the government in the preparation of its Budget. On page 7 of his Budget statement the Treasurer referred to the task force in The Department of Treasury and Economics which worked particularly closely with the staffs of The Departments of Revenue and Municipal Affairs.

This task force delineated the Smith and select committee's recommendations in terms of their implications for provincial-municipal financial operations. The task force then provided a comprehensive range of policy for review by the government.

I want to ask the Treasurer if he will make available to us, either in printed form or in his comments on these estimates, a statement of the comprehensive range of policy options which were submitted by the task force? The reason, of course, is that I happen to believe that there are always alternatives, that all problems are not simply technical problems. That there are in fact, alternatives.

The government had to direct its attention to them and they had, from the civil service, this comprehensive range of policy options. I would ask that the Minister would make that statement available to us.

Similarly, on the question of programme priorities: Throughout the Budget statement the Treasurer stated that he had to curtail severely many programmes and that new programmes were not launched and that in other programmes in which improvements had been envisaged, the improvements could not be carried on.

Again on page 16 of his Budget, we have this statement "that these targets", referring to the targets of efficiency improvement in the government, "were based on a system of priority rankings for the whole range of government programmes".

I would like to have a statement from the Treasurer either in printed form or in his comments of how many programmes are there in which the government has a priority? I cannot tell whether or not the method of classification is the rather rudimentary classification system set out in the new form of the estimates, or whether, in fact, it is a detailed programme by programme priority statement.

I think it is most important that we, on this side of the House, have available to us the priority decisions of the government, with-

out having the dig through each specific programme in each of the estimates as we go through to find out whether or not this is a programme which has been curtailed, whether this is a programme where the improvements have not been carried out or where a decision has been made not to expand the programme.

It would facilitate the work of the committee, Mr. Chairman, if those priorities were available. I can see that the Treasurer does not accept that with any great degree of acquiescence.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not with a great degree of enthusiasm.

Mr. J. Renwick: No. Perhaps I could just emphasize the point, if he has not got it. What we have to do is to comment upon, in the course of these estimates, the programmes of the government. This is the programming, planning, budgeting system that you have instituted. Now are we supposed to engage in the activity of finding out which programmes have been cut back, which programme has not had improvements made in it. Is this what we are to do, or are you going to facilitate it by making available to us the priorities that you have allocated for the government programmes?

Mr. Chairman, that in substance, until the Treasurer comments or until others participate, are the remarks that I want to make on the opening of these estimates. I have tried to itemize for the Treasurer the kind of information that we want from him on these estimates. I have tried to indicate to him the specific concerns we have about the structure and functioning of this committee.

I have expressed to him the concern which we have had about the form of the estimates and the various simple matters which have been referred to on previous occasions, which would do so much to facilitate our study of the estimates of every department. I have dealt with PIP. I have dealt with the request we make for the task force statement of the comprehensive range of options which were available to the government in making its budgetary presentation. I have asked for, specifically, the listing of the priorities of the programmes of the government and those that have been curtailed, those which have not been implemented and those where improvements have not been made in them. I leave it now to the Treasurer or for the other members of the House to comment.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I will do my best to deal with these questions

as they come to the related vote and items. If I forget to comment on them at the right time, I am sure the hon. member for Riverdale will remind me.

I think it would be preferable if we proceed in order of the votes as outlined in the estimates and do it in that manner.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2401; it has a number of similar items. Perhaps we should deal with that one, item by item.

On vote 2401:

Item 1 agreed to. On item 2:

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Treasurer can give us the reason for the substantial salary increase, between the two years, from some \$34,500 under general administration at least to \$117,000. Perhaps at the same time, he might wish to give us the increase in the travelling expense amount projected from the \$2,000 to \$10,000 in item 2 of that vote?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am having a little difficulty relating the figures proposed by the hon. member. I see clearly the \$117,000 and I see the travelling expense item of \$10,000, but I do not follow the other—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Are you referring to the previous year?

Mr. Breithaupt: 1968-69.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: 1968-69—\$86,300 versus \$117,000. Is that what you are making reference to?

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The salaries pay a staff of five in the Minister's office—which supplies an executive assistant, a driver, two secretaries and a clerk—and a staff of six in the deputy Minister's office—the deputy Minister, an executive assistant, an administrative assistant, two secretaries and a receptionist.

The complement has been increased there slightly and I would think the balance is made up largely because of negotiated salary increases during the period.

Item 2 agreed to. On item 3:

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this would be a useful point for the Treasurer to comment on the question of standard objects—the salaries, travelling expenses, maintenance; whether or not the government does

intend to change the form of the estimates to provide the standard objects information. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. The question is quite an appropriate one. I was interested in a reference to salaries in one department charged to highways and another to capital, for instance. I am prepared to pursue that; I cannot give you that answer but this is something that can be pursued. I propose to talk also, when we come to the estimates of the Treasury board, on the programming-planning-budgeting system and attempt to bring that situation up to date one more year.

I will just take this much time, because it was the lead-off item that the hon. member referred to, to say that we realize that these estimates are not in programme-planning-budgeting form yet. There is no question about this. You are quite right. It is a refinement over the former process but it is far from complete. I will go into more detail on that later if I may.

Mr. J. Renwick: If that is a more appropriate place.

Mr. Sopha: Can I ask a question of the Treasurer through you? Does this provide for the expenditure for the administration of his office?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: My office?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask, very courteously, how many offices do you have?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have one office.

Mr. Sopha: You get along with the office across in the Frost building? Do you?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: And you have none in this building?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, that is right, Mr. Chairman. I am close enough at the Frost building. Some of the other Ministers are not.

Mr. Sopha: That is interesting.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have a short three-minute walk. I think it—

Mr. Sopha: Have you actually measured the distance that you are? Would you say

you are any farther than a three-minute walk? Are you any farther than the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko)?

Mr. Chairman: I would just suggest to the hon. member that—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That comes under the athletic commission—

Mr. Sopha: Labour?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): All I have got is a hole in the ground.

Mr. Sopha: Lands and Forests?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have one office.

On item 4:

Mr. Sopha: Do you have an executive assistant?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: How many do you have?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: One.

Mr. Sopha: Now your executive assistant, he does not have an executive assistant?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not yet.

Mr. Sopha: Does he have an office?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Who, the executive assistant?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, of course.

Mr. Sopha: Could you give us an idea of the size of office your executive assistant has?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Oh, just a cubicle.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suppose these are appropriate questions, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: I have no doubt they are.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —if the hon. member wants to pursue this course. I am not much good at measurement by the eye, but I would think the executive assistant of the Treasurer occupies an office approximately 14 x 15, 12 x 14, something on that order. Functional, comfortable.

Mr. Sopha: What sort of rug in his office? Is there a broadloom rug?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I should say the same rug as everyone else uses.

Mr. Sopha: It has a rug?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask, what kind of a staff has he got, the executive assistant? What kind of secretarial staff has he got?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He has a secretary, one secretary.

Mr. Sopha: Now, how many other people are employed in the Treasurer's office in the way of providing administrative assistance to him other than the executive assistant?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Minister's secretary, the executive assistant and the executive assistant's secretary would comprise the Minister's staff. The deputy Minister occupies space in the same office complex, and his office is also in the same office complex.

Mr. Sopha: I see. I have just one further question. Does the deputy Minister have an executive assistant?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, sir. There is complement for one, but he has not been hired yet.

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is complement for him, but there is nobody occupying the job.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, they have not actually hired one?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Sopha: Well, has an office been set aside for him?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we will have to find space for him when he arrives.

Mr. Sopha: And without asking, I ask rhetorically, he, of course, will have a rug on the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can answer that question. Let me say that the offices that have rugs on the floor in the Minister's complex have now all been occupied. So, whether there will be a rug on that floor or not I cannot say, because at the moment I do not think we know where he is going to be located.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I want to make sure everybody is housed, you see.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are making out.

Mr. Sopha: Because the housing I have to put up with as we start to engage in—what is it, \$2,996,000,000? Is that in the ball park?—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: As we start off on this journey which will take us to May or June or July, I want the satisfaction of knowing that everybody in the most modest positions of the civil service are adequately housed and that they have necessary staff to help them. Because I want the people of Ontario to know—no sense of beating the chest like Job of old—that the accommodation I have to put up with, as I embark on this responsible task, is a far cry from that which is either adequate or dignified.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Ask him if the executive secretary is here every day.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sopha: Have you got an executive assistant?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if I could, through you, ask the Provincial Treasurer at this point whether or not other copies of these regional development studies are available, and whether or not it is possible to postpone the consideration of regional development until the last item in the estimates, so that people who come from various parts of the province might have an opportunity to first get a copy and have a look at it. I think the only way in which we are going to rescue the Minister's tabling of them on the eve of his estimates from being, in effect, a road blocking effort to dealing with them this year, is that we get copies and that we postpone this estimate until the end of the department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that I have not seen the contents of those reports on the table here myself yet. We have not had them.

Mr. MacDonald: Could the Minister tell me why he has not seen them himself, when some of them are dated November?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I have not seen them, and some of them have not been around more than a very few days. Now, I have a fair pile of prescribed reading for me. I thought it would be a sensible thing if I could have them all at once and get them all read in the same context. I might say that there is no attempt to cut off Opposition comment on these reports. If there had been, they would not have been tabled.

Mr. MacDonald: Can we have a set or two here so that they can be distributed?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They are tabled now to give you and others an opportunity to make comment on them. I would say that there have been no conclusions developed with respect to these reports as far as final policy is concerned at all. In other words, I would welcome any comment that anybody cares to make on them, before the final policy is decided.

What we propose to do, of course, is to take all these reports and then consolidate them into a report from the regional development branch. But these are the individual reports that have come to us. This is the grass roots study I made reference to. No final policy has been concluded, and I would say that the comments of the hon. members to the extent they want to make them will help in the formulation of the policy.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Provincial Treasurer has just said but, pursuing this point of order, can we have a set of them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: A set?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we will have a set over to your office right away.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good, because the set that was here—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Any member can have one. As a matter of fact, if they are available, may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we will have a set in the hands of each member as quickly as we can get them to the post office.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you very much.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Could I just speak to this? Could the Provincial Treasurer assure the House that we will not be dealing with this item tonight? I would agree with him that the department has not made

policy, but I think there was a policy in having these created, and I think it is incumbent upon this House to take a look at what has been done and to regard what has been done in the light of the estimates that are now before us. Some of these reports were made three months ago. They could have been released; they could have been in the hands of members two or three months ago. And I think there is no reason why. I know the Minister is an intelligent man and I am sure he will recognize the importance of us knowing what is in these reports.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Pursuing this point of order, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister, through you, if these reports have been available to the public prior to the tabling today. Could I ask the Minister if they have been available to the public prior to the tabling in the House?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, they have not. I can illustrate that by saying that—

Mr. MacDonald: Careful, careful!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, not to my knowledge. One of the regional development conferences spoke to me two weeks ago, wanting to distribute it and I asked them to wait until we had tabled them in the House concurrent with the estimates. There may be one—I think maybe the Georgian Bay Development Council did publish theirs—but it certainly was on their own. The rest of them withheld publication until we concurred.

Mr. Young: Well, I think the member for Thunder Bay has a word.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes, I would like to refute what the Treasurer has just said. Before this House sat at 2.30 p.m., I got a call from the television station at the Lakehead asking me to comment on the report that was released. I said, "Well, it has not even been tabled yet," and he said, "Well, we have a copy, and we would like you to comment on it." So I think it was released in advance of its tabling in this House. Otherwise they would not have known about it and its contents. I was asked to comment on its contents before I had an opportunity to even read it.

Mr. Young: This was before it was tabled in the House, Mr. Chairman; this was my point.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, one further point. I asked the Minister a question—and I am not particularly interested in em-

barrassing him, although the situation, I think, has some potential embarrassment in it. Will the Minister leave regional development until the last item in consideration of the estimates so that copies which he is going to send over to us, can be perused, and we can perhaps give you some advice to guide you as you move towards shaping a policy on the basis of this great mass of information?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think we can accede to that request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pitman: Good!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is no problem. You see how easy we are to get along with?

Mr. Pitman: Do not carry it too far.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not spoil it, because at the moment your position is a pretty vulnerable and embarrassing one. I think you are taking the wisest way out of it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Treasurer on his increase to the St. John Ambulance Association. As hon. members may be aware, I am chairman of my local branch committee, which is a group of citizens that attempts to assist the uniformed personnel of the two divisions that happen to be in the cities of Kitchener and Waterloo.

It is amazing the numbers of volunteer hours, the tens of thousands of hours, which these people spend at no remuneration to themselves and, indeed, at an actual cost. I do congratulate the Treasurer in seeing fit to be able to increase the grant to this association in order that its work may be developed even further.

Items 4 and 5 agreed to.

On item 6:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask of the Minister the question dealing with this item concerning the Royal commission on civil rights, does the Minister foresee the commission completing its findings this present year, because the vote this time is only \$50,000 as opposed to \$130,000 the previous year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. B. Newman: Right, thank you.

Item 6 agreed to.

On item 7:

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Treasurer tell us what are the research and special studies which are projected under that vote?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It actually covers most of the department's research programme. I do not know that I can say too much more about it other than that, unless the member wants some detail as to the members on the staff and so forth.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, I would like the details of any projected special studies which are going to take place. There must have been some method by which the \$132,000 was arrived at.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is collecting some information, if I might put a similar question, so that it will not have to be repeated. It occurred to me that item 7 might deal with the research studies that the Minister made note of in one of his speeches this past autumn. I recall reading that he had suggested there was a range, or a spectrum, I believe was the word he used, of 50 different research studies with considerable range of importance that were being funnelled into his department as a precursor to new policy. Perhaps if that is the same thing, then it would not be necessary to ask a further question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not know that that is related to the question that was also touched upon by the hon. member for Riverdale. I think it is more in that context that this reference is made.

The \$132,000 is made up of a grant of \$2,000 to the Association of International Economics and Commerce Students, a grant of \$2,000; the Ontario Economic Review, \$27,000; the Ontario Statistical Review, \$8,000; policy statements, \$10,000; economics and statistical services publications, \$25,000. Those are the publications. Under special studies are the Conklin project, University of Western Ontario, optimum size of municipalities, \$15,000; and a study conducted by Professor Conway of York University, study for Ontario Development Corporation, use of provincial public organizations vs. private sector to finance development, \$7,500; and then a range of other research projects which involve more than one branch, but which were co-ordinated at this level, \$37,500. That makes up the total.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask the hon. Treasurer where are the studies that he referred to in his previous speech, a range of 50 studies that were leading to new policy in his department—I just had occasion to read some of his recent speeches where those are accounted for?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. Now I understand what the hon. member means. It is a long list.

Mr. Nixon: I do not want to hear the list. Is it under item 7 or is it in another part of the department for the development?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is under the next vote, 2402.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, since you may not be putting the statutory item by itself, that is the Minister's salary, I would like to take this occasion to ask some specific questions about the form of the estimates, and how we might perceive from studying them the federal increment in the cost that is put forward here.

Last year there was some confusion in various estimates whether or not, in fact, they were gross estimates including the complement from the federal government, or whether they were net. In fact, if they are gross estimates, we are asked to approve the expenditure of money that was already approved by the Parliament of Canada.

It was very difficult for us to determine in those departments where there is a federal component, where there are shared-cost programmes, just what the federal component was, and how much of the money we were voting actually came from our own consolidated revenue fund. I wonder if the Treasurer could advise me how we might solve that problem this year, since it has been brought to our attention in the Minister's Budget statement that this is of such great importance.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not know that the format of the estimates makes provision for what the hon. leader of the Opposition has pointed out. As far as I am aware, all expenditures are shown on a gross basis, whether they include the contribution of federal funds or not. But I do not think there is anything in the printed estimates format that would illustrate the component parts, or how much was federal and how much was provincial. In each circumstance I think we can provide this information as we go along.

Mr. Nixon: I would be glad if that is so. Last year we had some difficulty getting that information. I know the Treasurer has read with care the criticisms that the Smith committee levied at him and his predecessors in their accounting procedures. One of those was that in the public accounts, or in the estimates, it is impossible to tell what the federal component is in the budget that we are asked to approve.

Vote 2401 agreed to.

On vote 2402:

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I want to raise a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Here again I would suggest we deal with it by items.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I want to raise a point of order on this very matter. If you will follow with me in 2402, you will note that the elaboration underneath item 9, is not co-extensive with item 9.

For example—take 7, grants and special studies for regional development. If you turn the page you will see that the elaboration is the whole branch, if that is what you call it, of regional development, and 9 merely selects one item out of that branch, \$481,000, if you are with me. So, conceivably—to use the word that youth employ—we might get into some kind of a hangup if, in discussing 9, we are talking about the \$481,000 whereas the whole branch involves both the administration of that branch—which I want to say something about—and an expenditure of over \$1 million. If you are with me, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest perhaps it is not so much a point of order as a question of clarification.

Mr. Sopha: Whatever you want to call it.

Mr. Chairman: I think it is up to the member asking the questions to satisfy himself that he knows what the items are related to.

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: So, if I may, I will proceed to call the items by number.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3 agreed to.

Item 4 agreed to.

On item 5:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to say two things about that. I had better measure my words with care. In order to obtain the document entitled "The Propositions of the Government of Ontario to the Federal-Provincial Conference" you really had to know somebody around here, you had to have some connection to get one. The leader of the Opposition got one, perhaps two. The leader of the New Democratic Party got one. I had to go down the hall and use a special brand of influence to persuade the handing over of an additional copy.

Mr. MacDonald: A special brand of influence!

Mr. Sopha: I will not dwell upon that. I got one, in short, from the Prime Minister's office, so they must have been something in the order of collector's items. I could not tell in looking at the document—apart from the introduction of the Prime Minister—who prepared it. I assumed that this branch, the federal-provincial conference secretariat, prepared it, but then I was informed by a member of the cognoscente that I was in error, and it was prepared by the advisory committee. Is the Chairman able to tell me who prepared it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It was prepared in The Department of Treasury and Economics for the Prime Minister—

Mr. Sopha: So it is their verbiage.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, that is a fair conclusion. Yes.

Mr. Sopha: I assumed that it was so. I will restrain myself from making any comment upon the quality of the document. I will reserve that for another place.

Mr. Chairman: You would be out of order if you did.

Mr. Sopha: Would I really?

Mr. Chairman: If you were going to comment on the content of the report.

Mr. Sopha: That is an expenditure of public money. I had better tread warily here.

Mr. Chairman: —or on the merits of the report—

Mr. Sopha: Well, certainly. If I want to say the money was misspent in the preparation of that report—

Mr. MacDonald: Then prove it by a detailed analysis of the report.

Mr. Sopha: Certainly.

An hon. member: Let us lean back and listen to it, shall we?

Mr. Sopha: I have looked over the list of the representatives of the government of Ontario who travelled to Ottawa. And I do not want to be in any sense a killjoy, but I must say that I was really overwhelmed, in the light of the policies of retrenchment laid down by the Treasurer on Tuesday, at the number of people that it was felt necessary to transport to the nation's capital. Aside from the five or six Cabinet Ministers—and I just say in passing that if I had my choice about it I would have left about five of them home—but aside from those—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You did not have any choice.

Mr. Sopha: No. I did not have the choice, but I have the freedom to make the complaint, here and now, about the large number of civil servants transported down to the nation's capital, which is only a couple of hundred miles away. Apparently they take 20 or 30 people down there and house them in the leading hotels, at great expenditure of the public money in an atmosphere of retrenchment—

Mr. B. Newman: It looked like an EMO exercise.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, retrenchment. On Tuesday afternoon he is telling us about how we have to tighten the purse-strings and we have to reduce expenditure. But it can be safely said that when the government of Ontario travels, it travels in first-class style.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How many did you say?

Mr. Sopha: About a total of 20 people, I should judge. About 20 people were housed in the nation's capital; I have not completed reading the document in front of me. I also obtained that document to see who they were. And aside from perhaps seven or eight politicians, 12 to 14 other people, I should say, were taken down there. And when, as I did, you watch it on television, you find that the only participant is the Prime Minister of Ontario.

I question the necessity of having large batteries of civil servants in the immediate office. Certainly, the position is that

the views of the government of Ontario have congealed by that time. The Prime Minister has been briefed. He is ready to state his policies, though I must say he gives himself leave to speak extemporaneously.

What is the necessity of going like an ancient warlord with all kinds of a train of satraps behind him, and putting up at the Chateau Laurier hotel or the Lord Elgin or the Skyline, and living high on the hog on the nation's capital? I really question that. But I well know from over ten years of experience, that this government in many ways engages in ostentatious and vulgar expenditure of public money. I know that. They go first class, and I dare say that if the Premier of Ontario, in the guise of the leader of one province of ten in this Confederation, journeyed to the nation's capital with a moderate and modest staff and some problem came up that vexed him, about which he had some uncertainty, and he was unable to glean the necessary information from his ministerial advisors who accompanied him, he has the telephone and he can call back to Queen's Park to the civil servants and have a discussion with them on the telephone.

But, really, to take 12 or 14 people to that Confederation committee room at public expense is, to me, certainly putting on the people of Ontario. Certainly putting them on and asking them to assume a lot. I am fortified in expressing those views. I fortified myself in the light of a notion that I have had for a long time about this. The working of this Confederation, and in part of the whole process, is that these provincial Premiers, when they meet with the central government, must perforce exude the atmosphere that a great feudal monarch is arriving on the scene. That is part of the stereo-typical process that they have to give the impression that it is a big wheel that has come to treat with the central government. That is really the reason for this.

Also, I am one of those offended that the leader of the Opposition is asked at the last moment. He is uncertain until fairly shortly before the conference begins, and the impression is given to the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party that something of a concession is made to them.

An hon. member: They were on standby.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Something of a concession is made. But I read with some amusement the column of Eric Dowd—and really I do not know any of these people—but I read Eric

Dowd's column written as a preview of the opening of the great conference at Ottawa, and then the treating of the equal, sovereign states in the high and solemn conference. Eric Dowd is a very fine writer, very readable. The whole impression given of the fellows in the federal-provincial secretariat, as far as Mr. Dowd's report of his interviews with them, is nothing about matters of high policy, nor the dislocations of the federal system, the fiscal impairment and rearrangement of the geographic boundaries of the component parts and so on. The impression given is that they think it is a great thing.

Some chap by the name of Greathead, who I am sure is a very nice fellow though I do not know him, is telling Mr. Dowd: "Gee whiz. Oh boy. I can hardly wait, and it is so exciting to get down there to the nation's capital."

They are going to have a great time, but there is no discussion of what matters of high policy are going to be discussed, the great John coming down to rub elbows with the political leaders and soon to be managers of the sinews of this nation.

I am encouraged at the beginning of the estimates by the atmosphere of retrenchment and caring and saving money for the people of Ontario, and we carry out our responsibility if we focus upon some of the ostentation. I have been conscious of it—this is one example. I would hope—and I do not call for any reply—that the next time the Premier of Ontario goes to a great conference with Mr. Trudeau perhaps he could be asked to make do—you know really sacrifice—and make do with two or three advisors. Two or three would be quite adequate. A telephone and a credit card would be just about right to keep in touch with his government in Toronto.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): How many did Trudeau take to the Commonwealth conference?

Mr. Sopha: Do not get me started on that. That is another story.

An hon. member: You are against everything, including the Liberals?

Mr. Sopha: I exercise an independent point of view about most things, being a free man such as I am. I point to this because I was sorely offended by it; as far as I could see in front of the television cameras only two emissaries of the government of Ontario had anything to say—just the Prime Minister and the Attorney General. As far as I could see during the time, and I watched it fastidiously

and very religiously, with great interest, only two of the emissaries had anything to say at all.

In the light of these things, I would hope that the heads of government—and where is a better place to start than dealing with matters of the highest policies—show the people of Ontario, that people engaged in the vital and necessary programmes for the well-being of our people, have a restraint which can be copied right from the top. A good place to start is to pare and stop—have a surcease—to this ostentation of American Express and Diners Club credit cards, such as is evidenced in this great migration to Ottawa to that conference.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the opportunity—since the name of Ed Greathead has been mentioned in a way which might cast some doubt on the industry of that man or his attitude—

Mr. Sopha: I said no such thing. On a point of order, I said no such thing at all.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You created that impression.

Mr. Sopha: I said I had read Mr. Dowd's column; on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister is speaking; he has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: I am on a point of order. So that he does not distort this thing, I merely said that I read Mr. Dowd's column and I reported the impressions I got from that column as he quoted Mr. Greathead. I said nothing else more about Mr. Greathead, except that I had no doubt he is a very fine individual.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the implication that I got—and I think everybody else that listened to the member's remarks got—was that his comment was about trifling things, nothing to do with the serious objectives we were pursuing at Ottawa. I just want the hon. member and this House to know that if Ed Greathead did not work 18 hours a day at least, if not 20, through those days that we were there, and perhaps for three months previous to that almost the same number of hours, then he did not work at all. But if there is any suggestion that he was not pursuing the serious objectives which we were pursuing, and assisting in a very valuable way, I would not want that impression to go abroad.

If the hon. member has any doubts about his seriousness and his abilities and his capabilities and his industry, let me put them at rest.

Mr. Nixon: I feel called upon to make some comments in this connection since I was there as an observer and my expenses were paid by this particular fund.

I had the impression myself that perhaps if there were too many people there, it was among the ministry. I had the further impression that at least one Minister was there who was not in the original line-up. But I must also say that having had an opportunity to see the staff backing up the Premier and the Ministers who were taking an active part in the operation, I have no doubts in my mind that their attendance was necessary under these circumstances. It was not a frivolous expenditure of public funds.

Now, in this I would like to back up my colleague from Sudbury by saying that his point is well taken. There are many frivolous expenditures of the type that might very well have been indicated by a press release or, let us say, a press comment in this connection.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense.

Mr. Nixon: I would further say that those people who belong to regimented parties, like the one on my left, should very well have been listening to the leader of the Liberal party in Canada last night, when he said the viability and strength of our party is because we can take differing opinions and we are quite prepared to state them publicly.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to dwell on this at great length, but there are one or two points I want to make. The ludicrous situation of one member of the Liberal party getting up and casting aspersions and then having his leader cut the ground from under him and end up by saying that there is some point in it—trying to be both sides of the question—it speaks for itself. One does not need to elaborate on it.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments on the general observations with regard to the conference.

Some of the comments made by the hon. member for Sudbury were a combination of ignorance and verbal ostentation. Anybody who made the comment, quoting in ignorance the implications that he happened to choose from Eric Dowd's article, simply does not know what Greathead was doing and what the staff was doing. I will join with the

leader of the Liberal party and say they did a good job.

However, I would just like to say this, Mr. Chairman, if you want to go off on this rather cheap pursuit of how you are protecting the oppressed people of the province, every Liberal government, even Newfoundland and New Brunswick—small provinces—it is an interesting fact that you should absorb—

Mr. Sopha: If you multiply, you are all right—

Mr. MacDonald: Pursuing the exercise of your independence, you will be critical of them as you are critical of everybody, including your own party. Every Liberal government there had just as large a group.

Mr. Sopha: If you multiply together, it makes it right.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. Everybody is wrong except the hon. member for Sudbury. His leader is wrong; his party is wrong; everybody is wrong. His leader makes a decision with regard to office staff; he comes down and blasts it to the heavens.

Mr. Nixon: This is not the time to lecture the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, it is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I through you thank the hon. leader of the official Opposition. This is not his time to lecture me.

Mr. Chairman: On Item 5.

Mr. MacDonald: Obviously this is not a vote we want to pursue because the Liberals are in an embarrassing spot on it.

Mr. Nixon: You are just out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure it was out of order.

Mr. Sopha: And supported by every one of your members.

Mr. MacDonald: And the hon. member for Sudbury took us out of order. Now, let me try to get back to order, having been derailed by the Liberals on it. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask questions with regard to a couple of issues.

The Provincial Treasurer, as did the Prime Minister some time earlier, said that the government was making a grant now to the constitutional conference secretariat because they wanted it to be a genuine inter-provincial

secretariat. Quite frankly, I am a little curious as to how the secretariat is going to change just because you are now making a grant? My impression is that the secretariat is overwhelmingly a federal secretariat.

If we are going to get a genuine representation of provincial points of view, I would like to ask a number of questions and having asked them I think the Provincial Treasurer can pick it up and elaborate without further questions.

Who is appointed, from the provincial point of view, or by the provinces, so that you get a balanced consideration of the studies of the agendas?

Mr. Sopha: Surely this is not in order in this vote?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, it is in order.

Mr. Sopha: How can it be in order?

Mr. Chairman: This is the secretariat for the conferences and committees.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, the secretariat for the conference and the grant that is being made to it.

Mr. Sopha: How would what the federal government does be in order? Because that is an expenditure of federal money.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps I could repeat it so that the hon. member for Sudbury, if he was not listening, will get it.

Mr. Sopha: Please do. Although I listened to every word you said.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, perhaps you did not get it the first time, some people are slow learners.

For the first time this government is making a grant to underwrite the cost of the secretariat. Now the question is, how is it going to become a genuine federal-provincial secretariat because that grant happens to be made? Surely that is relevant to this estimate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, the secretariat actually serves the conference, it works for the conference. We participate, we will have staff on the secretariat that serves the conference. One was seconded prior to, and during the last meeting in Ottawa, but we will have a permanent representative on that, maybe more as time goes on. Therefore, this is simply a matter of sharing the cost of this national conference situation. We will have full participation on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it seems to me that the Provincial Treasurer has underlined the point I was trying to get at. You say we have one person who went up during the conference. We may have one permanently. Now from that, I conclude that up until now the secretariat has been basically a federal secretariat.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is right but that is about to change. The reason—I think I am correct—that the contribution is to go up from \$10,000 to \$40,000—is that the secretariat will do some travelling. They are about to meet in Toronto very shortly, I believe. The secretariat will be travelling.

New Brunswick has seconded one person this year to serve as secretary of the official languages subcommittee, for instance. They have given this man to the secretariat. Ontario will second a person this year to serve as secretary of one of the committees. This amount of money simply represents the value of what we think the extent of our contribution to this work will be.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, am I clear that the \$40,000 is an outright grant of money for the operation of the secretariat and in addition to that, do you second, for a short term or for a permanent basis, personnel?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is our share over and above the secondments that I have made reference to; Ontario's accepted share or portion of the cost of operating the secretariat for the advantage of the conference.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I just conclude briefly, Mr. Chairman. I was interested, in talking to a number of provincial people from various provinces during this conference, to find that there was a fairly widespread belief that the secretariat had been a federal secretariat rather than a balanced federal-provincial secretariat. The results, in a very subtle way, often were reflected in the shaping of agenda and in the conclusions of the studies and in the options the secretariat would pull from the studies—therefore, a pretty profound and effective influence.

While I do not want to set up any more of a confrontation between the federal government and the provincial governments than is necessary perhaps for a vigorous democratic exercise, I think if we are going to have an effective federal-provincial consultation in reshaping the constitution we must have meaningful participation in the secretariat and I would hope that the kind of thing that

has been started this year is going to result in that.

The second point I wanted to raise was with regard to the Ontario advisory committee. Now, very briefly, I am going to thresh some old straw.

I wonder how long we must go on with this being such a secret organization? Nobody has an opportunity to share in its meetings or to benefit from its activities or its work, other than through published reports. Quite frankly, if the 40 proposals were a product of the Ontario advisory committee, it is about as thin a product as they have turned out for quite some time. On occasion they were literally restricted to one line, some 20 to 25 words in the centre of a page. That was proposal 17 or something of this nature.

If something is going to come from so formidable a battery of brains, as you have in the Ontario advisory committee, I'd hope it would be something more pretentious, something more valuable in terms of background to the specific proposals that were being advocated. But it is the whole operation of the advisory committee on Confederation which I raise. I had a chat with one member—and I think I can report this without any danger of his identification—one time I had a talk with him and said surely, if there is a feeling, on the part of some of these academics that they do not want to get involved in public debate over their views, they still want to present their views to the government, in the first instance, and through the government, to the politicians.

Is it not possible that at least the leaders of the Opposition parties or perhaps three people from each of the Opposition parties might be able to sit with the advisory committee?

All I am saying is, here is a body that is doing a continuing job. It seems to me that more people should be able to benefit from its work, and they are operating completely in secret as far as the general public is concerned, apart from periodic reports. In fact, even the first reports, I think, finally saw the light of day only because there were about two years of badgering at every estimate in which the issue was in order, and some in which it was not in order.

To sum up, to the Provincial Treasurer, is there any possibility that the government is going to change its mind with regard to the operation of this committee?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman. The committee was appointed in the

first instance to serve the Prime Minister. I think that has been made clear here before. I do not know that I am altogether capable of commenting on whether the Prime Minister would consider a change in the format, if you wish. In general, however, I would say that there are times when you get something less than objectivity, unless you had it constituted the way that it is. Above and beyond that, I cannot say very much. I would suppose that when the Prime Minister felt it might be changed, then he would so inform the House. But I am not in a position to say what the Prime Minister may wish to do.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if I could just make one point. Are we out of order?

Mr. Chairman: It would seem to me that the Prime Minister is the one who can answer your question.

Mr. MacDonald: All right. If so, the Prime Minister should be here. This is in the estimates of the Provincial Treasurer. We are dealing with his estimates.

Mr. Chairman: You will have an opportunity to—

Mr. MacDonald: I will not have an opportunity to deal with it. Well, maybe I shall, but it is certainly in order now, since we have this vote before us.

The only point I was going to make in conclusion and briefly, Mr. Chairman, is that if we cannot get any fuller public participation—public only in the sense of the involvement of this Legislature—I think this debate underlines the absolute necessity of a select committee to do a continuing job of work in this field.

All right. The Provincial Treasurer shakes his head. I invite anybody to take a look at the nature of the constitutional debate we have had this past week, we have one about every two years. In the second or third day, the government moved out en masse. There were only enough Cabinet Ministers to intervene for five minutes or so in the debate. So the constitutional debates, which are generously conceded to us periodically, simply are not an adequate vehicle for consideration of such important issues. There is no willingness nor desire on the part of the government to be here, other than when the leaders participated the first day. Since then, everybody has moved out, I submit that if we are going to come to grips, with a meaningful discussion, of the very serious issues involved in reshaping the constitution, it has to be in that kind of committee, since

apparently we are going to be excluded from this point forward, as in the past, from the Ontario advisory committee proceedings.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask the Treasurer a further question. But before I do, I merely say to you that I am only carrying out what I think to be my responsibilities in conserving the public treasury and the public money. I am willing in response to my own conscience and its demands to accept any scolding I may get, from whatever quarter it may come. I was really surprised—I want to put on record my surprise—to learn today that those 40 propositions were written by this secretariat. I accepted the offering of the person who told me that they were written by the advisory committee. There was no authorship on them, and I was really surprised. I would like to ask the Treasurer, am I right in suspecting that there is not, on that secretariat, a lawyer versed in constitutional law?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The members were all vetted—I guess that is a good word to use—by the advisory committee. The Attorney General and deputy Attorney General were involved. In other words, there was enough involvement in the selection of these people to ensure to those concerned that they were properly chosen. I think that is a fact, I do not think there was a man of the legal profession on there, but—

Mr. Sopha: I am speaking of what I call the secretariat; that might not be the term—the federal-provincial secretariat.

Mr. Chairman: I think you are talking about two different things.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I think we are.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes, that is right. All the propositions—that was your original reference—from our point of view were all vetted by The Attorney General's Department, which seems to remove the need for a constitutional lawyer.

Mr. Sopha: I am really surprised. I do not want to be prolix about this at all, but I have to say in all honesty that here is the etching that I will paint in—that I think the 40 propositions are pretty sad. I do not like the quality and I do not like the manner in which they deal with things. But I am going to reserve that speech for another day, when I will show my reasons for thinking that.

But I want to make this comment: Without extolling the virtues of the legal profession at all, to which I have the honour to

belong, the lawyers since 1867 and since Oliver Mowat made his first attack on the federal House, have been on the firing line with the Constitution. They have been in the front trenches.

Over the years the lawyers have gleaned a great deal of knowledge about the workings of The BNA Act. In the light of that historic truth and the constitutional development, the judicial interpretation of The BNA Act, I do not see how that federal-provincial secretariat can really form a composite approach to the Constitution without that body of knowledge that a constitutional lawyer can bestow upon it.

Let me just leave it with this comment. We come to Section 38 or 39, the distribution of powers, and the distribution of powers is really where the constitutional lawyers have been down through the ages, battling in the Supreme Court of Canada, the judiciary committee of the Privy Council. Now here we will come to the pith and substance, a good constitutional phrase. I read the page and it is about money. That is all there is—for a page and a half they are talking about money. They are not talking about section 91 or 92 at all. One of my disappointments.

So I hope that in the future that secretariat—if that is what it is called, Mr. Greathead, who, I am sure, is a very worthy, intelligent, well-equipped individual—will have join them a person versed in constitutional law. I really do not see how you can make a sensible approach to the problem without such a person.

The other thing I want to say concerns this advisory committee, and to repeat my complaint that a couple of years ago the member for York South says it is as a result of cajolery and stimulation from this side that the Premier finally consented to publish a number of the papers. Eventually they came out in a red book, and one of the prize volumes in my library is one in which the Prime Minister of Ontario has inscribed his name in handing it to me with a nice comment. That will be a piece of Canadiana for me.

That book had three articles by Forsey on the advisory committee, whom I do not treat as a serious scholar any longer. Three articles in favour of the monarchy. Professor John Conway, chairman of the department of the humanities at York University, a distinguished Canadian scholar, a year ago December put in the hands of the secretariat advisory committee, an essay, a scholarly treatise, or whatever you want to call it. And it does not accord with Professor Forsey's dedication to the continuation of the monarchical system in

Canada with all its loyalist symbols. It is a varying point of view.

But Professor Conway's article has never seen the light of day. Whoever forms the editorial board of that advisory committee is not going to allow it to be used for the dissemination of republican propaganda. I enquired about that. The Prime Minister eight months ago said here that he would look into it and see if, perhaps, it might not be published, as were the other articles, including one by Professor Forsey on constitutions of such places as Trinidad, Jamaica, Pakistan, and so on.

The Prime Minister's enquiry was not fruitful of any action because it has never been published. I am told that article, just to make the record complete, will be published privately by the University of Toronto press this spring.

So, what I really complain about is that the Prime Minister, having invited these scholars to come and sit on his committee, and they having devoted their time, talents and energies to the production of what they would consider fruitful work, I do not really see that the advisory committee or anyone else has the right to pick and choose, and to decide in the light of the present state of thought in this country, and present attitudes towards the continuation of the monarchical system, that they have the right to say we will publish all those in favour of Royalty and we will bury those that may call the monarchy into question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am sure the hon. member would want to be aware of the facts. Professor Conway's report was probably too late for inclusion in the first volume, and he has been asked if he would like it included in the second. He has said that he would prefer to have it published in a collection of Candiana to be shortly published by the U of T press.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I said.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You said we excluded him; he chose the one for the other.

Mr. Sopha: Well, who published the first volume?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: His article was too late for the first volume. We are publishing another. We asked him if he wanted to be included in it, and he said no.

Mr. Sopha: Have you had a communication from him that says that, because I will take

the trouble to dig out my communication from him.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have a letter.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask some rather practical questions.

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps you would let me have a copy.

Mr. Pitman: I think the advisory committee was one of the wisest decisions that this government made at a very early point, in which the government of Ontario played a major role in getting this whole business of finding some proper relationship of English and French-speaking Canada. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how many meetings were held last year, of this advisory committee. Could you indicate what will be the agenda for the advisory committee in the coming year?

I do not see a very large sum of money on behalf of this. I am not too sure if \$35,000 is a very large or small sum in comparison to what it was last year. I am wondering just whether the interest of the government is waning or whether it is increasing in regard to providing the people of Ontario with the wherewithal to be able to make some kind of sensible decision in this very complex area.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is certainly the intention of the government to continue this work. There is no question about that. The committee met eight times in plenary session, and a number of members met in committee.

Mr. Pitman: That was last year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. This work will continue—there can be no question about that. I think you have had some indication of the extent we are going to support the work financially. We have already talked about that. I can only assure you of the continuing interest and support of the government for this work.

Mr. Pitman: In other words, the committee will be as active in this coming year as it was in the past year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Slightly more.

Mr. Pitman: Could the Minister indicate when this volume is expected—the second volume of papers on Confederation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not later than this summer, we hope. It may be available before the House rises; depending on how long we sit here.

Mr. Pitman: Is it the purpose of the government to see this as a continuing preparation for perhaps further Confederation of Tomorrow conferences, because I think this was one of the major thrusts and perhaps this is the only way we are going to be able to get out of this mess. Certainly when the federal government calls it, it tends to be a financial crisis and a confrontation; it seems to me when Ontario called the conference, it appeared to be a place where this tension did not exist.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I can assure the member that Ontario is prepared to consider further meetings if they are felt necessary.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to make another comment to leave it in focus. What bothers me is the impression left by the Premier that Professor Conway's article was to be published under the aegis of the government of Ontario. Now, the communication I had from Professor Conway certainly indicated to me—and I do not have it here with me—that he had rather given up on the hope that the government of Ontario, the advisory committee, would publish the article; some group at the University of Toronto was going to publish it.

As I say, it was put in the hands of the government in December 1967. I happen to know that as a fact. And it failed to be published. In midsummer, I asked the Premier in this House where it had got to, and he said he would look into it. I have not the propositions before me, but I read them so avidly and digested in round terms what they said, that I do recall the one about the monarchy—the continuation of the monarchy—which does not take first place with this government. It is about No. 13 or 14; the monarchy is never leading the way. It makes some reference to the fact that there is a variation of opinion in our province about the continuation of our monarchical connection. Well, the best way to elucidate on the variation of opinion, I would think would be to publish the work of a scholar written for the government to indicate that somebody has taken the trouble to articulate it in scholarly verbiage.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure once again that the hon. member understands this situation. Professor Conway was invited to submit this paper. As the member pointed out, it arrived in December, 1967, but the publication of the volume to which he refers was so far ad-

vanced by midsummer that it would not be included.

I want to make this clear. He was then asked if he wanted it to be included in another volume, and his letter on January 29 of this year, addressed to the deputy Minister, said:

I think it a very good idea to publish a second volume of background papers and reports. The public should be informed of the various conclusions members of the committee have come to.

This is the second invitation.

I am sorry my own essay cannot be included in the volume as I believe I told you it has been accepted for publication by the University of Toronto Press in a volume of essays to be brought out this summer.

Now, really, it has nothing to do with opinions about the monarchy on the part of Dr. Conway or Dr. Forsey. We have certain opinions about the monarchy, but surely the member is not implying that an opinion of Dr. Conway's would not be accepted because it is in variance with that of the government?

Mr. MacDonald: He did not imply it, he said it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Certainly, if that is not clarified now, Mr. Chairman, I propose to you that it cannot be clarified.

Mr. Sopha: Well, why was it not handed to us when I enquired last summer? Why is it that the work, the product of this advisory committee, when a member of the Legislature asks, that somebody over there cannot say: "Look, we are not going to publish it in a book for a period of time, but here is a copy of it." Is that too great to request? Is that too forward?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would the member not think it is appropriate to respect the wishes of Dr. Conway, who prefers to have it published in a book of essays by the University of Toronto Press? Would he not think that is an appropriate thing to do? We do.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if—

Mr. Chairman: We could go on indefinitely.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, we could go on indefinitely and I propose to make a small contribution to the debate at this time. Unfortunately, I missed the opening remarks by the member

for Riverdale, but I am told on very good authority by the member for Sudbury that among his statements he said that it was the NDP's proposal that during these estimates a lengthy discussion of policy matters would be undertaken. In spite of that, the leader of the NDP a moment ago made some reference to the inclusion of Opposition representation on the advisory committee, whose vote is before us now.

Now, I do not want to let the occasion pass without first saying I do consider this a matter of policy, and that it could have been expressed on another occasion, and in fact in the case of the leader of the NDP it was. But I cannot let the occasion pass without concurring with his view expressed here, although to some extent out of order, which puts me, I suppose, in the same category.

But since you permitted the other statement, I would like to say that I can hardly credit that these propositions were put by the government to the constitutional conference as representing Ontario's views, when in fact the Legislature had nothing to do with them whatsoever, and it was not until after the propositions had been put forward that we had a chance to discuss them.

Now, the quality of these propositions has been criticized by the member for Sudbury, and I agree with his position there, definitely. But my point is this, and it is a matter of great importance and it has been brought forward in other debates and it should, I suppose, be stressed now, that if the subsequent deliberations of the committee, the advice they give the government and particularly the propositions as they may be printed and put forward as at least emanating from the province of Ontario, if these are going to have continuing validity and value, they must surely emanate as well from the Legislature, either through a committee that is established to work with the advisory committee or one that works independently of it.

Surely, if the propositions had been put to the Legislature previously, if we had had a chance to discuss them before they had been taken down to Ottawa, then the Premier of Ontario might well have said, "I do speak for Ontario because they had been discussed and approved or otherwise by this Legislature."

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I want to get this clarified. I find it really very hard to believe that the propositions emanated from the advisory committee, a group of scholars. If this does need clarification, surely the Provincial Treasurer—

Mr. Sopha: That is not what we were told. They were written by the secretariat.

Mr. Nixon: The advisory committee or the secretariat.

Mr. Pitman: Well, a group of scholars who are honest would want this clarified because I am sure those propositions could not have come from that very learned group. Secondly, I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer could indicate whether there have been any changes in membership on this committee over the past year or since this was last discussed?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. There have been two changes in membership due to the resignations of Mr. Magone and Dean Dillon. They have not been replaced yet. One resignation was through illness and the other for other reasons.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order. We are at item 5 and you are dealing item by item, as I understand it. If you would turn to page 177 you will see that the headings are much more appropriate for discussion.

Item 5 is federal-provincial conferences and committees, \$80,000. If you turn the page to page 117, you see the \$80,000 is subsumed under the total amount falling within that federal-provincial affairs. I think that before we move on, for example, to item 6, which is tax studies, \$25,000, Mr. Chairman, the proper way to proceed is to deal heading by heading with the items on page 177, and the following page. It provides a proper scope for the discussion on the particular area of the estimate.

Mr. Chairman: I am not aware as to whether or not we have a problem here with the rules or the practice of the House. My guess is that the Chair is required to call these votes by number and item, but I can check with the Clerk and find if this freedom you suggest exists.

Mr. Sopha: That is the point I raised at the outset.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, would it not be within your prerogatives to permit us to discuss the estimates under these headings on 177 and then put the votes as they appear on 176—

Mr. Chairman: Certainly, we can always go back and vote on the number—

Mr. MacDonald: May I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that up until a year or two ago

we did not even consider the sub-estimates. We did that only to establish some order so that we would not be jumping back and forward. I think what is being proposed now is that you deal with the heads on page 177, as a more meaningful breakdown of this estimate than the sub-votes on page 176, but you end up by covering the same thing.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if anyone from the government side would like to comment on this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I see nothing wrong with it as long as the discussion is pertinent to one of the items under the vote that is being discussed, otherwise we will range all over the place.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We probably will anyway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will let that pass. I will not comment on that.

Mr. Chairman: We have not come to it. We will have handled this point, administration policy planning, and the summary, and we are in the process, I would judge, of concluding federal-provincial affairs.

Mr. J. Renwick: I can think of a couple of minor comments.

Mr. Chairman: If it is the consent of the House and if there is no objections that anyone wishes to make, then we will proceed that way.

Mr. Nixon: What way?

Mr. Chairman: Through the summary.

Mr. Nixon: And then go back to the vote?

Mr. Chairman: No, I will call the vote as a single number at the end.

The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell me whether there is any ongoing expense to the government as a result of the Confederation of Tomorrow conference?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, the bills have been paid.

Mr. Sopha: What about the hotel bills?

Mr. J. Renwick: The point I was making is that I understand that there was some kind of continuing committee following on from that conference. Is that so or not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That may be. There was a suggestion that the members

of that committee, who were in effect the first Ministers of the province, would get together at the call of the chairman, but that has never taken place.

Mr. Nixon: That was the only decision arrived at.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think the idea was to arrive at decisions. If you were there, I do not think you would have recognized it for that purpose either. It was to deliberate, clarify, develop positions; I do not think it had any basis for decision making.

Mr. Sopha: It was a TV spectacular.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it turned out to be. Indeed it did.

Mr. Sopha: The Premier came on and my four-year-old dived under the couch. What would you have done? What you did the other day?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale is speaking to federal-provincial affairs, is that correct?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the advisory committee. Just what is the procedure by which it is convened or functions? Does it function by itself, or is it through the call of federal-provincial affairs branch that it assembles or does certain work?

What I am getting at is, is there a plan by which in the next year the federal-provincial affairs branch wants to have certain things covered by the advisory committee, or is it just a group of academics who are, as and when they decide themselves, meeting and dealing with topics that they themselves want to deal with?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is an ongoing process. Subcommittees meet or are available on call by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Taxation and fiscal policy.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, in the past six years, we have been coming in the House to assess the estimates. We are starting out now for this year to look at the year 1967, in fact that is what we have here. I am wondering—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Those were public accounts.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir, that is what I mean. I do not know whether it is feasible, but it seems to me we are talking 1969-70 and we

are looking at the 1967 figures. I believe that any giant corporation, Mr. Minister, such as General Motors can have their current statements available. I do not see any reason why, with the staffs and all the equipment and people you have, that you cannot have your 1968 figures available for this board of directors to assess.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is a very good reason, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to know why.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Because the fiscal year is not concluded until the end of this month.

Mr. Sargent: Change it to make it a calendar year, then.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It could still have the same effect, depending on when you are discussing it in this House.

Mr. Sargent: I say very respectfully that in the seven years I have been here, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen one single vote changed by anything anyone has to say. The worst of it is we very diligently look into the estimates to find if there is any way we could get at the government (you have got these covered up pretty well) and I wonder what the good of it is, because nothing—not one single vote—is changed in all the time I have been here. It is kind of an exercise in futility.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would be delighted, Mr. Chairman, if he would just say, "I will pass them all right now." I will be quite happy.

Mr. Sargent: I know you would. I am sorry I was late getting into the House but the Minister, I understand, introduced this study today, The Georgian Bay Region Development Council, and it is under this vote 6. Now how can we, at five minutes to midnight, talk intelligently (if I ever did), and know what you are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order, for a moment! I think I might, from the Chair, advise the hon. member that there were certain undertakings with regard to discussion of these reports, perhaps before he came to the House.

Mr. Sargent: Well, on this point, I think we have been talking about tax studies. It is pretty safe to say, Mr. Chairman, that today in the United States, President Nixon announced a tax cut of \$4 billion, and progres-

sively we have been on a spending binge for the last five years, which you acknowledge. You have got things up so high, and now you have an austerity programme; instead of cutting taxes, you add them on. So, I wonder what we are doing here. We are not going to change a single cent in this whole volume here.

Mr. Chairman: Might I intervene from the Chair and try to draw a distinction between what will be dealt with in the Budget debate and what we are dealing with here.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think we are talking about a tax study of \$25,000, and so far as I understand it, it is under regional government. Will the Minister explain what his plans are for the \$25,000?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is anticipated that the branch will have an extensive involvement in tax structure reform at the provincial, federal-provincial and provincial-municipal levels over the next several years. Among the research projects that are being considered at this time—and particularly following the government's white paper, Budget paper "B", which I read in the House on Tuesday—are computerized quantitative assessment of federal taxes on Ontario's personal income tax revenue, options in respect of taxable income base, progressive schedule of income classes, tax rates. All of these things, you see, will be necessary if we are going to have—

Mr. Sargent: Who is doing the study?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is the taxation and fiscal policy branch of the department—

Mr. Sargent: Well, you are paying them already.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —with outside assistance. This is set up to provide us with some expertise in this field. It has been suggested here from time to time that we should employ outside expertise that could be helpful to us. We would want advice on the integration of provincial personal income tax with other provincial-municipal taxes, that is, retail sales tax and property tax, welfare payments, guaranteed income policies, and so on. These were all outlined incidentally in Budget paper "B" on Tuesday. This is to start the implementation process now. We have indicated we cannot do these things for two years. If we do not get about the

business now, the implementation process cannot be undertaken.

Another matter involves provincial capital gains and gift taxes, which was also discussed in Budget paper B. We need a quantitative analysis on new tax forms available to the province for personal income tax collection. It would involve a task force approach requiring accounting, legal services, investment and economic expertise. So, again, a proportion of this amount will be used for that.

We already have a task force which studied the Carter report when it first came down. We now have a task force ready to pursue that matter if there is some implementation of Carter to be undertaken shortly.

These are the things that we will use those funds for.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just follow up the last comment of the Treasurer. Is it the intention of the Treasurer, through this particular branch, to do his utmost to make certain that the provincial income tax, as he views it, will be identical so far as the base is concerned with the federal one? And what plans are being made for co-operation between the federal government and this branch, when the white paper comes down from the federal government, which I expect will be in June? In other words, it seems to me that you must indicate your willingness at that time to co-operate with them in working out a single identical tax base under The Income Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am sure the hon. member would appreciate, that the present federal base would hardly lend itself to what we are contemplating in terms of personal income tax.

Mr. J. Renwick: I understand that—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And that again is one of the purposes for which this fund—and probably succeeding amounts of voted money—will be used.

As recently as today, in my office, it is fair to say that I had discussions with the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) and his Deputy Minister leading into this situation. They are involved with us in this pursuit to.

Now, of course, it is important to discuss with the federal government as to whether we can harmonize a base and a reporting system with the federal government. This we must know. If we cannot, I think we also

have to pursue it along these lines to develop a base and a structure system of our own. So really both pursuits will be undertaken.

Mr. J. Renwick: I understand the ultimate problem that you may have to agree to disagree. But I want to make absolutely certain that it is envisaged within the amounts provided in this estimate that that kind of co-operative activity is planned in advance and will take place when the white paper that the federal government proposes to issue comes down, and that this branch will be, between now and then, updating or refreshing their minds about whatever studies they have made on the Carter commission.

The next point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask: Is it possible for the Treasurer's branch to begin to publish these studies that are made in these fields, rather than just the particular studies that we do receive as supplements to, for example, the Smith committee report? Is there any reason why the particular studies could not begin to emanate from your department as a series of tax studies in this complicated field?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It would be imprudent, to say the least, to release studies of this kind until it had been determined as to whether they were compatible with the policy that would require to be developed. It might well be that after a policy had been developed in respect to them, they would find their way onto this table, but I doubt if it could just be regarded as something that would take place upon completion of a study. I think that the government would have a right to look at it to see whether policy determinations were involved. I think that would be the procedure.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to come back—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, regarding the same particular studies—are any studies being done in Ontario, at the moment, to provide a more equitable redistribution of income? It appears to me, from one of the reports put out by your department, that something like 80 per cent of the people get about 54 per cent of the income, whereas the 20 per cent get the other 46 or 47 per cent of the income. I just wondered if any of these studies are aimed to provide, shall we say, a more equitable redistribution?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite possible to say yes. If you go back to Budget paper "B", and you cannot read into the remarks in Budget paper "B" that it is the intention of this taxation reform move to find a better way of distributing income through the income tax medium, then I would be sadly mistaken. That is to a very considerable extent the burden of the observations I made on Tuesday. Against that background then, it would seem to be nothing

short of obvious that this whole matter requires to be studied so that we know how to implement it. That is what I have been putting on the record through you, Mr. Chairman; that is really the purpose of responding in this manner to the hon. member for Grey North.

Mr. Sopha: That is Grey-Bruce—Dry Gulch.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 6, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 6, 1969

Estimates, Department of Treasury and Economics, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1059
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	1994

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1969

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND ECONOMICS (Continued)

On vote 2402:

Mr. Chairman: Order, we were on taxation and fiscal policy.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): In my opening remarks I asked the Minister if he would be good enough to give us the comprehensive options which were presented to the government as a result of the studies within his department, so that they could decide on their taxation and fiscal policy. I made the point during those remarks that I was not talking about the specifics of policy choices, but the area of the options that were available to the government. I would ask the Minister if this would not be an appropriate time for him to provide the House with the comprehensive options to which he referred in the course of his Budget remarks.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am prepared to make a commitment to do that tonight. These policy guide lines were developed for the policy decision making purposes of the Cabinet committee on policy development, that made policy decision. It was part of the policy making process. I am rather inclined to think that that is a policy function in its entirety and as a result I am not prepared to make a commitment to accede to the hon. member's request on that matter tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Economic planning!

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about the Minister making any commitment to me at all, I am talking about opening up the debate so that we can understand what the options were that the government civil service of the province of Ontario made available to the Minister. Now, if he wants to play it close to the vest and say that they have decided what the policy is going to be but the rest of us in the province of Ontario are not going to understand the options that are open, that is his privilege.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: But I am simply saying to him that that is not the way the government of this province should be conducted, because the comprehensive options which are available are matters which are of profound public importance and they are essential, they are essential if this routine that we go through in this Legislature is to be of any significance. I think that the government has got to be prepared to stand by the decisions which it made about the choices of options, and I reiterate and reaffirm the proposition. I am not talking about whether they decide to add two cents to the cigarette tax or five per cent to the liquor tax, or anything else; I am talking about the proposition where the ministry of the province was presented presumably through an information development procedure, which is outlined at considerable length in the review, of a procedure by which they are given options, and the Minister opted for:

- (a) A balanced budget;
- (b) For a curtailment of expenditures, which means a curtailment of programmes, and we will deal with that when we come to the Treasury Board;
- (c) No borrowing.

He opted for those positions. Now I want to know first of all whether or not there were in fact before the Treasury and before the government of this province, options in those terms from which they made their decisions or did they just, as a political matter, make their decisions? Now if they have valid options, then of course they as a government are entitled to make political judgments about the method by which they chose the option they selected, or the variations or the mix of the options, as they suggested.

That is fine but if the government in its statement to the province of Ontario says that there are comprehensive options available to the government, I want to know what those options are. I think we are entitled to know, I think it will facilitate the business of the House and I think it will ensure the fact that perhaps, somehow or other, the people of the province of Ontario may possibly participate in this kind of decision making process.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain to the hon. member that the guidelines for options that were submitted to the Cabinet committee on policy were probably 90 per cent or better, the options that were dealt with in the Smith committee report and the report of the select committee.

I think it is quite appropriate for me to say, to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the committee, that we should discuss the options, or the policy options, that were chosen. They have been dealt with quite extensively in the Budget statement itself and in the white paper, but I see no purpose in submitting information that was provided to the Cabinet committee for policy making purposes, to this committee.

I do suggest to you that the preponderant number, probably as much as 95 per cent, of the options, were those that were proposed by the two committees to which I have made reference, the Ontario Committee on Taxation followed up by the work of the select committee. And within that total framework then there were all manner of options, some of which have been accepted for policy purposes, some of which have not, all combining to make up certain elements of the Budget statement itself, and more particularly, the white paper, or Budget paper B.

Now those are the subjects that can be debated, some of them more appropriately in the Budget debate, some of them—if they are relevant—as we go through these estimates. But I do not think, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to table or make available to the committee the guidelines processes that were used. I do not think it is appropriate at all for me to disclose to the hon. member, the basis upon which our policies are determined.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we are likely to be here a long time on this particular matter because it involves a fundamentally different viewpoint as to how the government is to operate. Now the Smith committee report is a public report—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is all there.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is right. Then we have the select committee of this Legislature and then we have a task force of this Minister's department where, in justification for the policy decisions which this government makes, he states that there were comprehensive options presented as a result of the study of the Smith committee report and of the select committee. Another point that I want to deal with very briefly, in consulta-

tion with officials of The Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Revenue, is that I would like to know who those officials were that the consultations took place with. The Minister says that 90 per cent of what was in the Smith committee report and the report in the select committee, constituted the options presented.

Well there was nothing in the Smith committee report, and there was nothing in the select committee report, which would indicate that the province of Ontario should give up the succession duty field. I am not arguing the merits one way or the other, I am talking about options and I am not arguing policy. There is nothing in either of those reports which would indicate that the government of the province of Ontario should decide that the corporation tax should be turned over to the federal government. No discussions whatsoever took place in those two reports about those items.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Have you read the Smith committee report?

Mr. J. Renwick: I have read the Smith committee report and there is no indication whatsoever; in fact, in the first volume, in the early pages of that report, they disclaimed any responsibility in the field of personal income tax or corporation taxes. That is what they specifically stated, and this was the point which I made over a year ago, that the government of Ontario was going this way, the federal government was going that way and they were leaving this great hiatus in between. And now the Treasurer opted yesterday for the abdication of these two fields.

Now I want to know whether or not, for example, one of the options that was made available to the government of the province of Ontario were the recommendations which were made almost 30 years ago by the Rowell-Sirois report. Because this is not a new problem; the problem has been around ever since Confederation, and was reiterated in the terms of reference of the Rowell-Sirois report.

Now I want to have this thrashed out right now. I am not arguing the policy that the government selected, I am arguing the question as to whether we here are entitled to the information about the comprehensive policy options which were made available to the government, and on which they based their decision. I think we are entitled to know that; I think we must know that if we are to have any useful function here.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, all right then. You want the estimate discussion to be reduced to the way it was this afternoon by the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) to the question of the kind of carpeting that you have got on your office floor.

What I want to have is a meaningful discussion. I want to know what the policies were that the government chose—I think it is a legitimate question, and I appeal to the Chairman. This is the kind of question which the Ministry, of course, refuses to answer.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Why should they?

Mr. J. Renwick: Why shouldn't they? Because this is an assembly in which, as usual, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management wants to have the continuous closed shop of the Tory government.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We will keep it up as long as you talk that way.

Mr. J. Renwick: What do you mean so long as I talk that way? This is not a place where my manners or your manners are in dispute. We are talking about the government of the province, and we are talking about whether or not you will provide us with the kind of information on which we can intelligently appraise, for the purpose of debate at the proper time in the Budget, the policies of this government.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That is ridiculous!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well you know what the policies of this government are.

Mr. J. Renwick: We do not know what they were based on.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You picked them out of thin air.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a new theory of government.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think all that one has to do is to read the bound volume that was circulated widely amongst the people of the province of Ontario of the speeches of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and of the Treasurer of the province of Ontario, talking about the fiscal nightmare and the financial jungle or vice versa, whatever the words were that they

used at that time. What they were saying, and what they were doing was propagandizing the people of the province of Ontario.

An hon. member: That is nothing; they did not get away with it.

Mr. J. Renwick: And what has to be done is to make the point to us and to the people of the province of Ontario, that yes, there were valid choices available.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You got them yesterday.

Mr. J. Renwick: Now, I am suggesting to the government that either they publish the valid choices or, as far as I am concerned and so far as we here are concerned, the government stands condemned on the proposition that they are engaged in a propaganda attack on the federal government.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, that is going a little too far.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is not going too far at all.

Let us listen to the attitude of the government. The Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) is not here; I wish he were. The Minister of Mines, talking on Thursday, February 27, said: "Yesterday's rumours coming out of Ottawa about the white paper indicate it will affect Ontario and 'we are worried about it.'" It is almost as if it is a foreign country that you are dealing with because you have carped so long at them—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are times it seems that way.

Mr. J. Renwick: —that they are not prepared to engage in any kind of dialogue.

But then listen to this: He has previously refrained from commenting publicly on suggested federal changes "but if stirring up public opinion against them might be effective, I think this is part of my job."

Now if that is the attitude of the Minister of Mines and if that reflects, as it has reflected for several months—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That is the Robarts policy.

Mr. J. Renwick: —the attitude of this government on the problem, then I want the people of the province of Ontario to know that you did have comprehensive policy options available to you. And you have to provide them to us.

Mr. MacDonald: In your own interests, you should provide them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, this is getting very repetitive. I have pointed out and I will point out again, repetitive as it is, because the member has repeated himself three times though I understood him the first time, that we have had two exhaustive studies, first of all the Smith committee study, and then a select committee to study their recommendations.

I have pointed out to you that as much as probably 95 per cent of the options that were considered by the government are embodied in those reports, further amplified in Budget paper B, the white paper, which really sets out most of the pro's and con's leading to the policy decisions. The member made reference to succession duties. Smith wanted to change succession duties; it is in his report. But we made our decisions—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): This is an indication that you—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just let me finish, would you, please? I listened quite carefully to the hon. member.

We made our decisions, not based on the options that are referred to here rather loosely; we made our decisions following the Budget of the federal government on October 22, 1968. We made our decisions on that particular item because of the move that they made with respect to estate tax. That was what motivated that change.

Now surely it is fair to say that irrespective of policy guidelines, or what might be better described as a waiting process against the programme—the operational programme of the government—which helped us make our policy decisions in expenditure controls, has no relationship to what the hon. member is talking about here tonight at all. We propose to discuss the policies that have been decided upon and if you examine the Smith committee report, the select committee report, and Budget paper B, you have to isolate those decisions for yourself. But I say, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of disclosing the policy making pursuits that the government employs for this purpose, and I do not think it is my part to do so.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister a couple of questions to elucidate aspects of his taxation fiscal policy?

Mr. J. Renwick: Is the member for Scarborough East going to continue on the same point or is he going off into a different one?

Mr. T. Reid: No, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, that is fine.

Mr. Chairman: The point has been made a number of times.

Mr. T. Reid: It is not the same point. It is an attempt to understand the Minister's views on economic policy so we can see where we are going. And the questions are quite brief, Mr. Chairman.

What is the Minister's view of a reasonable stability of prices for Ontario? And what is his view of a reasonable rate of inflation? He must have some ideal in mind.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think possibly the hon. member, and other hon. members, have been here long enough to hear that statement policy before. I think there have been occasions when it has been suggested—and I may be out a little bit—that the growth factor of something on the order of 5½ to 6 per cent is a fairly sustainable rate of growth. When you break down the mix of real growth and inflationary or price growth then it becomes another story.

There is a limit to what the economy can stand in terms of strain, I am sure the hon. member is aware of that without asking the question. These things provide us with guidelines, the same type of guidelines that would direct anybody's thinking. Now, we have also indicated that we see some improvement coming in this factor, as far as inflationary processes are concerned, related to the economic aspect that the hon. member has made reference to. So, these are the sensible guidelines that are employed. I may be out a little, as far as today is concerned, but I think generally that is about the sensible approach that is pursued.

Mr. T. Reid: I thought I made my question quite clear. If the Minister could determine these things, would he like to have a 1 per cent inflation rate, a 1.5 per cent inflation rate for the provincial economy, or a 5 per cent inflation rate? In other words, what is his policy objective with regard to the rate of inflation in the province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suppose this is appropriate under this vote, but it seems to be a little away from the purpose of the estimates. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I do

not know that it is possible to make a precise statement on that at any given point in time. The objective can vary depending on the circumstances of the day. If the economy needs a little pump-priming, all right, you can stand a little inflationary pursuit, involved in deficit financing if you wish.

When you think about it, and I am sure the hon. member would concur with this, if inflation becomes a matter of concern, as it has, then probably a balanced budget is the way to arrest it. Now, I cannot get into any more of a finite argument or debate on it than that with the hon. member, but surely this is general enough.

Mr. T. Reid: Could the Minister again give the members of this House some idea of what he believes a reasonable goal of unemployment is in this province? In other words, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have as an objective of his taxation fiscal policy, some goal of unemployment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Full employment, no inflation.

Mr. T. Reid: Does the Minister agree?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You have a captive labour force.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, to be more precise, we said before that 2 per cent is probably an optimum increase related to price or inflation. That is an optimum. Last year it was 3½ per cent, but we indicated in the budget papers and in the budget statement, we hope by next year to get down to 3.3 per cent. We doubt, though, whether we can get below that.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is 60,000 people.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But we also outlined in our Budget statement what we think in terms of optimum employment, and what factual employment is likely to be. It is all in the Budget statement.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They do not want to work.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What was that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You would not know, you have never hired anyone in your life.

Mr. T. Reid: To continue with this, I am just trying to find out what the Minister's objectives and policy recommendations are. If

I understand his Budget—which I have read very carefully I assure him—and his statements now, he is saying that the main objective of his taxation fiscal policy is contained in his Budget, is an unemployment rate of no more than 2 per cent in 1969, and a price increase rate of 3.3 per cent. Is this your objective?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We said that is what we hoped to achieve this year, 3.3 per cent; a decline of .2 per cent. That is what I said.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not just happen to be one of the persons who believes that the committee of ways and means is a committee in which you discuss the policies of the government. I think we are entitled to elucidate, and extract from the government.

Mr. T. Reid: That is a pretty big switch around.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is not a very big switch around at all. I am simply saying, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think we have the right to extract information and to question the Minister about what they are doing, not about their policy.

Mr. T. Reid: What do you think I am doing?

Mr. J. Renwick: But to seek information about it. Now I think this is very important from the point of view of the work of these estimates in the course of the next several months. I admit to a certain amount of concern about the fact that we are now going off on to one of these Liberal red herring tangents, which lead nowhere, when we are trying to elucidate a certain amount of information.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Has the member—

Mr. J. Renwick: —on the point of order, I would like the Minister to rule as to whether or not the member for Scarborough East is in order in the line of questioning which he is pursuing in these particular estimates?

Mr. Chairman: Well, that is a very difficult question the member for Riverdale has posed. The thesis that he presented this afternoon was along the same lines and would, as far as I can see, have meant a much more expeditious handling of the estimates. But without wishing to stir up trouble, I think there were times when your leader went well beyond

the limitations that you yourself have laid out. Now—

Mr. MacDonald: When, for example?

Mr. Chairman: I am just pointing out that—

Mr. MacDonald: When, for example?

Mr. Chairman: When we were discussing, I believe it was, the delegations or attitudes involved in the Confederation conference.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was commenting briefly on what the hon. member for Sudbury said and then I went on to ask specifics as to the operation and the role of the Ontario Advisory Committee on education.

Mr. Sargent: You wandered off—

Mr. MacDonald: I did not wander off. I wandered only to deal with the wanderings that one of your members had dealt with. Then I went back to two specifics as to what is the change in the secretariat, because of the fact that we have put in this money, and what exactly is the role of the Ontario Advisory Committee.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest if you do not indulge in imputing just what we are doing, you will not get yourself into so much trouble.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, if I could have a chance—

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. T. Reid: —on this point of order. I thought that the Minister and I were engaged in a very worthwhile debate. I thought this was part of the debate for the estimates of this department. I was trying to elucidate from the Minister information which I think is necessary to understand the taxation and fiscal system of this government—

Mr. J. Renwick: It is irrelevant.

Mr. Sargent: He just took the ball from the member for Riverdale.

Mr. T. Reid: And I ask for equal treatment.

Mr. Chairman: If I may, my submission to the committee is that the member for Riverdale was right. In other words, his questioning, as I understood it, was dealing with policymaking machinery and the exposition of the processes involved in policymaking. As I would understand his line of questioning, he is asking expressly what particular policies of the Minister were.

I find that the member for Riverdale has an excellent point, and it would certainly tidy up our deliberations here if we could stick to that discipline and if the questions be allowed to be opened to any length that members may wish when we are discussing the Budget itself.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder if I might offer a proposal to you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that the examination of estimates is to elicit information and once the information is given in an answer I think that is about as far as it should be pursued. I do not think it should get involved in a philosophical debate following that, about what is a sustainable rate of growth or unemployment policy.

Once the hon. member gets whatever answer he is given, the debate process is over and I think I might say that to the hon. member for Riverdale. I have stated the position in that respect and he has his opinion, I have mine. But I think at that point it is not a debating society.

Mr. Lewis: Right—in the one instance you clarify—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order I would like to assure the Minister that I have very simple questions to ask and I am sure he knows the answers. The answers are not always found, Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's Budget. He does not state explicitly the answers to the questions I am asking. I can assure you and I can assure the minister that I find this very helpful in understanding his policy and how he arrived at decisions—which is what the member for Riverdale is concerned with to some extent—and also, what some of those decisions are in fact. I will not pursue a point if the Minister feels he has answered that type of question.

I would only say, sir, that I could, of course, make a long speech in this House and I have made long speeches in this House, covering 55 pages at one go. I do not like that way of making my views known and the views of my party known. I much prefer debating and I consider this debate to be very much in order, sir.

An hon. member: What is the Legislature for, then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I hope this will be a final and satisfactory answer to the hon. member.

We have said before, and I think it is fair to repeat, that the desirable combination of

growth factors would probably be, if it is obtainable, something on the order of 5 to 5.5 per cent real growth and as low as 2 per cent inflationary growth, if that is an achievable goal. It has not been lately. I did say in Budget paper B or in the course of my remarks that we hope to move closer to it, not that much, but from 3.5 to 3.3, on the inflationary side.

Mr. T. Reid: Five to six per cent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly. We have moved that far. We also made certain comments in there on what we think our optimum position should be with unemployment. And I might say, just for the sake of the committee's information, that in this instance we are following federal policy as closely as we possibly can. I think our policy is almost identical there.

Mr. Sargent: You cannot go wrong then.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That may be one place where we cannot go wrong, but I will tell you there are a number of others that are wrong.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have another short question. I would like each question to be judged on its merits. If it is out of order, fine.

What are the different types of unemployment in Ontario, according to the Minister's view, and how does the provincial-fiscal policy affect each of these kinds of unemployment?

An. hon. member: Very good question.

Mr. Chairman: Try and be consistent, I still feel that the first part of that question is out of order, if we are trying to direct ourselves to the machinery of the decision-making process as distinct from their results. But perhaps the Minister would like to comment.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will, if the hon. member would repeat that again. I did not get it too well.

Mr. T. Reid: I will of course abide by your ruling. Could the Minister elaborate on the mechanism and the systems he uses to estimate the seriousness of the time lags involved of his taxation fiscal policies to achieve the provincial objective of his policies which he stated are a certain level of minimum inflation and certain level of minimum unemployment? What system has the Treasurer set up in the taxation fiscal policy part of his office, to get at the degree of seriousness of the time lags involved?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There again, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to be specific about that. But all our continuing research, our day-to-day research, week-to-week if you wish, is directed at that. I cannot get into this thing by chapter and verse or specific terms. I suggest to the hon. member that, if he would like to think about it, he would almost be able to determine the processes he would use himself. But this research goes on all the time. It never stops. It relates to the day, or the week again, as I said before, or the month, but you cannot lay down anything specific today because there are a whole host of other considerations that bear a relationship to it or have an effect on it. So it must be a continuing research process.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Minister correctly, is he saying that he really does not know what the time lags are in terms of the impact of his fiscal taxation policy on unemployment and price inflation in this province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am not saying that at all. Let us see if some of this information would be—the latest unemployment rate is down to 2.7 per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis. This is getting close to optimum in Ontario, so more stimulus, if you like, might easily get the economy overheated. This is a word we used in our Budget statement too. It is a fine balance at a certain point as to how far you go. You could affect the economy either way. But at 2.7 per cent the bulk of our unemployment is the variety that will always be with us and I think that must be recognized. I really do not know how to pursue this any differently, Mr. Chairman, but I think these must be the matters that determine the decision-making processes.

Mr. Chairman: Economic planning?

Mr. J. Renwick: Before we pass to economic planning, I want to reiterate very briefly the position which I have taken with the Treasurer's question. He referred to the fact that most of what we are talking about was in the Smith committee report or the select committee report. I am simply putting the proposition that once he has presented his Budget, and all the budgetary papers that he wants to present, we here, in order to inform ourselves for the purpose of adequately assessing the government's policy-making decisions, are entitled to know the "comprehensive policy options which were available to the government". I do not

accept the proposition of the Treasurer that he is using other than rhetoric when he talks about "comprehensive policy options" if he is suggesting for one moment that the great bulk of what was in his Budget was in either the select committee report or in the Smith committee report.

The fact of the matter is that, so far as capital gains tax is concerned, it was not recommended by either the Smith committee report or the select committee report, and yet the Minister has provided for that. Neither of those reports recommended that the province give up the corporations tax, a tax field which, if properly exploited by this province, would provide a substantial amount of money.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We did not propose to give it up, we proposed to have it centrally collected, which Smith recommended. We did not propose to give it up. If you examine our position, we want to retain our share of the revenue. We did not propose we give up corporation income tax. I ask the member, how could we?

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, as I understand what the distinction is I do not want to get into—

Mr. Chairman: Well, this is not the member's question.

Mr. J. Renwick: I simply want the Minister to correct me if I am wrong. I understood that what he said was that they would turn over the corporation tax field to the federal government on some negotiated basis. Is that correct? That is quite a different position from the position with—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. J. Renwick:—respect to the income tax where there may very well be a common collection basis. What page is the Minister referring to?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Page 59, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out we are drifting into the Budget physically now.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to keep the point of order of the member for Riverdale and ask the Minister the following question—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would refer the member for Riverdale to the second paragraph under section 5 on page 59 of the budget.

Mr. T. Reid:—in the study prepared for the Ontario committee on taxation by James A. Johnson entitled "The Incidence of Government Revenues and Expenditures" on page 77, there is a table, table 5, entitled "Net Fiscal Instance of Government Revenue and Expenditures Programme, 1961". I would like to know if the branch in the Minister's department concerned with taxation fiscal policy is updating the research results from 1961 to 1966?

The reason I am asking this, Mr. Chairman, is that it seems to be very important for the Minister to know—even if he will not let the hon. member for Riverdale know—what the net fiscal incidence of the Ontario government's revenue expenditures programme is—or, if you like, taxation fiscal policies are, on the various income groups in this province. For example on the income group \$7,000 to \$9,999 and on the lower groups and the upper groups. As he knows the report by Mr. Johnson utterly condemns the burden of taxation and expenditure policy on the lower income groups in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: We are getting well out of order again, I would suggest.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether his department is looking at a more up to date measure of what is called the net fiscal incidence of government revenues and expenditures?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, of course, this is a continuing process and if this was not made manifest in the Budget that was presented in this House on Tuesday I do not know anything that was—

Mr. T. Reid: Not what you hope it to be, but what it actually is.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well we have moved toward that and I suggest that that is dealt with in here, too. We have indicated to the House on Tuesday the incidence of taxation as prescribed in the Budget for the upcoming year. It is broken down in there percentage-wise to show that it effects high income groups, and corporate levels, if you wish, much more than the low income groups. I might say now, and I am not trying to be political about this because it has been mentioned many, many times, if there was anything that made us aware of regressive taxation it was the two per cent social development tax imposed by the federal government.

Mr. T. Reid: If I could again ask the Minister my question, which he did not answer,

because I think he may have shown his ignorance of the terminology I was using.

I asked him about what is called net fiscal incidence. I did not ask him just about the incidence of taxation, because he ought to know now the result of the expenditure programmes of his government on the people of Ontario. I suggest to him, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the incidence of expenditures really makes the lower income groups, and the middle income groups—\$6,000 to \$10,000—much worse off under his Budget for next year than they were previously. But he does not know that, because he has not bothered to do the studies.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is not correct, but we will let that ride.

Mr. Chairman: Economic planning?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave taxation and fiscal policies, the Minister was perfectly right. I had misunderstood the corporation tax proposition contained in the Budget. It does not alter my basic point, a disagreement between the Treasurer and myself as to the kind of information to which we are entitled here after the Budget has been presented in order that we can adequately assess the governmental decisions on budgetary policies. I leave that point.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, will the Minister advise why economic planning and the—

Mr. Chairman: We are just coming to economic planning, is that the one you want to speak on?

Mr. Sargent: You are through taxation, are you?

Mr. Chairman: I believe so. All right, we are at economic planning.

Mr. T. Reid: No, taxation.

Mr. Chairman: You still have questions on it? The hon. member for Grey-Bruce had better wait.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, one of the background papers for the Ontario committee on taxation was prepared by Clarence L. Barber entitled "Theory of Fiscal Policy as Applied to a Province." On page 38 there is a statement concerning the dependency of economic growth in Ontario on an adequate and continuous supply of social capital.

I would like to ask the Minister about the objectives of his taxation fiscal policy and the mechanisms designed to measure their achievement within his department. Are these studies being done to show the degree to which economic growth, low rates of inflation and low rates of unemployment are dependent upon a very high rate of increase in social capital involving schools, hospitals, social welfare and the whole works? What studies are being done now to update the previous studies?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would simply have to say that that is a continuing day-to-day function of the taxation and fiscal policy branch which we are examining right now.

Mr. Chairman: Economic planning—the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: There seems to be some reason why economic planning and regional development is in this vote. In my opinion, it should be under The Department of Municipal Affairs. If we want to talk, Mr. Chairman, about the bad economic situation in Grey and Bruce counties and I asked the permission of the chair to talk about that I would not get very far tonight. But where are we going to talk about that if we are going to talk regional planning? Is this the place to talk about it?

Mr. Chairman: Probably not under economic planning but the scope of regional development would be wider.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister not agree that this is the baby of Municipal Affairs? Why have we got this slot here?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well it is here. I do not know that that is—

Mr. Sargent: It does not matter, it is all dollar bills but—

Mr. Chairman: Earlier in the day, before the member for Grey-Bruce entered the House, it was agreed that regional development would be the last item we would deal with and I would suggest it has a much wider scope than economic planning.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am only taking a moment, but when we make reference to economic planning in this context, it is total economic planning, aggregate economic planning. When we come to analyzing the economic growth or the economic situation of Grey-Bruce, then this is a part of

the studies undertaken by regional development.

Mr. Sargent: This is my very point.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we agreed to leave discussion of that matter until later on under vote 2402. It was agreed to leave it so that some of the material that was tabled today could be studied.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, during the estimates I can find myself relating to all or the most of the topics one way or another but I find it difficult to relate to the economic planning. I find it equally difficult when I find the Treasurer making a statement about something called total economic planning. Perhaps he would give an explanation to the House as to the function of the economic planning branch of his department.

Mr. Chairman: I think not. I think an explanation as to what the estimate means is fundamental to our understanding of it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I could recite a number of them, there are many here, and probably if I recite some of them they will exemplify what this branch does. For instance, in the natural resources field, the study being undertaken now, or in process, involving international trade in forest products, deal with Canada's trade liberalization policies with implications for the forest based industries; there is a study in process involving the current economic situation of Ontario's pulp and paper mills; a report prepared in support of policy decisions by the Ontario Water Resources Commission re pollution by pulp and paper mills; there is an appraisal of cost benefits, techniques and recreational programmes, and this was undertaken at the request of The Department of Lands and Forests. These are samples of what it has done. They are in preparation.

The study of Ontario's iron ore mining industry—a comprehensive study including an analysis on the impact of the mining tax within the industry; there is a review and assessment of recommendations presented in the report on the special committee on farm income in Ontario being prepared for study, and this will include an analysis of the implications of these recommendations and their possible effect on broader considerations bearing on the provincial economy. This is what we mean by the aggregate economy, if you wish, all matters that bear on that. A continuing review and analysis of Ontario's agricultural policies, in particular as they relate to farm productivity, farm consolida-

tion and returns on factors of production, in close liason with The Department of Agriculture.

There are many more here, but this is a sample of what is being done. I do not know how far to go with it—more studies are related to water supply and demand in northern Ontario; a matter of a bridge from Kingston to Wolfe Island to Cape Vincent; the economic background of that, the economic potential for development in a broad area of such a bridge—that study is nearing completion—the trends in job families and educational achievement levels of the Ontario labour force—this is in draft form now—an analysis of industrial man-power requirements by skilled families, for education and training purposes—there is a host of these.

Productivity trends in Ontario and Canada for the 12 year period between 1952 and 1964—this will be an analysis of output and productivity changes which affected demands for labour, hence for training and education. These projections have been updated to 1966 and comparisons with United States trends have been made as part of our continuing studies on manpower requirements. This is an example of what is undertaken by this particular branch, on a continuing basis.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would furnish me in due course, I do not mean during the estimates, with a copy of the studies which he is referring to, and being undertaken in this branch.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: I take it from the description of the topics that some of them would be initiated within the Economic Planning Branch, and others are obviously requested from other sources.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Could the Minister, at this point, give any indication of the number of other departments which are using the resources of the Economic Planning Branch for this kind of forward study and planning.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. A good number of them are. I just do not have the precise number, but—

Mr. J. Renwick: The bridge fascinates me. Was that at the request of the member for Kingston and the Islands!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we must give him credit for initiating the idea that prompted the study. Yes, we will give him

full credit for that. I presume he must have known that you were going to ask the question. But The Department of Highways and Department of Transport associate themselves with them. Most departments do in one way or another, some more than others, but the branch is available to all departments for assistance or direction in the field of economic planning and will undertake studies for any department where there is a proper relationship.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister classify the Opposition Parties as departments of government for this purpose? So that we could have access to the research skills that you have in your department.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): In terms of economic planning in your department, do you examine social goals in things like hospital beds, schools, and so on—the social necessities—and then decide to plan your economy to generate the necessary social capital, either through tax revenue or various other sources to be able to pay for these particular social needs? Is there any correlation between the social needs of our society and your economic planning?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, in that case, Mr. Minister, could you give us some indication as to your goals in terms of social needs and services in providing hospital beds, we will use that as one example. And could you, from the statistics that you have available, indicate to us when you are going to meet that particular goal? What year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No. I do not think I can be that precise. Neither am I prepared to say that there is that much shortage of hospital beds now. We made it prior to the budget statement, or associated papers—look, you asked a question, let me pursue it. In certain health care areas we have been obliged to curtail our capital construction programmes for this year. But we work with The Department of Health, or will work with them, so they have associated facilities of their own with the Ontario Hospitals Services Commission or the facilities of the Health Insurance Registration Board. Now if there are any specific assignments related to economic planning that they would want us to do, we would be happy to undertake them.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, let us move into another field. As an example let us take housing or places in universities and so on, there are many areas of social need. Now what I want to know is, are you looking at the areas of social need and deciding what you are going to do in the other sectors of the economy to ensure that you are able to provide either the housing or the places in universities?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, of course, we are looking at them and our plans are made manifest in those circumstances. They have been outlined again, as I say, in the papers which I presented to the House on Tuesday for the budget year. But it should be obvious, I think, to the member that these are matters—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): It certainly is not in the budget—there's nothing obvious about it at all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —these are matters of study that are continuing all the time.

Mr. Peacock: Nothing obvious about it at all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, why should it not be obvious? Because you are over there you think that it is not being done? This is an absolute fallacy.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, you know you may have your plans but you cannot live in plans, you have to have houses to live in. What I want to know is when you are going to implement your plans to provide the necessary housing, to provide the necessary hospital beds or schools or whatever it is again in the social or the public sector? What we want to know is when you are going to put those plans into something tangible and solid, or when are we going to have the housing?

You can't live in a plan, you know that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No. The function of this branch is to do the economic planning. The decision-making process, I would say, rests with the various departments of government who are responsible within the limits of the funds that could be made available to them through the budget.

Mr. Peacock: Well we are back, Mr. Chairman, to the point raised by the member for Riverdale. Just what is obvious about the links between this particular office of the Minister's department and the policy options that he talked about in his Budget statement, which he chose? There is to me

absolutely nothing that is obvious at all about the provision in the Budget, by way of example, Mr. Chairman, of \$55 million for investment in housing and the work of this policy planning branch. Nothing whatever.

Mr. Lewis: Make the connection for us.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, we would be just delighted to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Let us get back to the functions of the economic planning branch that is under discussion now. This branch has been responsible in the first instance for bringing together the Ontario Housing Corporation and The Department of Municipal Affairs in the whole field of housing and urban affairs, the goals of the two and the recommendations to the government on the appropriate level of housing. These studies are carried on in co-operation with the department by this branch.

Now, the member made reference to our proposal to set up a fund which would make mortgages available. Surely it has been stated in this House often enough that one of the roadblocks in the way of providing housing is the difficulty of obtaining mortgages particularly at the present high cost. This is what prompted us to propose that we will set up a capital fund to be administered by the Ontario Housing Corporation for this purpose on a revolving basis. I have indicated it would probably be \$50 million to start the fund and it may turn out that this is sufficient as it revolves; it may eventually be sufficient to take care of the requirements.

The figure is not firm, it is an example of what might be made available. Now, there again, if that is not dealing in adequate terms, following examinations through the economic planning branch and translating them into action to relieve the housing situation, I simply have to ask you, Mr. Chairman, what is?

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, that is what we want to find out, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have told you.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, the point which my colleagues, the members for Brantford and Windsor West are speaking about, is very clear. Is the economic planning branch accepting any responsibility for the assessment from the other side of the coin?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What other side?

Mr. J. Renwick: In terms of social need in the province? The member for Brantford raised the question about housing. Now, we have had the Ontario Housing Corporation before us for two sessions in the standing committee on government commissions, and we will have them before us for a number of other sessions in order to answer questions which we have placed with them. But it is obvious, on the basis of the information which they have provided us with at the present time, that they have no conception of what the economic or social need for housing is in the province of Ontario. I am asking the Minister whether the economic planning branch is engaged in that kind of fundamental study as to the extent of the need, the social need, in the field of housing, in every one of its categories. And whether or not it is engaged in all the other aspects of housing, because it is perfectly clear that the Ontario Housing Corporation limits itself to a market operation in terms of (a) construction and, (b) rental or sale. It is totally involved in that context. Now, that is an entirely different thing to the social need for housing.

It seems to us that we have to ask the government; we have to ask this department; we have to ask this branch, to accept the responsibility of preparing, through the statistical centre and the information centre and all the resources which are available, a total assessment of the social need for housing. A total assessment of the kind and quality of housing available in the province of Ontario. A total assessment of what is happening to land costs and a total assessment of what is happening to building costs, in order that this department can come up with the basic information on which the government can finally come to grips with the question of that social need.

I am quite certain that the Minister can nod and say "yes, we understand that" but at the risk of taking a little bit of time, I am going to talk about the other matter.

The member for Brantford referred to hospital beds and an assessment by this branch, if it is a social economic planning branch, and not strictly an economic planning branch, in the non-human sense of that term, and whether or not there is an assessment of need in that area. Then I would like to say to the Minister, "Well, all right, in the fifth report of the Economic Council of Canada we have again that same question raised and that is the question of poverty".

Housing is an aspect of poverty in the province and I want to know whether or not

the economic planning branch, renamed if necessary, the social economic planning branch, is concerned at all about the kind of fundamental research which would enable it to attack what the economic council claims to be the major problem in Canada, and that is, the incidence of poverty.

One has only to refer to the fifth report of the Economic Council of Canada in order to find statements such as this:

Statistics cannot adequately describe poverty, but used with care they are capable of furnishing important clues to the types of policies likely to be effective against poverty. It is evident from the incidence figures that income is more likely to be low when one or more of the following characteristics are present: (1) the head of the family has no formal education beyond elementary school; (2) the family lives in a rural area; (4) the head of the family is not a member of the labour force; (5) no member of the family worked during the year; (6) the head of the family is 65 years of age or over; (7) the head of the family is a woman.

Then you can get into the whole question of the level at which a person's money income permits that person to say that he is not a poor person.

Now, is this branch engaged in the kind of fundamental research which would enable it to attack what the economic council claims to be the major problem in Canada, and that is, the incidence of poverty.

I have spoken about housing and I have spoken about poverty. There is also the whole question, Mr. Chairman, of jobs. The Minister, each year that I have listened to the budgetary presentation in the House, has stated that the labour force is growing at a faster rate than the number of jobs available. We also have the very generalized statement made by the Prime Minister about the jobs for students during the coming summer.

Now, I want to know whether or not the economic planning branch is, for example, studying the problem of jobs, the availability of jobs in the province of Ontario and whether or not they are going to be adequate in terms of the projections of the population trends of the province.

I want to know whether or not this branch is making any study of the basic number of people, who can be called, for the want of a better term, hard-core unemployed persons.

Are any plans being made to re-absorb them if they wish to be re-absorbed and can accept that kind of training, back into the labour force.

Is this kind of fundamental social work being done in that department or are we restricting the activities of the department to things called "the census of manufacturers" or "the census of forestry". Is the government getting down to the gut problems of people's needs in the province of Ontario?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have a similar series of questions to the hon. member for Riverdale, which I could put if the Minister would—

Mr. Chairman: Well, probably the hon. Minister could handle these both at the same time, if the member for Scarborough East wants to speak on the same point.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Minister not want to reply first?

Mr. Chairman: Well I would suggest it would be simpler if the Minister replied to both together.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if there are a number of related questions I might as well reply to them all at once.

Mr. J. Renwick: No, we want to have a debate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, you want a debate. I did not think you wanted a debate. I thought you were just looking for information.

Mr. J. Renwick: We want to be able to extract more information, but it is very difficult.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well I am going to try and give you the information in much less time and much less words than you asked the question, if I may. Let me set out, if I can, the terms of reference for the economic planning branch, and then I will try and be a little bit more specific.

This expanded branch is now responsible, as I said before, for the aggregate analysis of the Ontario economy, including forecasting, the establishment of targets, and the identification of problem areas and bottlenecks. It is also responsible for the study of individual sections of the economy relating to the supply and distribution of specific resources both human and material. I emphasize

human and material. And in that broad context I think follows most of the things that you made reference to, if not all of them. And the—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I said, I think, most if not all of them, but I would say, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Brantford has a right to his opinion. The results of the sectoral studies will be fed back—

Mr. Lewis: He is much reassured.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, well, we get a little reassurance from you once in a while, I think it is only fair to give you some back.

The results of sectoral studies will be fed back into aggregate analysis, because an important decision made in areas such as industrial development, labour relations, resource development, education, or transportation, frequently has important applications for several areas of government concern, which the hon. member for Riverdale touched on. In research and policy liaison the branch will work closely with the taxation and fiscal policy branch, and with the regional development branch, again embracing many of the problems to which the hon. member made reference.

Now, we have now five professionals essentially on natural resources and transportation. We have three on manpower and social security and housing, and we have two on aggregate analysis and forecasting. I cannot sum up an answer for the hon. member any better than to give him this general information, because it embraces, I believe, all the things that he made reference to.

Now, with respect to the matter of employment—

Mr. Peacock: It does not show up in the policy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On page 49 of the Budget paper we mentioned large increases in employment in Ontario in 1969 could lead to slightly lower levels of average unemployment. The labour force will grow by a further 103,000 to reach a level of 3,037,000, and the expansion of economic activity will probably create about 105,000 new jobs so that average unemployment could drop from 3.5 to 3.4 per cent of the labour force.

I just simply say this to you, Mr. Chairman. This information came off the top of nobody's

head. It was the result of studying by the economic planning branch and related branches.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough West, and then the member for Scarborough East.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough—

Mr. Lewis: West, as a rule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: West, and then East.

Mr. Lewis: We will move from West to East; I have no objections whatsoever, Mr. Chairman.

My problem, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, is to comprehend what the estimable gentlemen in his department are doing. If there are five on aggregate analysis, or five on—what was the first, manpower analysis?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, natural resource development.

Mr. Lewis: Natural resource development, and three on manpower, social security and housing, I think he said, and two on aggregate analysis. One finds it difficult to envisage, to conceptualise, what they do in terms of the policy options which are enunciated by the government. One is loath to reflect poorly on the economic planning secretariat, but the gap between planning and reality is almost more than can be coped with.

Now let us take one of the obvious areas, Mr. Chairman, the area of housing, just in terms of what the government is prepared to do. If memory serves me, the government budgeted \$62 million last year for direct investment in housing, used \$19 million of it, and has this year budgeted \$56 million. All right. The \$19 million that the government used, of the \$62 million last year, was 40 per cent less than it used the year before, and it has now again lowered the maximum figure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was elicited from the Ontario Housing Corporation last week, that the evident need, based on a survey in the province of Ontario today, is for 34,000 family and senior citizen units, and that the Ontario Housing Corporation presently has 7,000 units under construction—roughly 20 per cent, if that, of the total requirements.

Would the Minister like to explain to me, Mr. Chairman, how the economic planning

of these reputable people in the economic planning secretariat can bridge the gap between 20 per cent and 100 per cent—between 7,000 and 34,000?

I want to comprehend how the studies that are done reflect on the options that are given. I want to understand how the Minister justifies the sense of priorities which he has apparently established, and calls economic planning.

Mr. Chairman, it may have been economic planning which would have been worthy of Adam Smith, conceivably edging into Ricardo, but in the middle of the twentieth century it is economic madness, it is not economic planning.

There is no planning in a department which falls 27,000 houses short in terms of construction starts, and then pretends that there is some basis for overall guide lines. And that is not even a basis of need, that is just on the basis of surveys, of some statistical data which we have on file in various municipalities.

And if it is that bad in housing, Mr. Chairman, then what must it be in university capital construction? What must it be in the area of hospital beds? What must it be in the field of poverty? What must it be in the analysis of the work force requirements?

Other than in romantic, highly rhapsodic and irrelevant terms, how can the Minister's planning secretariat relate to the day to day realities of the way human beings function, and the requirements they have in this society? That is what agitates us on this side of the House: the gap, the continuing gap, in the government between what it posits and what it produces.

The gap is absolutely overwhelming in the case of all these social areas. It is sad, indeed, to suggest that we now have an economic planning secretariat which appears to be so far behind the needs. Maybe the secretariat has to be increased in numbers. Maybe its terms of reference have to be altered. Maybe it should be working more closely with government departments. But in the context of the needs as this government itself has exposed them, this branch is almost impotent in terms of its effect on the "economic options." That is really what we are putting to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. A plea to understand how one relates to the other, and it is absolutely incomprehensible to the members on this side. I would like him to try to explain that to me, and then I have one other point I would like to raise with him.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that the branch was impotent, so I think I will just leave it that he said that. I think I will leave that alone.

Mr. Lewis: Well, all right, Mr. Chairman. You accept that your branch is irrelevant?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not.

Mr. Lewis: Then I would like a defence of the branch, a stirring defence of the branch, by the Provincial Treasurer. The Provincial Treasurer knows how to rise to that, I have seen him do it in this House many times before.

I think it is a legitimate question, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the information that is elicited from this Minister in this department. When, on the one simple point that you are 80 per cent behind the requirement for houses—27,000 units short; obviously abortive in terms of the amount of money you are prepared to set aside—admitting yourself in your budget statement that you have cut off all kinds of social priority areas for the purpose of enhancing other areas, or for so-called financial austerity, we want to know, Mr. Chairman, where all this high-level intellectualized, profound, thoughtful, economic planning relates to the provision of houses. Just as simple as that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just as simple as that?

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Sargent: You want to give dialogue only on what you can answer!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, we will give you some dialogue. What would really help me to answer the question is if you would keep quiet.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, dad.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just a simple statement of fact.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I will go back and answer the hon. member this way. Is the hon. member proposing the Ontario government should assume unto itself, financially and otherwise, the total burden for housing in Ontario?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am asking the hon. member, I am not asking you.

Mr. J. Renwick: You can understand as clearly as I can.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, let him answer.

Mr. Peacock: Don't you even set a target?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But you make reference to the total starts. I have already indicated to you one of the major roadblocks in the way of achieving housing starts in this province or anywhere in Canada. That is the lack of mortgage money.

An hon. member: So what are you going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have said that already. The lack of mortgage money, available funds. I stated in the Budget address that—

Mr. Sargent: Well, you have money to built these big monuments around here; these government buildings—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will just take an aside here and say that that programme has been totally curtailed for the second year. There was nothing added to that complex last year or this year.

Mr. Sargent: It is about time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No funds were provided for it.

Now, I will go back to the hon. member if I may. You will have your turn. First of all, we stated in the Budget address or paper that we have been able to obtain much-needed mortgage capital from private sources during the last year, substantial amounts. If we had not done that, had not been able to avail ourselves of some assistance from the private sector, the picture would have been much worse than it is. We cannot rely on that forever. We cannot rely totally on CMHC for the funds required. If we could, they would be much fatter. The picture would be substantially better. This is why, on the advice that we get from our economic planning branch of their studies and the close relationship to the taxation and fiscal policy branch, which is manifested in the Budget, we have decided to set up our own revolving mortgage fund. Because without mortgage money, I am here to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member that we will have problems meeting our housing demands.

This is one way we have attempted to do it. There are others. We have pleaded with the federal authorities for more funds from CMHC. Let me put it this way to you, Mr.

Chairman: Compare the rest of Canada with Ontario and you will see that the record of housing starts, short as it may be, is substantially better than any jurisdiction in Canada, substantially better.

Mr. Lewis: That does not provide the houses for 27,000-family and senior-citizen units presently on the list. And that is not need, that is just a survey of those who do not have any shelter that is adequate at all.

Mr. Chairman: The member is straying from the estimates.

Mr. Lewis: And the fact, Mr. Chairman, that there is a revolving mortgage fund has nothing to do whatsoever with direct investment in the housing market. Even if the federal government were half responsible, you would still be falling 30 or 40 or 50 or 60 per cent behind what you had guaranteed to undertake.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, we would not.

Mr. Lewis: Well, frankly, Mr. Chairman, I will divide it for him. If you divide 34 by two, you get 17 and you provided 7,000 of the 17,000, 7 of the 17,000 units so you are at least, in your own terms, 10,000 units behind: more than 50 per cent behind.

The point that I am making, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order if I may. I think we have been rather generous with our debate on a subject that should really be debated on the estimates of the Minister of Trade and Development. Mr. Chairman, just hear out my point of order.

The economic planning branch, in its general terms—and I have explained its functions in some detail—is being used here as a vehicle to get into a full-scale debate on housing and I do not think it is appropriate.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was appropriate as long as the Minister was prepared to answer, then suddenly, it becomes inappropriate when another question is raised, in exactly the same area—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The rule as to appropriateness, I think, has to come from the chair and not as a result of an argument between two of the combatants.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I speak on the point of order which the Minister just raised?

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to you that the discussion did get out of order on both sides of the House?

Mr. J. Renwick: That is precisely the point I want to say. I want to express to you, sir, that the discussion did not get out of order. What we are simply saying is that there is an economic planning branch of the government. There is a corporation which is an agency of the government, called the Ontario Housing Corporation.

The evidence before the standing committee on government commissions is perfectly clear that that corporation considers itself a builder, buyer or constructor of dwelling accommodations. It considers itself a landlord in the sense of renting within the market place. And we wanted to find out whether or not this branch of the government is the government which is dealing with the other aspects of housing. And the other aspects, Mr. Chairman, are very simply the question of need, the question of the cost of land, the question of the construction of houses, the question of the availability of capital and the question of whether or not the dispersal of housing can be done in such a way that people can be housed.

I believe that is quite appropriate within this branch unless the Minister says no, this branch does not engage in that kind of research. But he has indicated, in a marginal way, that, yes, it does touch on it and I am suggesting to you that the Minister's point of order should not be allowed because his point of order was simply that this was appropriately under Trade and Development. Our point is that it is appropriate only under this branch of the government and the only branch which is seized with the obligation of doing any kind of planning. They call it economic planning, we believe that it should be social economic planning.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, are you recognizing another speaker at this point?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, we are on a point of order. I do not—

Mr. Chairman: Let me put it this way. As far as the Chair is concerned, a criticism by anyone in the House relating to a breakdown in planning is relevant, if that is the criticism, and it can be answered by the Minister. The Chair does not quarrel with the proposition but, of course, the Minister is not a witness, he does not have to answer. It is up to him.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I introduced the specifics because I wanted to make it real, and not to argue in the abstract. Perhaps the Minister is right: there will be other times we can raise housing more specifically in Trade and Development. I think what I was trying to elicit, Mr. Chairman, was the relationship one to the other, and I fear, sir, on the basis of what has been given, that the economic planning secretariat is some abstract, rarified group of highly intelligent men whose usefulness bears no relationship to what the other government departments do. At least, not to what they are now producing. If that is the nature of the economic planning secretariat, Mr. Chairman, then I am rather sad that it has been emasculated in that fashion.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to a discussion of the economics of the planning branch, and to try and elicit from the Minister an understanding of what that branch is doing in the way of economic policy formation.

I think the Minister must realize that the whole basis of the theory that underlines economic planning is very shaky these days in economies such as the one in Ontario and indeed in North America. The gist of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not, in the economic planning branch or the secretariat, there are detailed studies of the basic premises on which the Minister's Budget has been based. If he acknowledges the fact that his Budget is a tool of economic planning and I think he has acknowledged that fact, then I would suggest to him that the economic planning secretariat must be involved in basic and fundamental research, a great deal of which is not being done in Canadian universities because many of the economists are geared to an examination of problems in the United States. For example—

Mr. Chairman: That is your question, is it?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have fair treatment from you in this House. The member for Riverdale and the member for Scarborough West were on a very substantive issue as they defined it, and as you accepted it to be. They have debated this for over half an hour and I would like to have the same privilege in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Is the rest another question or another proposition?

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to elucidate an example as the hon. member for Scarborough West did in the area of housing, I would like to relate it to a couple of specific areas in the area of economic planning, and if you granted him that right and the hon. member for Riverdale the right to throw in examples, to elicit information from the Minister, I, sir, as a member of the official Opposition would also like to have that right in this House.

If I am out of order, they were out of order, and I do not think they were out of order.

May I continue, Mr. Chairman? Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: But we cannot stay in order, I would suggest to the members, if we allow a multiplicity of examples because that quietly turns our discussion, which is in order, into another kind of creature.

Mr. T. Reid: I suggest, sir, again, if you want to be arbitrary and use discretionary power and apply it unjustly in this House between the two Opposition parties, I would suggest, sir—

Mr. Chairman: Well, conclude your point.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you very much. For example, Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable debate among professional economists in the so-called free enterprise economies, concerning the degree of built-in flexibility in the application of monetary and fiscal policies as well as other aspects of economic policy making.

Now if the Minister is not examining what is happening to other economies, if the Minister is not examining what has happened in the Ontario economy concerning the degree to which his policies result in a built-in type of flexibility, then I suggest, sir, that he does not really know the impact of his budget on economic growth in this province.

Another area which is pretty serious, I have mentioned it before, is the area of time lags, and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's Budget, which must have been based on advice from the economic planning branch, assumes certain characteristics about the time-lags involved in the impact of various aspects of his Budget. The big debate across this continent, sir, and in western Europe, in the European Common Market, in the European Free Trade Area, is almost the nature of these time lags, their extent, and the degree of their sensitivity to fiscal and budgetary policies—taxation policies.

Not only that, sir, his Budget assumes that there is in fact a substantial impact of his fiscal and taxation policies when that in itself is being questioned, as indeed it has been questioned at the federal government level. To summarize my type of questioning, sir, I would like to put it this way: At a time when the whole theoretical basis of the premises upon which this Budget has been based are open for debate among U.S. economists in particular, the Minister brings into this House a Budget based on those questionable premises.

The Minister brings in a Budget which is based on text books written five and seven years ago, not on the recent articles as coming out in *American Economic Review* for example, of which the federal government is very much aware. I suggest that the time-lag in his thinking is a very serious time-lag. And I suggest, sir, that the Economic Planning Branch is not feeding him the most relevant information on which he is basing his budget.

So I would like to ask the Minister to what extent have his senior economists been travelling around, not just to talk to their counterparts in Ottawa, but to go down to Harvard where a lot of the latest research is being done, to Chicago? Whether or not they are pursuing studies summarizing the latest review articles, questioning the very premises on which this Budget is based?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: It has not done the federal Liberals much good.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not very much. I was just about to say that one of our senior economists spends I guess, about three-quarters of his time with the Economic Council of Canada, so I doubt very much if we are being fed information out of text books that are outdated. I might say we do not rely too much on text books at all.

I know the particular tendency on the part of the hon. member to place a great deal of other people's opinions on the record of this House but I suggest to you that we do not require to do that. We have, in my opinion, one of the finest economic, planning, taxation and fiscal policy branches that exists in Canada at any level of government and we are satisfied with the advice that we get.

Mr. Lewis: That is probably true and it is a pity no government department listens to them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They listen a great deal, we listen a very great deal. I am going to come back once more to the question of the hon. member for Scarborough West—and we are back again to housing.

The target proposed by the Economic Council of Canada for Canada was 200,000 starts—agreed? Ontario's target was 90,000. The private sector has, one way or another, provided for 73,000 starts, and the public sector 7,200 starts or a total of 80,200 starts achieved. This works out as I calculate it to about 89 per cent of Ontario's objective. The Economic Council's target is for total housing, not public housing only. Public housing, of course, is a partnership arrangement with the federal government. In this area it takes two to evolve the solution to the problem—we cannot do it alone. But we recognize the need for public housing. We are not in complete agreement, I might say, with the recommendations of the Hellyer task force. As a matter of fact we are not in sympathy with very many of them.

Mr. Lewis: They are building tasks instead of houses.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But we have been building houses of course, and I want to emphasize it. It may be imperfect, but we think it is pretty good. There have been many studies in this branch that have led to the high priorities the government has been putting on housing and I repeat what I said a few moments ago—it has been heard in this House, it has been read in statements that we have submitted at federal-provincial conferences of Ministers of Finance, and this has been done the past two years—that we assign the highest priority—or one of the highest priorities as far as the economic well-being of Ontario is concerned—to housing. This has been stated very, very clearly and succinctly.

Unfortunately there have been times when staff and funds have tended to reduce some of the potential of what we might have liked to do, but I would just simply say to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the hon. member, that we have conducted with the Ontario Housing Corporation a full commentary on the Hellyer report. We have studied it thoroughly and again these branches are relating their efforts to this particular fundamental problem that you, quite appropriately, address yourself to.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, just to reply to the Minister, and thanking him for the figures, I will not dispute with him the Hellyer report—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would rather not get into that.

Mr. Lewis: All right. That document is an absurdity, it is not relevant in this Legislature and it was predictable before they began their junket. There is nothing substantive in that; it is typical of federal Liberals.

But, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is saying is that the private sector produced 73,000 of the 90,000 housing units and in all the apparatus, resources and substance of government you were not able to produce another 17,000 units. And to this day, by virtue of your Budget, you are not prepared to make the direct capital investment in financing those units, let alone what is required next year.

Now the simple proposition, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the priorities, is that the same Minister had no qualms whatsoever about maintaining the level of highway expenditures at exactly the same level as last year, or even higher than that. There was not the slightest possibility of a cut in that area in southern Ontario, where cuts could be made quite legitimately, but every possibility in the world of cutting housing which relates to sheltering people—human beings, not some inanimate objects.

If that is the sense of government priorities, Mr. Chairman, then it casts an extraordinary pall over the capacities of this economic planning secretariat. What kind of economic planning secretariat is it, Mr. Chairman, that provides options such that a Cabinet can choose highways over the construction of houses?

In terms of the Minister's own submission, in terms of what he is putting to the House, I simply cannot fathom what it is that motivates either this branch or, indeed, the Ministerial policy itself. He could not find the money to build an additional 10,000 homes, yet he can find all kinds of money for pretentious and lesser-priority items and horse racing—\$1,800,000 again—but, Mr. Chairman, not sufficient direct capital investment for housing.

It seems to me it is too humiliating for the economic planning secretariat. I can imagine that the two men who are sitting in front of the Minister are fairly writhing in attempting to control their discomfort at the suggestion that in their planning choices they would put highways before provision of houses.

I want to come to the defence of the economic planning secretariat, Mr. Chairman

—demeaned by the Cabinet, slurred, affectionately slurred by the Minister, obviously without integrity in the provision of services. Somebody has to defend these reputable gentlemen, and we in this party are prepared to come to their defense.

It is a simple proposition, Mr. Chairman, that the economic planning secretariat has probably made some of the studies to which the Minister alluded, it has probably given certain priorities, and the Treasury Board over there, whose priorities are as perverse as any set of priorities could be, rejects the information, and rejects the statistical data.

Some of the Ministers indeed, like the Minister of Trade and Development, would not know the significance—so as a result the economic planning secretariat is rendered some kind of frivolous appendage that is trotted in here at estimate time and then trotted out again for a Budget white paper.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The member is getting ridiculous now.

Mr. Lewis: Well, do something for your economic planning secretariat and implement their recommendations rather than treating them that way.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Minister very badly misinterpreted one of the remarks I made.

My statement was that his Budget contained very questionable economic premises. I did not mean to say that his very highly skilled economists made that type of recommendation to him. For him to stand up in this House and to accuse me of slurring the ability, the professional competence, of his chief economist and his chief economic planner is a slap in my face that I do not appreciate.

His Budget has premises in it that are probably out of date. I dare say, sir, that if he would make the studies of his economists available to the members of the Opposition parties, his ignorance and the ignorance of the Treasury Board would become obvious to all.

Mr. Lewis: If you allow the chief economist to speak—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If there was any sense of insult to the hon. member I apologize. I was not attempting to criticize his observations.

I was just reaffirming to you, sir, what we think of our economic planning people. I shall do it again, and again, as long as

they are held in any type of contempt, or whatever you like to say, because you will be surprised to learn that we have a rather satisfactory partnership basis of working in The Department of Treasury between all our branches. Very satisfactory.

One observation, and that, I think, will do for this debate on economic planning and housing. I would like to propose to you, Mr. Chairman, that if we could pry loose some \$35 million that is on Mr. Hellyer's desk, that belongs to us right now, we could get along with some public housing.

Mr. Lewis: If we could pry Mr. Hellyer loose.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we cannot use Hellyer. We can use his money.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the Minister if his department is consulted when industry decides to move into a given area, because of the socio-economic impact? I specifically refer to the Ford move into Talbotville, because I wish to know if the department was consulted before Ford moved in there. May I have an answer?

Mr. Sargent: Economic planning.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is true, as a matter of fact all the economic branches were part of that very department at that time, so there was quite close liaison.

Mr. B. Newman: Did the department recommend to Ford that they move into the given area, or was this a choice that Ford Motor Company made on their own.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I think it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Ford Motor Company made the choice of the area. From that point on, there were many discussions about the economic impact and availability of land, the availability of transportation, the availability of water and all those things associated with the decision in which the economic branch was involved.

Mr. B. Newman: Did the ministry department list various other areas that the Ford Motor Company could have moved to rather than simply say you must move to Talbotville?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think we went that far. It is very difficult, I think, for the government to positively direct

a company like Ford to go to any particular area of the province—

Mr. Lewis: Including Allied Chemical and Union Carbide?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But, the particular area they chose was, for a variety of reasons, quite satisfactory.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the Minister prepared to follow some of the recommendations of the regional development councils concerning location of industry?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Did you say to consider the recommendations of the Ontario development council?

Mr. B. Newman: No, regional development councils.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Regional development? Yes, of course.

Mr. B. Newman: In the regional development council of the St. Clair region, specifically, one of the recommendations is that industry should not move into a given area. Now, an industry willing to move into an area—and I am going to use the town of Kingsville for an example—one of the recommendations of the study states specifically that the area is to be a dormitory, and a commercial centre—not for manufacturing. Were a manufacturer to come along and move into the Kingsville area, would your department recommend or suggest that it move into another area?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is a possibility, a distinct possibility. I think you might discuss this matter with the Ontario Development Corporation, they use some sensible guide lines for this purpose. I do not think that they are just simply categoric about a community that they want to move into. They have some criteria and some terms of reference for that purpose.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, I can understand that, but you said a while ago, Mr. Minister, that you would be willing to follow the recommendations of a development council. The recommendation is that industry should not move into a certain area, then you would come along and say to an industry: you are not to go in there, but you are to go into other areas that the regional development council specifies—and they name areas designated for manufacture now. I am referring specifically to the St. Clair regional development council.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, you asked if those recommendations would be considered, and I said of course they would. I am not in a position to tell you yet what decisions will follow because all these reports will be examined, the recommendations will be considered, and they will go to considerable length to making up the policy of the regional development branch.

Mr. B. Newman: But you would not specifically say to the industry, you must move into a given location.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What we would say, in terms of the incentives that are offered, is that the incentives would only be available if the criteria that supports them are met.

Mr. B. Newman: But you would not necessarily follow the recommendations as laid down. Okay, thank you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not as specific.

Mr. Chairman: Administration?

Mr. Pilkey: Economic planning.

Mr. Chairman: I thought we had finished with that. Well, then the order would be Grey-Bruce and then Oshawa.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think it is fair for us to flog the Provincial Treasurer on the economy. I do not know how he got wearing this hat, but I understand that his estimates are up first so he can get away for a well deserved rest, I guess, after that two hour speech.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That has something to do with it.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister whether there are tax credits and tax incentives through this branch for industry moving into a depressed or designated area.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Chairman, there are no tax incentives that I am aware of. There are other incentives, of course, in terms of the equalisation of industrial opportunity programmes.

Mr. Lewis: They are not incentives, they are—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, they are incentives.

Mr. Sargent: For years we have been having these reports, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: They are handouts.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They are the incentives we use. They are working, they are very effective.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member please continue on the economic planning branch. I think really that is trade and development.

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about planning, economic planning, and the whole motivation behind this is to get the have-not areas back in the ball game. We have been reading for years about Grey-Bruce, fifty-first and fifty-second lowest incomes. People get \$2,000 a year total income from their farms up there. These areas need support, but we have been reading about this for years and nothing happens. So, if this is economic planning then why do you not give these people tax incentives and tax credits? You say to these industries specifically: "You go to the Grey-Bruce area to locate and you will get tax credits and tax incentive programmes".

If we are going to have really true planning to help out these economically distressed areas, this is the route we should take, Mr. Chairman. There is nothing, in my mind, ever happens. I could go through this book and quote you some glaring things you would not believe—that in this day of 1969, there are 700 families in one area who take in less than \$2,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This should be under 2402, item 7.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I think, Mr. Chairman, there should be some statement by the Minister that he will consider tax incentives and tax credits for my area, because we are the last on the economic scale in this great province. We talk about it but nothing is done about it. I am not so naive as to think that the Minister would not help out a member of the Opposition because it is a Liberal seat. I think these people, as Ontario people, should be recognized.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, does the economic planning branch consider the building of old age homes? Is there any planning in that regard? I want to make this point: homes for the aged are comparable to the question of housing that my colleagues have raised, and I understand that prior to the Treasurer bringing this Budget down, that the Minister of Social and Family Services stated that in 17 locations in the province of Ontario there would be a curtailment of the building of homes for the aged.

My question is: Is the economic planning branch in this field as they are in housing?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As I tried to explain before, Mr. Chairman, it is fair, I think, to say that in the aggregate sense they would be; but in specific terms, no, I do not think so.

Mr. Peacock: Never bring your estimates in so close to the Budget.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I guess the member is right.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if the economic planning branch of his department is engaged in a study of economic costs of air pollution—for example the fact that in areas of high pollution the people have to paint their houses more often, that the finish on their cars wears off more quickly, let alone the health hazards to productive members of the labour force perhaps dying five years earlier than they otherwise would? And if he is, Mr. Chairman, could he explain how the results of this research are reflected in his Budget?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, yes, we have very active studies under consideration in The Department of Health. There is nothing reflected in this Budget but there shortly will be—not only air pollution but a number of related matters are being considered by the branch right now.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the report, such as this report which is being done in The Department of Health, come to the economic planning branch of the Treasurer's Department for evaluation before it goes any further, before it finds its way to those people who chop programmes? In other words, is the economic planning branch really an economic planning branch or is it just another *ad hoc* approach in trying to unscramble some of the social-economic problems in this province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not know that it will have to come in that sense. It will be a joint study, a joint study by the staff of the economic planning branch and the Health people. As a matter of fact, they met very recently to work out the study process on a point basis.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, Mr. Chairman, what happens if another department refuses to cooperate with this economic planning branch? Who decides?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would answer that question by saying that the departments of this government do not refuse to co-operate, they do co-operate.

Mr. T. Reid: Oh!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do not say "oh", because I am very much aware of the extent of the co-operation that exists, very much aware of it.

Mr. T. Reid: But, Mr. Chairman, there is a question of final authority here. In other words, if the Treasurer of the province decides that there shall be co-operation among his economic planning personnel and people doing research in some other department, then co-operation takes place? Is it his decision? Or is it a Cabinet decision? Or is it an administrative decision within, say the upper echelons of the civil service?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no, economic planning and other branches of The Department of the Treasury, I mentioned earlier, are available to all departments for assistance on any matters that have an economic relationship or otherwise to what they propose to do. And I have indicated the extent to which we take on assignments for departments on request, I have also indicated the type of aggregate studies we do which in effect involve all departments. And I simply say to the member that the relationship in terms of communication and co-operation is very great indeed. There is no question that more and more decisions are being considered that cannot be decided in isolation. Does it not become evident that where a decision involving this sort of thing is concerned, it involves one or more departments, two or more departments, to the extent that more than one department are involved—and it is probably a good way to say it—that the economic branch of the department that I administer at the moment can be a very great catalyst in doing this on a joint basis. It is being done more and more all the time and it will continue to be done. There is no lack of co-operation among departments in this area at the moment.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's full response to this; I think it is a very important question and I know he considers this to be important. But the words he has used in replying are quite interesting. He said the economic planning branch, the secretariat, "responds to requests" from other departments, that the economic planning branch is a "catalyst."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It can be in those circumstances.

Mr. T. Reid: This is good, I do not knock the Minister for this. But what I am concerned with is whether this economic planning branch is the nerve centre of economic planning in this province or whether it just responds. And if it does not just respond, does it initiate, does it have the power of initiation of research over the objections of another Minister in the Cabinet? Suppose, Mr. Chairman—and I know the Minister is following this very closely—suppose he is advised by the senior members in his economic planning branch that while there is a study being done, say, in The Department of Highways on the economic benefits, or why external economies as they are called, of highway development in certain areas, it is a very badly run study and is being done by, in their opinion, incompetent people, that the time for the results of that study to come in is too far away, and they advise him, "Look, if you want to make rational decisions on Budget allocations, we had better have a better study than the one being done." There is a direct conflict between the advice the Minister is receiving and his colleague, the Minister of Highways, and the research being done there. Who, Mr. Chairman, who in the government decides who has the last say? Is it really the Treasurer who says to the Minister of Highways, "Sorry, Minister of Highways, the research being done by you is not good enough, my boys are going to take over and co-operate with your department because we need better research and we need it faster?" Is the Treasurer the Deputy Premier of this province in terms of economic planning or is he just another member of a fragmented approach to the economic development of this province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I regard that as a very good question. I have explained before the extent to which studies are not only initiated in the aggregate sense by the branches, I have indicated the extent to which co-operative studies are undertaken by The Department of Treasury and Economics. I would also draw your attention to what I think I observe, that studies in other departments will eventually reach our branches for information's sake and if some refinement is required that will be undertaken. But I do not think anybody has to—nobody in our government has to—say to another Minister who is undertaking some research in any field that, "You know, really, that is bad research, we will take it away

from you and will do it properly ourselves," we do not do it that way. But the relationship as far as economic research or applied research, if you like, is concerned—and it is mostly applied research in the department—the applied research then can be translated into broader research in the branches of the department that I represent and that I administer. So I think that has to be the answer to the hon. member, I think that should be satisfactory.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the Minister apply that response to research being done by the Ontario Housing Corporation, by the Student Housing Corporation, by Ontario Hydro? In other words, there are commissions of this government, Mr. Chairman, which are independent, shall we say, to a much greater extent than a department, and I know since the Minister is interested in economic planning for the province as a whole, in an integrated sense—what happens if he feels that something is going wrong with the impact of, say, Ontario Housing Corporation, or even better in economic terms, Ontario Hydro, in terms of regional development, economic growth and so forth? Water resources is another one. What happens if he feels their policies and their research evaluating the impact of their policies on the economic development and growth in this province are inconsistent with the desires, his own views, shall we say, of economic developments in this province? Can he turn around and order a study from within his department about the economic impact of the policies of Ontario Hydro and the Water Resources Commission and so forth? In other words, what I am really asking, sir, is: Where is the final lever of power in terms of economic planning in this province? If it lies with the Minister I wish he would say so. If it does not then it exposes economic planning in this province as a complete fraud.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I want to talk about the final power. Probably the central responsibility for this rests with The Department of Treasury and Economics. I think that is a better way of saying it.

We, for instance, have a co-ordinating committee with Hydro, a committee of our people and theirs. But this is a co-operative, co-ordinated effect. I can think of few circumstances where the various agencies and commissions of government do not come to us and solicit our help when economic research and planning is concerned. Their research departments come to us for the economic planning that is required. In the

broad sense of the word, there is no power element needed in this government because it is not done that way. It is done on a basis of either central responsibility for some things or separate responsibility that only the departments can undertake. But in that broad framework I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, there is much communication, much co-operation and I am not aware of any need for anyone to have central powers, as the hon. member has suggested.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, on this same line.

I would like to throw into this debate the instance that happened last summer and which I spoke about in this House a week ago, where the Minister's research people and The Department of Municipal Affairs both had their staffs working hard in Waterloo county to build up a synthesis to determine the kind of future which that county ought to have. After a great deal of study, when both these staffs were working hard and the Fyfe commission was ready to bring its report forward, the Minister of Trade and Development announces proudly one night that he has bought acres of land, three thousand acres, in the heart of that planning area and he is going to build a new town.

Now I know that this came as a shock to the Minister across the way. It came as a shock to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Here was an illustration of the very thing which the member for Scarborough East was talking about and I think here is a place where this kind of problem emerged.

Now we do not know what happened after that. As I said in the House I expect the next Cabinet meeting must have been a beaut. But who resolved that problem? Where is the centre of power?

Who set the Minister in his place and who is finally resolving that problem which the Minister of Trade and Development created? A problem where the staffs of the Treasurer and Minister of Municipal Affairs, as well as that of the Minister of Highways and the several other Ministers, had worked hard and, suddenly, another Minister came in and blew the whole thing sky high.

Mr. Chairman: Is the item carried?

Mr. Young: No, surely the Minister has an answer?

Mr. T. Reid: He doesn't understand.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, how did this matter of power get in here anyway? I

do not know what prompted the hon. member to introduce it at all. But I guess it is fair to say that if there is a centre of power, it is the Cabinet itself or the Cabinet committee on policy.

I do not propose myself to be designated or regarded as having any central power. For all practical purposes, it is not needed and the matter the hon. member referred to now is past history. I do not propose to comment on that.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, I just want to follow through on this point for a moment.

If the economic planning council makes specific recommendations—and let us go back to this point that I raised earlier, the question of the additional facilities or homes for the aged—and the economic planning council outlines the specific need in this area, does the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, make the policy that they proceed with this? Or does the Minister that is in charge of that specific department make the decision to proceed? Or is it an entire Cabinet position, in terms of this policy?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, policy decisions are invariably Cabinet decisions.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister, having alluded to it, inform the House who is on the Cabinet committee on policy? What is the Cabinet committee on policy? The Committee, the central Politburo where final power resides—who is on this committee?

An hon. member: The executive committee?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The committee is headed by the Prime Minister—

Mr. Lewis: That is reassuring.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes it is. There is nothing more reassuring that I can think of. The Treasurer is on it and five other Ministers.

Mr. Lewis: Do you know them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I know them very well. I know them intimately.

Mr. Lewis: Can you name them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can.

Mr. Lewis: Would you vouchsafe them to the House?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can try. There is the Prime Minister; the Treasurer; the hon. Minister of Correctional Services, who just left his desk; the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales); the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall); and the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wells).

Mr. Breithaupt: So that is what he does?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, he does a great deal. More than you do right now, as a matter of fact. Maybe more than you are likely to do.

Mr. Lewis: I may say I was reassured at the outset; as the list went on, I became rather more anxious. The idea of a serious policy committee with the Minister without Portfolio and the Minister of Trade and Development is enough to cause an economic nightmare. The idea of a significant exchange is almost too much.

Mr. Chairman, just a reflection, if it may be permitted. I think what we have seen in this debate this evening is the triumph of the technocrats. The Ministry, the government, have finally come to the point where the managerial elite, the technocrats, have now moved in in very serious ways to the policy making areas. There is a lot of power that resides in that branch of that department. That comes pretty clear.

An hon. member: You mean Wells?

Mr. Lewis: But it is kind of fragmented at the moment, Mr. Chairman. One does not have the sense about an overall economic planning secretariat in that crucial term where you have an overall direction of policy, but one has at least a sense of some policy, and a gentle sorting out of fratricide between Ministers and between departments.

I want the Minister to know that when there is serious overall economic planning, he will not have any problems with this party in the House. Maybe the next time the estimates roll around in some of these areas we can get into tough-minded scrutiny of what the priorities are and what the realities are. Maybe then his economic secretariat will have been given the prestige that economic secretariats require in order to function.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The peculiar thing about these economic people to whom you refer is that they have infinite stature all across this country except over there where you sit.

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Chairman, it is precisely that point—no one worries about their

infinity. It is the finite aspects of their work we are concerned about. When you make that transfer for us in the House then our respect for them will exceed even what it now measures.

Mr. Chairman: Carried?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, we are not putting this vote. As I understand it, the Minister agreed to stand down this vote until we could come back to regional development, is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we agreed earlier, Mr. Chairman, that the regional development vote could be the last vote.

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Administration, economic and statistical research.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on the section administration, economic and statistical research, I would like to get from the Minister some idea of the problems that this branch of his department encounters in getting primary research data from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa.

I had the opportunity several summers ago of doing a research report for the Privy Council in Ottawa and had to deal with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I found it shattering to say the least, Mr. Chairman, to find that it was very, very difficult to get very important statistical information from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics because of The DBS Act. So I would like to ask the Minister first of all if he can give us some idea of the kinds of data—perhaps by some system of classification—that his department is not supplied with from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I know, because of my involvement with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics on a research study, that DBS will not make available to researchers for the federal government certain types of data. Thus, I would like to ask him whether DBS refuses to supply his economic and statistical research branch with certain types of data, and if so, could he give us some idea of the classification of that data?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am advised that we do not have any more access than the federal government itself to certain classified statistical information but we have a number of inter-related committees dealing with probably everything else.

Mr. T. Reid: I realize it is difficult for the Minister to answer in detail the question I put to him but I would like, Mr. Chairman, to have at some future date—hopefully some time in the next couple of weeks, if at all possible—a statement from the Minister, perhaps just privately, if he might share with the New Democratic Party the detailed list of information perhaps that his Economic and Statistical Research Branch has requested from DBS and has been refused because of some peculiarities in the interpretation of The DBS Act. I think this is terribly important.

The significance of this question and the answer to it, Mr. Chairman, is simply this. If the Treasurer's economic and research branch personnel are unable to get certain kinds of information relating to the economic development and growth—and, indeed, even some of the social statistics that the hon. members for Riverdale and Scarborough West mentioned—if this research branch cannot get that data from DBS, then I suggest that we should really protest very strongly to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the federal government for a change in The DBS Act.

The reason it is so important, sir, is that the Minister has told us that he is getting into rational budgeting, capital budgeting, and the works. It is a very excellent statement, but the fact is that unless he has adequate statistical information on a massive basis to feed into his big hungry computers, he will not be able to make the best rational decisions about how to allocate very scarce funds in terms of the various priorities of the province. I would just like to say, sir, that for my part he and his researchers have my strongest support in getting after DBS, but I would like to have the facts on it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Whatever facts we feel can be disclosed will be disclosed, but I would say this: We are not denied any information that we feel we need, or any information that we cannot produce ourselves. We feel we are being well served by DBS.

Mr. Peacock: It is a political problem and not one of DBS?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It could be.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Minister that if DBS is collecting certain types of data, say relating to housing, or relating to poverty in Ontario, and the Minister has requested some of this—or perhaps it is even more subtle than this. He will

not request it because he knows he cannot get it—and then he gets involved in a separate collection of this data—that to me is very, very expensive and should be placed on the agenda of this government for discussion at the next federal-provincial conference.

I think in the area of research there must be complete cooperation between the statistical collection agency of the federal government and what I gather to be the central statistical collection agency of this government, because without that type of cooperation research is useless.

Mr. Chairman: Ontario statistical centre.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have no special knowledge in this area. I am very much indebted to the article "Development of Information Flows for Economic and Financial Policy Formulation" which appeared in the Ontario Economic Review at the end of last year. I have a number of questions I want to ask arising out of that article. I would ask the Minister if he could comment upon this development of the central information system and what progress has been made in establishing that system? And how does it differ from the way in which statistical information is presently gathered and analyzed and programmed for the purpose of his department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, this relates to some extent to what the hon. member for Scarborough West spoke about. A great deal of this is obtained from DBS; probably all we require is obtained from DBS.

Mr. J. Renwick: I do not want to belabour it if the Minister is not familiar with it, but in this article by the executive director of this particular area he says:

An adequately specified central information system must be designed to meet the multiple needs of economists and statisticians concerned with the development of analytical techniques.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is precisely what the hon. member before you discussed.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, he indicates that it must be designed, and I am wondering what it is about the present operation that requires redesigning in order to meet the requirements of a central information system. It may be that the member for Scarborough East spoke about the same thing but I just did not understand it in that context.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it is like anything else. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is safe to say that it needs refining, it needs further sophistication and improving all the time. This is what the reference in that particular article is concerned about.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on the amount of \$410,000 for data processing; this is computer services, is it? It is systems and programming—charges for data processing, item 9—\$410,000. Is this computerization?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, and all the systems—

Mr. Sargent: Is it book entries or is it charged back to a master programme?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The amount referred to there is associated with the total amount of data processing systems work for the whole department, or departments—that amount is associated with that only.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the only point, Mr. Chairman, is that we have the same pattern you are trying to follow for regional government—to do away with duplication of services. That is the motivation for regional government. Is there a central fund of information so that statistics could be jointly processed across Canada through one bank instead of having duplication? You are spending \$3 million here in this department for statistics. Is there no way you can trade information with Ottawa and save this \$3 million expenditure here?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I do not know that this is altogether relevant. This is associated with the cost of the services provided through this vote.

Mr. Sargent: For Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This vote is for Ontario, yes.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that Ottawa would, if they were doing their job, have this information at their fingertips. If DBS is doing a job, they would have this information.

Mr. Chairman: Ontario statistic centre.

Mr. Sargent: Now just a moment. We are talking about \$3 million in this section here and—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I might point out to the hon. member that these are the administrative costs, the staff.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, but who needs it? Who needs it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We need it; it is payroll.

Mr. Sargent: The point is—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is payrolling, it is pensions for the whole department, administrative data processing, the issuing of payroll cheques, deductions from cheques, pensions for instances.

Mr. Sargent: We are on different wavelengths. I am talking about—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are indeed.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the fact that the Ontario Statistical Centre—the budget is \$400,000 for that chunk there; systems and programming \$604,000; economic analysis is \$194,000. To the average man on the street, the guy that carries a dinner pail—he is the fellow that we should be thinking of and he cannot sense any more in this than I can. So somewhere along the line, if you are talking about efficiency, there should be a trading of information back and forth between Ottawa and the different economies of this country. It seems to me you could—there is some dent you could put in \$3 million by working with Ottawa.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, just a brief question in regard to data processing. Is this offered for the other departments or is this strictly for The Department of the Treasury?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is the cost for our department, as I mentioned before.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry, I must have missed your explanation.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This relates to the cost for the service to our department.

Mr. Deans: I wonder if you indicate whether the increase of about 32 per cent over last year is in increased salaries or increased staff or where you get such a large percentage increase in that particular vote.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is associated with the use of the computer service centre; hardware is the technical term for it. As the service expands then the more it is required. As the government functions grow, the service requires to be expanded from time to time. This vote will always grow. I do not

think it will ever stay static because, of course, the services demanded of it grow at the same time.

Mr. Deans: I can then assume it is because of expanding services and more people involved?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Do you rent computer services or do you own them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We rent these facilities.

Mr. Sargent: In all the operations of the government, how much money do we spend each year on computers?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We would have to obtain that information. I would say to the hon. member there is a very large computer service in The Department of Highways. It is being consolidated more all the time but there are some computer facilities that I would suggest cannot be totally consolidated. To use Highways as an example, the computer facilities there are largely associated with engineering. So that they bear no relationship to some of the other computer functions.

Mr. Sargent: You cannot use their equipment?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes we can. If there is capacity there, we can assign certain programmes and other departments do, too. I forget how many departments use the computer at Highways.

Mr. Sargent: How about Education?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They have their own. The function is centralized to the greatest extent possible at the moment although it is hopeful that it can be further centralized.

Mr. Sargent: Then it would be safe to say we spend maybe \$5 million a year on computers in this operation here? I would like to ask you how many people have you displaced since you have installed computers? How many people have you laid off to take up the slack there?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am bound to admit I just do not happen to have that figure at my fingertips here. It is true that computers replaced personnel but I would not have that information and I do

not know whether it is safe to project a figure without more information. As you assumed, it was safe to say that it cost \$5 million. We can get this information for you and make it available.

Mr. Sargent: Have your efficiency people in your planning, have they analyzed some way of—if this is a \$6 million recurring cost from year to year—you cannot buy it; I imagine it is a straight lease or rental deal. But my information is that one computer can handle fantastic work loads, and so I would suggest that if you have more than one computer in the overall operation you have more than you need because you cannot keep one computer going. They have such a big capacity. So if you have a figure like \$6 million a year in that area, then you probably have a lot of duplication.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the Minister. I understand that the Bank of Canada has been involved for a number of years in a very sophisticated computer model of economic growth for Canada and that this is broken down by regions and provinces. I was wondering, what is the relationship between this aspect of the Minister's operation and the work being done at the Bank of Canada? If there is a transfer of knowledge between the Minister's group of researchers and the researchers at the Bank of Canada, is the Minister purchasing the results of this research? Are his officials meeting with the Bank of Canada officials to discuss the relevancy of their computer programmes for forecasting in the Ontario economy to help him and his economists understand better the economic forces in Ontario, so that he can have a more rational allocation of scarce resources in his budget?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. We are not purchasing anything from the Bank of Canada model that you made reference to, although we have engaged ourselves extensively with them in studying it and we are now going to produce our own, fashioned after the model that the Bank of Canada has developed.

Mr. T. Reid: The two models would likely be consistent, then, so there could be continuing co-operation

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Their model, incidentally, I am informed, is not broken down by provinces.

Mr. T. Reid: Is it a sector analysis so that you can accumulate into the provincial component?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, we have to develop our own, but we can use the same model technique.

Mr. T. Reid: I think you should talk to the Bank of Canada; talk to the people up there and tell them to—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did. It was interesting. We went to see the Bank of Canada when we were at the federal-provincial conference.

Mr. T. Reid: Another question, Mr. Chairman, is this. There is an item of \$37,000 for a statistical study and survey costs and I would like to know whether the survey costs are the costs of surveys run from within the Minister's department or whether these are contracted out to various institutions. If so, which institutions?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It involves \$6,000 to the information system data bank, \$2,000 for geocoding, \$4,000 for the census of forest and manufacturers, waste disposal \$3,000, input-output tables \$3,000, hydro, labour, management statistics \$3,000, credit union \$1,000, a central list of industrial establishments \$5,000, small area statistics \$4,000, coding for the retail sales tax branch \$3,000, and other statistics \$3,000, for a total cost of \$37,000.

Mr. T. Reid: I would gather from the Minister's reply, then, that the costs of survey research were for research done by members of his department as opposed to that contracted out to, say, the survey centre at York University.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Systems and programming?

Mr. J. Renwick: Before we move on, perhaps this could be a place where the Treasurer could give me some assistance. The prior estimates showed a total in the government, as far as we could establish it, of \$2,500,000-odd for data processing, listed in about seven departments; Agriculture \$28,000; Attorney General \$103,000; Health, something over \$1,000,000; Lands and Forests \$150,000; Provincial Secretary \$37,000; Social and Family Services \$7,000; and the Treasury \$1,159,000. Is this the kind of processing operation that lends itself to a centralized operation in the government, or, of necessity, must data processing be decentralized into the particular departments?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Maybe I can answer it by saying that it is one of the

terms of reference that has been assigned to the productivity improvement project, to look at this and determine the answer to the very question that you have raised.

Mr. Sargent: This efficiency survey that you are going to spend \$300,000 on—this is part and parcel of this? You would analyze this area?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Systems and programming.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us some indication of the types of surveys presently being carried out, statistical surveys being carried out, or new ones that are planned by the centre of statistics or by this particular area of his department?

The only ones that are referred to in this particular report are ones dealing with the census of manufacturers, the census of forestry, study on mortgage registration and a municipal assessment survey, which, of course, is very pertinent right now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, those, combined with the list I just read out, that is it, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Systems and programming. Economic analysis. That would then carry vote 2402.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): No, there is regional development.

Mr. Chairman: Oh correct; that is to be dealt with not at the end of this vote, as I understand it, but at the end of all your estimates, Mr. Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well I stand corrected, I thought it was the intention to leave it until all the estimates were through, because of the time factor. I doubt if we have had time to look at those things yet.

Mr. Lewis: We have read eight of the ten.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have read the eight that are available?

Mr. Chairman: That brings us to vote 2403, general expenditures, disbursements; wait now, it should be finance executive, if we are following the summary at the top of page 179.

Mr. J. Renwick: I have some questions but I am not quite certain where the appropriate place to ask them would be. I would assume that this is probably the appropriate place for trying to get some information about the

factors that enter into the decision of the government as to whether to borrow or not to borrow, and where they are going to borrow. For example, what the decision was in this present Budget as to whether they should or should not borrow in the market.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This would come under taxation and fiscal policy branch, which we have just dealt with; which has just been voted—fiscal policy.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well I am very—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What else?

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, I would assume that I can get to the points that I am interested in under the new bond issues, or studies and trends in public finance. I am looking at the heading "finance". Under this programme, all matters relating to cash flow of the public debt of Ontario are administered, including new bond issues, the servicing of existing debt and the management of certain capital aid corporations. I would assume that any remarks that I wanted to make in either, come under, what, public debt, or under finance executive and finance management?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would suggest finance management.

Mr. Chairman: Can we clear off finance executive then? Agreed to?

Finance management.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on this would the Minister explain to me, as a taxpayer, why, I say kindly, why you would travel on a junket to Germany to borrow money when the Hydro is borrowing money, they borrowed \$75 million on New York market three weeks ago. Their credit is good in New York, but the province's credit is not good in New York. Now why do we take a junket over there when you could borrow in New York?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will show you how totally inadequate that statement is—

Mr. Sargent: Well, we have to start some place.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is fair enough. Actually, we borrowed in New York for the Hydro account. Hydro cannot borrow on the United States market. It was an Ontario loan for Hydro purposes.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I must apologize. It said on the financial pages that Hydro was borrowing the money. I do not know.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is an Ontario Hydro Electric Quebec issue but it is the—

Mr. Sargent: No, it is Ontario Hydro.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Ontario Hydro, I should say, Ontario Hydro Electric Commission issue, for all practical purposes but it is borrowed on the credit of consolidated revenue fund of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: All right, then why did you go to Germany if you could borrow in New York?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, the province went to Germany for its own capital requirements in the amount and to the extent that was proposed in the Budget of a year ago, the equivalent of \$100 million, for all practical purposes. The reason we went to Germany for our purposes was to take some of the pressure off the Canadian capital market—

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the American market.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I agree you are. And for the same purpose we financed our Hydro requirements in the New York market.

Mr. Sargent: Now come on, that does not make any sense at all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now just let me pursue this. We borrowed for Hydro purposes in both the American market, the New York market, and the Canadian market. You will observe that the New York loan was followed very shortly by a Canadian loan, a matter of some short weeks after. But, the purpose of our going to Germany was twofold. First of all, it reduced the pressure on the domestic capital market, let me put it that way, and secondly, we borrowed at very favourable rates.

Mr. Sargent: Better than New York?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We announced the rates in the House.

Mr. Sargent: I would just like to know.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, by something on the combined order of three quarters of 1 per cent, to 1 per cent better.

Mr. Sargent: And repayable in what money?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Repayable in Deutschmarks.

Mr. Sargent: And if there is a rise in the economy it will be a darned expensive loan then, if they have a rise in the economy. Sometimes it makes you wonder who won the war. I think it is degrading that you would have to go to a nation like that, when we have this great economy of ours down here to the south of us that controls about 90 per cent of our corporate wealth here anyway.

You go to Germany when you could borrow money in the United States, saying that it would deplete the money market, which is ridiculous. The amount of money you borrowed in Germany will pay the interest for 45 days on our debt, so after another 45 days you go back for another trip. Our debt is \$1.5 million a day in interest that we are are paying now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not being either reasonable or sensible when he says that.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is ridiculous to take a junket like that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If the member will recall again the observations made in the recent Budget statement, we have so ordered our capital requirements, our cash and liquid reserves, to the point where Ontario does not have to go to the capital market at all in the next Budget year.

Mr. Lewis: That is what you have said.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not just what we say, it is true. As far as our budgetary position is concerned we say that we cannot perceive the necessity of going to the capital market again.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I thought you needed a billion dollars for Hydro.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said "the province of Ontario account."

Mr. Nixon: The Minister just said a moment ago that they were the same thing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, yes, but the hon. leader of the Opposition heard the Budget too. In this way we clear the decks for Hydro's continuing substantial requirements.

Mr. Nixon: But you go to borrow for Hydro?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am talking about the Canadian market.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, to clarify this situation, we are talking about finance management under this, and the Minister makes a statement that a \$50 million loan he received in Germany would deplete the money market in New York.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is a limited number of times you can go to New York for money.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, it is not only New York, there are 48 states down there, there is Los Angeles, we have offices all over the states down there.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They are short of money themselves.

Mr. Sargent: I think this is a misleading statement. When the Minister has this \$3 billion debt, he tells the House that a \$60 million loan would affect the money market in this area. It is ridiculous to make a statement like that.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): The member for Grey-Bruce should be the financial adviser.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not propose to answer that question because the hon. member does not understand.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly do not, and a lot of people are as stupid as I am.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the procedures the Minister follows when he does decide to borrow. I assume from his earlier remarks that the actual decision to borrow does not fall under this particular branch, it falls under the preceding branch, or is made by the Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it is a moot question—

Mr. J. Renwick: Let me assume, for the moment, that the government were to decide that they were going to borrow for budgetary purposes. Then would it be this particular area which would decide or would recommend—not decide, but recommend—the market in which the borrowing would take place, and state what the options are that are available to the government in terms of borrowing—the Canadian market, or the New York market, or the European market? And would it be this branch of the government that would negotiate with you to carry out all the details that are involved in negotiating

the loan? Is it personnel from one or the other of these areas, the finance executive, or finance management?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is both. It would be in that instance, or related instances, the Deputy Minister and the comptroller of finances, who would provide the advisory services to the Minister to make those determinations, as to where to go for capital, when to go and the type and term of security, the rate of the coupon and the price and all those related matters that go with the bonds or debentures that are being sold.

Mr. J. Renwick: Would it be that same area that would make the assessment of what, if any, exchange risks were involved in borrowing in the European market in this last venture of the government?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: As a matter of curiosity, why is it that Hydro itself cannot borrow in the New York market?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Securities Exchange will not permit it.

Mr. J. Renwick: Does the Minister know the reason for that? Again, as a matter of curiosity?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They require the credit of the consolidated revenue fund of the province.

Mr. Nixon: What about Consolidated Edison? As a private company, could they not go to the New York market without having the backing of New York state?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As a private corporation, they probably could. Hydro in itself is a different type of creature; its asset structure is not the same as a private utility corporation would be.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if any study has been done as to what would happen to Hydro's borrowing rate if in fact it were cut loose from the credit of the province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It would cost them a great deal more, in my opinion.

Mr. Nixon: Because surely they must have equivalent financial status now as any of the large private American power companies. They are much larger—their facilities, their in-plant facilities, their capital market, must be much larger than most of those private corporations.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, there is a difference. They are not a corporate structure.

As I say, the asset structure and liability structure of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario is not the same as a private corporation or a public corporation; it is different. I do not know just how to go into more detail on that, but the security for the loan is not vested in the Hydro-Electric the same as it would be in other circumstances.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I recall when I was in civic politics that when the debenture debt of a municipality was 25 per cent of the total assessment, then we were, as you know, approaching insolvency, and the government will move in and take over. Does the Minister agree that is a pretty good guide line?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is for a municipality.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, what is the danger point so far as financing—our gross debt now is about \$3 billion, roughly—what is the danger point that caused you to say it was a financial nightmare? How close were we to a financial nightmare some three months ago?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In this context, we were neither close, nor are we likely ever to be.

I suppose the yardstick that might be applied here to the one that the hon. member is referring to, as far as municipal debt is concerned, is the most recent recommendation by the Smith committee on taxation—that our debt could reach the proportions of nine per cent of our gross provincial product. It is not even close to that yet.

The member probably recalls me mentioning—and I am very proud and happy to be able to mention it every year—our debt is not \$3 billion, as the member points out. Our debt is something on the order of \$1.7 billion, which—

Mr. Sargent: I am talking gross debt, not net debt.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, net is less than that. Net is in the order of \$1.7 billion.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the Minister had better revise his books, because they say \$3 billion in debt.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, we have never said that. If the member points out where I can find that I will take him out for dinner. It has never been said; it is not true.

Let me point this out to you again, and I say I repeat it with great pride as far as the credit of Ontario is concerned, we can again this year retire our total debt, total debt, with eight months' revenue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A great province. Are you not all proud?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am very proud of it.

Mr. Sargent: The Hydro debt is \$500,000 a day in interest, that is a matter of record. You will probably want to change that one too, but that was in their statement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What does the member mean? I do not change anything; I only give the facts as I know them.

Mr. Sargent: I do not want to infer that, so I will take that back; I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wish the hon. member would.

An hon. member: Where are you going to put it?

Mr. Nixon: You change his statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Your usual expression is "snow job." Have you forgotten that one?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has had a rough time and I do not want to flog this point, but it is pretty well the key point in all this talk leading up to this Budget. When other economies are cutting taxes, we are increasing taxes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Cutting taxes?

Mr. Sargent: Well, the news release in New York tonight is that Nixon is going to cut back \$4 billion in taxes—take it off the surcharge tax.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But we do not have a surcharge to take off.

Mr. Sargent: They had a 10 per cent surcharge down there, the Minister knows that. If he does not know that, he should know that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do, but I say to be consistent how can we do the same thing? How can we take off a surcharge if we do not have one?

Mr. Sargent: About the only thing you do not have here is the surcharge. The next thing you will be taxing will be the pill; that is what you will be getting to next.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which one?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I think somewhere along the line you got to the point—you went along with the Opposition, all of us here who have previously said you should have a purchasing committee, which you did set up. Over the years we have been saying you should have an efficiency survey. And the only thing out of that efficiency survey we will ever hear about are things that you want us to hear.

But somewhere along the line, I think we will have—the Minister said 9 per cent of the gross national product. That is a completely unknown—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Gross provincial product.

Mr. Sargent: That is a completely unknown and flexible thing that you cannot gear financing to. I do not agree that that is the way to judge solvency or insolvency—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I want to get into an extensive debate here. We relied on a committee of very, very knowledgeable people who studied this matter for four years—very knowledgeable in this field. For anyone to suggest that the gross provincial product is not capable of identification, of course, is an obviously absurd statement.

Mr. Sargent: It is an intangible.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think, Mr. Chairman, I will let it go at that.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister questions concerning the financial management.

As the Minister knows, if his fiscal policy is to be successful it must be co-ordinated very closely with the debt management policy that he pursues given the constraint of the federal government's monetary policy. So the questions I have are these:

Could he give us some idea of the policy of his department concerning what might be called the length of term of new issues? There are various theories that in certain economic conditions you try to have more short term bonds as a proportion of your total borrowing. At other times you try to extend the length of term, and so forth. I was hoping the Minister might elaborate

what his policy is in this regard, and to justify it in terms of his view of what is happening in the provincial economy over the next year or so. Perhaps the Minister could comment on that?

I have several questions, would the Minister like me to list them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I would like to deal with this one and I do not know that it makes for a great deal of fixed or firm policy. I think maybe that I would say first, that the decision to go to a capital market—or what type of term you are able to develop—is largely associated with the availability of capital. Certainly it has been this last two or three years.

There was a time, I suppose, when capital was more readily available, that the borrower could have something more to say about the terms of the rates than he can today. These things are determined in the light of the circumstances of the day. In a very tight capital market, as I pointed out, the terms are more often set by the lender. If they see a rising cost factor, or a rising interest rate, they are probably going to propose either a short term, or a combination of short and medium term.

In other circumstances, long term money may be more readily available if they want to get it out at a reasonable rate of interest rate over a longer period of time. This is the situation. It is all related largely to the competitive factor of availability. This is another thing that took us into the European capital market—more readily available funds in that market at a better cost.

There are other considerations involved too. We would have to take some look at our refunding schedule, the extent to which we have to refund maturing loans x number of years ahead. That would all have to be co-ordinated. These are some of the considerations that would be involved.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that answer. I would like to also suggest that he perhaps should examine the effect of his mix on his fiscal policy and taxation policy. He might find that because he believes that the terms are set primarily by the lenders in today's capital market, that this is costing him something in terms of his fiscal and taxation objectives. I would like to suggest that this is what has happened recently in regard to some of his borrowings.

Another question, Mr. Chairman, is this. We hear a great deal about the need for co-operation between this government and the

federal government in a number of areas. This government has certainly made its views known—that it thinks the federal government is going off on its own without adequate consultation in certain areas. I would like to see if this government would say the same thing about its debt management policy.

Does this government consult with the federal government finance Minister concerning the objectives of the debt management policy of the federal government? Or is this Treasurer charging off to Germany pursuing a different type of debt management policy than the federal government thereby sterilizing the efforts of the federal government to a certain extent in the achievement of national goals?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: May I answer?

We have, a number of times in my memory, disclosed a great deal of this information to the federal-provincial conference of finance Ministers at the request of the federal government.

Going back to the former Minister, the Hon. Mr. Sharp, the departmental people, through the Deputy Minister, make this available to the continuing committee at stated intervals. We disclose our position—present, short term and medium term—to them. There is close collaboration. We get a great deal of information in this respect from the Bank of Canada so that our collaboration is very close indeed.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I deduce from the Minister's remarks, Mr. Chairman, that his debt management policy for the next 12 months is consistent with the debt management policy of the federal government?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I could only assume it is. We were criticized very roundly by the federal Minister at the December federal-provincial conference of finance Ministers, and we took some exception to it. He was very critical of our debt finance management programmes and he strongly advised us that we should not have any more deficit budgets. I think we maybe set that consideration aside in this present Budget.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in talking about the insolvency point used the figure nine per cent of the Ontario gross national product. Was nine per cent the safety figure? Is that right, nine per cent?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Of the gross provincial product recommended by the Smith Committee on Taxation.

Mr. Sargent: Right. So last year, using page 39 of your Budget, you said in 1967-68—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What page are we on?

Mr. Sargent: Page 39, top of the page. Your percentage there was 8.7 per cent in 1968. In other words you were .3 per cent from insolvency. Is this right, or not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot go along with your arithmetic.

Mr. Sargent: How do you subtract 8.7 from nine per cent? So you are .3 per cent from insolvency in 1968, is that right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not—

Mr. Sargent: I want you to answer this question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You do not want me to answer it.

Mr. Sargent: I want you to answer it, yes sir.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are making reference to the growth rate in the provincial product. You are not making any reference to the relationship of our debt to gross provincial product.

Mr. Sargent: All right, I will go one step further. You say that you have things all set now; the hopper is good now and our position now is 7.8 per cent. So the change now in 1968-69 is 7.8 per cent—at the top of page 39. So we are now at this point exactly \$292 million in 1969 from insolvency.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no.

Mr. Sargent: I am not a very good book-keeper, I do not know how else to read that. You tell us how we work this out.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is referring to some unrelated figures. Actually the percentage of our debt to the gross provincial product now stands at six per cent—\$1.7 billion gross debt, against about \$27 million gross provincial product.

Mr. Sargent: Your gross debt on the back page is \$4,355,000,00.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Where?

Mr. Sargent: On the back page—page 92.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, according to the table on page 89 your net debt as a percentage of the provincial domestic product has never dropped as low as six per cent.

Mr. Peacock: It is over seven now.

Mr. Lewis: Not according to your table; it has risen—not to the point of what one might call insolvency—but it has risen close to the nine per cent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no. It is the net debt figures you should always compare.

Mr. Lewis: That is what you have got on page 89—net debt as a percentage of provincial domestic product. Chart C6 suggests that in 1969 it is up over seven per cent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: About six per cent over 1968.

Mr. Lewis: Agreed, and it is rising. Rising meteorically. In fact, we are obviously almost out of control.

Mr. Pilkey: A fiscal nightmare.

Mr. Lewis: The fact is, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Talking about a nightmare—

Mr. Lewis: It is getting very late and we are not quite as concerned about the debt here—

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister explain then—he says the net debt is \$1.6 billion but the back pages says the gross debt is \$4,355,000,000. Was this a misprint?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no. That is the gross debt, but it is the net debt that—

Mr. Sargent: Oh, come on. I am talking about the gross debt. You said the gross debt was \$1.7 billion.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If I did I am wrong. It is the net debt—

Mr. Sargent: You cannot afford to be wrong when you are dealing with seven million people.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I say for all future reference purposes, whenever we make reference in this context to debt, it will be net debt.

Mr. Sargent. Then why do you print the gross debt at \$4 billion to \$5 billion here now? Why do you print it, then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are supposed to know that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do you not want that information too?

Mr. Sargent: Well, you do not want to hear it. You told me this was only half that. Tell me what you pay interest on? Do you pay interest on the net debt or the gross debt?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We pay interest on the funded debt.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The funded debt.

Mr. Sargent: You pay interest on the gross debt, do you not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, on the debenture debt.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I always thought when you had a debenture debt of say \$100,000 that is the gross debt, so you pay interest on the gross debt. Right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The gross debt involves debt against which there are no interest payments. Is that clear? No interest costs—

Mr. Peacock: It is getting late.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, this may be a convenient place to make a break.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will continue with these estimates.

Mr. Speaker: For the information of Mr. Speaker, will there be a private members' hour?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, at noon tomorrow there will be a private members' hour.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 7, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Friday, March 7, 1969

Tabling review, Mr. A. F. Lawrence	1997
Burwash industrial farm, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. MacDonald	1997
Estimates, Department of Treasury and Economics, continued, Mr. MacNaughton	1999
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Deans, on second reading, Mr. Deans, Mr. Belanger, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Price, Mr. Ben	2013
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2024

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1969

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning we have full galleries: In the east gallery, students from the Franklin Horner public school, in Etobicoke; in the west gallery, students from Chelmsford high school, in Chelmsford; and in both galleries, students from Chedoke public school in Hamilton. Later today we will be joined in the galleries by students from Thistleton middle school, in Rexdale, and Fenelon Falls secondary school, in Fenelon Falls.

We welcome these young people here so early on Friday morning.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1968 review of The Ontario Department of Mines for the calendar year of 1968. The department construes this year's review as a salute to the mining industry, from the Ontario government and from The Department of Mines, for its remarkable achievement in increasing production by 12.2 per cent last year to a new peak of more than \$1.3 billion.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That's the effect of the new Minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That, as just a side effect of the new ministry, follows on the heels of a 24.5 per cent increase in 1967, and we think this is a real achievement.

The development activity in many areas, as outlined in the review, gives us every reason to hope that the industry will continue to expand, in the year ahead and in the years ahead. I would recommend the review to the attention of all hon. members and any others who have a genuine interest in the financial well-being of our country. It contains a great deal of interesting information of prime importance.

As usual, we followed the procedure of dividing the contents into two separate sections. Part 1 deals with the industry itself,

and part 2 contains information about the activities of the branches and officers of The Department of Mines. The book was designed for publication as quickly as possible after the close of the calendar year, in the belief that its practical value will be enhanced if the information it contains is still current and newsworthy.

I suggest to you, sir, that the preparation and production of such a comprehensive report, in a period of only a few weeks since the end of 1968—

Mr. Nixon: Very commendable!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —is a very noteworthy achievement—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Who did the picture?

Mr. Nixon: That picture moves the Minister to No. 9.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —and to the best of my knowledge is unmatched by any department in any government in Canada.

Mr. Nixon: In the world!

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The hon. member for York South has a question from away back, of the Minister of Correctional Services, which I do not think has been asked. My date is February 6, but I do not think it is that old.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How true your comment is.

To the Minister of Correctional Services: When staff members of the Burwash Industrial Farm have asked their local MPP to discuss conditions which they deem unsatisfactory, what justification is there for the superintendent's ban on such a meeting?

Second, if this meeting is to be banned, why was the Conservative candidate in the last provincial election permitted to hold a meeting within the institution after being requested by the local branch of the CSAO?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, in answer to

the first question, it is the policy in the department that political meetings are not held on institutional property. Because of this, Mr. Kirby, principal of the school in Burwash village, wrote to Mr. Marsden, a member of the staff at Burwash, in reply to a request for the use of the school for a meeting, advising him that as it appeared in his view that the meeting was to be of a political nature he, Mr. Marsden, should get permission from the superintendent. Mr. Kirby's reply, Mr. Speaker, is fairly well in keeping with what has been our policy.

Incidentally, I should add that no further application to this moment has been made to the superintendent as a result of that letter, which, on the fact of it, would lead one to believe that the intention was in fact to use it for political purposes.

However, I recognize that a general policy in respect of the use of institutional property is difficult to apply to Burwash because of the fact that a large number of staff live on the property. Therefore, it is obvious that some change in rules must be made for use of meeting facilities for staff at this particular institution. For this reason, I am considering the problem with a view of revising instructions so as to clarify the use of the village facilities for meetings, either to discuss village problems or problems of staff conditions, if the members of the staff feel they require such discussion.

And I would think if they wanted to invite their local MPP to be present, there should be no objection providing the meeting is not of a political nature. In fact, as an MPP myself, I feel that not only is it the right of an MPP but his duty to meet his constituents if they invite him to do so.

I would, however, appeal to hon. members not to take this as an invitation to utilize institutional property for political purposes, keeping in mind that Burwash is a penal institution and that is very easy for actions which would be normal in any other setting to precipitate very serious repercussions in a penal setting.

However, in answer specifically to the first question, as explained at the outset of my remarks the superintendent has not received a request to this moment for the use of the school, following the principal's letter.

In answer to the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that after investigation—and I made sure a considerable amount of investigation went on since I got this enquiry—it was found that in March, 1967, the Conservative candidate, on the in-

stitution of one man, attended a private meeting of the local branch of the CSAO; and that at the end of the meeting he addressed them at their request. This was a private meeting of the local branch of the CSAO and I am advised that permission to invite the candidate was not sought from the superintendent or the assistant superintendent.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification, I am not exactly certain as to the local conditions. When the Minister refers to "village" conditions, are the village conditions or village problems within the institution property?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. Burwash village actually consists of property of the Ontario government, occupied completely by staff members who administer the penal institution.

Mr. Speaker: My list of questions indicates that there are no further questions to be asked today unless someone has—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would grant me the privilege to ask, through you, why a member of the House cannot have the courtesy of taped in-House proceedings in his office the same as the press has? I understand even most of the Treasury Board do not have this courtesy; I understand the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), has it, which is rightfully so. Every member of the House should have the privilege to know what is going on in the House to find out if he should be here when he is in his office working. As the press has this courtesy, why can we not have it? I would like you to consider it.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I do not think anyone would be here.

Mr. Speaker: I might advise the hon. member that there are a great many considerations and the situation is presently under discussion, both with The Department of Public Works and with the government, by Mr. Speaker. Due to the change in the official Opposition offices, the speaker which was in the office of the leader has been disconnected. In order to connect that, some decision has to be made with respect to other speakers. It is a matter which is under consideration. There are a great many considerations both ways. As the member for Peterborough says, it is possible that we might all decide to work in our offices rather than come in the House if we—

Mr. Sargent: That might be a good idea!

Mr. Speaker: I have no comment.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to this point I may say that I have some sympathy with the position put by the hon. member. I do not think that it is feasible to expect every member of this House to be in his seat during the entire proceedings of the House. There are, sometimes, matters that are of more interest to certain members than others. Also, the mere fact that a man is not in his seat in this House does not mean that he is not doing his job.

As the sittings get longer and we sit longer hours, I know I personally find it necessary to be out of the House when I might prefer to be here. If you are able to keep some idea of what is going on here then you can come back and participate in the matters that are of particular interest to you.

As the Speaker said, this whole matter is under pretty close examination at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twenty-fourth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND ECONOMICS (Continued)

On vote 2402:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, when the House closed last night, we had arrived at the point where some of the facts which the hon. Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), gave the House did not agree with the publication of his Budget.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He said he did not pay interest on his gross debt.

Mr. Sargent: Right. I would like to find out from the Treasurer what segment of our debt we are not paying interest on.

A further disturbing point to me: I asked the Treasurer, Mr. Chairman, if the interest on the debt that the Hydro owed, as stated in a Hydro release, was \$500,000 per day and the Treasurer did not know that that was a fact. To have \$500,000 a day going out in interest and to have the top man in our finance not knowing about this is a shocking situation.

We tried to establish, Mr. Chairman, the danger point we were at two months ago and the danger point today. The Treasurer said that the danger point was nine per cent of the provincial gross product and that his

release in the Budget book stated that in 1968 our position was 8.7 per cent. That left a spread of .3 per cent from bankruptcy. Somewhere along the line, he does not agree with these figures. Either he is wrong or the book is wrong.

Our position point today is that we are 7.8 per cent of the provincial gross product or about \$292 million away from bankruptcy. If these figures are not right, I think we should know the facts about where we stand.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I will try to clarify this again.

Mr. Sargent: You did not clarify it last night.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I thought I did, but I will try again. You make reference to a danger point. There was no reference last night to a danger point. We said that one of the guidelines was the relationship of net debt to gross provincial product and that the Ontario committee on taxation had recommended that it could safely rise as high as nine per cent of gross provincial product. Gross provincial product next year is indicated to be approaching \$30 billion.

Mr. Sargent: It is \$29 billion!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said approaching \$30 billion. So that against that proposition—

Mr. Sargent: Are you sure it is taken off the page where you say \$29 billion?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is \$29.2 billion. All right, we will go down to \$29 billion. I was trying to make it a little easier to calculate nine per cent of it, that is all.

Against that background, that nine per cent figure recommended or proposed by the Ontario committee on taxation, our net debt could sustainably be something on the order of \$2.6 billion in their opinion. But, it is not; it is something on the order of \$1.7 billion—substantially less than nine per cent.

Now, I refer to the comparisons the hon. member made last night and referred to again here today. On page 38 at the top of the summary he is making reference, first of all, to the gross provincial product and the increase in the gross provincial product that we foresee for the fiscal year ahead. The figures that he is using to reach the conclusions that he reached last night and reached again this morning have no relationship to debt whatever.

Mr. Sargent: Let us go back a point. We have said that in the municipal field if your debenture debt is 25 per cent of your total assessment then you are insolvent. This point too: You say now that nine per cent of the gross national—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Gross provincial!

Mr. Sargent: —gross provincial product is the position point that you have to watch, your target. All right, in a projection here you say that your position in 1968 is 7.8 of that nine per cent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Chairman, this is where I must correct the hon. member. This is what we forecast—an increase in the gross provincial product in the upcoming fiscal year to reach \$29.2 billion. This is the increase. The gross provincial product. Incidentally, and I will say it for the hon. member's information, if he is not already aware of it—this is the value of the total production of goods and services in the province for the year. It is not—

Mr. Sargent: Do not talk down to me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not talking down. I am trying to relate the comparison that you introduced yourself. It has nothing to do with assessment. The yardstick used by the municipal board for debt is related to the assessment of the municipality and they say 25 per cent is a proper ration between debt and assessment. There is no basis of comparison between that figure and what I am relating to you now. I am only using it to make a comparison. I am not talking down—

Mr. Sargent: All right, I do thank you. But getting back to the net debt—you say this is your guideline, your net debt position?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Last night I asked you the gross debt and you said the gross debt was \$2.6 billion—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I said it was over—

Mr. Sargent: Well it will be in *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: —over the \$4 billion mark.

Mr. Sargent: We went to the back of the book and found on page 92 that our gross debt at this position is \$4,355,000,000.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but—

Mr. Sargent: You are out about \$1.8 billion on that factor. Now, when we go back to 1968 we find that the gross debt then was \$3.5 billion. We have an increase in gross debt of \$800 million or 25 per cent in one year. When I go to the bank to borrow some money, if I owe the bank a lot of money and, I am one of the average small businessmen, the bank manager looks at my different operations and says "you are indebted to the bank X thousands of dollars." He takes my gross indebtedness not my net position.

Now why is the province different than any other business? In your share of operations you establish a net position by taking off your assets and you find your net position. Now who establishes your assets? What is this building worth? What it is listed at? Your auditors or bookkeepers can take any figure in the world and say our highways are worth "x" hundreds of millions worth of dollars and you can show a good net position. So getting back, Mr. Chairman, I say respectfully, I asked you to give me a figure of where the danger point was two months ago and how close were we to this financial nightmare?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I am not going to attempt to make any comparisons with the basis upon which the hon. member obtains credit from the bank, but I would refer him again to page 92, the page from which he obtained the gross debt figures and the net debt figures. The net debt figure is arrived at by deducting revenue producing and realizable assets from gross debt. He made reference to highways and buildings. These are not included. These revenue producing and realizable assets could be disposed of, loans if you wish, offsetting the gross debt—debts that are owed to the province because of advances that are made.

So this is why, when we refer to debt in these terms, we refer to net debt. I think that may compare, if you like, with what you have already said yourself. Maybe this is collateral that we would use in the personal or private business sense, and it is taken into consideration, it is shown, incidentally, on table C.11, page 92—the same table to which the hon. member made reference. He will see starting in columns 3, 4 and 5, and then totalled in column 6—what I refer to as revenue producing and realizable assets. So, when you deduct those from the gross debt it produces a net debt figure.

Mr. Chairman: Financial management!

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I have three or four questions I would like to ask the Minister, somewhat technical I think.

Would the Minister explain to me why it is that when Ontario Hydro borrows in the province of Ontario it borrows directly with the guarantee of the province, and when Ontario Hydro borrows in the New York market the province borrows and then lends the funds on the same terms to Hydro?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I explained last night that I believe it is a requirement of the Securities Exchange Commission in Washington.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would make a note—and not during the estimates—and at some point, ask someone in his department to write to me and explain in more detail why that is so.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I will be glad to do that, but I will explain, as I did last night, that in the United States they make their advances in terms of approvals by the Securities Exchange Commission, on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund of the province, not the assets, whatever they may be, of Hydro. I will be glad to have someone provide a little more detail on the reasons for it, but I can assure the hon. member that it is a regulation of the Securities Exchange Commission, and it is the only way we can borrow in the New York market.

Mr. J. Renwick: Again I am only surmising, and I surmise that what the Minister is saying is that whatever the appropriate Public Utilities Holding Companies Act, or other regulations are which the Securities Exchange Commission apply, in some way Ontario Hydro does not meet the requirements—the point that the leader of the Opposition made last night—as do, for example, Consolidated Edison or Niagara Mohawk. It is along that line that I would like to have the specific chapter and verse of why it is not possible for Hydro to borrow directly in the New York market, leading to the point in time where Hydro might very well borrow directly on its own account, so that the province would be freed of the contingent liability of the province by way of guarantee, or by way of direct borrowing and relending.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will be glad to give you that information.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell me when last the Ontario government borrowed in the Canadian market?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The last direct loan for provincial account was in January, 1968, from the Canadian capital market.

Mr. J. Renwick: In the Canadian market?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. Hydro borrowed last month from the U.S.

Mr. J. Renwick: Hydro borrowed. Yes, I was thinking of government itself for its own purpose.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It was February, 1968, not January.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would like then to look at what the department does in terms of the relationship with the investment community. Is it a consistent group of investment bankers who have the privilege of underwriting the government of Ontario bonds on the New York market, or on the Ontario market, and what is that connection? Is it a traditional connection, or is there any change made from time to time in the particular investment banker who either heads the banking group or the group of bankers that composes the banking group?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The Canadian banking group has been rather constant for a long period of time. There have been changes over the years, where I suppose it is fair to say other investment bankers have been admitted to the banking group, but on balance it has remained pretty consistent. The management of the banking group has remained the same over a rather protracted period of years in Canada.

In the United States it is different because some American investment bankers are involved, and some Canadian investment bankers who are situated in New York, are involved. It is a combination of American investment bankers and the Canadian investment bankers who are incorporated in the United States and who operate in New York.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would just like to pursue that a little bit, Mr. Chairman. I have not got either the prospectus or the newspaper advertisement on the province of Ontario domestic issue, but is it the same traditional connection that Hydro has in the investment market as the government uses? It is the same group. I notice, if it is the same group, that undoubtedly McLeod, Young, Weir, and Wood Gundy are in fact the leaders of the banking group. I assume they put the group together, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, not altogether. For provincial issues the management group would involve the same group, but the management is just a little different. The provincial banking group, I suppose it is fair to say, is headed by one firm; the Hydro banking group is headed by another firm; but in total they are the same group.

Mr. J. Renwick: Could the Minister then specifically tell me who was the manager of the last Hydro issue in the domestic market and which firm was the manager of the banking group in the last province of Ontario domestic?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, in the case of Hydro it was McLeod, Young, Weir and Company Limited, and in the case of the province it was Wood Gundy Securities Limited. But the total group is the same, it is just a difference at the management level.

Mr. J. Renwick: When the province borrows either for Hydro or on its own account in the New York market, is the banking group as such the same as on this latest prospectus of the province of Ontario, namely: Drexel, Harriman and Ripley, First Boston Corporation, Solomon Brothers and Husler, A. E. Ames & Company Incorporated, Wood Gundy and Company Incorporated, Halsey, Stewart and Company Incorporated, Smith, Barney and Company, the Dominion Securities Corporation, and McLeod, Young, Weir Incorporated? Is that more or less a similar group that is used at all times for the province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. I am not aware of any changes that have been made in that group for quite some time but I would say that Wood Gundy and Company Incorporated are joint managers with Drexel, Harriman, Ripley Incorporated.

Mr. J. Renwick: Then in their financing in the New York market they use a joint management of the banking group and Wood Gundy is the New York offshoot of Wood Gundy in Canada and has a role to play in it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Drexel is the principal manager there but Wood Gundy is associated with them as a co-manager, that is true.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would like to ask the Treasurer whether or not we have reached the point in a sophisticated investment market in Ontario or in Canada, or in New York, where you could go by way of bids on the

government bonds. I have here the advertisement of the comptroller of the state of New York offering \$81 million of the state of New York transportation capital facilities bonds, and it is done by public tender. The pertinent points, I think, are of interest in this particular discussion we are having.

The comptroller of the state of New York will sell at his office, at the state office buildings, 23rd floor, 270 Broadway, New York, New York, August 19, 1968, at 11.30 o'clock a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, \$81 million state of New York transportation capital facilities serial bonds. Bidders will be required—

It gives particulars of the issue and the kind of bonds and the authority under which they are being issued under the laws of the state of New York. But the pertinent matter here is:

Bidders will be required to name the rate, or rates of interest which the bonds are to bear; such rates shall be multiples of fractions—Not more than one rate of interest may be named for any single maturity—Bidders may condition their bids upon the award to them of all, but not part, of the \$81 million, and the highest bidder on the basis of all or none will be the one whose bid figures the lowest dollar interest cost to the state after deducting the amount of premium bid, if any.

No bid will be accepted for separate maturities; no bid will be accepted for less than the par value and so on. All proposals together with the good faith security must be enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed "Proposal for Bonds" and be directed to the comptroller of the state of New York—

at the address which I gave, and so on.

The unqualified opinion of the Attorney General of the state of New York—The comptroller reserves the right to reject any or all bids. The successful bidder, or bidders, will be required to pay for the bonds upon delivery of the bonds by deposit in the Chase Manhattan Bank in the city of New York.

I must ask the Treasurer whether or not we have not reached the point where either Ontario Hydro in the domestic market in Ontario, or in the New York market, or the government of Ontario directly in the New York market for its own purposes or for Hydro purposes, or in the domestic market here, should not give serious consideration to offering those bonds by way of public bid and tender in the way in which the government of the state of New York raises funds.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, it is appropriate to say that this method of obtaining financing has been considered from time to time. It is the opinion of the government and the Treasurer that we are doing it in a most advantageous way as far as we are concerned. We accept advice on this from time to time and we are convinced that it is still the most advantageous way for us to conduct our borrowing.

That does not mean that it is not something that can be reviewed from time to time but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee, that we are convinced that it is the most advantageous way for us to conduct our borrowing.

I would say, too, by way of information to the hon. member that domestic borrowers in the United States are dealt with somewhat differently from the foreign borrowers—and Canadians are regarded as foreign borrowers. Most states make it a requirement by law that their utility issues particularly have to be sold by tender. That is the reason why it is done over there. Whether it is the most advantageous way or not I am not prepared to say but it is a matter of state law in certainly most states if not all of them.

Mr. J. Renwick: I realize that, I realize that the historical circumstances in New York, for example, led the assembly to pass the law in the state of New York that there would be competitive bidding on government bonds. In other words, that various investment bankers could join together in various groups in order to make their proposal on it. I am simply saying to the Treasurer that there is quite obviously no law to that effect in the province of Ontario, but I do not think that is the point.

The basic point is that the time has arrived where I think a very serious consideration must now be given to the proposition that competitive bidding for the bonds of the province of Ontario, with the fine credit rating that the province has, is an appropriate way in which this government can ensure that they have obtained the best deal that they can at the lowest cost to the province and the largest net proceeds of these issues to the province.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I just want to follow up on the point of the member for Riverdale. As I understand it, the point that the member for Riverdale is making is that first of all the province really is operating through a fiscal agent in terms of selling their bonds—maybe

that is not the proper term. But a number of municipalities, at least, tender for their debentures, which are comparable to your bonds.

Has the province produced any study in terms of finding out whether the municipalities are better off tendering their debentures, which are comparable to your bonds, or going through a fiscal agent, which would be, I think, comparable to what you are doing? This is happening not only in New York but in many municipalities. They do tender. And as they tender to sell their debentures, there is a great disparity in terms of what some offers are compared to others. In other words, usually—and again depending on what the money market is like—you get a fairly good tender from, say, 10 or 12 people who are tendering for those debentures.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I can do no more than repeat what I have said to the hon. member for Riverdale, that we do study these things and consider them from time to time. Up to now we are convinced that we are doing it the most advantageous way.

We do not employ fiscal agents in that sense. The banking group, of course, is a group that, in the final analysis, buys our securities. They are not an agent. They are all major banking institutions, investment bankers, in the two jurisdictions. They do not represent us as an agent fiscally.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, they do purchase.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They are the buyers. They actually buy them, that is true. But I can only say we are still convinced that it is more advantageous to do it the way we are doing it.

Now, this is not something that is ignored. We pursue it from time to time, and, I suppose it is fair to say that when we can be convinced that it is more advantageous to do it the other way, that will be given very careful consideration. The discussion is a good one, but I would like it to be assumed to some extent we are convinced it is most advantageous to do it this way or we would be doing it another way.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, that is not the point.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, let me follow—

Mr. J. Renwick: The traditional method is not necessarily the best way.

Mr. Sargent: Well, on the other side of the picture, on the short-term cash flow you

have, for instance, in the last auditor's statement taken off, you had \$264 million cash on hand in the bank.

Some time ago I asked the Minister in the House if he would consider a parallel policy to the city of New York. They retain an investment firm to advise them on short-term cash flows and how to invest it. At this point you do not have a system like that in Ontario. I think it rates consideration. Would the Minister consider that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think we need to consider it, Mr. Chairman, because we have a fully constitutional branch—and we are discussing the functions of that branch now. That is the branch headed by the comptroller of finances, who advises the government and also engages in close collaboration with the suppliers of short-term capital.

The banking community as such advises the government through the comptroller of finances. So we are in receipt of this type of advice, I would say, on a daily basis; really on an hourly basis.

Mr. Sargent: Are you doing it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, of course we are. Management of our liquid reserves, Mr. Chairman, is a very important function of the financial comptroller's responsibility, and let me say it is done on an hourly basis.

Mr. Sargent: By professional people?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, who is more professional than the banking community?

Mr. Sargent: I say this kindly. If an economy like that of the city of New York finds it advisable to retain an outside investment firm to advise them on this—and that is the route they travel—why could we not get intelligent once in a while and do things like that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I rather think we are employing, Mr. Chairman—I will try to emphasize this—all the expertise and advice that is available to us. The people who are in the business must be the best advisors; the judgment of the comptroller of finances in the advice he gives to the Treasurer is very, very important. The management of cash, I will repeat, continues on an hourly basis. These contacts are made from the comptroller of finances' office every day and as frequently as every hour.

Mr. Sargent: One more question and maybe this is not relevant, but could the Minister

advise, insofar as the Canada Pension Plan fund is concerned—they rebate money to the province of Ontario which you loan out, is this true?

Could the Minister give me an idea of the net position of that? How much money has been distributed and where do we stand on those funds?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we will have that information for you in a moment. It is not a rebate, we actually borrow the money from the government of Canada, in return for which we issue our debentures at frequent intervals.

Each month we provide them with a debenture in the total amount of what has been advanced to us for the period. We are able to obtain this money at the average rate of interest, or the going rate of interest, that is paid by the government of Canada on their bonds.

We, in turn, as the hon. member knows, make it available to school boards at the same rate, plus a fraction of a per cent to cover the cost of administration, and we in turn take their debentures. So the federal government is secured by the debentures we issue and we are secured by the debentures issued by the school boards to us.

This is one of the components that was referred to when we made reference to realizable and revenue-producing assets. This is a very big component of that matter to which I made reference a few moments ago.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just pursue very briefly the question of the relationship of the government with the Bank of Canada in terms of any discussions that they have.

As I understand it—the Treasurer can correct me if I am wrong—but my recollection is that the Porter commission in substance pointed out that the Bank of Canada has the authority to act as fiscal agent for the province, as well as for the federal government. I would like to know, in the first instance, what the reasons are—if there are reasons other than traditional ones—why the Bank of Canada is not used as a fiscal agent for the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. member, that the authority is probably there.

We recommended at the November conference of Ministers of Finance and the December conference of Ministers of Finance that the federal Minister give serious con-

sideration to employing the Bank of Canada for that purpose and we were supported by the province of Quebec. Now, the authority may be there but it has never come to pass that this is done. We have recommended that it would probably be useful, not only to Ontario, but to all provinces.

It might be a very essential instrument to overview, if you like, debt control across Canada. We have proposed this on two separate occasions. I think the matter is probably under consideration at Ottawa, but we have not heard anything more about it as yet.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am pleased with the Treasurer's remarks. It may well be that my question was some hazy recollection of having seen some reference in the press to the very point. But I must emphasize, it seems to me in this hangup between the federal and provincial governments that the Bank of Canada in this particular field may have a very important co-ordinating role to play in the whole of the economy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We feel that way about it too.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, well, moving on from that lack of formal arrangement at the present time. Just to what extent do you, when you are planning to go to the market either for yourselves or for Hydro, co-ordinate your thinking with the Bank of Canada in terms of the overall demands made on the domestic capital market?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: An example of a recent experience, Mr. Chairman, was that the deputy Treasurer and myself visited with the governor of the Bank of Canada when we were in Ottawa in February. We maintain that liaison and contact with Mr. Rasminsky and his people on a continuing basis and we propose to continue it.

I agree there could be some real value in the co-ordinating ability of the central bank in this field, and that is why, of course, we proposed it to the federal Minister of Finance.

As I pointed out and as you pointed out, it has not been formally implemented yet, but we are certainly ready to lend the co-operation of the province of Ontario to such a co-ordinating feature.

Mr. Chairman: Finance and management? Securities control?

Mr. J. Renwick: Just before we move on, Mr. Chairman, there is another line of

thought I would like to pursue with the Treasurer on this same question.

When the government decided to follow the lead of others and borrow in the western European market and made whatever investigations were taking place, they must have run up against the problem of whether or not they were going to be able to market the bonds of the province of Ontario on an underwritten basis or whether they were going to have to use an agency commission basis in order to market them. My conclusion is drawn from the answers which the Minister gave to the leader of this party, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), when he asked the questions, which is shown on page 1393 of *Hansard*, the questions were:

What are the net proceeds of the \$64 million loan floated by the government of Ontario in Germany?

The answer of the Minister to the first part was that the final proceeds of the \$64 million loan would be \$62,492,181, or roughly \$1.5 million less than the principal amount of the loan. The second part of the question was:

If there are commissions and other charges, what is the effective interest rate through to maturity on the net proceeds?

The Minister's answer was:

6.67 in the case of the private placement of 90 million Deutschmarks, and 6.98 in the case of the 150 Deutschmarks public issue.

The point of my remarks is simply to ask the Treasurer whether or not he anticipates, even with different traditions in the European market, that having introduced the bonds of the province of Ontario into that market on the broad scale that was indicated by the number of persons who formed the group who were engaged to distribute the bonds, whether he anticipates that in fact the government will, in due course, be able to get a better rate having regard to the then existing interest rates structure, by having the bonds underwritten in that market rather than to have to employ agents to sell on a commission arrangement?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is no real difference in terms of the underwriting that the hon. member makes reference to than there would be any place else.

The banking group is substantially larger in Europe than it would be in Canada or in the United States. I think I would attribute this largely to the extent that there are banks outside of Germany itself who are in possession of Deutschmark balances. They are brought into the banking group whether they are western German bankers or not. But, it is a large banking group. In terms of underwriting, however, the management of the banking

group buy it from us just the same as the management of any one of the Canadian or United States syndicates, if you wish.

Incidentally, we deal only in this instance with the Deutschebank whom we have chosen to be our banking management. So we have no contact with the other banks ourselves, none whatsoever. The Deutschebank looks after all the internal arrangements. They have certain standards as far as charges are concerned that are characteristic of the whole European capital market, just the same as we have certain ones in Canada and there are certain situations in the United States.

So I think the significant thing to look at, as far as the German loan is concerned, is the net cost. And the net cost that I have made reference to in reply to the question of the leader of your party some days ago, is still a very favourable net cost.

So I think that this is the—

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, I understand.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton:—this is the significant thing that we have to concern ourselves about.

Some of the matters that I make reference to, Mr. Chairman, we have no way of changing. They are standards that are uniform in the European capital market, just the same as they are here and the same as they are in the United States.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, if I could just make one brief comment then.

I was under a misapprehension. I had understood that in the sale of the bonds in the European market it was not an actual outright purchase by the banking group managed by the Deutschebank and, therefore, it was distinct from the method by which Drexel, Harri-man and Ripley and Wood Gundy and Company Incorporated, that banking group in New York, bought outright the bonds and resold them.

I had the impression that in west Europe and the United Kingdom you were engaging, through the Deutschebank as the principal person, a network of persons who were going to sell the bonds on an agency basis for commission. I am pleased to hear that I was wrong.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it seems that the Minister is doing a pretty smooth job of glossing over his position at this point and the general acceptance of the situation has changed fantastically.

The public was geared to having a catastrophic situation whereby we were going to

be all in the poor house, and so on. But the motivation of PR got the television cameras in here and everything was hunky-dory the next day. Because you had taken the old policy that if you cannot beat them, you will confuse them. I think that—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Well, your leader will try to confuse them next week.

Mr. Sargent: That policy works, because believe me, Mr. Chairman, I am, as always, confused.

An hon. member: So you will never beat him now.

Mr. Sargent: So—that is right.

It is all right for the Minister to stand here, Mr. Chairman, and laud his department heads; what a great team they are. But they have got us in a pretty shaky position.

We cannot find out how close we were to that shaky position because when I mention the fact, he deals in GNP—it is an intangible.

The hon. Minister of Correctional Services—they all got a big joke out of that. They may know all the answers of the intricacies of finance. I do not.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I think we should make our laws so even the average guy can understand them. But the way you guys juggle things back and forth, no one knows what in hell is going on. I do not know.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not juggling anything.

Mr. Sargent: You did not know last night and if the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) had not adjourned the House you would have been in real trouble. You did not know the answers last night.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, he was saved by the bell.

Mr. Sargent: You were doing some great stick handling. You had the boys in front there going.

However, in the Provincial Auditor's report of 1967-1968—we are going back to the only official document we have of the *status quo* we find out during the year—I am quoting page 36. He says:

During the year the province issued debentures in the amount of \$723 million and redeemed debentures in the amount of \$109 million for a net increase in funded debt of \$614 million.

Now in finalization and summary, that is an increase of 20 per cent in funded debt in 1967-1968.

The picture presented today, Mr. Chairman—the 1968-1969 situation—is that we increased our debt from \$3.5 billion to \$4.3 billion, an increase of probably \$8 million—an increase of \$800 million, I am sorry. An increase of 25 per cent.

Now the hon. Treasurer talks about net position, but I am wondering, when does pay day come? Here we have an increase of 20 per cent the year before last, 25 per cent last year. Where are we going this year? What is our funded debt position going to be come 1970? Is there not a ceiling some place where we can do these things?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am lost, I do not see the relationship, Mr. Chairman, he has lost me.

Mr. Sargent: I will make it pretty simple. You jumped the debt position 20 per cent a year ago; 25 per cent last year. Now what is it going to be this year? The gross debt position at the end of this year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is shown again on page 92. It is forecast in the Budget papers, the bottom line.

Mr. Sargent: You have increased it 25 per cent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, let us not talk about the gross debt, let us talk about net debt, because that is really all that matters.

Mr. Sargent: I know it is embarrassing to talk about those things.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is really all that matters; net debt is what matters. The net debt has increased, yes. And it is all there.

Mr. Sargent: I know it is all there. I say it has jumped 20 per cent last year, and 25 per cent this year, now what is it going to jump next year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have a balanced Budget. I indicated to the House when I presented my Budget, that in the provincial account we do not anticipate requiring going to the capital market as such, at all.

Now, I go back and mention that within the framework of non-budgetary funds these transactions take place all the time. They have to show in gross terms, but they also show in net terms. Because what we put

out on the one hand, and secure to a lender, we also get back on the other hand secured by the borrower to us.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you cannot borrow yourself out of the poor house, and that is what you are trying to do.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): We are not in the poor house.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me pursue this for just a moment. How can you possibly say that we are borrowing ourselves out of the poor house when we have been able to order our position to the extent that we do not have to go into the public capital market next year at all?

Mr. Sargent: Are you talking net debt?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is no other debt to talk about.

Mr. Sargent: The per capita net debt, then, increased from \$199 million to \$231 million and is that a net position?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: All right, how much is it going to increase per capita debt, then, next year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me do some arithmetic that may be appropriate. The per capita debt, of course, is the total net debt divided by the number of people in the province. Now, if we eliminate or reduce our borrowing requirements and the population increases, the net debt, per capita, should go down.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, but they do not use the pill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It should come down.

Mr. Chairman: Securities control.

Mr. Sargent: One more question here, on the stumpage charges in the timber situation.

Mr. Chairman: That is very difficult to take—

Mr. Sargent: Who sets the percentages? We are talking finance management, are we not? Who sets the policy on what you will charge the people here with the timber rights? Is this not set by Treasury board? Who is it set by? The Minister of Lands and Forests? He does not set those rates, what you charge for timber rights.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It has nothing to do with the vote.

Mr. Sargent: Is it not finance management we are talking about? \$8 million?

Mr. Chairman: It is the Budget I would suggest to the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, just a thought in this regard, and a question for the Treasurer. The exchange takes one back to previous years when the member for Woodbine would join with the then Provincial Treasurer in attempting to fend off the reactionary financial views of the Liberal Party in this Legislature, and we are getting back to it again. Mr. Chairman, I want to express to you, sir, that the Provincial Treasurer should not be corrupted by this absolute fixation on the debt, without any comprehension that governments incur debts, and that debts are valid, and that budget financing and budget balancing it not some kind of fetish before which everyone must bow.

Mr. Sargent: He will take your advice.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You have operated on credit all your life; what are you talking about?

Mr. Lewis: There is no easier way to destroy the economy than to be preoccupied with this kind of fact, and there is no question that is precisely what Benson is doing at the federal level.

Mr. Nixon: Do you not think it is our function to enquire into the debt position?

Mr. Lewis: It may be the function to enquire into the—

Mr. J. Renwick: Of course you mention it but you do not keep on about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if ever there were a dialectic it is what the leader of the Opposition is now advocating, because I must say, sir—

Mr. Nixon: I am advocating free discussion.

Mr. Lewis: Well, that is fair enough, we are not in any sense—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is fine with me.

Mr. Nixon: It is incredible that you would attack a member who was putting forward his views.

Mr. Lewis: Oh no, not attacking the member, making the point, Mr. Chairman, that—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, that is it.

Mr. Lewis: —that in the field of financing, or provincial expenditures, if this government ever fell into the trap of Liberal governments across the country, with their preoccupation with a balanced budget at the expense of developing a productive economy, then we all go down the drain, and one has to understand that.

Mr. MacDonald: It just proves that the Liberals are more Tory than the Tories.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order. The position of this party, as I understand from my leader—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: We are concerned with the debt load for the taxpayer and the debt load—

Mr. Chairman: Order. You may put the question afterwards but that is not a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not take up other people's debating time. Your leader wants to hear a pointed recitation of views, not your instructions.

Mr. Chairman: Can we leave the commentary and get back to the estimates?

Mr. Lewis: You are quite right, Mr. Chairman. Your indulgence is appreciated. I wanted to ask the Treasurer, in this rare spirit of equanimity, about the private loan which he talked about, the 90 million Deutschmarks, the first one. Have you a list of the private placement with Deutschebank?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The private placement is somewhat different. In that instance, too, we only dealt with the Deutschebank. They distributed that one all themselves. They did not form a syndicate of a banking group for that first loan. We were advised to undertake a private placement, in the first instance last year, to become identified on that capital market. It was our first venture in that capital market.

Mr. MacDonald: Establishing our credit.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Establishing our credit, and we did it. The first venture, the private placement, accomplished that very

well. It was put out, I think, in small-denomination bonds, and given widespread distribution through the facilities of the Deutschebank. It identified us on that capital market. It sold quickly and has been trading at a premium ever since, so it made it easier for us, then, to get into a public issue in this last round because we had established ourselves on that market. That is the reason we did it, but the Deutschebank, in this instance, handled that all themselves. So the banking group was not employed.

Mr. Sargent: On this point, Mr. Chairman, may I say that—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if you will let the member—

Mr. Sargent: On this particular point, I want to say this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: If the Treasurer were to request from the Deutschebank a list of the principal placees, would that be given to him?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, it probably could be. The 30,000 certificates that went out each had a value of 5,000 Deutschmarks, the equivalent of \$1,250, which permitted the issue to be taken up by small investors, out of savings accounts, and so on. Whether they would disclose that information to us or not, I do not know. The bank has many branches in Germany, as our banks have here, so they would distribute it through their own banking system, to their own accounts, their own customers—small people using their savings accounts, if you like, to purchase the securities that would yield them more interest, and they were put out in those small denominations for that purpose.

Mr. Sargent: The shocking situation is that we have in this economy of ours hundreds of millions of dollars being built downtown in business developments by banks and insurance companies. We go across to Germany. Twenty-four years ago they were bombed off the map; there was not a shot fired in this country, we never suffered a bit of war. We go there to borrow money. I think it is degrading that we cannot go on our own market for money.

Mr. Chairman: That is a commentary.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is all right.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Will we stick to the vote?

Mr. Lewis: The reason I was wondering about the placement list—albeit it might be difficult, given the subsequent trading to which you allude—is that I have a very strong feeling that a goodly number of the \$1,250 portions might well have been absorbed by the American subsidiary companies operating in Europe, not to mention companies of the Krupp kind. I would be interested to know on what basis the Ontario economy is shoring itself up again in the interests of corporate concerns, not all of them entirely palatable, from outside this province, and I am not certain that the Minister would not subscribe to that in certain ways. He might be a little concerned about it too, and I think there would be value in finding out just who these magnates are, other than the small people, who purchased in any quantity, that first issue.

Mr. Nixon: Only little German farmers.

Mr. Lewis: No, I do not think they were little German farmers, I suspect they were fairly major concerns.

Mr. Chairman: Securities control?

Mr. Lewis: Might the Minister try just out of curiosity to make an enquiry, and if it showed some major interest, reveal it to the House, or privately?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not know whether that would be altogether possible. I have very grave doubts whether the Deutschebank, or any bank in Germany or in Canada, would want to disclose the names of their customers or their patrons. I do not think it is of as much concern as the hon. member mentioned.

I suppose it is fair to say that while there is a different relationship between Canada, probably, and the United States in certain terms, the same thing can happen there. We have no assurance as to whether little people buy our bonds or whether a goodly portion of them are taken up by institutional investors in the United States just the same as they are in Canada. But the very nature of this private placement and the size of the certificates that are put out were really to effect widespread distribution through the Deutschebank branch system to get as much identification on the market as possible. This was their advice to us. We think it was good advice, and we took it for that reason.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Treasurer if this did not cause him to wonder about the inability of the province of Ontario to satisfy its capital needs from within the province because of this chasing of capital needs in western Europe? Surely, Mr. Chairman, this must have occurred to the Treasurer.

One of the reasons he had to go overseas to western Europe to find funds there, to find acceptance of provincial issues there, rather than finding acceptance for them here in the province of Ontario, is that some of the very same contributors to the difficulties we find in placing provincial issues in the province of Ontario, are the same corporate entities that have contributed so much to the favourable position in western Europe, which has permitted him to go there to find the moneys that he needs to finance the government operations in this province.

There has been movement away from the province of Ontario at the behest of the U.S. money managers, and there may well have been a redirection from Ontario into western Europe for more favourable conditions, which resulted in the United States government's setting down its guidelines which, even though they were not ultimately applied to Canada, still find western Europe a more favourable place in which to invest the surplus funds of United States corporations.

Why cannot we, Mr. Chairman, in this province find the means of retaining more of the surpluses of these corporations that operate within Ontario, to finance this very requirement?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we were motivated by different requirements from those the hon. member has made reference to. We were motivated first because of the availability of convertible Deutsch marks in the West German and European capital market at a very favourable rate of interest. As a matter of fact it has already been indicated, I think, to the House that our last venture will result in the saving of some \$600,000 in interest alone per year.

Mr. MacDonald: If they do not revalue.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If they do not revalue. If they do revalue, we have a good built-in hedge because the favourable interest rate will offset revaluation either totally or to such an extent that we are still no worse off if revaluation takes place. Revaluation is not the policy of the government of the day; we know that the people of West Germany do not want revaluation so we have that in our

favour. In all honesty, however, we cannot exclude it as a possibility; but the very favourable cost of the money offsets the possibility of revaluation. I do not know that there is anything wrong with the province of Ontario undertaking to go abroad for funds for more favourable interest rates and costs in the first instance, also recognizing the pressure that is on not only the domestic capital market but the North American continental capital market. It seems to me that it is providing a little bit of leadership when we can broaden the base of our capital sources. Ontario is second only to the federal government in this particular field.

I can agree with what the hon. member said previously about balanced budgets, surplus budgets, and deficit budgets; I think those decisions have to be taken in the light of the economic circumstances of the day. I think, Mr. Chairman, we have proven that we are not afraid to budget for a deficit if we think the economy of our jurisdiction needs it.

In these particular circumstances, again, whether the hon. member agrees with us or not, we think it is a desirable thing this year to work for a balanced Budget. The same considerations motivated us to make that decision this year as motivated us to decide to have a deficit Budget in previous years, so I think it is fair to say that we try to recognize these things whether it is perfection or not. But certainly they are all taken into consideration in the light of the circumstances of the day.

Mr. MacDonald: You may have miscalculated.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not always. I recall very well what the hon. member for Woodbine used to say, and while I seldom agreed with him I agreed with him on this point, and I think he agreed with me on this point. As I recall it, I think he did; I am quite confident he did.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what concerns me about what is emerging is that the Ontario government then becomes part of the grand design, sort of a well-meaning pawn of international finance. That is what happens to the Ontario government, and they are supported in it by members of the Treasury board who feel very comfortable in that position, as you indicated to the Cabinet committee on policy last night. One need only note the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) and the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman), two of the most rabid continentalists that the government has among

its numbers—and what happens then is that American-controlled corporations own and control the Canadian economy with our own money—and that is particularly true of the Ontario economy. Certainly it is, because the money they derive from within the country for their own financing is their basic source of wealth; so they own and control us with our own money. We are then forced into the American market to make certain direct loans at appreciable interest rates; and when that does not appear to be appropriate because we do not want to put all of our capital borrowing in one area, we are then off into the west European market, which has been similarly influenced, not to say directed and controlled by international corporations, primarily American controlled subsidiaries, and we are part of a pawn, we are part of a—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the member's party becoming isolationist?

Mr. Lewis: Isolationist to this point, Mr. Chairman, that why in God's name is it not possible for this government to demand certain degrees of corporate behaviour and certain degrees of corporate financing, which will be sufficient for us to fund ourselves from within our own economy?

Why not? Why are we always the willing pawns of the international corporate game which is the state we are perpetually in, whether it is Hydro off to New York or the government off to the Deutschebank? No one denies the validity of borrowing on the international market but only when one has exhausted one's internal capacities. And one takes some exception to the fact that because we are controlled and owned by external forces anyway, we do not make certain demands of them which would give us our own financing and indigenous terms, rather than send us running around the world in this desperate chase for funding?

Mr. Sargent: I am glad you agree with me.

Mr. Lewis: On that point I agree with you entirely, if that is in fact what we are agreeing on, and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister might not occasionally examine that. If memory serves me correctly, sir—I can stand to be corrected, I wanted to come back to it—in 1964 (I think that is the last year for which figures are available) only five per cent of the capital inflow for direct investment in Canada actually came as capital inflow from the United States. All the rest, 95 per cent, was indigenously produced.

Given these factors—given the fact that the 95 per cent is indigenously produced but the ownership remains outside—it seems to me that it is a pity we have to continually go outside even for further government funding.

I, for one, resent it and I think the members of the New Democratic Party, as the session evolves, will be able to make reference to the fact that not only are we playing into their hands in terms of the borrowing on the market as you have indicated, but even in terms of our own economy, by what we are handing out to American corporations in other government programmes. We have become one of the rarest, most precious exploited financial tools of international corporate financing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are doing pretty well here.

Mr. Lewis: I do not see why you should lend yourselves to that when we can create it internally.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because we believe trade keeps peace.

Mr. Peacock: Some of the customers for those bonds in Germany are probably getting ODC loans in this province.

Mr. Lewis: That is right, Mr. Chairman. If—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we are wandering all over the place here. I have indicated what motivated this but I cannot let these observations just pass like that.

I am not one who believes that the capital market of the world should not be employed. I am not one who believes that we should not, of course, do what we can to encourage more investment in debt securities by our banking community in Ontario and in Canada.

Mr. J. Renwick: And the individuals in this province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But I still submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that as long as we can obtain our capital requirements in an offshore market as advantageously as we have appeared to have done in West Germany, I think it is fair to say we will be employing those capital markets. We are not the only jurisdiction that has done it. The government of Canada has seen fit to do it. Many of the provinces of Canada have seen fit to do it, and I might point out to you the strongest economic nationalists in Canada have been urging that we borrow abroad so that capital

coming in is debt and not ownership. This is debt capital; it is not equity capital as the hon. member has been trying to point out. It is debt capital and there is a very great difference.

Mr. Lewis: Well, yes, I appreciate—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well you did not imply there was any difference, in your remarks. It was a red herring and I call it that.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a red herring because there is every—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, it is.

Mr. Lewis: There is every possibility, Mr. Chairman, that we are giving away money through EIO, handing it over to American corporate interests, and then paying these same interests for our borrowing in Germany.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is not the context in which you were speaking before.

Mr. Lewis: It is all a part—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not.

Mr. Lewis: I do not see how you alter the two. No, I do not see how you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You were implying that they had control of our economy.

Mr. Lewis: Well, of course, I am implying they have control of our economy.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like the hon. member to tell me how anyone can gain economic control of a jurisdiction through debt securities.

Mr. Lewis: I did not say that, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. You may be borrowing for the purpose of debt funding on the German market, the point I was making in overall corporate terms is that the same people to whom you are paying interest in Germany may well be the same people to whom you are giving forgiveness loans in Ontario. It is entirely possible through ODC because—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what you implied.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): You have changed gears a little.

Mr. Lewis: Oh there is no changing of gears, Mr. Chairman, it is a simple proposi-

tion that the Ontario government has put itself in the position where it is necessarily subservient to the international corporate market—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Subservient is a bad word.

Mr. Lewis: —whether that market works in the direct investment or the debt area. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question then arises in terms of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a Machiavellian approach.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it may be Machiavellian, it is nothing compared to the government. Mr. Chairman, the question then arises, at two minutes to 12, why in the government's financial management policy it is not possible to borrow at an equally favourable rate of investment in Ontario? Why is it necessary to have so mismanaged the economy provincially that one has to go for the borrowing in Germany? Why should the rate of productivity be so much greater than we are able to achieve here? And one comes back, Mr. Chairman, to the principal argument that somewhere—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do you want an answer?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, there is plenty of time for an answer, you have a full minute. Somewhere it comes back to the question of the nature of the internal financial management and your refusal to come to terms with the corporate investment in this society.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is 12 o'clock and I simply answer that by saying this situation is not confined to Ontario. It is confined to the whole North American continent.

Mr. Lewis: What do you do with it all?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are doing the best we can to live with it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was just going to send the hon. leader of the Opposition a note. He will admire this statement. The late C. D. Howe was a pretty sensible man, and he said he did not really care about the nationality of a dollar: Neither do I.

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth) moves second reading of Bill 6, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the bill that I intend to direct myself to at this time is dealing with the matter of empowering municipalities to impose rent control at their discretion. I think at this time that the question is not now between whether or not we ought to have rent control. The question now appears to me to be the determination of how we ought to implement this rent control.

This bill permits the municipalities of the province of Ontario, wherever they feel it necessary, to impose some form of rent control. We believe that the only people capable of making a judgment as to the validity of rent control in any specific areas are those municipal politicians who operate and live in that particular section of the province.

This very basic premise was completely ignored during the debate a week ago Thursday in the private bills committee when the city of Ottawa came before us and requested permission to establish rent control. The representatives of the city of Ottawa established, at least to my satisfaction and obviously to the satisfaction of nine other members of that committee, the need in their municipality to have permissive legislation of this kind.

While I recognize the inadequacies of the Ottawa bill and some of the problems that might have been inherent in the manner in which they drafted the bill, I still believe that in their good judgment they felt the necessity to have such a bill in order to protect the people of their municipality.

And I was quite disturbed by the attitude taken by the government members and two of the Ministers who appeared at that meeting on that day, in that they did not deal with the merits of the Ottawa situation at all, but rather with some misguided conception of what rent control really is and their opposition to controls of any type. I would also go so far as to say that I was a little

disappointed that more of the members of the Tory party who represent metropolitan areas that are facing the problems of ever increasing rents, were not present at that meeting in order to support the Opposition in an attempt to have this bill passed.

It is not only the city of Ottawa that has requested this kind of legislation; Woodstock has come out in favour of rent control, Scarborough has indicated a desire for rent control, the city of Hamilton is presently studying the whole matter of rent control and it has been proposed by at least one of their councillors that it is necessary in that area. The city of Toronto had considerable discussion a year or a year and a half ago about rent control, indicating that they felt it was perhaps necessary at this time. The federal task force on housing indicated that there was certainly a need for landlords to have to justify rent increases. And so to come before this House and request the passage of a bill of this type does not seem to me to be out of order, in the context of what is taking place across this province.

I think I should make it abundantly clear at the outset that this rent control that I propose and that is proposed by this party, is an interim measure. It is not intended to solve the housing crisis. It is not intended to be a lasting piece of legislation, but rather it is intended to be a stopgap measure to combat a social problem that has inflicted great hardship on many segments of the community over the last five or six years. It has reached the proportions in many communities, in the last two years, of denying them the opportunity to a decent standard of living.

I am sure we would all agree that were there enough houses in this country for everyone to be able to afford one, then inflated rentals would be a thing of the past. We would no longer require this kind of control. And when that day arrives no doubt this rent control would be completely disregarded.

In fact, even when we reach that enviable position we perhaps might require only rental review agencies that would have power to publicize unwarranted increases and bring to the public's attention unscrupulous landlord practices. I would say, in dealing with unscrupulous landlords, that these are not the majority, I recognize that. I recognize that the majority of landlords deal fairly with their tenants.

But, unfortunately, there are some landlords who own a great deal of property and

who have really no relationship between themselves and their tenants. As was stated in the private bills committee, they sit in Florida and thumb their noses at the municipalities which are attempting to get some kind of reconciliation between tenant and landlord.

It is to these people that I direct this kind of legislation. The landlord who deals fairly with his tenant need fear nothing from this legislation, because he will be able to go before any rental board or agency and justify his particular rental.

I would say, though, that there are a number of points in favour of rent control at this time. I think first we have to recognize that decent accommodation within one's ability to pay is an absolute prerequisite for living in this country.

I would suggest that any person who is working for a living should be able to acquire accommodation large enough for his family, in decent surroundings, so that his children will not be forced out into the streets and to live in accommodation that has not reached a state of dilapidation and decay. It is a basic necessity of life and it appears that the private sector is not capable of dealing with this and therefore the public sector must take steps to relieve the difficulty.

At the moment we all recognize that there is not nearly sufficient accommodation and therefore the rents have increased well beyond the ability to pay.

I would point at this time to a little article which indicates just what has happened in relation to the cost of living. It indicates that shelter costs have increased much faster in Ontario than the general cost of living. The cost of living has gone up six per cent between January, 1967, and 1968, while the shelter index went up 8.6 per cent—considerably more than the general cost of living.

I think we must insure that the term "rent" really implies all of the moneys paid by the tenant to the landlord, including security deposits. As I have said before in this House, the way to overcome that, of course, is to eliminate the security deposit altogether. But it must also include such things as cleaning charges and the many other extras, parking and such, that people are forced to pay for over and above what is stated as being the rent.

I think we would find that if these payments did come under the rental structure, then landlords would be forced to face the problem of setting a fair and equitable rent,

as opposed to using them as an extra method of garnering revenue over and above what is reasonable to expect on their investment.

I think there have been many cases publicized in the last year or year and a half that give a clear indication that the effort required to determine a fair rental level in any community would be well worth while in terms of the many residents who today are paying rents far, far in excess of their ability. I think the saving, not only in monetary terms, but in terms of physical and mental suffering on the people who are presently being forced to spend considerably more of their income than they can reasonably afford, would pay dividends to the community as a whole.

I also believe that, after having established a fair rent, we should not fit into it some method of pre-determining increases on a yearly basis. And we should recognize the right of the tenant to appear before any rent control board and to contest any rent increase.

It would be undesirable to allow automatically and annually a specified percentage increase. It is not inconceivable that a proposed increase may well be within the ability to pay and, in fact, be a realistic increase in terms of increased costs to the owner, but it would be better not to build this in. Rather allow the tenant to appear before the rental control board to state his case and to allow the landlord to justify his rent increase.

I am sure that in a short time the landlords would raise rents only in accordance with need. A fair profit margin would be established which would allow them to receive a good return on their investment without inflicting hardship on the community at large.

A rental review board which, out of necessity, must go along with any rental control legislation, would base its judgment as to whether or not an increase was acceptable on both cost and demand criteria. The cost criteria are fairly simple and straightforward. It should be possible to compute an index of apartment maintenance costs, including municipal taxes, labour costs and other incidental costs to the apartment owners, on a city-wide basis, particularly in smaller cities. Perhaps in the city of Toronto it might be necessary to do it on a basis of community, rather than city, but, generally speaking, it should be done on a city-wide basis, thereby arriving at a fair rental for accommodation.

Of course, in establishing a rent some guarantee would have to be provided regard-

ing the services that one could reasonably expect for the rent that was paid. Otherwise we would find that there would be a few landlords who would simply cut back on the heating and lighting and servicing and maintenance of the buildings and would effectively increase their rents that way.

As far as the demand criteria are concerned, I think it is a very obvious thing. One must take into consideration the number of apartments and the number of persons who are seeking them. We cannot allow apartment owners, because they own great complexes, and because the major apartments are in the hands of so few people, to up their rents without any consideration for the numbers of people who must have accommodation.

Together with the establishment of this temporary control, we must of necessity, as I said, come up with a tenants' bill of rights, establishing tenure and giving legal protection to the tenants, otherwise the threat of eviction may well be used to deter the tenant from protesting rent increases.

One final thought in this particular area is that perhaps the matter of control should not be placed on a selective basis. There have been suggestions made that we put controls on selectively on a variety of different kinds of buildings in accordance with the luxury of their appointments.

I think this would work to the detriment of the lower and middle income groups, because, quite obviously, what would then happen would be that the luxury apartments would become abundant and the lower and middle-income apartments would then fall off and there would be fewer of them. So we would have to establish rentals for all apartments, including luxury.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to two or three increases that have been forced on the people in the Hamilton area. I have raised them before in this House during my discussion on the tenants' bill of rights. On Hamilton Mountain, for example, on the east end of the mountain there were apartment dwellings where the increase was in the neighbourhood of \$50 per month. The increase could not be justified; it was obviously for the purpose of evicting the tenants, thereby enabling the landlord to bring in a different kind of tenant and establish a rental on a luxury basis. And in another instance, together with one of the other members of the House. I attended a meeting of fixed income dwellers, old-age pensioners many of them, where their rentals had been increased two and in some cases

three times over the last year, unjustifiably. And yet they have no place to go. It is unfortunate indeed that we should subject our elderly to this kind of tenure.

It is very difficult to describe the need for rent control without getting into the other area of assuring tenants' rights and making sure that tenants do have some guaranteed rights in the community. I was intrigued by the Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart) statement that he was going to implement some of the recommendations of the Ontario Law Reform Commission. I am delighted to hear this. I am just not too sure exactly which ones he is intending to recommend. The law reform commission itself indicates quite clearly, and I quote from page 123:

That the fundamental and legal basis of rent control is to prevent the speculative and unwarranted and abnormal increases in rents that would result from an unnatural competition of too many tenants bidding for too few apartments.

And of course, the economic and social hardships that this causes. The prime purpose of rent control is to make it possible for tenants to find and to keep decent apartments at reasonable rents. There are rent controls in many parts of the world; there is a form of rent control in the province of Quebec. It is not perhaps the best, it is what is known as a conciliatory rental review—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): I wish the member would tell us about the experience of those countries where rent control has been tried.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We will, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Deans: We probably will in time, it is getting on.

In Quebec it does not work that badly, actually. It is not an overall rent control; it permits the tenant to come before a review officer and to request that he investigate the rent increases; and if it is found to be unwarranted he has the power to reject it. I suggest that this is not an unreasonable thing in today's society under the present conditions.

Hon. Mr. White: That is not what the hon. member's bill says.

Mr. Deans: Well, no, my bill does not say anything other than that; it says that municipalities should have the right to establish rent control and does not in any way dictate how it should be done. At this time I am trying, for the benefit of the House, to tell

how it might be done. It could well be necessary in this province that all the most common forms of rent control measures would be encompassed in any particular Act of general legislation—the first permitting the courts to deal with any matter of eviction and unreasonable demand for rent; the second, perhaps the rent freeze method in some areas, and this was in effect some time ago; and the third, of course, the fair rent legislation which permits an appeal of rental and assures a fair return to the landlord.

I would say that this is a very necessary thing, the landlord must have a fair return on his investment and no one denies that. I want to be sure that this is abundantly clear, that we do not expect landlords to pay out of their pocket in order to ensure that people have decent accommodation. We expect a fair return.

Now, unlike many in this House I do not happen to believe that the law reform commission rules out rent control.

An hon. member: What is a fair return?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That is what we would like to know, what is a fair return?

Mr. Deans: It was suggested in one report, as eight per cent; perhaps ten per cent is a fair return, maybe twelve. I think this can be determined without too much difficulty. As I was saying, I think the law reform commission does not in any way rule out the need for rent control; it deals with two elementary steps, two steps that might be taken along the way towards it: the establishment of a rent review officer and the rental review board. I do not object to this; I do not think it will solve the problem but I do not object to the establishment of these two things initially.

I do feel though, that in order to give this rental review officer and rental review board some power, some backing, it is necessary that the municipalities have the right, if in event they find they are not able to do it by gentle persuasion, to impose a control of some type. I think this would put a few teeth into the legislation that perhaps may come from the Attorney General, and in so doing it would assure that the municipalities in their efforts to deal with the social problem, had some way of leveraging. I think we have noticed that persuasion, gentle persuasion, has on occasion worked but not for very long. And I do not think it will work very well in this particular instance.

Mr. Speaker, I notice my time is about up. I do not want to take any more time on this particular matter. I was going to read into the record the recommendations of the law reform commission but I am sure every member in this House has these recommendations, starting on page 135, ending on page 137. I just would suggest that No. 9 is perhaps the most important one, the one that is most necessary of all—the recommendation that said that if these measures do not prove sufficient to secure just rents, introduction of a more stringent and compulsory system of control should be considered. I suggest that not only should it be considered, but that in any legislation drafted it should be part of the legislation, thereby giving the municipalities something with which to work. Thank you.

Mr. J. A. Belanger (Prescott and Russell): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity today to speak on private member's bill No. 6. First let me clear up some misunderstandings about the issues of rent control and whether the Ontario government is going to get into that so-called business.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), according to a newspaper report in the *London Free Press* on February 19 of this year, flatly denied any plans by his department for rent controls. And this denial also included a mention that there were no such plans by the government either. This same denial came later, as recorded in the *Globe and Mail*, Friday, February 28 of this year, from The Attorney General's Department, which stated that The Attorney General's Department is presently drafting legislation to deal with rents. And this legislation, according to the Attorney General, is being based on the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission inquiry into landlord-tenant law.

The report of the law reform commission, Mr. Speaker, proposes that there be rental review officers who would mediate in tenant-landlord disputes and publish their findings in an effort to keep rental increases reasonable.

Please note—and I wish to stress this point—that nowhere is there any indication of rent control as the hon. member for Wentworth suggested there should be.

Mr. Deans: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker; has the member read page 137, item 9?

Mr. Belanger: We already have a so-called Act respecting rent control. It is an Act which came into force in 1953—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Oh really, the Minister threw that out the other day.

Mr. MacDonald: He says it is going to be repealed.

Mr. Belanger: And it is an Act with an original that goes back to wartime emergency as did similar Acts in Britain and New York.

Mr. Lawlor: The member's research department does not know what is going on in his own—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Very embarrassing!

Mr. Belanger: This Act empowers only those municipalities which had regulations known as wartime leasehold regulations.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister said he is going to repeal that Act.

Mr. Belanger: It has not been repealed yet—and made under the authority of The Leasehold Regulations Act, 1951, to create rental authority and provide for the administration enforcement of the wartime regulations.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. members to the left of this speaker will give this speaker the courtesy that their speaker had a few moments ago.

Mr. Belanger: The two cities which have been contemplating rent control most recently, Ottawa and Windsor, have shown no interest in the 1953 Acts, because as a solicitor from Windsor put it:

The legislation is unclear, and the city would soon be in lawsuits that would drag on for years without the situation being resolved.

As a matter of fact, The Department of Municipal Affairs officials have already indicated the possibility of the 1953 Act being repealed.

Mr. Deans: He says it is definitely going to be repealed.

Mr. Belanger: Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the overriding argument against rent controls is the fact that they are self-defeating. When an investment in rental accommodation does not bring the return available from alternative investments, money goes elsewhere and the supply of rental property dries up. And that,

Mr. Speaker, is the last thing that this province could possibly want, the last thing that any sensible person would want.

Mr. Lawlor: A little ingenuity might solve it, though.

An hon. member: What is the alternative?

Mr. MacDonald: Machiavellian is the word for it!

Mr. Belanger: It has been only in the last few years that the supply has been somewhat short of demand. For example, in Metropolitan Toronto in the mid-sixties, up to about 1965, the demand was considerably short of the supply. Landlords resorted to all sorts of gimmicky to lure prospective tenants. So-called free trips to Florida, broadloom throughout, and free hi-fi's and many other extras were offered to those who would sign leases for two or three years. Well, we know what happened.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): That must be in Lower Slobovia.

Mr. Belanger: By 1966 the supply had dried up somewhat, mainly because investors in apartment buildings were not getting a good return so they were putting their money into other things. This created a slowdown in apartment construction. Meanwhile, the demand continued and soon caught up with the supply.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): That is the Li'l Abner school of economics.

Mr. Belanger: Thus rents skyrocketed. This is well illustrated by the number of apartment starts in the Toronto area: in 1964, 16,700; in 1965, 21,131. Then, because of the lack of demand, there were only 11,531 apartment starts in 1966. By 1967, the demand had caught up and there were 21,212 apartments started, and in 1968, there were over 28,000. This tremendous increase in construction is once again causing a flood on the market, and according to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, there are four times as many vacancies in January, 1969, as there were in January of last year.

An hon. member: People cannot afford the rents.

Mr. Pilkey: The member has missed the point entirely.

Mr. Belanger: The vacancy rate was reflected in a 42 per cent decline in apartment

building in January of this year, when building of only 1,134 suites was undertaken. Last year more than 2,000 were started.

An hon. member: Get more German money!

Mr. Belanger: Simply stating facts.

Mr. Makarchuk: Rip Van Winkle woke up!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deans: The fault lies with the government. It needs a more progressive housing policy.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Belanger: If we do permit rent control, we will put ourselves not only into the rent control business but we will have to accelerate our subsidization of housing.

Mr. Deans: And we will provide accommodation—

Mr. Belanger: It only stands to reason that if we tell a landlord he can only charge \$150 for a specific type of apartment, and a builder cannot or will not build for that price, then we have got to step in and provide homes for those people whom we have just put out into the street.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): What about the ones that are already—

Mr. Belanger: Yes, this is specifically what rent control would do here today.

Just before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from an article which appeared March 1 of this year in the *Financial Post*, and I quote from it even though the editors have jumped the gun and accused this government of wanting to get into the rent control business. We forgive them, though, for what they said in the very next breath is of very great importance. And I quote:

Rent control experience in Britain and in New York, both with their origins in wartime emergency, show that controls woefully intensify rather than ameliorate housing problems. Not least of the outrages bred by controls is the practice of extorting key money and the renting of "furnished flats" with the furniture represented by broken-down stuff that even charities wouldn't accept. Human nature being what it is, rent control always brings with it racketeering.

And of equally great significance is a remark attributed to the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr.

Bullbrook) by the February 27, 1969, edition of the Toronto *Daily Star*. He said, in part:

But I caution that this type of legislation can go from rent control to wage control to price control and total control.

Mr. Lawlor: He voted for it, though.

Hon. Mr. White: That is what NDP want.

Mr. Pilkey: That would be bad, that wage control would be bad.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You would not like that, eh?

Mr. Pilkey: Oh no, terrible.

Mr. Belanger: As an elected member of this Legislature, I intend to do everything in my power to protect our people, and that is why I wish to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as opposing private member's Bill No. 6.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, when I rise today to support this bill for rent control, to enable municipalities to impose it, as I do so I see evidence of a desperation on the part of people who are trying to find housing that they can afford to pay for, and still have something left over for their own food and clothing; desperation on the part of those who are wondering what is going to happen when they are evicted because of the rent increases that have been put in, not five per cent or ten per cent, but 50 per cent; desperation on the part of all kinds of people who are trying to do something positive about solving the shortage of low-cost shelter by constructing more of it; and my own personal desperation after watching this government do nothing but say no, time after time after time when somebody tries to come in with a solution to really solve the situation.

I want to give a few examples of this. We have heard time after time about people wanting to build houses here. "You cannot build houses here." "No, you cannot have a sewage plant there." "No, you cannot have a commuter service here." "No, you cannot borrow money there." "No, you cannot approve a plan of subdivision because it is premature." "No, you cannot merge with that municipality." "No, no, no, no!" But nothing in the way of a sensible, reasonable alternative.

This government has been the most frustrating, negative, unimaginative government I could ever imagine in dealing with solving the crisis in low-cost housing in this province. Never an alternative, just no.

What we all know is that you cannot solve low-cost housing and provide a solution to that problem with high-cost land. It is not the cost of the building of the houses themselves that is the problem, it is the high cost of land. So why has not the government gone to the root of the problem? Why has it not done something to help these people who are trying to get land opened up for development and get the supply in excess of the demand?

I want to give you some examples of just how frustrating people around this province, who are trying to do something to solve this crisis, have been finding it.

Last Friday I was at a hearing chaired by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), where the people were seeking approval for a sewage plant to serve the new hospital in Richmond Hill and two school additions, plus 400 acres of land to be developed by clients of Mr. Hollis Beckett. The government stated very specifically it was to be understood that even though that plant was located at a point where it might service ten times the area of land, the government policy and directive given to the Ontario Water Resources Commission was no more than the 400 acres of land served by Mr. Hollis Beckett's clients.

What sort of long-term programme is that to solve the housing crisis in an area? If they are going to approve package plans which the Ontario Water Resources Commission considers are terrible, why would they approve a plant just to serve 400 acres instead of ten times that amount in that area? No solution, no hope given to the people in the area that really need housing—the people in the area that have houses that need more sewage—that they are going to be able to get services for their homes.

Example two: Pickering Township last year stated that they want to be able to merge with Metro Toronto for several reasons: 1. They are in desperate financial straits; 2. They need more services and they are absolutely stopped in development.

But it is no, no, no, and when the government provides an alternative it does nothing to assure—if it was Pickering—that it will have a solution to its problems. All it says is, "You can merge with all the other municipalities around you which are in the same plight. You can all be miserable together." No solution, just continued frustration.

Example three: People recognize that in this area of Toronto and the area close to the lake we can only expand in two direc-

tions. We do not have the normal areas available to a developing city in the heart of a country where you can expand in a 360-degree circle, and as a result we have a comparative shortage. But when people come forward and say they want to have commuter service not only to serve a narrow band east and west of Toronto, but to serve a whole, full semi-circle and thus help eliminate the shortage of land in this high-cost land that we have for development, the government says no, they cannot have commuter service; no, they cannot have plants.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): When did they say that?

Mr. Deacon: Look in the Budget that just came out. No expansion of GO north—no money for that. A few hundred thousand dollars would expand and open up an area to the north of Toronto and make it accessible and therefore practical for people to commute into this city and thus greatly increase the potential of the amount of land available for development. But no—it is always no. Never any encouragement or anything to alleviate the problems that are faced by these municipalities in getting access in transportation.

And to meet this shortage of low-cost land to build on so we can get low-cost housing, we have to see this government recognize the important role it has to play, a role that no private person can play—they cannot put in the sewers, and municipalities cannot put in sewers that are going to affect another municipality. We have an Ontario Water Resources Commission that can do this. But look at the Budget coming forward this year and no increase in the Ontario Water Resources Commission budget—nothing to open up and make that commission do the job it was intended to do.

It does not need to have financial agreements and contracts with municipalities in order to raise its money. Its money comes because it is guaranteed by the province, or provided by the province to the Ontario Water Resources Commission. But it is always no, no, no, you cannot get on with the development until you sign up an agreement for 10, or 15 or 40 years in order to finance this thing.

They do not seem to understand the basic role of Ontario Water Resources Commission would be to give a tremendous expanse of new area in which housing could be built, land which is not now low cost. By means of their legislative powers of assessing land that is ready for development they could be

sure that this land gets on the market, and by getting the supply of land in excess of demand, that is land on which housing may be built, we will see the prices come down so we can get low-cost housing.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill because it is a bill of desperation. It enables those who are in desperate situations—these cities—to bring in rent control. We know that is not the answer. Here is a housing report from Glasgow: “Eighty-four per cent of the housing done by public housing.” It is the worst housed city in the world, probably, certainly in the civilized world. Conditions like that, we know, arise when there is not free open supply in excess of demand. Here is Stockholm—it is supposed to be the ideal city—but is short of places to build and opportunities for people to go in and get housing. You wait eight years for your apartment building, or your house, in Stockholm unless you want to pay \$2,500 under the table.

We know this is not the answer by rent control but at least if municipality after municipality said we have to put in rent control, maybe this government would at last wake up to its role, and perhaps then we will see some real solution to the housing problem.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, the other day in the private bills committee the bill came forward from the city of Ottawa in this matter.

Firstly may I say that curiously enough, however you may construe it, the member for Carleton East (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) of the Tory party, and the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Morin)—the member for Ottawa East going out of his way possibly because he lives in Ottawa—voted for the Ottawa bill and the balance of the Tory members voted against it. Why is it that in the crunch, when it really comes home, when the roosters come to roost, they go for the bill? I daresay that the Tory members, had it been a Metropolitan Toronto bill in the Metropolitan Toronto area, might have found it conducive to their charms and best interests so to do, too.

I find that particular division, based simply on the fact it happens to affect their electoral chances, as a most invidious way of carrying on government over there. May I say that the member for Prescott and Russell came forward to this House this morning with a very variegated mess of misinformation. I mean it is appalling for us to have sat on the committee just a few days ago and listened to a conflict, as I took it, involving the position as set forth by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who was there, who even stated

categorically—in what I would think was in line with general Tory tradition—that he was totally opposed to rent control. On the other hand, the Attorney General of the province sought to draw our teeth—in his usual benign manner, I am sure in the best faith in the world—to the fact that, “Please do not move on this thing in this way. We have it under consideration and in the fullness of time we will bring forward in the Legislature in some form. Of course, I cannot even begin to intimate the nature of the beast, but some time we will bring forward some kind of rental control, and we would trust it would be in this session.” So just where do you boys stand on this particular matter? Certainly he ran directly contrary to what the Minister of Municipal Affairs had to say under this heading.

Departing from that particular area, shortly afterwards, walking down Bay Street, I met a fellow lawyer who then proceeded to accuse people like myself of causing the increase in rental by raising our voices against it. In other words the argument being that by us thumping away almost in Stygian darkness in the Legislature here—thumping away and asking for rental control—this was some kind of an encouragement to landlords to anticipate its possibility and to increase rentals.

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds like a Machiavellian plot!

Mr. Lawlor: That is a very strange argument. If members of the Legislature are not too forward with various proposals for reform, to say the least, in any area, then that is to be taken as a device whereby those who refuse the reform can go forward with the very thing about which reform has to be initiated. There is very little point in speaking about anything if that were the case.

It is an irrational, cross-eyed argument. We will come to another one in a moment, raised by the member for Sarnia, the business about going on from one step to another, that one control breeds another. That again is strictly illogicality. I suppose it is like saying that if you eat porridge you are almost certain to go for filet mignon, or that one leads to the other, necessarily speaking. So—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member can do better than that.

Mr. Lawlor: In any event there are a number of arguments brought forward here as to why rent control, being one of them, leads on to another. I suggest, for instance,

the area of building restrictions. On the whole, where control has been initiated and well accepted it is seen that it is absolutely crucial and necessary to the interests and social good of any area, and that they have not necessarily led on from one another. As a matter of fact, after some refinement they have been able to cut back and see where they are really crucial and where they are not. In the first case, they usually try to cover the heavens and find that they have gone too far.

One of the arguments that is often used is that it is fine in wartime when there are other controls initiated, but that it is not a necessity in time of peace. One of the reasons I am a socialist is precisely that argument of necessity. When people who are not of my ilk talk about necessity they tend to consider that only wartime makes for beneficial social reform and the movement of government interference into various areas. They think that that is the only kind of overwilling necessity which has any stringency.

People like myself, however, are convinced that wherever human need is very great and aggravated—as has been indicated from the Liberal side—when people are being afflicted to the extent that they are, and it is known to all of us in this House, then it is the duty and necessity of government to do something.

That is what governments are for. That is what they are all about and if they do not do that, then they fail in their responsibility. In effect, they connive with the continuation of unnecessary suffering in the community. Because of certain prejudices and predilections that you people over there have, that is precisely what you do.

Let us go to another argument that was used here a moment ago. If controls were placed on rents, then the investment portfolios, finances and other institutions would be diverted into other areas of the economy and the second condition of the command would be worst than the first.

You do not have to have the ingenuity of an infant to be able to figure that if you graduated it and built into the new leases a certain escalation clause, or freed a new building from control, that those devices would meet the need and might even stimulate the building and provision of apartments. I have not seen any argument used against that particular point of view. Therefore, how can it be argued, as the member for Prescott and Russell (Mr. Belanger), did that the whole theory is self-defeating. Obviously it is not self-defeating if there is a way out. That is just a pure throwback piece of business that

can have very little validity in an argument in this House.

The committee appointed by this government—I am sure with some degree of care as to who they will get so that they will not have upsetting individuals around—the law reform commission, has come forward with a number of recommendations. They see the need in the second volume of their work, the appendices, and they set out elaborate statistical data. They have come down very hard and said there is no question in their minds whatsoever that rental controls of some kind are necessary. They start off by saying that a rental review officer ought to investigate and review rentals. If that does not work—

Mrs. M. Renwick: That is about two years too late.

Mr. Lawlor:—he comes on to the next stage and says—and this is just the way he puts it—then a rental review board that would have investigatory, persuasive and publishing powers would try to bring them to heel. We moved beyond that. This is the position we had some time ago, but malingering over the whole affair, as you have done, causes these aggravations to become overwhelming. You have to move to rental control, and Leal says so, so that within the degree of your own—

Mr. Speaker: Might I interrupt the hon. member for a moment? Up to date now today we have kept very well on our timing. He is about to go into the next member's time. Would he please bring his remarks to a conclusion shortly?

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I say, this is not a straight black-and-white proposition even within your own ranks, and I would ask you who sit in the back benches, who have good will in this matter, to bring all the pressure you can to bear on your own government.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this morning to have the opportunity of participating in this debate on rent control. I find myself in opposition to the bill. This subject of rent control is a form of price control which has been engaging the attention of man since the dawn of time. In the few minutes we have to discuss rent control this morning it is not likely that we will find the complete solution to this real and vexing problem.

Rent control has never been, and never will be, the answer to high rents. I think the statement of the hon. Attorney General

at a recent meeting of the private bills committee neatly summed up the situation. The hon. Attorney General stated that rent control probably would result in a shrinkage of capital in the housing market thus aggravating the very situation we are endeavouring to correct. If we were to introduce rent control I fear this is exactly what would happen. I readily agree that high rents are a matter which should concern every member of this Legislature. We must endeavour to find the solution.

While I agree that price controls are essential during wartime, it would not, I feel, be a measure which would be congenial to the public at large in a time of relative prosperity. High rents are presenting a problem to a wide variety of our citizens, including young working people, young married couples, students and senior citizens, to mention a few. What is needed is to find and introduce more capital into housing. We need a housing accommodation co-ordinating committee made up of representatives from churches, unions, life insurance companies, and other interested groups.

I am confident that with this kind of co-operation we could find and channel ample new funds into housing thus going a long way towards solving the difficulties. The agencies I have mentioned are in a very real sense involved, but they seem to be loath to channel funds into housing, when it calls for management and operation of housing projects. They should be encouraged to sit down with government officials to study rent and housing problems which are facing us. These agencies have funds available. If they are really interested in helping the housing and the renting crisis they should be willing to co-operate with us.

Another source of capital not fully explored is the possibility of housing bonds offering a tax free inducement to the buyer in which corporations and individuals could invest. This would provide additional funds to relieve the shortage which is causing high rents today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to page 69 of the Ontario law reform commission interim report on landlord and tenant law, 1968, which reads as follows:

Suspicion of rent gouging and profiteering, however is not alone enough to justify controls. It is essential, that so drastic a measure not be undertaken unless it is certain that the welfare of our society demands it. One of the factors which has made rent control acceptable to persons

normally unsympathetic to such controls has been the conduct of lessors. It has been seriously questioned whether they maintain a reasonable degree of self-control in light of their advantageous bargaining position. On the other hand, however, if they are the victim of a general inflationary trend they ought not to be made the scapegoats for a universal economic *malaise*.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have offered some workable alternatives to rent control which have the support and blessing of this House. I think my recommendations are worthy of further consideration.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution of the hon. member for Wentworth, I want to state that I feel I am fortunate to be the last speaker because I have an opportunity to reply to some of the nonsense that has come forward from those that would oppose this bill.

One of the most nonsensical statements is that imposing rent control will discourage people from creating new units. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that one of the reasons we are in such a dire plight with reference to housing units is that the high cost of living prevents people from saving money. It is savings that are subsequently invested into new housing units in the way of mortgages.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we did have rental control so that the people would not have to put almost their last cent out in order to pay for the existing, shoddy housing accommodation, they would be able to save a few pennies. This money would be invested by the banks in new housing units. I would suggest to you that rent control will give this province an opportunity to raise the necessary capital to expand its housing stock. Then, perhaps, the worthy Treasurer of this province will not have to be going over to Europe to try to raise money. This nonsense that rent control is going to decrease housing units is absolute nonsense. It is so old-fashioned that only this government would subscribe to it.

I point out another thing to you, Mr. Speaker. Those who can recall rental control during the war will know that one way that housing accommodation was increased was that people put up new housing accommodation because at the time it did not come under the rental control. When you put up a new housing unit you could then charge a basic rental. That was one way of trying to circumvent the rental regulations at the time. So I would suggest to you that if we

did have rent control there would be a large number of new housing units going up because people would feel that putting up new units would be the only way they could get high rentals.

Third, Mr. Speaker, a statement was made about landlords. One of the things I find out is that the new apartments are usually put up by developers who calculate what it would cost to make that building economically feasible. Then these large apartment developers give their tenants leases. This is at least one thing we can say in their favour—if anything can be said in their favour—and I imagine that all those who do belong to UDI, Urban Development Institute. It is when these apartments are sold to someone else, who is there not as a developer but simply to gouge, that we run into difficulty. They will not give leases and they just raise the rent almost month after month, or at least quarter after quarter. Do they ever gouge the tenants! These are the people that we have to guard against.

True, they may be small in number, if that is what this government wants us to believe. We will even go so far as to say: "Fine, we will accept your statement they are small in number but even with that small number, it is too great for our liking." There are too many of them, even though they may be, relatively speaking, small in number in ratio to the population of this province. And this is what we have to do. It is about time that people did have a few dollars left over to buy something else in life besides a roof over their heads. And we, this party, support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker: It now being 1.00 o'clock, private members' hour has expired.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will resume the Budget debate with a contribution from the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon). With what time might be left, we will go back into the estimates. I believe the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman) will be submitting his estimates to the House. We will sit Tuesday and Thursday nights next week.

An hon. member: Is there a rule we start at 2.30 o'clock?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not know if some special time has been laid on for this. The bell may go ten minutes early again, if the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), does not object, in order that we may get his leader

on television on time. In any event, may I suggest that the members come in as soon as the bell goes on Monday so that we may start exactly on time.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Will there be a private members' hour on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. Well now, I do not know. Yes, there will be, excuse me. So probably that will occupy the whole afternoon. There will be a private members' hour Monday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Before I put the motion to the adjournment of the House, I would like to acquaint the members of the proposed changes in the orders of the day and the procedure of the House on Monday and Tuesday, so that if there is any objection this would be the time to raise it and not after the event.

On Monday the House will go in, I hope, exactly at 2.30 and there will be television for the duration of the speech of the leader of the Opposition and the adjournment of the debate by the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). Thereafter we will return to the order paper as we did on Tuesday last, beginning at the commencement of the normal orders for the day.

The same procedure will be in effect on Tuesday, when the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, the member for York South, will be giving his Budget address. We will endeavour to have the House sit exactly at 2.30 and we will again go direct to the hon. member's speech and then come back to the normal course of business of the House. If there are any objections, any points of order or personal privilege, with respect to these two matters I would suggest that now would be the time to raise them rather than at a later time.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Prime Minister if, in view of the indication he gave that The Treasury Department estimates will not be continued next week, the Treasurer will be present on Monday and Tuesday during the addresses of the leader of the Opposition and the member for York South?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there are two comments I would like to make. I do not think the Treasurer will be here on Monday. As I hear this routine, it appears to me there will be very little point in going into estimates on Monday, so we will go to the order paper and deal with bills in that interval between the time that the leader of the

Opposition finishes and the private members' hour starts.

Mr. Peacock: The point is, the Treasurer will not be here?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, he will not.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Will we be continuing with the question period?

Mr. Speaker: We will go back to the introduction of our guests that we have in the galleries, then petitions, motions and so on, just as we did the other day. In other words, the order of proceedings in the House will be exactly the same as normal after the two addresses have been completed on Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to strain the patience of the House, but I wonder if I could ask the Prime Minister whether it is intended we go on with Correctional Services on Tuesday. We will now delay the Treasury estimates for next week?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer is going to be away for a few days. I will give you notice when his estimates are to be resumed.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Wear a blue shirt for television and a pickaxe for me.

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

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 10, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Monday, March 10, 1969

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Nixon	2027
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to	2037
Ontario Hydro, statement by Mr. Bales	2037
Hamilton and district school of nursing, questions to Mr. Dymond and Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon	2037
Water fluoridation, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Nixon	2037
OMSIP and London Life, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald	2038
Snowmobiles, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. B. Newman	2038
HIRB and summer employment for students, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Ben	2039
Ambulance service, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Ben	2039
Brockville hospital investigation, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Ben	2039
Toronto city council, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Ben	2039
Hydrochloric acid, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	2040
Conservation authority and drainage, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Paterson	2040
Hydro meter estimates, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Ruston	2040
Boating pump-out stations, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Young	2041
Moose hunting season, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Stokes	2041
Miss Fiona Nelson, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. Pitman	2041
Election returning officers, statement by Mr. Wishart	2042
Homes for the aged, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Spence	2042
Ontario Co-operative Credit Society, bill respecting, Mr. Welch, second reading	2043
City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson, second reading	2043
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, Mr. Bukator, second reading	2043
Town of Lindsay, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, second reading	2043
March Diamond Drilling Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Kerr, second reading	2043
Town of Parry Sound, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson, second reading	2043
City of Cornwall, bill respecting, Mr. Villeneuve, second reading	2043
County of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. Meen, second reading	2043
Town of Mitchell, bill respecting, Mr. Edighoffer, second reading	2043
County of Peel, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, second reading	2043
Board of education for the city of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. J. Renwick, second reading	2044
City of Belleville, bill respecting, Mr. Henderson, second reading	2044
Township of Teck, bill respecting, Mr. Jackson, second reading	2044
Carleton University, bill respecting, Mr. Kerr, second reading	2044
Tilbury public school board, bill respecting, Mr. Ruston, second reading	2044
Co-ordinated Arts Services, bill respecting, Mr. Dunlop, second reading	2044
City of Sarnia, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, second reading	2044
Banks Alignment Limited, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, second reading	2044
McMaster University, bill respecting, Mr. Gisborn, second reading	2044
Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	2044
Matrimonial Causes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2045
Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2046
Jurors Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2047
Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2047
Department of Justice, bill respecting, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2047
Fines and Forfeitures Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	2052
Evidence Act, bill to amend, reported	2052
Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act, bill to amend, reported	2052
Governing bodies of universities, bill to provide for, on second reading, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Pitman	2054
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2062

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as the members rush to take their places at this somewhat early calling of the House, I want to recall to you, sir, that the Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton), Budget statement brought before the Legislature just a week ago must be considered, in the light of statements that both he and the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Robarts), have been making for the last six months, and, in some regard, for the last two years.

I know that you, sir, will recall the Budget two years ago—that was in our Centennial year—in which it was proudly announced by the Premier sitting opposite me that there would be no new taxes and, in fact, that our services would expand by an amount approaching 20 per cent in the total Budget costs. While this seemed to be a good way to mark a Centennial year, it seemed an even better election-year Budget in which everything was in great shape, milk and honey, no problems, not even any real criticism of the government of Canada.

Now, immediately following that election, in which my friends opposite were very successful in being returned to office, as you recall the next Budget increased taxes enormously. There was also some considerable complaint that the government of Canada was not meeting its main responsibilities in funding programmes that are essential to the progress of this province. But, it was not until this fall that the real programme of anxiety was brought before the people of Ontario, and to some extent, those of us here in this House.

I well recall the shock with which I read the speech made by the Provincial Treasurer in which he—not the leader of the Opposition, but the Provincial Treasurer—said that we were approaching a situation that he called a "fiscal nightmare". Now that phrase has been used many times, but surely it is the bellwether, the symbol of the government's programmes during the last few months.

More and more there has been an indication that the government of Canada was not fulfilling its rightful responsibilities in meeting the costs of our growing programmes here. Now, we on this side, Mr. Speaker, as Liberals, and in the official Opposition, have been calling to the attention of the House and to everyone who would listen, that it has been 25 years during which the Conservative administration has been bringing new programmes into the service of the province. Admittedly many of them good programmes, but programmes which cost money, real money. And it is this expansion of programmes, much faster than the expansion of a reasonable tax base could possibly occur, which has brought us to what the Treasurer said was practically ruin.

Then, of course, last week's Budget changed that situation dramatically. We were told that while some services were going to be cut back, still the government of Ontario was going to meet its commitments; it was going to raise taxes certainly, but not in a way which would have any dramatic impact, or regressive impact, on the people of this province, and best of all, and most surprising of all, our Budget was going to be balanced.

Now this, in view of the statement that had been made—sometimes I had thought without any kind of personal control at all both by the Treasurer and the Premier, when they were meeting their counterparts at federal-provincial conferences. I tell you, this reminds me of the old story of the boy who cried wolf. The government sitting opposite has a credibility gap which it must now shoulder. After saying that the circumstances in this province were so bad financially, they then presented us with a balanced Budget.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be useful if we examined the role that is played

in our budgetary transactions in this province by the government of Canada, because we believe in confederation. As a matter of fact, everyone here believes in the future of the programme that has brought us successfully through our first century as a nation. We also know that while we have had shared programmes in the past, there is a considerable pressure to abandon these programmes and let the provinces and the government of Canada go their own way.

Well now, let us see what it entails when we look at the Budget that we have before us. Our largest single source of revenue, our share of the income tax pie, amounts to \$712 million for the coming year. Now in addition to that we get, I believe, 75 per cent of an abatement on the estate taxes that are also collected by the government of Canada. This means that we have \$734 million that will be coming in the form of a cheque, addressed to the Provincial Treasurer, without any strings attached and which can be used to fund our provincial programmes.

Now I suppose it is because I am the leader of the Opposition that I am particularly sensitive that the electors know where the money comes from, that pays for our programmes here. We are very proud of our schools. We think they could be better, but we are proud of what has been established here, particularly since the war. Our highways—I see the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), in his place today—while there is criticism—let us say that even in his own area up until recently they have been inadequate—still we know that we have built a magnificent highway, the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, from one boundary to the other and that we have made a lot of progress.

My point is this: That a large share of the funds that buy these facilities come to us from our agreement with the government of Canada and without the responsibility of this government opposite to levy the taxes to pay for them.

But I have just begun this story, Mr. Speaker, because I have told you that there are \$734 million that come to us, sort of from our rich uncle Ben Benson up there in Ottawa, which are used to fund our programmes. But if you examine the Budget statement that has been read to the House by the Provincial Treasurer, you will find that for the first time—and I suppose this is in response to the criticisms levied by our Royal commission on taxation—the federal involvement in all of our programmes is listed as a separate item.

And as I look at the Ministers in the front row over there I know the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko), sitting on the end, gets a large share of the funds that he uses through a federal-provincial shared cost programme. The Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) is absent, but in housing we know that Mr. Hellyer's disbursement of funds, through CMHC and other sources, finances a great deal of the effort to mitigate the housing difficulties that we experience here. The Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) gets the largest share of all—and I will talk about that in a moment—and even the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) receives significant funds. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), through manpower training, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) to a lesser extent, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), through the development of our resources, is on the receiving end of a federal shared cost programme. The Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) assures me that he gets no federal money.

But the total, and it has been very difficult to determine the total until this year, is another \$200 million, and that is a conservative figure not a ball park figure. So we are in a position where, besides the \$734 million with no strings attached, there is another \$200 million for shared cost programmes. But you know, not all of these programmes appear—and this is where the Minister of Education straightens his tie because there is a special budgetary item of, I believe, \$176 million which is the federal contribution towards paying half the cost of post-secondary education that comes under the Minister of Education's jurisdiction. This does not come as direct federal aid to education because of constitutional problems of which we are aware, particularly in the province of Quebec. But still the money comes down here.

I have taken the trouble to add these various funds together and they approach \$1 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to compare that with our total budget, which is under \$3 billion, and it means that the government of Canada funds close to 40 per cent—about 37.5 per cent—of the Budget that we vote here in the Legislature.

Now the Premier and others may be prepared to say that this is an insignificant contribution towards the retention of the strength of confederation, but I, for one, am prepared to say that I am glad that in this Budget the Treasurer, who unfortunately is not with us today, took the bull by the horns

and at least tried to set our financial house in order, so that our programmes were not growing so much faster than our tax income. I congratulate him for this because this is quite an accomplishment.

I personally, am not a believer in a balanced budget for its own sake. There is another phrase which appeals to me more, a balanced economy. But surely as a politician, and most of us here are politicians, we know that the people back home, whether in large cities or in rural areas, have been crying for a reduction in programmes so that at least they could see an end to ever increasing taxes.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: I am not at all sure that this accomplishment is going to be worth the paper it is written on when we see just how the Treasurer went about it. I do want to draw to your attention, sir, that in achieving this balance, the decision was made to cut what my friends opposite sometimes rather condescendingly call, soft services. I refer to the fact that our hospital programme in general has been reduced by a very serious amount indeed. And, as is usual, the government opposite tried to pin this problem on the government of Canada, which has reduced its grant for sharing hospital expansion. The fact remains, however, that these hospitals are controlled by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, they must submit their budgets to that commission, and the decision to slow down the rate of expansion in these facilities was made by the government sitting opposite. Now already the word postponement has taken on a particularly important meaning with regard to this stand-fast Budget, this balanced Budget, this Conservative Budget. The postponement of a number of programmes, I would suggest to you, sir, is going to reflect in the reduction of important—I would say, essential—services in many communities. This is going to mean that all of us in this Legislature are going to receive severe criticism in the next few months.

Already two communities have had to accept the decision made by this government that there will be no further assistance for the expansion of their homes for the aged. I refer to the city of Brantford and the city of Niagara Falls. In at least one case, the construction had already begun before the cut-back came, and the municipality and the county will continue with the expansion entirely at their own expense.

Hospital expansion, as I have already men-

tioned, is going to be a continuing and serious problem in communities like Metropolitan Toronto, where there are already lengthy and serious waiting lists for anything but emergency procedures. Psychiatric facilities—particularly those for research—have been cut back, and those of us who in the past year have visited Ontario hospitals know how serious a matter this is. Too many of our citizens, perhaps including many members of this House, have tended to put this terrible problem out of their minds. They hear about it from time to time in speeches by the hon. members when the vote comes before the Legislature. But, for many people here, the problem of caring for the mentally ill is something that is another family's difficulty, somebody down the street, somebody around the corner, and not ours.

I feel that the deliberations of the health committee last week—while they were questionable in their value at least on some circumstances—brought to public view, once more, the important concern that those professionals who are dealing with the problem of mental health on a day-to-day basis must face. And this, of course, was another area that was seriously cut back by decision of the Treasurer and the Prime Minister of Ontario. I would say that the cutting of these community services, and those attendant particularly upon the facilities for emotionally disturbed children, are going to reflect on the general attitudes of this administration. If it is true that \$400 million was cut from the projected budget requirements, then it appears that a large share of these cuts came from those who are least powerful and least in a position to respond to government programmes and criticize them. It is up to us in this House to see that the criticisms are put forward and that some steps can be taken to restore these cuts. I believe the answer is very well before us.

There are two other budgetary cuts that I want to refer to, Mr. Speaker, before getting on to another subject. One is the fact that our housing programme is still largely funded with federal money. The Minister of housing, the Minister of Trade and Development who is responsible for housing in this administration, takes a lot of the headlines. But the funds, which are to be used to buy land which when serviced should relieve the high costs of at least this aspect of housing development, still come from Ottawa.

There is one area, which I think is particularly important where our Budget does cut our own efforts. That is the effort that is

headed by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management—the Ontario Water Resources Commission. Unless the water resources commission gets into the business of installing the services in an effective and progressive way in land which can be used in large urban areas for housing development, then we will never get the costs down to the level where an ordinary man receiving employment and salary from \$5,000 to \$10,000 or \$12,000, can ever expect to own such a lot and construct his home upon it.

Last year I was startled to find, in looking at the public accounts, that \$50 million which was voted in this House for the expansion of the OWRC facilities went unused and went back into the coffers of the government. No wonder the decision was made to restrict OWRC expenditure this year, because they apparently are not properly set up with a modern administration that can make these funds available to municipalities and others so that the expansion of serviced land, which is in such short supply in our community, can be mitigated. I think this is a serious matter. I believe that, rather than cutting back on the funds available to them, we should improve the organization and set as a standard policy renovation of the view with which the OWRC has been tied down. I believe that they must have the prime responsibility to service land with water and sewage services so that part of the problems associated with the housing crisis in Ontario can be done away with once and for all.

A moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I was drawing to your attention the fact that health services received the brunt of Budgetary cuts, and while the government opposite has a tendency to blame the government of Canada for these cuts, it is surely here where the solution lies; that is, to put back in the general train of community development, the hospitals, homes for the aged and so on. The solution lies with the federal government's Medicare programme which has been rejected by the government of Ontario.

When I am talking about this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall to your mind that the Premier of Ontario, sitting opposite, said in the House just a few days ago that he was not against the principle of Medicare itself and that he felt that a properly composed insurance programme is something that would be in the best interests of our citizens. Now, with that statement I am completely in accord, but where we part company is where the gentleman sitting opposite is prepared to say that we in Ontario have the best of all possible schemes and, in fact, must not and

should not participate in federal Medicare. I think the inflexibility lies right here in this government and particularly with the leader of the government.

He, or his advisors, have told the House that Ontario already has coverage in medical insurance right here in the province, of something over 94 per cent, which would be tantamount to saying that we have universal coverage in Ontario. We have very close to it, and I believe that we could achieve this federal requirement if we decided that we would go for the federal programme. I think that the programme would be comprehensive enough so that we would be able to take part in federal Medicare, and all that remains is for the government opposite to pass legislation or regulation, which will prohibit any company offering medical insurance from making a profit on such an insurance.

We know that we have several large establishments outside OMSIP which are offering these insurance programmes—PSI is one of them, the county co-operative movement is another one; I happen to belong to that one myself—and if we were to examine the flexibility in the federal programme that has been found by other provincial governments, notably B.C. and Alberta, there is not a doubt in my mind that we could live up to the four minimum requirements which would permit us to go into federal Medicare and all the advantages that that would entail. It would not change our system here dramatically. It might be an embarrassment to some of the private insurance companies which are still either making a profit on medical insurance itself, or the ancillary package of insurance that often goes with it.

I believe, however, that it would be well within the principle of Medicare that the Premier of Ontario himself accepts, that we could move into a programme, living up to the four minimum requirements of federal Medicare without disrupting our system as it is at present constructed and operating. I personally believe in government-operated medical insurance. The Premier sitting opposite does not, and if he prefers to have a spectrum of carriers, I am saying to him, sir, through you, that this is a part of the flexibility of the federal plan and there is no reason it cannot become a part of our plan.

The only reason I am putting this forward is that if we were to accept federal Medicare and be accepted by the federal government in Medicare we would receive during the next fiscal year \$170 million in assistance, which should be spent on reducing premiums,

or eliminating them, or at least in my view, funding those medical services which have been cut out of the present Budget. And I say this with great sincerity. The flexibility is there and I would challenge the Prime Minister and his Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) who may even now be conferring with his federal counterparts, to examine this flexibility to see whether or not what I say is true. I believe that it is, that we can adapt ourselves to the federal requirements, and come out of this programme by July 1 this year since we have missed the opening date for 1969, with a participation on federal Medicare which will restore those aspects of medical facilities that have been cut from the present Budget. I believe that this is something that can be accomplished and that must be accomplished, and would, in fact, restore a more progressive life to a Budget which is in every aspect regressive, stand-punt and based on retrenchment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any Budget that is a balanced Budget accomplishes this position by cutting its costs—and I have already referred to some of those cost cuts—and by increasing the tax take. In Ontario the Treasurer has been able to increase the tax income this year by \$180 million. I suppose as politicians examined where these increases in taxes occurred, they thought there was a certain deftness, a political deftness, in the way this was accomplished. After all, most people are prepared to say, "Well, higher taxes on liquor and cigarettes, expensive meals, hotel and motel accommodations; people have a choice whether or not they are going to spend those funds, and therefore they have a choice as to whether they will pay the tax". I think the fact remains, however, that where last year 19 cents out of every dollar we raised in tax funds came from the sales tax, this year it has been increased to 21 cents. And whether or not you believe people should buy liquor, smoke cigarettes or buy expensive meals, the Treasurer knows that \$100 million extra is going to be paid by the man on the street. I almost called him the little man but my friend, the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), says there are no little men in Ontario and it is a point well taken. The point is that this tax is still as regressive as it ever was; the largest increases in our tax amounts will come from the average citizen, the man with an income below \$8,000, and this is the regressive feature that we have been critical of in past years and are again criticizing this year. We must realize that if the tax income goes up by \$180 million, that is about \$100 per

household and perhaps over a period of 12 months it is not going to be a serious matter, but still it means that the spiral of taxation continues to move upward in this province of opportunity, this banner province that leads the economy of the rest of the nation.

I think it might be well for us to recall that we have four main sources of taxation: the income tax, which I have already mentioned, collected by the government of Canada; the sales tax which goes up by about \$100 million this year, and at five per cent, part of it at 10 per cent, will net \$630 million; corporation income over \$400 million; gasoline tax more than \$350 million; and then we get down to what I suppose C. D. Howe and some other politicians would call the small potatoes, but all of which add up to close to \$3 billion.

It is interesting to recall that we in this province have one source of revenue which is a very important one, which is not in fact a tax; it is a monopoly. We have a law passed in this House that will permit only the government to sell liquor. We handle that monopoly very well indeed. We buy the raw material cheap, water it down and sell it dear. This year we intend to make \$190 million in that particular business. So you can see that the formation of a Budget has this flexibility. We can look to the government of Canada for changes in the tax base, we can look to our basic regressive taxes—and these have been increased this year—and we have also increased the take on the liquor business as we have in most years in recent history.

The one tax increase which I think should be severely criticized is the decision to levy the five per cent sales tax on production machinery. It is much too easy to say: "Oh, well, that's really a corporation tax, the wealthy manufacturers will look after that and they should be paying more tax." We know, of course, that the \$38 million that this tax will net the government will be passed on *in toto* to the consumer. If anything, it will result in an increase in prices well beyond just the payment of the tax. The normal pricing by the manufacturers—and even the government of Ontario does this from time to time—is to round off the new price to the next highest five cents or ten cents so that they make a little profit as well as pay the new tax.

While we are looking at the federal example, I am sure there are Ministers opposite who recall the famous federal Budget in 1963 when a tax of this nature was levied at the federal level on production machinery.

It was not five per cent, I must admit, it was 11 per cent. And it was not long until those who were concerned with the economic livelihood of our nation convinced the federal government—a Liberal government admittedly—that this tax was not in the best interests of the nation. Over a series of months it was reduced and, I am glad to say, finally abolished.

I would think that while this tax will fall very heavily on the consumer, it is the Minister of Trade and Development and the Minister of Labour who might also be very much concerned about its effect. As the costs of production go up, our position as an export market or as an export producer is going to be jeopardized. There are those, more expert in economics than I, who are prepared to predict that this tax in the long run will cost us money—and a great deal of money—and together with that, the availability of jobs. To back up my argument I need only quote the recommendations in volume three of the royal commission on taxation, which I read before going to bed each evening. I read to you, on page 228, Mr. Speaker, as follows:

We recommend that the present exemptions from sales tax be reviewed and revised so that all purchases of machinery, equipment and other goods that enter into the direct cost of manufacturing and producing will be exempt.

Now, the Royal commission—and we paid a lot of money for their advice—considered their position for four years. The Royal commission recommends not only retaining the exemption but expanding it in the manufacturing area so that it would relieve the cost to the consumer and improve our position as a manufacturing province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to cost cutting, I think the government made a serious error in approaching health services. The villain of the piece is surely education. Once again, it is expanding tremendously. While we on this side favour the provision of the best facilities that we can possibly afford, it seems to be generally understood—even by the Treasurer—that it is in this department and those branches that come under the direction of the Minister of Education, that costs can be pared. There, we can reach a new level of efficiency which seems to have gone by the board in recent Budgets.

I happen to come from a rural part of the province and we, of course, are following with a great deal of interest the decisions made by the new county boards of education. These boards are duplicating the facilities

that had been offered by The Department of Education as far as inspection and supervision are concerned. We now find that each county, independent of each other and apparently independent of any guidance from the department, is undertaking to hire staff from a pool that was employed by The Department of Education until January 1 of this year.

I well remember the Minister in a speech last year saying that all of those who would be replaced or displaced by the new statute would, he expected, find employment with the new county board. Well, of course, it has come to pass that those officials at the county level have all been taken on in some new capacity with the county board system. The only difference is that their salaries have gone up—usually by a figure approaching \$10,000. Where an inspector or a supervisor would be making \$15,000 a year ago, he is now making \$22,000 to \$25,000 plus.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce); More than a Cabinet Minister!

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Education is shaking his head. He must surely be aware that a large percentage of these officials is making more money than he does. While I would be quick to say they may be worth it, the fact remains we are duplicating, on a county to county basis, this involved procedure in supervision and inspection without any guidelines from the Minister of Education whatever.

Mr. Speaker, the members sitting opposite are very sensitive to this. As a matter of fact, it even crept into the Treasurers' Budget statement. He shook his finger at the television camera or somebody on this side—and said if the county school boards do not improve their situation we may set up a budgetary review board. He says this at least a year after Parkinson's law has been acting. Everybody who was available was hired at new and increased salaries and all these new people had their own staff. So, we will find that any budgetary review board that might be set up in the years that lie ahead will have to fire people. It would have been better if the Minister of Education had set reasonable guidelines—not only for salaries but for the positions that might very well have been filled at the county level. We do not know what the future holds for education other than increasing costs.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), is imposing a network of regional government across the province, and at least on the authority of the Royal commission on

taxation, these regions should have something to do with the governance of education.

We know that some of the county boards are already planning centralized administrative facilities to house the gentlemen who have been hired to administer the matter. We can see that we have set in motion a vast spending machine particularly involving those who never get into the classroom to instruct the students. These men are well above the principals who are on the firing line in modern education. They are at the level where they hand down *dicta* and opinions, confer with the regional offices of The Department of Education and then perhaps go one step beyond that and talk to the Minister and his staff here.

I would say that education is dissolving into a bureaucratic nightmare. Its expenses are not returning dividends in excellence in education. It is in this particular area where efficiencies and cost cutting should have attracted the budgetary attention. There is a great deal of duplication, of course, in these educational facilities. It was told by a taxpayer in the Lakehead—and I talked to them on several occasions—that there are three separate and distinct educational television facilities to train young people in the uses of television both at the technical school level and at the university and at the community college level. Surely an approach that was predicated on providing good facilities, but providing them efficiently, would have put these facilities together so that the Lakehead would have been well served by one good system rather than three which perhaps were incomplete in themselves.

There is another example of waste and poor planning. Perhaps it does not involve too many dollars, but it comes from Huron county, the constituency of the hon. Treasurer himself. My informants in that area, particularly the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), tell me that Huron county undertook in their wisdom to build a separate building for assessment purposes and their county assessment staff would use those facilities. The cost was something like \$160,000 and the ribbon was just cut on this building—probably by the Treasurer himself—when he came down here to Toronto, to say that they were going to do away with county assessment and actually move all these assessors into Toronto where they would be employees of the provincial government and they would go out with the wisdom of the government sitting opposite and impose the assessment on the local communities.

I believe that surely some effort at rational-

izing the plans that are coming forward is required. The taxpayers, I suppose, greet a balanced Budget with approval but they are certainly not going to greet the continued waste of their funds in this particular way with approval when there are enough members of the Crown sitting opposite so that their new approach to municipal government, to education, to assessment, to regional development can be co-ordinated in such a way that it will be better and more efficient rather than worse and less efficient, which is the way it appears when we look at the announcements as they come from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, my first session in this Legislature was in 1962. The Premier was new to his job then as well and one of the most interesting speeches that I heard from the other side was one that predicted a complete revamp of the provincial tax system with heavy emphasis on municipal grants. It was said then, of course, that nothing could be done in this direction until the Royal commission on taxation, which was appointed in that year, had brought down its report. Well four years later this report came before the Legislature and still, in this particular Budget, we are told that a revamping of the grants for the municipalities will be postponed.

Last year one of the recommendations was picked right out of the report—that is, the recommendation for the basic shelter exemption—and used as an election promise. It was put before the Legislature a year ago and we have now seen it in operation for a full year. This was the only attempt at reform that was meaningful, and taken separate and by itself it has not been effective in meeting the needs at the municipal level. I would say that its cost of \$111 million was in fact that much overtaxation of the people of this province, that their alternatives, which were available a year ago and which are available now, would have been a means whereby this sort of assistance through tax credits would have been made available to the local taxpayer rather than the cumbersome and inefficient method that was adopted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

It is true that we, on this side, voted for a programme which was designed to give some effect, however small and however short-lived, to the local taxpayers. But we did not vote in favour of this cumbersome bureaucracy which has been set up, I estimate, at a cost of \$7 to \$8 million to administer these funds.

But we are talking about general reform of these grants that should give the municipalities an opportunity, for the first time, to

make some decisions themselves and make meaningful that phrase "local autonomy" that is heard so frequently on both sides of this chamber. We know that the promise in the white paper that accompanied the Budget last week—to pay 60 per cent of the costs of education locally rather than 50 per cent—is a step in the right direction.

Our programme, on this side, is on a phased basis to take over even a larger share of these costs and to tie them in with unconditional grants so that the municipalities, whether they are amalgamated into larger regions or not, will in fact have some decisions to make at the local level without their freedom of action being impinged upon by the Minister sitting opposite who may have pet programmes—whether they are regional jails or regional health centres or regional welfare or some other aspect. The local citizens who are elected to serve in municipal councils must have the responsibility finally—and once again, they have not had it for a long time—to make some of the important decisions which I believe will result in efficiency.

Regional government, of course, is a very touchy issue indeed. It has been discussed in this Legislature and certainly advocated from the Opposition for a good long time. That is why, when the government moves to bring forward some manifestations of regional government, we cannot oppose them holus-bolus, we must look at what the proposals are. But one of the weakest links in the programmes that have been put forward by the municipal affairs expert and by the Premier himself, has been their assurance that local taxpayers and local elected officials will have some decisive role to play in what form the new regional government will take.

Now I believe the government has reneged on that position, that they are prepared to impose their own views. The worst example is at the Lakehead where they are not going to permit the citizens to have a plebiscite on whether or not the proposals should go ahead. Now the Lakehead is, of course, a special circumstance where two historic cities have grown side by side, almost with equal populations and with certain backgrounds that they feel make them somewhat different. I believe the future of those two cities is in amalgamation but I believe as well that this future will be jeopardized if the decision is going to be made irrevocably by a junior Minister 1,200 miles away rather than by the citizens who live in that part of Ontario and who have chosen to live there and who feel

that they have a role to play on the decisions that have so much to do with their own future.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that regional government is something of great concern to all of us, whether we come from the rural areas and that we insist that those people at the local level must have a more meaningful voice before decisions are imposed upon them from this level of government.

I have already said that when regional governments do come into existence in those areas where they will be an advantage or where certain amalgamations make the municipal governments, let us say, more efficient, more realistic in their size, in their jurisdiction, that we should leave the responsibilities for assessment with them, particularly at the regional level. I do not look forward to the time when an army of assessors will be added to the payroll of the provincial civil service already numbering close to 60,000.

If we are going to regionalize the responsibility of government, then the regions must have autonomy, they must have the basis to pay for their responsibilities, and this is surely what they are chiefly concerned with. I do not want to miss this particular occasion, Mr. Speaker, without referring to the development of northern Ontario which did not feature in any prominent way in the Budget that was presented to us just a week ago.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Lost and forgotten!

Mr. Nixon: The decision to impose a special mining tax on our natural resources was greeted, I think, even by those industries concerned, with some equanimity, particularly since the net result of the tax would be \$8 million. This is a token only, but it may in fact set the stage for using our natural resources as a better basis for the funding of provincial programmes and particularly those programmes which should be carried on in the northern part of the province.

I have felt for a long time that our plans, or the plans set out by the government opposite, to foster northern development, have had too many political overtones to be modern and efficient. The most recent announcement came just at the time of the last provincial election when the Premier sitting opposite sensed that he was losing northern support, and—I believe it was in Port Arthur—he made the announcement that there would be a grand new programme, expansion of funds, that would be funnelled into northern development.

Mr. Sopha: I do not think he ever had very much support from the north.

Mr. Nixon: Well it is even less now than it was then.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed!

Mr. Nixon: And I am quite prepared to say since the last Liberal administration—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Just as we sit over here and the hon. members sit over there!

Mr. Nixon: The last Liberal administration has not been in office in the province for some years, perhaps there was a time when politics was plied by them in this same way; but that was a quarter of a century ago. I believe very strongly that the funds that should be made available to northern economic development and the development of our natural resources, should be administered by a development board, on which all the elected members from the north, whether NDP, Liberal or Progressive Conservative would have a role to play.

Criticism has been levied against this proposal, saying, "You are a northern separatist". I do not believe that is so. I do believe, however, that the decisions associated with northern development can much better be taken by those people from the north with proper economic advice, and by those people who are in the north, rather than the Ministers who have their head office down here in Toronto. This is a small thing, perhaps, but surely those citizens who have chosen to tie their families and their lives to the northern way of life, and particularly with the development of natural resources, want to believe that those who make the decisions affecting them, are not 500 or 600 miles away, that their offices are in the northern community, and that the decisions are made by those people who have some background in and sympathy for special northern problems.

Frankly, I am not prepared to admit that the Minister of Mines, for example, sitting with his feet up before the fire at his home in Rosedale in Toronto, is capable of that sort of knowledge. He is a great fellow, and his picture in the mining report looks very good—he has a mining hat on, and so on—but I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that northerners must have a much greater part to play in the decisions that affect themselves. And while I am talking about an attitude of separatism, I get to the other aspects of this Budget that were, in fact, contained in the

white paper read after the Budget, which gives me some considerable anxiety. I read the speech over very carefully after listening to the Treasurer so that I would not have missed any of his meaning. But I believe that his announcement that Ontario will have a separate income tax, is not a threat; I believe it is an irrevocable decision. I believe in the mind of the Premier and of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) it is the cornerstone of a new fiscal approach for Ontario. And I would say that, because of that belief, I am particularly anxious; that it is, in fact, a statement of a policy of fiscal separatism, much more dangerous to our national unity than any bomb in a mailbox down in Montreal.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: We in this province have the advantages of the leading economy in Canada, and even when you compare it with many of the industrialized northern states, we are in a great position to attract new industry and new people. But, if we are going to use this preferred position to build a brick wall, a fiscal wall around our province, with the idea that we can handle our own affairs, and that our responsibilities to Canada come somewhere down the list of priorities, then I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side will oppose that attitude with all the force at our command.

The first announcement of a separate income tax was backed up by the second, that there should be, and would be, in Ontario a capital gains tax, whether or not this is imposed by the government of Canada. To show how symbolic this was, the Treasurer went on to say that if, in fact, we impose it separately, it will only be nominal in amount, and I suppose be there just to say that we have a progressive system. Because I do not believe that a capital gains tax can be a part of any province's system, without regard to its effect across our nation. I subscribe to the recommendations of the federal Royal commission that capital gains should be taxed not as they are taxed in the United States, but that they should be taxed as an income from any other source, and this I would predict and I believe and would urge, would be a part of the fiscal policy of the government of Canada.

But I would like to read to you, sir, some quotes from those more learned in these matters than I. This comes from the *Toronto Daily Star*, March 5 this year, under the heading: "Ontario Income Tax Plan Cited as

a Threat to Canadian Unity", and I quote from the article:

Creation of a provincial income tax as advocated by Ontario Treasurer Charles MacNaughton, could seriously endanger federal control over Canada's economic policy, Douglas Sherbaniuk, Director of the Canadian Tax Foundation, said last night. Sherbaniuk said, "A provincial income tax would mark a return to the tax confused pre-war years of the 1930's and could weaken Canada's economic unity."

I believe that the comments made by this gentleman, and reflected, by the way, by both Mr. Smith and Mr. Carter, the chairmen of the two Royal commissions on tax matters advising the federal government and the provincial government would indicate that the policy pronouncements last week are historic; that these pronouncements, in fact, spell the beginning of a fiscal provincialism, and fiscal separatism, that is bound to weaken our national unity.

Now, at this stage, when I have brought this to the attention of the House before, there have been interjections from the gentlemen opposite saying, "Do you not believe in Ontario first?" And I would say, sir, that I do believe that we in this House have to accept our responsibilities to the province first, except where our responsibilities as Canadian citizens must take precedent. And it is in this case that they do, because we must not lead the other provinces away from the strength that must exist with the government of Canada if, in fact, they are going to continue the programmes which will strengthen our unity, and, more than anything else, pay for equality of opportunity.

There have been politicians at both the provincial and federal level who have said that shared-cost programmes will have to be done away with, since it is not possible for provinces to co-operate with the government of Canada, or vice versa. I do not believe this. I believe that as long as we are a confederation, as long as Canada exists, that we will have a group of shared cost programmes that will change in their importance and in their intentions. Right now these programmes feature health services, hospitalization and certain other programmes, but it will not be long, I predict, before the emphasis comes on a guaranteed minimum income as a goal not just for people in Ontario, but for people right across Canada. I believe the emphasis in shared-cost programmes will move towards a coming to grips with the problems of pollution, which in many provinces simply can-

not be faced because there is not enough money, and in some provinces such as this one, cannot be faced because there is insufficient leadership.

The third area where shared-cost programmes are bound to come in the future will be in the area of education finance. We already receive close to \$200 million from the government of Canada in support of our education programmes in this province, but I believe there will soon be an improvement in this situation which will allow us to spend at least some of these funds in areas below the post-secondary level. I look forward to this. I believe that Canada must have such programmes if we are going to do away particularly with that last area of inequality of opportunity, and that is in education.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say in closing my remarks, that I want to put the government in full possession of our position, that we will not vote in support of any programmes which we believe will tend to weaken the unity of our nation. We have heard the Prime Minister sitting opposite say that he believes in a strong central government but—and after that word comes his objections which in fact erode, and continuously erode, the powers that I believe must continue to be in the hands of the government of Canada. In my view we are embarking upon a dangerous road indeed when we attempt to set up a tax system that simply is putting aside once and for all the requirement of co-operation, a spirit which I know exists in the minds of the government opposite, and in the minds of the government in Ottawa which has a common goal, and that is the establishment of a tax system that is fair for all. By "all" I mean all of the citizens of our country, which cannot be achieved if we in Ontario use that selfish, unco-operative approach which has manifested itself in the announcements by the Treasurer last week.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these thoughts in mind I move, seconded by Mr. Sopha, that the Treasurer's motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means, be amended by adding thereto the following words:

That this House regrets that the government:

1. Has adopted policies which greatly impair the provision of services to our people in vital areas of health, welfare, housing, education and agriculture;
2. By its refusal to join in the national Medicare plan has deprived the people of Ontario of adequate standards of health

care, as well as financial benefits to them as taxpayers;

3. Has seriously disrupted the efficient operation of local government, and especially has failed to give an adequate voice to citizens of local municipalities and their representatives before deciding upon far-reaching changes in municipal government and administration;

4. Has again postponed necessary reforms in our provincial tax structure retaining inequitable grants reflected in unfairly high local taxes;

5. Has failed to put forward a co-ordinated policy to deal with the growing problem of regional disparity and poverty in Ontario;

6. Has announced policies amounting to fiscal separatism which will lead to the creation of disharmony in the operation of the federal system, rather than seeking accord and accommodation to the end that the citizens of Ontario, together with the people of other provinces may enjoy the benefits of a fair and equitable system of taxation.

Mr. MacDonald moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the members would like to know that earlier today we had as our guests, in the east gallery, students from Franklin Horner Public School, Etobicoke and from Hillsdale Public School in Oshawa; and in the west gallery, students from Willowdale Christian School in Willowdale, and folk from the North York University Women's Club in Willowdale.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Before the orders of the day, sir, I would like to advise the members of the House that a memorandum of agreement has been signed between Ontario Hydro and the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Ontario Hydro, Local 1000.

The agreement has been completed this afternoon and is subject to ratification by the membership of the local. The agreement itself is to be placed before the executive board of the local later this afternoon, and

will subsequently be submitted to the membership at large. That, however, will take a little time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions of the Minister of Health.

1. What action is the Minister going to take to assist in the settlement of the strike involving the teachers of the Hamilton and District School of Nursing?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to meet representatives of this school within the next two days. In the meantime this is a matter between The Department of Labour and the parties concerned. I believe The Department of Labour is more deeply involved in it than The Department of Health.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order if I were to ask the Minister of Labour if he has any special knowledge of this?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that one of our conciliation officers has been endeavouring to assist the parties and will continue to do so.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Health answer a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member may not ask questions at this moment. The leader of his party, the official Opposition—

Mr. Sargent: It is regarding the nursing situation.

Mr. Speaker: Well the hon. member will have an opportunity, if he has placed his question, to ask it. If he has not placed his question, he does not ask it at this time.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Health which I believe is left over from two or three days ago if you will permit it.

Is the Department of Health undertaking an assessment of the findings of the medical science research report from Ottawa General Hospital to the Royal Canadian College of Physicians and Surgeons which evidently reveals new information on the long-term effects of water fluoridation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this report came out of a paper which was read before a scientific body by the doctor in question, Dr. Posen, of Ottawa, who is a

very highly regarded and recognized specialist in his field. I have not yet had an opportunity to read the scientific paper, nor has my staff had that opportunity. When we have done so, we will be in a better position to answer the question more fully.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Is the Minister aware that a major American magazine, the *Saturday Review*, last week had a full article assessing the report from Ottawa, and that it is going to be incumbent, I would say, on this Minister to have some fairly professional reactions to it, since it is going to stir interest across the United States?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I did personally read the article in the *Saturday Review*, but it was pointed out by the editor of that magazine that John Lear is their scientific correspondent or scientific reporter. I can hardly come to any definitive decision on such a deeply involved and complicated matter on the basis of an assessment by the scientific editor of a newspaper.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions held over from last week, Nos. 831 and 832, to the Minister of Health.

The first: What percentage of physicians, serving OMSIP subscribers, bill OMSIP directly?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: According to the volume of claims, Mr. Speaker, 90 per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: The second question is: What are the principal differences between the coverage provided under OMSIP and under the London Life plan for the Ontario civil service?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, OMSIP, of course, is purely a physicians' services insurance bill.

The programme that is provided after negotiation with the public service of Ontario is a package deal. It includes basic life insurance for the employees, supplementary life insurance for employees, supplementary life insurance for dependents, basic surgical-medical benefits and supplementary medical expenses.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question was with particular reference to the differences on the medical coverage. Would the Minister clarify that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, on the basic coverage there is no difference.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Does the Minister want to think that over?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Perhaps I should elaborate on that a little. I believe, at least to the best of my knowledge, optometric benefits are not provided under the public service programme and I question if the dental-surgical procedures permitted under OMSIP are provided under the public service programme.

Mr. Ben: Better take it as notice.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Does London Life pay chiropractors?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would care to take it as notice, I would like a detailed explanation as to the difference in medical coverage. I know there are other elements in the package deal that London Life gives, but the medical differences—

Mr. Sopha: Is the member not a member of London Life?

Mr. MacDonald: No.

Mr. Sopha: I am, I am a member.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. The *Toronto Telegram*, Saturday, page 2, final edition, reports an accident in which three men were injured when the cable supporting a hoisting elevator broke on a construction job and they dropped eight floors. Yet, according to the same *Telegram* news report, the accident was never reported to the workmen's compensation board.

Is the Minister investigating this allegation of failure to live up to the requirements of The Workmen's Compensation Act?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to have the matter investigated. I will let the member know.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have question of the Minister of Transport.

Is the Minister prepared to require better lights for snowmobiles as a result of the recommendation to that effect by the coroner's jury investigating the death of a snowmobile operator at Bradford last week?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the House on February 26 last, our staff is carrying out a continuous and detailed examination of the operation of motorized snow vehicles—and this includes the adequacy of existing equipment—for a period of one full season, and in

light of this experience they will examine and review the legislation to ascertain if practical improvements can be made.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the Minister a supplementary question: Would the Minister not consider making some changes immediately so as to prevent any further deaths as a result of insufficient lighting on the snowmobiles?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I think my answer was complete.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, before asking the question, I just want to welcome back to the House the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), who happens to be my member. I am happy to say he is looking well and the rest did him good.

Mr. Speaker, I have two questions that were carried over from March 6, to the Minister of Health, questions No. 842 and 844. No. 842 reads as follows:

1. How many students were employed during 1968 by the health insurance registration board?

2. How many students have been hired by HIRB for summer employment during 1969?

3. Were students who were employed last year given an opportunity for further employment this summer?

4. Is it true that applications are no longer being received for summer employment by HIRB?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, 168 students were employed during 1968 by HIRB. 159 students have been hired by HIRB for summer employment during 1969. Yes, they were given preferential consideration because of related experience. Yes, we have more applications now than we can handle and all vacancies are now filled.

Mr. Ben: As a supplementary question, in the light of what the Prime Minister said in trying to provide summer employment for students, may I ask what caused the large decrease in the number that were required for HIRB for summer employment?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have not studied the new math, but according to the old math, there is a difference of nine, and in my view that is not a considerable difference, in the light of the number hired—168 and 159.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, considering that the number of people available for employment is increasing, I would say that such—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is asking questions, not making comments.

Mr. Ben: Question No. 844, carried over from March 6, Mr. Speaker:

In view of the responsibility of the Minister of Health for Ontario Hospital Services Commission, which regulates ambulance services in the province, is the Minister planning to request that a member of his staff attend the hearing on March 12 which will investigate that a Metro ambulance driver refused to take to hospital a woman he thought was dead?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, my staff will attend this hearing on March 12.

Mr. Ben: Perhaps the Minister will make a report on the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, the next question is question 849, of the Minister:

Has the Minister engaged anyone else to help Mr. Sedgewick in the Brockville hospital investigation?

Is the Minister doing any personal investigation of this matter?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no!

Mr. Ben: That is about par for the course. Mr. Speaker, the last question of this hon. Minister—I think there is one more here.

Mr. Speaker: I have one from the hon. member of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Ben: May I ask it now?

Mr. Speaker: This is the time; this member has the floor today.

Mr. Ben: Of the Minister of Municipal Affairs: With reference to report No. 12 of the Toronto city council, why is the province not complying with the city's request, as the federal government is, regarding payments to the city, which would allow the city to meet its obligations to Metro?

Mr. Speaker: That is the end of the question as has been approved by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ben: Thank you.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, report No. 12 from the Toronto city council has not yet reached my desk. I understand that it goes

to the city council this Wednesday and presumably if it is approved by the city council it will find its way in due course to my desk and I will be glad at that time to give the member an answer.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Now ask the balance as a supplementary!

Mr. Ben: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Ben: The letter he refers to, which is referred to in report No. 12, mentions that three letters have been directed to the Minister's department since 1967 on this topic. May I ask why he has to wait for the latest letter when he has already received three?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Had the hon. member asked me about letters which I have already received, I would have been in a position to answer, but he has asked me about a report which I have not yet received.

Mr. Ben: In light of this, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

The fact that he used the words that the city has for a couple of years been asking the department to make its payments to the city on time so it could meet its obligations to Metro—why does it not make its payments in time, as the federal government does?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We believe that we do make them in time, and I would be glad to give the member a full report of just how we do make them. The city of Toronto is asking for something which would obviously have to be done for every other municipality in the province. We believe we are doing it equitably now and for good reasons it has not been changed.

Mr. Ben: Well, they do not think there is anything equitable about it.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: Has the Minister received the report on the investigation undertaken into the reported dumping of 150,000 gallons of hydrochloric acid into Hamilton Bay during the week of February 14, by the Steel Company of Canada?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer is, yes.

Mr. Deans: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Deans: Will he make the report available to the House?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

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

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question from the other day of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, a five part question.

1. When did The Department of Municipal Affairs rule that for drainage purposes—that is, municipal drains—a conservation authority is a municipality?

2. Why was this programme effected?

3. What is the estimated cost to conservation authorities?

4. Does the Minister now believe that if conservation authorities are municipalities that they should be relieved of municipal tax burdens?

5. Was the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) consulted with this change in the policy of your department?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the member's question—I am sorry I was not able to discuss it with him ahead of time. We have made no such ruling and I am really not clear as to the import of the question because there is no such ruling in existence. The member may be referring to the amendments which were passed by this House at the last session. The Drainage Act amendments of 1968 which made it clear that certain lands owned by municipalities or highways or railways or conservation authorities were not eligible for grants from either our department or from federal ARDA. That is perhaps what he means but this was a matter of legislation not a matter of ruling.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

What authority does Hydro have to estimate meter readings when in fact some of these estimates are 500 per cent over the amount actually used by the consumer?

Will the Minister take immediate steps to refund grossly overcharged users of hydro who were forced to pay estimated bills or be forced with hydro cutting off their power?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, Ontario Hydro estimates electrical consumption only in those cases where the normal practices to obtain the meter reading have failed.

For example, if a meter reader cannot gain entry into a premise with an indoor meter to obtain the reading, a meter reading card is left. The customer is asked to read the meter, record the information on the card and mail it to the area office. Estimated bills are issued only in cases where cards are not returned. This is fairly common practice with all electrical utilities. It must be admitted that the present strike situation has caused some disruption in the normal meter reading and billing schedules, thus increasing the number of estimated bills.

Unless there are unusual circumstances it is generally possible to predict, with reasonable accuracy, energy use from past billings. Any under or overcharge is corrected on the next billing. It is not the policy of Ontario Hydro to disconnect a customer's service for the non-payment of an estimated bill that is in dispute. If the estimated bill is in dispute, the area office will make every effort to obtain an actual reading. An adjustment is then made on the estimated bill.

Before any service is disconnected, a reminder notice is sent followed by a final notice and personal visit. This procedure provides ample opportunity for customers to discuss billing matters. If the hon. member would be good enough to supply me with the details of the circumstances to which he refers, I would be pleased to arrange to have the matter investigated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview has a question of this Minister from last week, perhaps he would ask it.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, the question is: How accurate is the charge made by William Robertson, executive director of the Marina Operators Association in a telegram of March 6, 1969, that only three units are ready to pump out boat tanks in the province of Ontario, and will adequate facilities be available by the opening of the boating season to effectively meet the demand arising from the legislation requiring boats with sleeping accommodations to have toilets with holding tanks instead of discharging sewage into the water?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of Mr. Robertson's charge but for the information of the hon. members we have received assurance from 70 marine oper-

ators in Ontario that they will have pump-out stations in operation this season. It is our objective to have adequate facilities available by the opening of the boating season.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes: (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Will the Minister adjust the moose hunting season for 1969 so that residents will be allowed two weeks hunting before open season for non-residents?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, seasons for moose hunting have already been announced and bookings are already being made. The closing season for non-residents is November 15 and for residents one month later, December 15, which means that residents will be allowed one extra month of hunting over the non-residents.

Mr. Stokes: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: Has he received any representations from fish and game hunters in northern Ontario to have the season opened two weeks earlier for residents, when they will have an opportunity to get a moose ahead of the non-resident hunters?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall having received any. There may have been some. At the same time I would like to mention that this is a sort of controversial question and there are many who feel that it should not be permitted. However, this subject of open season is under constant review and we will be pleased to look into it the next time seasons are changed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour.

In view of the statements of the Toronto Board of Education in regard to the firing of Miss Fiona Nelson, would the human rights commission investigate the hiring and firing policies of the Toronto Board of Education as it affects freedom of speech in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this matter is beyond the jurisdiction of the Ontario Human Rights Commission. As I am sure the hon. members are aware, the code deals with discrimination in employment on grounds of race, colour, creed, nationality, ancestry and place of origin. It does not cover this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to advise the hon. members that charges have today been laid and warrants issued respecting certain returning officers who acted as such in the provincial general election in the fall of 1967.

The charges relate to acts arising from the financial operation of their offices, which acts are alleged by the Crown to have been fraudulent. The facts upon which the charges are based in no way relate to the election aspects of their duties and these proceedings would in my view have no prejudice whatsoever to the validity of any election results. It was to provide that assurance which, in part, compelled me to make this statement.

These charges arise from an investigation which I directed in August of last year when I was advised by the assistant chief electoral officer of irregularities which came to light in the course of routine audits following the election. The Ontario Provincial Police force has been in charge of that investigation which is continuing. Certain facts have thus far been established which necessitate the laying of these charges but it is possible that more charges may be laid against other persons as the investigation proceeds. I assure the House that the investigation will extend into any area of the province where the police consider it appropriate and necessary to pursue the matter, but at this moment it has been directed at the Metropolitan area.

I realize the proper concern which this subject will raise in all of the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, but I do ask that they understand my inability to elaborate or go into extensive details as the matter is still under investigation and people are now charged before our courts.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence) asked question number 801 last week. The question was:

Does The Department of Social and Family Services set the admission policy to homes for the aged? 2. Is an individual

refused admission to homes for the aged if he has convalescent hip fracture, heart disease or diagnosis of cancer?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, which is lengthy because I think it sets out a general situation, is as follows: The department does not set admission policies for the municipally operated homes for the aged. However, this matter is governed by section 13 of The Homes for Aged and Rest Homes Act. Relevant clauses of subsection 1 of section 13 of the Act read as follows:

(c) Who is over the age of 60 years and who requires bed care and general personal nursing services but does not require care in a hospital.

(i) A statement in the prescribed form certifying that the applicant is eligible for admission to a home or joint home under clauses A, B, C or D, and signed by the physician of the home or joint home.

Moreover these subsections have been interpreted for us by an eminent advisory committee on geriatrics, as follows:

No person should be admitted to a home or maintained in a home whose health or well being might be considered as being in jeopardy, because a home does not, and should not, supply the treatment services or facilities of a hospital.

The policy directive on this particular aspect has been given in greater detail for physicians and administration of the homes for the aged. Inherently unstable conditions or terminal situations are therefore not recommended for admission or care in a home. This is in the interest of the person himself because the home is not equipped to provide the intense medical care required. Home committees and boards of management rely, of necessity, on the qualified medical practitioners who serve as home physicians.

These latter dedicated professional men rely on the guidelines I have outlined and meet together informally at least once a year. What is, in effect, a general policy has been found acceptable by the majority of home physicians, who bring to bear their own professional and clinical judgment in individual cases. This division between domiciliary care such as our homes for the aged offer, and the regular full scale health care of a hospital or health setting was also acceptable to the select committee on aging a few years ago. On the basis of this approach our homes for the aged provide the best available domiciliary care for the greatest number of residents.

In answer to the second part of the question, therefore, if any of the conditions set forth by the hon. member for Kent are stabilized and are—in the opinion of the home physician—suitable for care in a home for the aged, these applicants may be admitted. Hon. members will, however, appreciate that heart disease and cancer may be difficult to diagnose in terms of their episodic nature (i.e.: blood pressure up today—more manageable the next, and so on). This is strictly the decision of the physician on the spot. Likewise, the stabilized hip fracture condition may, under ideal circumstances, allow the afflicted individual to be admitted to a home for the aged.

In view of the hon. member's interest I will ensure that the consulting physicians stand ready to visit any area if invited.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): May I ask the Minister a supplementary? If I understand your remarks, it is up to the home physician to say whether these people are eligible for admission to homes. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If they meet the criteria as laid down in the general directive and he makes a judgment on the spot.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

ONTARIO CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary), in the absence of the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), moves second reading of Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Ontario Co-operative Credit Society.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton), in the absence of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil), moves second reading of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls) moves second reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF LINDSAY

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), in the absence of the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson), moves second reading of Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the town of Lindsay.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MARCH DIAMOND DRILLING LIMITED

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West), in the absence of the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton), moves second reading of Bill Pr9, An Act respecting March Diamond Drilling Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF PARRY SOUND

Mr. Henderson, in the absence of the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. A. Johnston), moves second reading of Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the town of Parry Sound.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF CORNWALL

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry) moves second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Cornwall.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF ONTARIO

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East), in the absence of the hon. member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman), moves second reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the county of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF MITCHELL

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth) moves second reading of Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the town of Mitchell.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF PEEL

Mr. Evans, in the absence of the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Kennedy), moves second reading of Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the county of Peel.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

WINDSOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale), in the absence of the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock), moves second reading of Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the board of education of the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE

Mr. Henderson, in the absence of the hon. member for Quinte (Mr. Potter), moves second reading of Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF TECK

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming) moves second reading of Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the township of Teck.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. Kerr, in the absence of the hon. member for Carleton East (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), moves second reading of Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Carleton University.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TILBURY PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent) moves second reading of Bill Pr26, An Act respecting Tilbury public school board.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CO-ORDINATED ARTS SERVICES

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill) moves second reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Co-ordinated Arts Services.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF SARNIA

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), in the absence of the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), moves second reading of Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Sarnia.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BANKS ALIGNMENT LIMITED

Mr. B. Newman, in the absence of the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson), moves second reading of Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Banks Alignment Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East), in the absence of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard), moves second reading of Bill Pr32, An Act respecting McMaster University.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PREPAID HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 22, An Act to amend The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about this particular bill.

The whole matter of bringing the drug plans under the same legislative umbrella as hospital and medical services is very necessary. I hope it is an indication from the government that they intend to include the drug areas within the scope of the programmes that are available to the people of this province at the present moment, namely OMSIP and Ontario Hospital. I hope they will make available to the people, within the scope of those programmes, the drug plans necessary to have a fully comprehensive medical care programme.

There is no question that it is a necessity in this province at this time. The cost of drugs is far beyond the reach of the majority of the fixed and low income groups, as the Minister is, I am sure, aware. If the Minister could assure us that this would be the next step in the programme of developing a medical health programme for the people of this province, we would certainly be delighted on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this before the Minister replies? The hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is enabling legislation which requires drug plans on a prepaid principle to be registered with and

supervised by the department. It would also enable any other plan to extend itself into that field. That is all I can say.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 66, An Act to amend The Matrimonial Causes Act.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, a word or two on this Act. I have three thoughts on this bill.

One of them has to do with the general costs of litigation in the province, which we are always prating that we wish to reduce. The bill, I think, unquestionably will have the effect of increasing the cost to litigants. The cost is being borne by the provincial government at this time and I suppose the validity of the argument the other way is that it is being paid for one way or the other, but in a range of services here I would think that it might be a retrograde step to that extent.

I wonder, in principle on this bill, whether the Attorney General has considered wiping out the official guardian's report entirely as being a routine formal matter which is not highly regarded except in the kind of cases where the official guardian's report is really a prerequisite to the determination of the actual divorce or other matter under review. In other words, the only time it seems to me that it is a practical matter in the courts to require the official guardian's report as to the condition and care of infants, is where there is a custodial quarrel.

In cases where there is some quarrel of this nature, the report is requisite, valid and necessary and probably the parties themselves should pay for it, but in the wide range of cases where it increases the task of the official guardian's office substantially, they have to make all kinds of investigations. I suggest that some thought be given in the future and possibly even through the passage of this bill, as to the validity of the remarks I am making as to both the load of administrative chores that is involved in submitting these reports. The Supreme Court judge has a report of the official guardian that has been filed, and the counsel—if there are two counsel and the case has not been tried *ex parte*—simply acknowledges that it is filed and that is pretty much the end of the matter in a goodly number of cases, maybe 60

per cent or higher. It is in the rest of those cases where the welfare of infants is very much at stake that the report is really necessary.

My third point, Mr. Speaker, is that if the House is going to make the alteration required under The Matrimonial Causes Act, I would like to know and this is not so much in the nature of a question, which I can ask in another place, so I will put it rhetorically—whether the Attorney General's office has envisaged the full impact of the alteration being made.

I would like to refer to section 1 of subsection 5 of The Infants Act which covers all actions for custody, not just actions for divorce. I notice in your note adversion is made to divorce only, but the Act as it is being amended here today would affect custody matters and also rights of access to the children, and that these would fall outside the discretion of the judge as it presently exists. It would make the payment of costs of official guardian's reports mandatory upon whichever litigant finally requested and desired and bore the burden of the costs in the eventualities of the action.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could not hear the hon. member on that last sentence—he said, “would make the costs mandatory upon—” and then I did not get the rest of it.

Mr. Lawlor: I am sorry. Upon the individual for whose benefit the full report was obtained. In other words what I am saying is that I wonder really if you wanted the thing limited to divorce actions only, or in certain cases only did the Minister really intend to extend the provisions of this amendment, making the costs to be borne by the parties here, and not by the provincial government, even in cases of actions having to do with access to children, and thirdly in the whole realm of custody actions?

If that was the intent, fine; all I can suggest to you is, that is what you have achieved. Let us not achieve things we did not intend, or intend things we did not achieve. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this before the Minister replies? The hon. Attorney General has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a few brief remarks and I appreciate again the comments of the hon. member, which are thoughtful. First of all I would admit promptly and immediately that I

think this will increase the costs of the proceedings in divorce actions to the litigants, or at least to one of the litigants.

If the action is such that it comes within the area where legal aid is granted, those who cannot afford it will not be damaged in that way by the increase of costs. The great majority of actions, I submit, are carried on by persons who are well able to pay the costs in their divorce proceedings. They should pay rather than having the province pay through carrying the costs of the official guardian, who in turn pays The Children's Aid Society, which does the investigation for them.

We have thought about the effects, but I think there is perhaps \$700,000 or \$800,000 involved here, in costs, not all of which will be passed on to litigants because in those areas where proceedings, as I say, are sifted through our legal aid programme, the province will still be picking up a substantial portion of that amount.

As to the second point, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I think the hon. member is not talking to the principle of this bill, but I was glad to have his suggestion when he said, "Have you thought about removing the official guardian entirely?" This bill does not attempt or consider that, or suggest that in any way, but it does say that the cost of the official guardian in these investigations shall be paid by the petitioner when he files a report.

So, we are really a bit off the principle here when we discuss this, but it is a useful thought to consider, and perhaps having said that, I might leave it at this time. It is something that has, I think, certain merits for consideration, but the principle of our present Act, if I could just stay on this for a moment, that where there are children under the age; named in the Act; involved in a separation; breakup of a marriage; in a divorce proceeding; in a dissolution of a marriage, that in every such case there shall be the investigation and that report being filed, the judge may read it and make himself aware of the character, the ability of the parents, their attitudes, the ages and educational status of the children and all the circumstances surrounding them. It is quite a substantial report and I think it is of very great value but in any case, it is not contemplated to change that situation in this bill.

Now as to the third point—the effect it may have on litigants—again, bringing it back to costs—I have noted the hon. member's remark about section 1 of subsection 5, The Infants

Act. It is to be noted that the costs are at the discretion of the judge and he may seek to make any disposition that appeals to him on the facts that come before him. So I think I need say nothing more on this matter, than that.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 67, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Mr. Lawlor: A few brief remarks on this, Mr. Speaker, if you will. I do not think it is a breach of the accord that exists between myself, Mr. Speaker, and the Attorney General to mention that I did slip into the seat beside him the other day and make mention of this bill, as to the effects when he abolishes subsection 2 of section 2, which is the purpose of this bill, to wipe out the amount of money to provide for the support and maintenance of a child, which has been up to now limited at a maximum of \$20 a week irrespective of the financial condition of the father, if he happens to be the deserting spouse, or for that matter, of the mother. When he does that, he throws the whole weight back and I think he will agree that the first subsection of the bill is too restrictive in the scope allowed to the discretion of the judge in awarding these costs, because it directs it against the husband only.

No mention is made of the role of a wife here who, in some circumstances in modern life, may be a darn sight better off than her husband. At least some contribution may go towards the total, the overall care and maintenance of the child from, say, the wife, if she happens to have custody of the children and is in extremely good financial circumstances over against the husband, who may not be in nearly as good circumstances. At least for periods of time one party may be in a better position than the other. The whole intent—I think the Attorney General will agree with me, Mr. Speaker—of this Act is to see that the children are well looked after, no matter who pays. I have suggested to him that perhaps it would be in order to widen the scope of the wording so that while judges, as everyone admits these days, do take the circumstances of both spouses into consideration, I suggest, have no formal power or jurisdiction with which to do so under the wording of

your existing legislation. It did not matter so much as long as subsection 2 was there. It may matter to some extent now.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further comment before the Minister has the floor? The hon. the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, again I appreciate the thoughtful consideration which has been given to this matter, and I did appreciate his speaking to me earlier about this proposed amendment and his thoughts on it.

I think that in our jurisprudence, as it has been established, the judge has power, and I think this has been carried out in some cases. The courts do take into account the financial ability of both parents. I think the thought is worthwhile that if we found there is a lack of this power, then we would have to move perhaps in another bill or another amendment to provide it. But I am aware and I am sure the hon. members are aware that the courts have exerted this power and have called upon both parents as the circumstances indicated to support the children. I think our whole jurisprudence accepts the fact that both parents have a responsibility, financial and otherwise, with respect to the children.

In doing this, I might say, we were simply implementing a recommendation made by Mr. McRuer. Perhaps I should have thought more deeply—but Mr. McRuer in considering this matter, made a recommendation. It is number 248, at page 1290 of his report and he simply said:

The limitation of \$20 per week maximum that a father may be ordered by a magistrate or juvenile court judge to pay for the maintenance of a child should be removed.

And he refers to where he made that recommendation at page 570—I think that is in the second volume—of his report No. 1.

We have been taking some pride in accomplishing the implementation of these recommendations and I hope one day to be able to say to the House that we have well over the 200, or up to the 300 mark. This was just one of those that we felt was a simple one to pick up and get before the House as promptly as possible and it is exactly what the right hon. gentleman recommended.

But I am glad to have the thought that you offered.

Mr. Lawlor: I believe in preventative medicine.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 68, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 69, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 70, An Act respecting The Department of Justice.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill establishes the department or at least it grows on the establishment a year ago. One thing that I particularly wanted to mention briefly in passing, is what has stuck in my mind from the debate last year about Mace, when the Attorney General indicated he did not have the authority to direct the police commissions as to the use of any particular weapon or method, he could make recommendations but nothing involving anything beyond that.

My feeling is that this amendment might very well have set out in a much clearer way, that we consider the Attorney General as the top official directing the affairs of the police forces across the province. We believe in their autonomy under their own police commissions—and this is a changing aspect—but I feel that there should be in this House, as the repository of the power, one person who is responsible for the activities, responsible in the broad sense for the activities of the police and the police commissions that govern them. I feel something is wrong when the Attorney General and Minister of Justice can, and does say in the House, that he does not have the power to instruct the police to do thus, or perhaps not to do certain things. Autonomy is one thing, but responsibility is what I am looking for and I would feel this is still a flaw in the organization of The Attorney General's Department, or, at least, his concept of his responsibilities as its first Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak? The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, they come too fast and furious for one, you know. When the flood gates are let loose there is no end of expurgation.

This is a very interesting Act which brings in a whole slew of chapters in the Metro area, and which we discussed during the estimates last year at some length, as to precisely what the purpose of the Attorney General's office was, what its functions were.

If you remember at that time—and this Act seeks to embody it—he was raised in some rather mysterious way; he was deified above the heads of other members of Cabinet, and he had to perform a two-fold function which, I notice in a speech by the hon. Attorney General to the New Brunswick section of the Canadian bar, in February of 1966, he finds, to say the least, ambivalent and which may even be conflicting. He is a man who is torn asunder with his responsibilities. Now he has put it down in black and white so that we can all refer to it to his detriment whenever a provincial judge goes off the rails. And when we think he should be beholden to this House in a way that other Cabinet members are not, and even against, possibly, the more partisan position of his own government on occasion, when seeking to play down or to obviate a certain difficulty that has occurred, he must rise above that, he must transcend the immediate partisan issues and give straight advice to the House in a sovereign way which is very difficult to do, I suggest, and as McRuer says in the course of the report, requires a little tight-rope walking.

Well, I have seen this occur in my brief time in this House on a number of occasions. I thought you straddled the rope rather well. Sometimes you have to sit on it, you know, if your legs are straddled, but—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit. Is the hon. member going to suggest that by some language in a statute, or by not presenting a bill to define the responsibilities and powers of the Attorney General, that this dual role could be obviated, or that somehow he could direct the Attorney General to be non-political, non-partisan in certain matters? Does he think he could accomplish that in a statute? I would be glad to know if he would tell me how to go, if he wants me to accomplish that.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, I am not much of a pragmatist, but it would have to rely on the individual case, nevertheless. That is what the very high-minded—and in some cases terribly idealistic—Mr. McRuer precisely recommends, as I read them, and I think the hon. the Attorney General well knows that. You know, in that speech to which I referred he talks about the plight of being an Attorney General, what a nest of vipers it is, and he quotes from a Mr. John Collier, a lawyer, who called himself *Amicus Curiae*, and wrote as follows: "He is only to be considered as the servant of the servants, the curse of the Israelites." And it is the Attorney General who recognizes the sign on his forehead that he quotes against himself in this regard. There is much more of interest in this speech, by the way, touching this very duality—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might say to the hon. member that those remarks and I think, perhaps, some of what Mr. McRuer has set forth, I found in a very lengthy and complete treatise by Professor Edwards, of the University of Toronto, and he uses that expression, the "tightrope walker," and torn asunder, and so on. So it is all there, they are not my original thoughts and I would not want to take credit for them.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They are academically pure, are they?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Quite pure.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, and may I say that I have been trying to get that. That book has been stolen from the library and you are the only one who has a copy.

Well, I had much more to say on this but I think the main thrust of my remarks could be saved for the committee of the whole House in the way of questioning on the various paragraphs.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, too, that the library I had, I gave up as part of the change of making room for members opposite, so I have no place to find books or even to return them, if I still have them.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I was absent from the House. It has been my intention, of course, to speak to the various bills on the order paper emanating from The Department of the Attorney General. I was in the law library preparing

some notes in connection with the private members' hour, but I would just like, if I might, to suggest that it would be nice to know what orders we are going to. Are we on The Department of Justice bill now, sir?

It is terrible to be popular, I suppose, or not popular. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this bill, I am concerned with two things, and the first is that my notes are all downstairs in my desk. That is the first concern that I have. My first point. It was section 8, I believe sir, that caused me concern. No, I am sorry, the functions and responsibilities of the Minister under section 5, and subsection (c) of section 5. Perhaps my friend from Lakeshore has mentioned this, but I am not at all content with the generalization there, "shall superintend all matters connected with the administration of justice in Ontario."

As I recall the hon. Mr. McRuer in his report dealing with the obligations, functions and responsibilities of this department, made no mistake in directing to the hon. the Attorney General that he has, of course, a responsibility for the direction of law enforcement throughout the province. Now, I invite the hon. the Attorney General to perhaps interrupt me at this stage. The position that I take is that he has not clothed himself in this statute, with sufficient power. The notes that I do not have with me are records of *Hansard* where the Attorney General has replied to myself and others in this House, in connection with the use of Mace, and in connection with the alleged autonomy of various police departments in the province of Ontario.

This has caused me great concern, because I think it should be understood, unequivocally, in some statutes established by this Legislature, that the Attorney General, without fetter or restriction, has the right to direct the police forces of this province. And then he can come back to us here, and we can have a day in court with him, so to speak. And I am not at all happy—

Mr. Speaker: For the benefit of the hon. member I might point out that this point was raised by his leader a little earlier in this debate.

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, that is fine. I apologize to you, sir.

Mr. Speaker: No, no, I just thought the hon. member should know.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, I realize that you must restrict me, but that was the prime concern that I had with this bill, and basically this is

the essence of my position, or the essence, I believe, of the position of this party, that we would like to see introduced into this legislation less general, less ambiguous words than "shall superintend all matters connected with the administration of justice."

I do believe under the present Police Act and I believe under The Police Commission Act, that the legal position taken by the Attorney General in this House has been wrong. I regret that I cannot specify to you and to the other members of this House the foundation for that position, since I do not have these statutes before me at the present time. But I do take the position that you do have control over local police commissions, under The Ontario Police Commission Act. I do not think there should be any reticence on the part of the hon. the Attorney General that if he is not happy with Mace, that he direct the police forces of this province that they shall not use it in the future.

Because I, as one citizen of the city of Sarnia, do not want to find that my Attorney General is disclosing to me in the House some features of this weapon that might have adverse and long-lasting effects upon me, and find that my chief of police has an arsenal of it at home. This is what I look for as one member of the House. I look for protection. That is basically my position, sir, with respect to the principle of the bill, I do not think anybody can take issue with it. As I understand it, it attempts to codify what has grown up to be a common law position in connection with The Department of the Attorney General. I invite the Attorney General's comments to my general remarks.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member?

Mr. J. Renwick: I would like to make a brief comment. Any ambiguity that the hon. member for Sarnia would find in the functions assigned to the Attorney General would certainly be removed by the fourth heading of his functions. I just admire the Attorney General, who is going "to perform the duties and has the powers that belong to the Attorney General and Solicitor General of England by law or usage, so far as those duties and powers are applicable to Ontario, and also shall perform the duties and have the powers that up to the time The British North America Act, 1867, came into effect belonged to the offices of the Attorney General and Solicitor General in the provinces of Canada and Upper Canada, and which under the provisions of that Act, are within the scope of the powers of the Legislature."

I can only admire the directness and specificity of the functions which the Attorney General is going to assume under this bill. I assume that when we come into the committee of the whole House to deal with that clause, he will be able to give us a precise and accurate list of the duties he is going to perform. I am particularly interested whether or not he is now going—as the Attorney General in England does—to appear in the courts on behalf of the Crown in the right of the province of Ontario in matters which come within the purview of his functions. Or, is he going to consider that he will not have to appear in the courts because of this limited language, “so far as those duties and powers are applicable in Ontario”?

I think quite seriously the Attorney General could do something about the ambiguity, the indirection and the lack of precision of that particular area of the functions which he is going to take under the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Any further discussion before the Minister? The hon. Attorney General has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am almost overwhelmed by this admiration expressed by the hon. member for Riverdale in those wide terms of that subsection.

I should point out at once to the hon. member that in drafting this bill, we followed again very closely the recommendations of the hon. Mr. McRuer. He will find exactly the language of subsection (c) on page 952 of his report, No. 1, volume 2. The subsection (d) to which the member for Riverdale has referred, is exactly the language set forth in Mr. McRuer's recommendation. And Mr. McRuer, in setting forth those recommendations, was quoting, I think, with very great approval from The Newfoundland Act. He said:

The Newfoundland Act which is modelled on the other Act in force in the provinces prior to 1952, serves as a useful precedent. For convenience we quote in full the relevant section—

And then he quotes it, and I think he quotes it with approbation. Bear in mind, in Britain you have the Attorney General who has time perhaps to go to court and take cases in the civil side at least, because there is a Solicitor General and a Home Secretary in that government and they divide all the activities in that country which the Attorney General of the province of Ontario encompasses within his office.

At Ottawa, you have the Attorney General and Minister of Justice, and you have a Solicitor General. The Solicitor General has under his hand the RCMP, his police force. And he has the administration of the Exchequer Court, and the Supreme Court of Canada. In Ontario you do not have a Solicitor General to take care of police matters or to look after administration of courts.

The Attorney General must not only have the administration of justice, be a prosecutor and defend the rights of the Crown as well as the rights of the public, but he has the police to carry out the investigation of crime. He must appear in that role as well as the role of prosecutor, the defender of the public, see to the administration of the courts, that they are maintained and that they operate. The duties of Solicitor General, Attorney General, Minister of Justice and, in Britain, Home Secretary, are wrapped up in one, in the hands of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General in Ontario.

When I came to this office just under five years ago, there were all those Acts—of Consumer Protection, The Securities Act, Real Estate and Business Brokers, Used Car Dealers and Bailiff. They were all in the office of the Attorney General. Fortunately they are now administered under another department.

As to the main question raised here by the leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for Sarnia, particularly, the question as to whether the Attorney General should control the police.

Mr. Bullbrook: Direct them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, yes, direct them. I would take that word, but if you direct them, you pretty well control them. I must say that considerable thought was given to inserting such a power in this Act. It is to be borne in mind that the Attorney General has operated without any departmental Act. Actually, there is no Department of the Attorney General at this moment, he is simply named as an official of the government. There is no such thing as a Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. MacDonald: He has a pretty free hand.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is free, yes, to a degree, bearing in mind that he must walk the tightrope.

Mr. MacDonald: And sometimes fall off among the vipers.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I never used that expression, that is someone else's.

We came to the conclusion, and I think perhaps it may put at rest the minds of some of the hon. members, to say to you that I propose to present amendments to The Police Act, wherein will be found the power to direct the police and perhaps control them in certain directions. Presently our Police Act does provide for direction and control of police forces and it is done by our Ontario police commission. It reports to the Attorney General and is responsible to him. The Attorney General, of course, reports to the Legislature as the responsible Minister of the government.

The weapons that police may carry, the equipment they may wear, the training they are to receive, the standard to which they achieve in all these matters is done presently under The Police Act. I think it is properly there that I would provide the direction and control—particularly on the matter of equipment or weapons.

I do not think the Attorney General should be able to say to a police force: "You are not to wear a revolver or a billy". Chemical Mace is a weapon and there will be and are other weapons; no doubt, that would be involved. I do not think it is up to the Attorney General to place that matter directly under his hand. In The Police Act you will find set out at length the powers and responsibilities of the Ontario Police Commission. One of them is to govern the police forces of this province—the municipal forces and the Ontario provincial police force—and to report to the Attorney General and this House on their conduct performance and the carrying out of their responsibilities. That Act I feel is the proper place to add the present powers, very similar to what you have suggested might be added in The Department of Justice Act. That is, the power to deal not only with this particular weapon, Mace, but all weapons. We are moving to that and you will—I think I may say to you—have deal with it this session. I think that is the place for it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General would permit a short question?

As I understand what you are saying, it is all right for the Ontario Police Commission to direct unilaterally and specifically as far as an armament arsenal is concerned but it is not all right for The Department of Justice or Attorney General to do so. I do not follow that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was not saying that exactly. I perhaps should have made it plain that neither the Attorney General nor the Ontario Police Commission has this power at this moment. The Ontario Police Commission has certain powers if inspecting, advising and regulating. Neither the Attorney General nor the Ontario Police Commission have the power to say—we checked this when this matter first arose some months ago—use or do not use a weapon or equip or do not equip yourself with this. We are seeking that power and I shall bring forward to hon. members—I think in appropriate language and legislation—that power which I trust the House will then give to what I think is the proper body.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is the nub of the point, if I might, Mr. Speaker, ask the—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Bullbrook: —ask the Attorney General—

Mr. Speaker: Order:

The agreement has been here that in order to deal with these things satisfactorily all the members speak to the bill and then, the Attorney General or the Minister having carriage of it replies to it, and unless we follow that, we are going to be into an interminable debate. I have allowed the hon. member again to ask a question which he has already placed to the Attorney General, and he had a reply. Now if the hon. member has a question which is something else again and which he would like to ask, and not a reiteration of the previous question, I will give him the floor; otherwise, I will put the motion.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Of course, your ruling is quite correct.

The fact of the matter is that I thought the Attorney General had brought to the attention of the House, something of which they were not aware. That is, he intended to bring in new legislation dealing with the very matter that I had brought up. I wanted to ask, if I might be permitted a question of the Attorney General, how do you rationalize the distinction? Why should this power be vested in the Ontario Police Commission rather than in you, a member of this House and a Minister of the Crown and directly responsible to us?

Mr. Speaker: I would rule the hon. member out of order because that has not been introduced into the House. It is not in this bill and when it is introduced, then I think it is

a proper question of the hon. member to ask on the second reading.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FINES AND FORFEITURES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 71, An Act to amend The Fines and Forfeitures Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE EVIDENCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 1, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill 1 reported.

THE DAMAGE BY FUMES ARBITRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 23, An Act to amend The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 2 of section 6 as contained in section 2 of the bill be amended by striking out "Minister of Mines" in the 12th line and inserting in lieu thereof "Minister of Health".

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Minister just what is the significance of that change?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, the significance of this amendment is that it is the wish of the government to change the administration of the Act from The Department of Mines to The Department of Health.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. member

for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk), that section 3 be amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

Section 3, subsection 2: The provisions of this Act, The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act may not be waived in whole or in part by any person.

Section 3, subsection 3: Any and all waivers that are presently in force shall be null and void as of the date that this Act comes into force.

Speaking to this amendment, Mr. Chairman, to cover a waiver that is presently in a number of deeds of property transfers from this government to the general population, we have extended the bill to cover a wider field of damage from different sources. And yet we allow a very, very unfair waiver to exist and to go on existing in deeds that are granted by this government on Crown land that is sold in Crown land sales. I spoke to this last year and I pointed out what I thought were the unfair provisions of that waiver. This amendment will remove that waiver from present deeds and will prevent its being inserted in any deeds in the future.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell us about the terms of that order-in-council back in 1941 or 1942 that requires that all grants from the Crown of lands in a state of nature be subject to this easement, the easement for sulphur fumes?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Not being part of the administration, Mr. Chairman, in 1942 when—

Mr. Sopha: I am not denying that—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —when that order-in-council was passed, I can merely say that when two of the hon. members brought the question up in the estimates of The Department of Mines last year, I must admit that was the first that I had heard of it. I have checked into the matter since then. It is simply a question today in relation more to private contracts than it is to public policy in respect of Crown grants. And, of course, I am not too sure even with the wording of this particular amendment which is before the House right now, if what the the hon. member is attempting to achieve would be achieved. If it is, I would suggest that it would affect a great number of private contracts but might have some surprising effects—under those circumstances certainly, because I do not think enough thought has been put into it or even into the wording by the hon.

member, that the amendment would be acceptable to the government.

Mr. Chairman: Might I just say to the hon. member that I do not think the motion as it is, is quite in order because section 3 reads:

This Act comes into force on the 1st day of January.

And the hon. member wants to add certain other subsections.

I think perhaps what he wanted to do was to add another section so that sections 3 and 4 should be renumbered sections 4 and 5.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, speaking to this point, I think the whole intention of this amendment—knowing full well that I cannot amend a government bill—was to bring to the attention of the Minister and of this government the unfairness of the waiver that now exists.

Mr. Chairman: May I say to the hon. member that I am not at all suggesting that his amendment and the concept thereof is not proper; I am suggesting that he should not be amending section 3, but he should be renumbering the sections and adding a new section 3 and renumbering the present 3 and 4, numbers 4 and 5. Then the motion would be proper.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I will accept that.

Mr. Chairman: Fine!

Mr. Jackson: I would just like to ask a question of the Minister. He says this will affect a great number of people. Does he not believe that the ones that are affected will be affected in a beneficial way? The only persons that can possibly be hurt by this amendment are the companies that have got off scot-free for a number of years because of this waiver.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I did not say it would affect a great number of people; I said it might possibly affect a great number of private contracts. I think the implication of this particular amendment has not really been thought through by the hon. member or his friends. I am saying that the implications of it may be much wider than he would suspect and that in any event I think the legislation under The Pollution Control Act, and specifically the legislation which is going to be administered in the area by The Department of Health henceforth will more than cover those releases in certain deeds in the

Sudbury area and around any of the smelting areas that now exist.

I know what the hon. member is after here and I have some sympathy for his point of view, but I would suggest that the implications of the actual wording in the amendment are such that I do not really think he has thought them out.

Mr. Jackson: I will accept any rewording that the Minister wishes to make to accomplish the same purpose that he has already recognized as being my purpose.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. leader of the Opposition?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I am interested to hear the exchange between the Minister and the hon. member who proposed the amendment. Part of the amendment seems to set out a very good principle indeed and the Minister has indicated that he sees some validity in the purpose. I might only say that if the Minister could make some further accommodation, even moving towards the removal of these special provisions, then it would be certainly an improvement in the present legislation. Otherwise if the Minister is not going to offer the possibility of such a change we would simply content ourselves with supporting the amendment as it now stands.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I am not making myself clear. I am suggesting that the general legislation relating to air pollution administered by The Department of Health, and especially the expansion that is going to take place in the administration of that Act in certain mining areas in the north, I would think, more than covers the purpose attempted to be covered by this particular amendment, the implications of which, I think, are much wider than the hon. member realizes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps in the circumstances, since it is 5 o'clock, the Minister might very well take this matter up with the member for Timiskaming to see whether it is possible, when this section comes again before the committee of the whole House, to make an appropriate amendment to meet the point. I make the suggestion simply because of the lack of precision in what the Minister has had to say in the problem that the amendment raises. He uses the phrase, for example, "surprising results" and yet I do not know any clear way in which I can appreciate what those results

would be. If that suggestion would be acceptable it would give an opportunity for consultation about the matter.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister care to comment on the suggestions?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I thought I had made my position quite clear.

Mr. Chairman: Then I have a motion before me; the committee has a motion before them and the Chairman is not going to anticipate that the motion will carry or be defeated. Therefore I think the proper wording should be included. I would suggest that the motion should read:

That section 3 be amended by substituting the following and that present sections 3 and 4 be renumbered 4 and 5.

Is this agreeable?

Those in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Timiskaming will please say, aye.

Those opposed will please say, nay.

In my opinion the nays have it.

Call in the members.

The hon. member for Timiskaming has moved that section 3 be amended by substituting the following:

Section 3(1), The provisions of this Act, The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act, may be waived in whole or in part by any person.

Section 3(2), Any and all waivers that are presently in force shall be null and void as of the date this Act comes into force.

And that the present sections 3 and 4 be renumbered 4 and 5.

All those in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Timiskaming will please rise.

All those opposed to the hon. member's motion will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 38, the nays 47.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost. Section 3 stands as part of the bill.

Section 4 agreed to.

Bill 23 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendments, one bill with amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House reports one bill without amendment, and one bill with amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

GOVERNING BODIES OF UNIVERSITIES

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East) moves second reading of Bill 19, An Act to provide for the governing bodies of universities.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, may I say how pleased I am that there are so many members in the House to participate in this debate and I expect they will still be here at ten after six or so?

This bill, An Act to provide for the governing bodies of universities, reconstructs the governing bodies of universities, replacing boards of governors and senates with one governing council having democratic representation of undergraduate and post graduate students, faculty members, alumnae, who would include the public community and the administrative staff, and including other appointed and *ex officio* members representing governmental links.

This Act, sir, would abolish the boards of governors and senates of Ontario universities. That is to say, it would abolish the present two-tier system of government which belies the principle that a university is a collectivity—a community of scholars—and it would replace this two-tier system with a single system, a one-tier system of government which would reflect the principle that our universities are a collectivity.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that as a bill which will never see the light of second reading—since it is introduced by a member of the official Opposition—the purpose of this bill is basically to stimulate discussion on some of the main and essential issues affecting our universities today. I believe, sir, that it is time that we started talking here, in this Legislature, about issues that are relevant to social change and reform which are now being reflected in our universities. I would fully support amendments to this bill if they could be proven to be in line with university reform.

I hoped that this bill would provoke a constructive debate, as it has already, concerning the need for reform in our universities. I should point out that this bill has been

circulated widely to university presidents, to university senates, to university students and to student council leaders for their opinions. And I hope that when I introduce this bill again next year it will be substantially revised to include their constructive suggestions. It is, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, somewhat like The Engineers Act, Bill 48, which, when it was introduced by the government, was introduced for the purpose of provoking productive discussion as opposed to trying to impose a single solution on a very complex problem.

I should also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, Bill 19, and its companion Bill 11—establishing the universities commission and abolishing The Department of University Affairs—are based on my remarks in this Legislature almost a year ago. In my reply to the Minister of University Affairs' (Mr. Davis) introduction of estimates, I outlined what I considered to be a constructive alternative strategy to the question of university affairs and reform in this province. The two bills grew out of my remarks at that time.

As I have noted, when I introduced the bills—at least noted publicly if not in this House—Bill 19, the one before this House today, assumes the enactment of Bill 11, which establishes the universities commission and abolishes The Department of University Affairs. The reason for this, sir, is that, as I stated last year in this House, it is necessary that the government, that the legislators, establish unequivocally the principle of free and autonomous universities. That is to say, to free the universities of direct penetration of their internal affairs by this government.

That is the purpose of Bill 11. By abolishing The Department of University Affairs, you abolish the ability of a Minister of the government, of a politician, to try to influence by innuendo, to try to influence by direct action and discussion, what takes place in the internal affairs of individual universities. For example, I simply point out that the Minister of University Affairs, by referring to myself as the member from York University, has intimidated my position at York University. Whether or not he meant it, the fact is that by making that statement in the House, he made, I am sure, people involved with York University very nervous about having a teaching member M.P.P. on their faculty being labelled by the Minister of University Affairs as speaking for that institution in this province.

So I would like at this time to make it quite clear that I have submitted a request to

York University requesting a full-time leave of absence, so the type of intimidation engaged in by the Minister of University Affairs will have no effect on decisions at York University. I refused to offer my leader my resignation as the university affairs critic in response to such pressure by a politician on the other side of this House.

Now, I would also like to state that one of the basic principles of this bill which I have submitted is to make The University Act a public Act, and this view, I believe, is being supported by the member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) from the New Democratic Party. It is a view that is denied by the present Minister of University Affairs. I would like to suggest, sir that the crises on our campuses in Ontario will not just go away. The crises are public crises. They are no longer the preserve of the university. This bill is designed as a small step towards solving those crises, or, as I prefer to say, defusing the crises on the campuses of Ontario's universities. It is a recognition on the part of the official Opposition, and I would hope on the part of the New Democratic Party, of the public responsibility of government for constructive reform in our universities.

The situation on the university campuses is explosive. It is potentially destructive in Ontario. The question of the reform of the internal exercise of power and decision making within our universities is an immediate issue. The universities of this province cannot, by themselves, solve the basic questions about how they are to be governed from within. The government of Ontario must act now to defuse the explosion on our university campuses.

The present division of powers within each university, between the senate and the boards of governors, is artificial, inefficient and expensive, and belies the concept that the university is, in fact, a collectivity, as expressed by Dr. J. A. Corry when he was president of Queens University. It is my view, sir, and the view of the Liberal Party, that unless the government of Ontario acts now we are faced with chaos within our universities. An unhealthy polarisation is taking place, a battle between entrenched and undemocratic boards of governors and student radicals. It is becoming more and more entrenched board power versus student power. Both sides, by their extremism, provoke extremism in the other. Victory by either side, sir, will ruin our universities. Victory by either side is unacceptable to the voters and taxpayers of this province.

I believe that my bill, or some modification of it, will prevent that destructive confrontation which is already becoming evident at many campuses at Ontario's universities. This bill calls for positive action by the government of Ontario. The government simply cannot stand at the edge of the shore and try to tell the tide of unrest to go back. It will not go back. Reform is needed, and reform is needed now. This bill, if you like, is a complicated solution to an extremely complicated and dangerous problem. It must be debated fully and openly by all concerned. There are no simple solutions to violence on university campuses.

This theme that I am proposing, sir, that the polarisation is in fact taking place on university campuses, is supported by a number of observations which I cannot, of course, go into in depth. I would like to talk about what I call the entrenched board of governors power, the extremism within the boards of governors of Ontario universities. Not all boards of governors and governors are extremists, but there are within each university board of governors I suggest, an extreme element that is as dangerous to the internal harmony, to the internal collectivity, of our universities, as the extreme and destructive student radical.

And I would say, sir, as I have already said in this House, as an example of what I mean by extreme destructive board of governors' power, the remarks made by George Drew. George Drew is on the board of governors of the University of Toronto. He was put there by the Conservative Premier of this province. And this is the same man who in recent months pulled out a 1936 anti-communist speech and labelled all student radicals as part of an international communist conspiracy.

I refer the members to pages 716 and 717 in *Hansard*, where I support that he made the statement. His slander and intolerance is only equalled by the intolerance of the few, the very few, student destructivists who say that every member of every university board of governors is a vicious, exploiting capitalist. I suggest, sir, that that type of intolerance by members of board of governors at closed meetings and open meetings, and that type of extreme statement of intolerance by a very few student destructivists, as I call them, has no place in a community which is designed to pursue academic excellence.

To show you how minutely entrenched power can cause an unhealthy situation on the campuses, sir, I would like to refer to what

might be called a hypothetical situation, but which illustrates the type of power that a board of governors has still on many university campuses across this province. I refer simply to a few extreme members of boards of governors who treat the university as their toy hobby, who because of the power of their personal and corporate purses can force, hypothetically in this example a full-blown football team on a new university.

Not really force perhaps, but decide without consultation with anyone else in that university that that university is to have a semi-professional football team. Without consulting with the people concerned with student life on that university, just overnight, out of their private pockets, they say, "Here's the money provided you use it to finance a semi-professional football team." This is, of course, a hypothetical example but this type of thing can still happen so easily in a university. And that is what is meant by an arbitrary board of governors. That is what is meant by the use of the purse by certain members on the board of governors to pervert the purpose of an institution. It is a small example but I think a fairly significant example.

I need only refer the members also to what might be called the blackmail tactics used by the Minister Without Anything from Scarborough North. He has said, you know, that students must not rebel against society, they must not make their views known about society and how bad they think it is, because if they do the capitalists will not hire them for summer jobs. Well, I suggest that a Minister of the government should not go around making such stupid statements.

That is one side of the polarization and to that extent the student radicals are correct. The other side of the polarization we all know has to do with the extreme student destructivists, if you like. The dramatic destruction of the computer at Sir George Williams is perhaps an example of that type of destruction. But I should point out, that what the students are saying about our society—excluding a few students who are advocates of violence if necessary—is very positive in the sense it does offer alternative reforms. It is very true that they do condemn many of the values that exist in our society and they are very idealistic.

But I say that the violence that can take place and which I believe is building up in our society and also in our universities particularly, has no place on university campuses. That destruction and the advocacy of it, I feel, will be blamed on all students. That

is, when there is a destructive act on a university campus, because the members of boards of governors have the power to promote and propagandize their views, and supported by certain Ministers of the government, that the destruction of university property on our campuses will be blamed on all students, not just the extreme students, in the same way that George Drew has labelled the students as being part of an international conspiracy. That is not just, sir, and that must not come about.

What really worries me is that if this polarization takes place between the extreme element on boards of governors, between extreme students, and perhaps even extreme faculty members, this will disrupt our universities. What I am saying, sir, is that this government by taking positive action, by insisting that university Acts be public bills and not private bills, by suggesting reform which would include all members of the university community on the single governing council as proposed in my bill, that would defuse the explosion building up on our campuses. It will undercut those extreme student destructivists and the arrogant members of certain boards of governors who treat the university as their toy hobby.

If we open up our universities to this type of participation by all members of the university community, I suggest that we will have gone a long way—not the full way but a long way in knocking out the props of the student destructivists and the often ancient and not relevant members of some boards of governors.

What I am fearful of—the government not providing this type of leadership—is a repetition of the riots that took place in the Middle Ages. Let me tell you, sir, and members present, something about those riots. This is when “the town” turned “on the gown”. This is when the citizens, and in our day, the taxpayers, turned upon our universities and this is what they did in an historical example. The famous battle of St. Scholasticus in Oxford originated in a tavern quarrel.

Some students disapproved of the wine at the inn near Carfax and when the innkeeper responded with stubborn and saucy language, they threw the wine and vessel at his head. The innkeeper's friends urged the innkeeper not to put up with such abuse and they rang the bell of St. Martin's Church. A mob assembled, armed with bows and arrows and other weapons. They attacked every student that passed and fired at the chancellor who retorted by ringing the bells of St. Marys

and a mob of students assembled. The battle royal raged until nightfall but resumed the next day when the mob defeated the students, ravished their halls, slaying and wounding wherever they went.

I suggest, sir, that if we allow the destructive element to build up on our campuses, that “the town” might react in this violent way. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, destructive student power—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a question—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my remarks; I am sure the member will have his—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am not speaking on the bill, I just have a short question, if I might.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would like to finish my remarks. If we had started at five o'clock I would be most delighted to debate.

Destructive student power versus entrenched board power is not the way to bring about reform in our universities in Ontario. This Act is designed to undercut the argument of the extreme student power advocate. It is also designed to undercut the power of extreme elements on boards of governors. The minimum requirements for each Ontario university are spelled out in this Act, Mr. Speaker, which creates a single governing council for each university. A great deal of diversity is still possible on how each university governs itself, which a close reading of the Act will make clear. But at least the basic principles of participation of all members in the governments of our universities will be right.

The basic composition of the governing council is spelled out in detail. I believe the passing of this bill would defuse the destructive explosion building up on the universities. And, finally, Mr. Speaker, to show you how strongly I believe that destructive tendencies and violence are building up in universities, I would like to close by quoting Dag Hammarskjöld in his book “The Light and the Rock”. This is what he said:

We all know how, when moved by fear, people may act against what others see as their own best interest. We know how, when people are afraid, they may act even against their own fundamental will. We have seen how, when influenced by such actions, the course of events may take on aspects of inexorable futility to the point

where out of sheer weariness, no resistance to the gravitation into open conflict any longer seems possible. This is a constantly repeated pattern of tragedy.

I suggest, sir, that what Dag Hammarskjöld said of the world could, unless appropriate action is taken by this government, in this province be true on our university campuses.

Thank you.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid). I have been interested this afternoon to sit and listen to his speech and to realize in what direction the Liberal movement in this country is now moving, into a dogmatic position, as that in the federal House. And I might say that if this bill was passed and imposed upon our universities it would be nothing more than placing them in a straitjacket.

I was very pleased that the member was perhaps more or less backing down his introductory remarks about the merits of the bill and this might very well be because of the little support it has received from academic circles in this province. When the Spinks commission, which was established to study the development of graduate programmes in Ontario universities, submitted its recommendations in 1966 for the universities of Ontario this idea as presented in this bill was unanimously rejected by all parties of government, by the universities, by the public and by the press.

The principle of central control which was embodied in this recommendation was recognized as not being in the best interest of higher education. The details of inter-active development that were proposed, however, were accepted at the time in principle and many have been implemented in the intervening period. In the future, there will be much more closer interaction within the university system. Nevertheless, this should not be construed as a move towards regimentation of these institutions. Each university in Ontario has been and should continue to be different. The government is desirous of encouraging diversity in academic patterns, course offerings, style of operation and the patterns of governing under which each university operates in response to the civic needs of the community in which it finds itself.

The introduction of a bill of this nature would prevent the healthy development of self-government which is so essential to the welfare of these institutions.

The hon. member for Scarborough East has, on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, supported the view that members of the academic community, including the students, should have a greater say in determining their own destiny. The introduction of this bill runs directly contrary to those sentiments. Obviously, some of the features proposed by this bill are generally accepted. In particular, it appears to be patterned after many of the features proposed for the Ontario College of Art. The report—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No, I cannot understand why the member is against it.

Mr. J. R. Smith: The report of the commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, entitled "University Government in Canada" sparked a general review by the universities of their methods of governing. While this report was released and subsequently, the point was made on numerous occasions that the universities should have the opportunity to initiate reforms from within, not from Queen's Park. The government has always supported this stand.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Yes, but it has got to change.

Mr. J. R. Smith: As the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) stated in a recent address in Windsor:

Ontario, governments, particularly, must safeguard against any harmful intervention in university affairs which would have detrimental effects upon their true role in our society.

Surely this, in itself is reason enough to insist that the universities should undertake the major responsibility for carrying out their own reforms. It was precisely in appreciation of this basic requirement to safeguard the universities' rights of self-determination that the government of Ontario has pursued the policy of reform being initiated from within the university community.

Looking into the future, then, it becomes obvious that collective decisions must be made in the spirit of full co-operation, in order to determine the pattern of future needs in higher education. No single group within our educational institutions—be it faculty, students, or governors; or of our society, be it government, the institution itself or the public at large—can afford to overlook the needs of any of the others. Each

helps in its own way to counterbalance the other.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, we have had two bills before the private bills committee, one regarding the McMaster University in Hamilton and also, one from Carleton University in Ottawa. When presented, both had the unanimous support of those committees. Each was distinctively different, each had major reforms and yet, they suited the particular needs of those institutions. It was a kind of uniform structure for all universities. This bill presumes that all universities in Ontario are at the same stage of development, that they have the same background and that their needs are the same.

Mr. Speaker, I would maintain that all universities in this province are very different in spite of the fact that they do obtain a substantial support from the province of Ontario. I would say that they are conscious of the responsibilities they have to the public of this province as represented by the government. We feel that each of us is best aware of how they can develop a governing structure suitable to the internal needs of the university and, at the same time, responsible to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely think that each university can best determine the kind of governing structure that it needs to satisfy not only the internal requirements of university management but also to respond effectively to the requirements the public place upon it. There was a particular situation recently at McMaster University where the students demanded to play a certain role in the government of that institution. And that was provided for in the McMaster private bill.

In the introductory letter by Dr. Thode at McMaster, he stated:

In essence, McMaster has decided to continue their two-tier board-senate system with strong emphasis on close liaison between the two bodies. The senate will be the supreme academic body and the board will devote itself primarily to the roles of controlling university's financial operations and of liaison within the larger community. While retaining overall *de jure* sovereignty, the senate retains the right to nominate and the board its authority to appoint all academic personnel including the president. Provision is made for each body to elect six members to the other and to express its views on any matter of university concern. There will also be established, several joint committees to deal

with matters that have important implications for the entire university. It is anticipated that such close co-operation will provide many of the benefits that are cited by proponents of a single governing body.

Mr. Speaker, this was the result of two and a half years of study by all levels of the university community at McMaster. It was very interesting to the private bills committee that the bill had the unanimous support of all the members of that committee. I know that some of the members of that committee might have been disappointed because there were no dissidents or radicals there to oppose the bill. They just did not appear because they were unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, McMaster students have said they do not at present want a place on the board of governors of McMaster University and that is one of the reasons why they do not have a place on the board of governors. But they want a place on the senate. What is the point of thrusting a single tier of government on universities such as McMaster? The choice should come from the universities.

It should not be imposed upon them by a big brother government at Queen's Park. I feel that the university ought to determine its structure remembering the concern for their academic community and the interests of the province at large. McMaster has demonstrated a large responsibility to all the province and an even more immediate responsibility to the people of Hamilton. They must define the way in which they are going to respond to this. They have to find a way themselves of satisfying both of them with a structure that is reasonable.

In conclusion, I feel that universities should have their own individual personalities as long as this personality satisfies two needs—the public interest and the private personality of the individual community. Each university should be permitted to develop in its own way with the responsibility to the province for the economic use of provincial funds and the responsibility for the needs of the people. The university should also satisfy the specific needs of that particular university and this particular stage of development.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the member for Scarborough East in bringing this bill before this House.

We have had at least two debates on university government this year, both of them in private members bills. As the member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) has

indicated, this is scarcely a proper and appropriate forum for such a debate to take place.

I would hope that this is what can be called the official business of the role of students in our universities.

I must say that I was particularly disheartened by the comments of the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) the other night in his conclusion of the Throne Debate when he said:

We feel that university administration has tried to understand the demands of the students and has met them more than half way.

I would hope that this represents the more forward looking policy of the Liberal Party in trying to create a more effective response to the needs of our society in this particular area.

Mr. Speaker, I think before I turn to the bill itself, perhaps it is worthwhile to remind ourselves of what the function of the university is. The purpose of the university really, is to serve the needs of mankind, not in a narrow local sense but in the international sense. It does so through its efforts to preserve those things of the past which have made us more humane and more civilized. It transmits those things to the present generation and recognizes the right of that generation to reject or accept and, of course, to seek our new horizons of knowledge for future generations.

The question of university government, I think, revolves around the whole problem of what kind of an atmosphere can be created in which these activities can best take place.

In past centuries it has not been inappropriate for the church to have control where the faculty were expected to accept the tenets of a particular church or a particular sect before they were allowed in university, before they were allowed to do research in that university, indeed before they were allowed to participate in any way.

Today, I think, our society expects that participation and dialogue in an atmosphere of freedom are the bases on which those activities can best take place.

Then we come directly into the problem which the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), I think, alluded to—the whole question as to how you can impose “freedom”. The whole question of academic freedom, I suppose, as expressed in the right of the university to carry on its own affairs without interference from governmental institutions. This clashes with our own responsibilities as legislators here in this Chamber for ensuring that the educational system of this

province provides those things which we believe to be necessary—equality of educational opportunity, for example—and of course to ensure that the taxation of the people of Ontario is best used at the post secondary level. Thus, in a sense, there is a direct confrontation of two principles—and I think we have to seek out some kind of balance.

First and most important I would want to say that this party would view with the greatest sympathy all of the matters which the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), has brought forward: the need for greater student participation; the need for a more meaningful activity on the part of faculty within the university administration; and also the need for some kind of responsible way by which the community can have its influence upon the university.

At the same time I think this party would take the point of view that guidelines established by this Chamber should be put in a more general fashion; that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to suggest that a university such as the University of Toronto, with some 20,000 students; with a number of church affiliated colleges; with a great many faculties—really a multi-university, should have the same number in its governing body and should have the same kind of governing body as, let us say, a small non-sectarian university which may only have two or three thousand students.

Perhaps we ought to admit that the member for Scarborough East and I are created by our circumstances. He has participated in a very large multi-university. I have participated in a very small university. For that reason I find it very difficult to see the small university being governed by the same structure which he sees as being quite acceptable and appropriate for the large universities, such as York University.

If I might just take one or two areas. I was also delighted to hear him say that this will be brought forward again next year, and I would hope this might be a developing dialogue which will take place year after year and which I think could be helpful to universities right across this province so I shall take one area—the role of students.

This particular bill suggests that the council could have six to eight students, yet I was interested in the private members bill—when the Carleton bill came before the committee, to see that it was possible there, because of the way in which students were being fed into the governing structure, it was possible that maybe 20, 25 or even 30—

although quite unlikely, but nevertheless a much larger number of students could actually eventually find their way into the Senate of that university.

I would immediately accept the problem that the member for Scarborough East brought up in relation to the dichotomy of the Senate and the board of governors. Although the board of governors is usually expected to look after financial matters, in essence they do make decisions which may seriously affect the academic matters which the Senate itself has to deal with.

At McMaster they tried to solve this by a committee between these two bodies in which they hoped to interpret the thinking of one, to the other and it seems to me that that was a very natural and acceptable way of dealing with it in that particular setting.

One of the things that I am sure the member who put forward this resolution would realize is that most of the decisions are not made in the Senate at all. They are made in Senate committees and one of the problems I see in this bill is the lack, perhaps, of structuring the students into the real guts, the real nuts and bolts, of the administration of a university. Possibly that might be a subject to which he might turn himself.

Another problem that I see, is the lack of any structuring of taking decisions to the students or to the general student body about matters taking place in the Senate or the board of governors. You have six or eight students on that board of governors who can be mere tokens and who can, indeed, be effectively separated from the general student body. I would suggest that possibly this might also be another direction which could be explored in the future.

As well as this, of course, I think that the faculty role has not been, perhaps, as clearly defined as it might be. This is a community of scholars, and faculty are a very important part of that community. In some universities the senate is entirely made up of faculty. That is true of the university of which I happen to be a part.

For one thing, the administration are taking part in the teaching role, and they are therefore regarded as faculty. In some cases the board of governors are entirely business oriented. In some universities they are representative of a very wide community, and, once again at the university which I happen to be part of, the board of governors do not represent the corporate elite, as I think one would narrowly define it.

And so, there is, I think, a problem of flexibility and I am wondering whether we cannot, in this Legislature, in discussion of this bill, both this year and in ensuing years, decide among ourselves on what could be called a number of guidelines.

One, I think, has been suggested by the member. First the guideline of openness. I notice, for example, that he suggests both the senate or at least the general council, would have its meetings completely open to the public. I think this is an important development. The concept that the things that are being talked about in what is essentially a public institution, should be completely open. The minutes should be printed, they should be distributed, and there should be every opportunity for both students, faculty and the general public to know what is going on.

I think that is a guideline.

I would hope, as well, that we would find a more effective way of representing the public, than through the member of Parliament, the MPP and the mayor of the community.

I do not think, I just do not think that we, as legislators, can devote the necessary time to this kind of activity. I do not think that in many cases we have the information, the knowledge and the interest to be concerned about the university and the way in which people who are a part of boards of governors, or a part of a general council should be.

I think that the other guidelines which have been suggested by this bill have some very important things to say to us—that the students and the faculty should have an effective role. Perhaps it might be suggested that the committee on education and university affairs, might turn itself to the discussion and the examination of the bills which affect the universities throughout this entire province.

Would it not be worthwhile to have the administration, representation from the students, from the faculty, come before that committee? Would it not be worthwhile for us to look and see whether, in the light of the discussion that has taken place here, whether the bills which we see before us really do represent the degree of openness and the degree of participation and dialogue which we think is important and necessary in today's Ontario?

Now, I do not want to bring before this House any spectres of burning buildings and chaotic universities, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have a responsibility. We have the responsibility of seeing that the work in our universities is carried on in an atmosphere of freedom, and if that freedom does

not exist, then we as a Legislature take some responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: There are three speakers still, one from each party. The hour is five minutes to six. I am just wondering how the House would wish to deal with these in order that everyone who is on the list should have a fair dealing. I have no objection, provided the House wishes, to sitting on and giving each member five minutes. But we only have five minutes left.

The hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), then, has the floor and we will see—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): If you wish, Mr. Speaker, I am directed, of course, by yourself.

Mr. Speaker: I am directed by the House, but it hardly seems right if we have a list of three more speakers to just have one of them.

An hon. member: Would it be in order for somebody to call 6.00 o'clock?

Mr. Bullbrook: I am content.

Mr. Speaker: If it is agreeable to the House, yes. It being 6.00 o'clock, then, the private members' hour has expired.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the leader of the New Democratic Party will make his contribution to the Budget Debate. We will have the same routine as we had today. When he has finished we will go to estimates of The Department of Correctional Services. We will also sit tomorrow night.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 11, 1969
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. MacDonald	2065
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Reilly, agreed to	2075
Presenting reports, Mr. Welch	2075
Ninth report, standing private bills committee	2075
Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading	2075
Federal Medicare, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	2075
Property tax rebate, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon	2076
Provincial returning officers, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon	2076
Committee on post-secondary education, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Pitman	2076
Student summer employment, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Ben	2077
Rest home in Essex county, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Ruston	2078
Brockville inquiry, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman	2079
Courtright Hydro generating station, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Burr	2080
Temporary licence suspensions, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. B. Newman	2080
Tax on hotel accommodations, meals and liquor, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Trotter ..	2080
Mrs. Fiona Nelson, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	2081
Disturbances in universities, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	2081
Grant regulations, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. B. Newman	2082
Donwood Foundation, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid	2083
Rights of women teachers, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid	2083
Welland school suspension, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lawlor	2084
St. Marys River pollution, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Shulman	2084
Courtright Hydro generating station, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Burr	2084
CNE pavilion, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Trotter	2084
Douglas Woods, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman	2087
Women cleaners, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Shulman	2087
Liquor licence transfers, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Shulman	2087
Television coverage of the Legislature, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Lewis and Mr. MacDonald	2088
Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Grossman	2088
Recess, 6 o'clock	2105

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, the most important feature of any Budget is its impact on the average taxpayer, that great majority of taxpayers who are struggling along on an income that may range anywhere up to about the \$6,000 bracket. Down through the years this government has tended to load the average taxpayer, and inequitably so, because with much less frequency, if at all, have they placed that load on other sectors of the economy.

Last year, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer in the province of Ontario sustained perhaps the biggest wallop in our history. There were taxes increased on gasoline and on tobacco. There were increases in hospital and medical premiums. There were increases in fishing licences and hunting licences and car licences. There were increases for entry to provincial parks and camping fees. All of this added up to something in the range of \$125 to \$150 for the average family. Indeed, depending on their spending pattern, it sometimes averaged some \$200 to \$300.

In short, there has been an aggravation of the situation down through the years, such a great aggravation that there have been repeated investigations as to the plight of the average taxpayer.

Some years ago, when it was recognized that this plight had become a very serious one, doctor Carter in Ottawa was called in with a whole battery of consultants to examine the average taxpayer's condition, and in a Royal commission report the prescription was made that he was carrying too much of

the burden, and that burden should be shared by other people in society.

That was not good enough—some five years ago, doctor Smith was called in by the province of Ontario and with his battery of consultants they too reviewed the plight of the average taxpayer and indicated that there was too much pressure on him.

That was not good enough. So doctor White, who sits here today, was brought in with his battery of consultants to second-guess doctor Smith and make some recommendations with regard to what should be done.

In other words, for seven years the plight of the average taxpayer has been studied, studied, studied and restudied. Then to top it off, now doctor MacNaughton comes in with his prescriptions.

And what are they? Well, two more years of study. No relief yet. Indeed, to make matters even worse, there are going to be more taxes, and in return for the heavier tax load they are going to get fewer services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer in the province of Ontario is a pretty tough fellow. He can take a lot. He can survive despite what this government has done. He can survive even for the next two years. I venture the prediction, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to survive long enough to be around to throw this government out, for not having done something to meet his problem. From the point of view of the average taxpayer this is a thoroughly unsatisfactory Budget.

Something could have been done this year and it was not. We need not have had the kind of massive cuts in services to people that this government is proposing, yet we are going to have them. The tax load could have been redistributed more equally throughout society, but there has been little more than a gesture in that direction. The long-suffering taxpayer should not have to wait for promises, promises, for another two years before he gets some relief.

How could this be done, Mr. Speaker? That is a fair question and I want to turn my attention to it. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) explained that in all of

that excruciating process that presumably went on behind the scenes, some \$400 million were cut off the departmental estimates.

Some of that \$400 million—my guess is some \$50 to \$75 million of it—was administrative fat, accumulating inevitably by an ageing government. Let us have no illusions, there is a lot of that administrative fat there and you do not need to take our word for it.

The government itself has conceded that the problem continues by the appointment of what is euphemistically referred to now as PIP—that projectivity improvement project—to try to achieve greater efficiency in the government's administration.

That still leaves us, Mr. Speaker, with over \$300 million of a cut in departmental estimates. Translated into something that is meaningful for the people of the province of Ontario, it means that there is going to be a cut back in the services to the people. The government itself says that this is regrettable because it concedes that these services are all in what the government chooses to describe as priority areas. But the significant thing, Mr. Speaker, is that they are not high enough in priority, as far as the Tories were concerned, to avoid getting the axe in terms of this Budget.

We in the New Democratic Party disagree with this. We do not accept the proposition that when there has to be retrenchment, that retrenchment should be focused wholly, indeed almost exclusively, in what is known as the soft services—the cut back in serving the needs of the people themselves.

Adlai Stevenson, in one of his very wise statements, said:

Something that is of assistance to the other fellow is an extravagance, but something that is of assistance to yourself is a necessity.

When a government, for example, is referring to cutback on forgiveness loans to industry, even though it is in a period of retrenchment, but it is refusing to cutback on a \$1.8 million handout to horse breeders (when a great chunk of it goes to those barefoot boys by the name of E. P. Taylor) then I suggest that they have not got the right kind of priorities. It is time we take a look at exactly what this cut back is going to mean in the lives of all of the people of Ontario, and particularly for that average taxpayer who is carrying an even heavier burden than he has carried down through the years.

The government is proposing cut backs in health. There is going to be a freeze on

hospital construction at a time when, for example, in the Metro area, we have the plans all laid out for the extension of hospitals to do something about those long waiting lists. There is going to be a postponement in building a system of convalescent hospitals, which would ease the burden on our high-cost general hospitals. The brakes are going to be put on doctor training programmes at a time when we have a desperate shortage of doctors. In northern Ontario, and other outlying communities where they have not got doctors, they are going to have to struggle along without this vital service.

There is going to be a cutback on medical research, which is capable of doing something to relieve human suffering and to save human lives. There is going to be a cutback on subsidies to the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, with the result that the load is being transferred to the premiums, which is beyond the means of people who are in the lower income group, and particularly people who happen to be on fixed income. Tragically there is going to be a cutback in grants to psychiatric hospitals at a time when we have known for years—that half of the people in our hospital beds are suffering from mental illness. Therefore, there is a desperate need to come up with the medical solutions.

In this same connection, there is a postponement of the establishment of a genuine programme to cope with the needs of emotionally disturbed children. The New Democratic Party, through the efforts of the hon. member from Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), and others, forced this government to face up to the need for meeting the needs of emotionally disturbed children so that they could be treated in their youth, and not have to live warped and twisted lives that are not capable of a normal existence.

All of these are the cutbacks, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest are unnecessary. I will show you in a few moments why they are unnecessary.

There is going to be a cutback on housing, that area which is perhaps the most shocking failure in our society today. Last year this government gave some indication of what it considered to be the objective which must be met. It brought in, a Budget with, an appropriation of \$62 million as its contribution, in addition to the mortgage money available from CMHC and elsewhere.

What do we find now, Mr. Speaker? We find that last year the government spent not \$62 million but \$19 million. What more dramatic underlining of the failures of this

government! The government has to confess that it spent only \$19 million of a \$62 million appropriation. But this year we are going to triple it, says the Provincial Treasurer; we are going to spend \$57 million. In short, this year, they are going to be doing less than they set as their objective a year ago.

We in the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, say that this is hopelessly inadequate. This government has got to do something about getting out and building houses instead of talking about houses. Investment in houses is just that—an investment—which for the most part will come back in terms of rents over the years. In addition to the money that the government has now appropriated, there is no reason why this government should not be raising \$50 to \$75 million and, if necessary, floating a bond issue through the Ontario Housing Corporation with the backing of the credit of the Province of Ontario. Get out and build houses and quit complaining about the lack of them!

There is going to be a cutback, Mr. Speaker, in services to senior citizens. Because the private insurance companies could not provide medical coverage for people within the means of those on the incomes of many of our senior citizens, the government established OMSIP. But they recognized that they would have to subsidize it—to assist those who were in this particular economic plight.

They did so, but they refuse to do it for hospital coverage, even though last year they increased, very sharply, the premiums on the Ontario Hospital Services coverage. Now the government indicates that they are going to cut back on their proposed increase in grants from 70 per cent to 80 per cent for the building of senior citizens homes across the province of Ontario.

I had a visit a few days ago—as did many others, I am sure, in this Legislature—from people in the Niagara Peninsula, with regard to the Dorchester Manor, a proposed senior citizens home for which there are petitions from the community, for where there is support from the municipalities, and yet you cannot get this government to move. Mr. Speaker, there are Dorchester Manors dotted all across the province of Ontario, and it is about time this government faced this urgent need instead of cutting back.

There is a cutting back, Mr. Speaker, on education. This becomes somewhat more complex to analyze. There is a lower level of increases than we have had for many many years in terms of the grants for education. In spite of the fact that the Ontario Municipal

Association, the Ontario Association of Mayors and Reeves, and the Opposition parties in this Legislature, backed by the majority of people of the province, have said that during the 28th Legislature of the province of Ontario we should be moving to an 80 per cent take-over of the cost of education by the provincial government, this government is going to do nothing now.

Indeed, they promise that they will start in 1971 and they will complete, by 1974, a take-over of only 60 per cent of the cost of education. That is not adequate, Mr. Speaker.

The great problem when we come to discuss universities, Mr. Speaker, is that this is an area in which there has been a massive expenditure of money in years gone by. And there are some people who now wonder whether or not we in the province of Ontario, got into too great a proliferation of universities across this province. But, Mr. Speaker, it is too late to lament that. That was a decision of this government, if, indeed, it really was a decision. Because one of the problems of this government is that it announces now, builds now and sometime later it starts to plan.

Some of the chickens are coming home to roost. Admittedly, you have large budget increases but they are not enough to meet what universities feel are desperately necessary. There is not, for example, an ample increase made available under the university formula, which is only five per cent this year as compared to ten to 15 per cent in the last two years. There is not enough to allow for the normal expansion of budgets to meet salaries and other operational costs in the university.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is exceedingly dangerous, because we recognize today that universities have become the focal point for protest and the ferment in our society. This kind of a restriction on programmes is going to be an invitation for that protest to be shared not only by students who reflect it in the most militant fashion, but by university faculties who in York and Toronto and many other universities have been announcing this year their contemplation of strikes if they cannot get a better deal on salaries.

So we are inviting a dangerous kind of situation, quite apart from the economic folly of cutting back now so that we do not get the full return on the investment that we have already made.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, without going into further detail, all of this is regrettable. These are Tory priorities. The average family is

going to be carrying a heavier tax burden in many of these areas on which I have touched and is going to be getting less for the taxes that it has already paid.

Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party do not take the approach of the Liberal Party which has been to criticize the cutbacks, but to provide no alternative other than in the instance of health. We are not going to put ourselves in the contradictory position, when every estimate comes up this year, arguing that you, the government, were wrong by cutting back when we have not presented you with an alternative.

Therefore, it is my intention in this debate to indicate why there should be no cutbacks, and why there could have been an alternative in terms of the funding.

That leads me, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the question of taxes. The government have indicated that they are going to raise this year some \$180 million more in taxes than they raised last year, and two-thirds of this revenue is going to come from the corporate sector. For the first time in many years you have an increase in taxes on the corporate sector. I suggested it could, and should have come a year ago, what you have had is the average taxpayer carrying that burden without it being shared equitably in the corporate sector.

So generally speaking, we do not have any objections to the tax increases that the government has made. I say "generally" because I would like at a later date, for example, to examine the validity of the tax on machinery. I think there is a very good case to suggest that you are defeating your own purpose.

But generally speaking, these tax increases, if anything, are belated. They should have come many years ago, not only because of the revenue they would have produced, but because of the greater equity that they would have introduced into our tax structure.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I ask the question, why did the government stop where it did? When you finally are moving to introduce equity? Why do you suddenly become so cautious, or shall I use the term, so conservative?

I want to suggest to you a half a dozen areas where there is more tax revenue that this government could have gotten. For example, we could have raised more revenue in the corporate tax field. I know the government always argues that we cannot get out of step with the rest of the nation. If our corporation tax gets higher than any of the

other provinces for any great length of time, it is going to result in the redistribution of industry.

But it is as certain, Mr. Speaker, as we are here today, that if the province of Ontario will move to get this revenue, and in so doing introduce equity by increasing corporation taxes, the province of Quebec would welcome it and would move too, because their need, if anything, is greater than ours for more tax revenue.

So this is a bogeyman, the proposition that you are going to be getting out of step.

Mining taxes: I listened to the Provincial Treasurer in his belated laments about the inequity of the mining taxes, and the fact that the mining companies had not been carrying their share. Then he gave us, a five-minute dissertation on what was going to be done to correct it. And then the letdown, Mr. Speaker. At the end of it what is going to be the net increase in the mining taxes? \$8 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has been raising \$17 million, they are now proposing to raise \$8 million extra, for a total of \$25 million, from our resources that are owned by the people of the province of Ontario, and that this year will be producing about \$1.25 billion.

So this government, on behalf of the people of the province of Ontario who own those resources, are going to get \$25 million out of \$1,250,000,000. This is fair? This is equity? All I need to do is to remind you, as we have done so often, that one company in this province, International Nickel Co., after they had paid their taxes last year, had in excess of \$140 million in profits. One hundred and forty million dollars for International Nickel alone, and \$25 million from the whole industry for the people of the province of Ontario.

Forestry resources: Each year I watch the widening margin between the money that this government raises from the forest industry and the money that The Department of Lands and Forests spends, for the most part, on the forest industry. Next year, the figures are \$36 million income and \$63 million expenditure.

Not all of that is spent on the forest industry; I concede. Some of it is on parks and so on. But the proposition that the people of the province of Ontario should be dipping into their pockets, that the average taxpayer should be shelling out to assist in the subsidizing and the servicing of the forest industry when we are not even getting enough revenue in to cover it, is an intolerable proposition that this government continues to tolerate.

Personal income tax: I listened to the Provincial Treasurer rise during his Budget speech and blow his little propaganda trumpet and say—no, this was in the Throne Debate last December that he blew his little propaganda trumpet. He said that we are not going to do what they are doing in Ottawa, those bad boys up in Ottawa, where they tax the poor and do not tax the rich, and they cut off the social development tax at \$6,000. We are not going to do that kind of thing.

Now is the time to put their action where their words have been. Why do we not have a surcharge on income tax, beginning at the \$6,000 level, so that we will get equity in the tax structure, which presumably the government wants—I wonder? But, presumably, in light of the Minister's words, they want it and at the same time would get more revenue. But, no, they would not do that.

Sales tax: I was interested in noting the extension of the sales tax in a minor way, but once again the government halts. There were many areas that the Smith report suggested should be covered in the sales tax, but the government is not going to move into those as yet. I shall have a few words a little later on the sales tax when I am discussing tax reform.

Capital gains: The government has said for years that we cannot have a capital gains tax in the province of Ontario if there is not one elsewhere. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we can, and should, have capital gains tax now on the speculative profits made in land, not only for the revenue it would raise but for the help it would contribute to our housing problem.

If the government say they cannot do that in the province of Ontario alone, may I remind them that they cut the rug out from under themselves. They have now said on capital gains that they are going to move on it even if the federal government does not in two years from now. In short, Mr. Speaker, as the Carter commission reminded us, there is \$5 billion worth of wealth in this country, and a good portion of it—40 or 50 per cent of it in the province of Ontario—is carrying no tax load at all. This government continues to refuse to raise their taxes. I suggest to you that they could, and should have done so in this Budget.

I have given you a number of options. I am not suggesting that all of those options need be exercised this year, but some of them could have been exercised. I suggest to you—without trying to put figures on them, because it is very difficult in the Opposition, on a few days' calculation to come up with a figure—that it would have been

very possible for this government to have raised taxes the equivalent of the \$300 million cutback in services and thereby avoided the cutback in services.

Indeed, it is certain that a few years from now, if we are going to establish equity in our tax structure, when the government is increasing its revenues in the years to come, they will raise from these very sources that I have mentioned—not \$300 million, but \$500 million or \$1 billion, or in five or ten years from now \$1.5 billion. Why do you not start now instead of leaving it until later?

There is another aspect of the government's approach that I want to touch on briefly, Mr. Speaker. The conventional wisdom today is that we must have a balanced Budget. I suppose it is not surprising that a Tory government is going to accept that conventional wisdom and do everything possible, no matter what the cost, to have a balanced Budget. They did so; but I ask the question—why no deficit at all this year?

I would agree that deficits are not something that you should seek consciously and deliberately if they can be avoided. I would say that down through the years this province many times has had deficits that were unnecessary because this government refused to raise money from some of its friends in the corporate world to avoid those deficits.

The result is that we have built a debt, and the burden of carrying that debt today which is in excess of what it should have been. But having said that, I am not one who is going to put the balancing of the Budget as a priority over meeting desperate human needs of the people of the province of Ontario.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let us put into perspective the data being given to us by experts who have examined the whole situation. Our debt in the province of Ontario today is seven per cent of the gross provincial product. Our *per capita* debt is less than it was back in the early 1960s.

Our net debt position is one which could be eliminated by eight months of our revenue, and I will say to any man, including the hon. member from Owen Sound, who is constantly talking about what the businessman would do, that any businessman who is not in debt beyond eight months of his revenue, does not consider himself to be seriously in debt. Indeed, the Smith committee said that you could go to nine per cent of the gross provincial product and still be in a completely manageable situation.

There are a lot of economists who argue that nine per cent is an arbitrary ceiling, but let us accept the nine per cent as being the level where you would get into a dangerous position. We are at seven per cent.

Next year the gross provincial product in the province of Ontario is going to increase by something over \$2 billion, and even at our present low level we could have gone into debt approximately \$150 million and kept that present debt level still below any dangerous proportion. You would have had \$150 million to meet some of these needs of the people, which in Tory priorities are going to be cut out.

So I return now, Mr. Speaker, to the basic question. How can you avoid the cuts? I suggest you can avoid the cuts in three ways. The first one is that you can exercise some of the options on new tax revenues which I have drawn to your attention. Second, Mr. Speaker, we can do it by becoming part of the national Medicare plan and accepting the \$175 million that is waiting for us to pick up in Ottawa today.

We now know that the plan under the guidance of the Liberals at Ottawa is flexible enough that the government in British Columbia has been able to keep private carriers on a so-called non-profit basis. Why does this government not operate that way? Why do they not, indeed? Perhaps I am beating this drum a bit too hard, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is now in the process of negotiating this in Ottawa. I hope he is, because it is a ludicrous proposition that a government in the province of Ontario should be complaining about not having money when they are refusing to accept \$175 million that is there for the taking. They can reshape our medical coverage to meet Ottawa's demands, even though I think it would result in poorer Medicare. So there is the second area where more revenues could have been raised—Medicare.

The third way is a manageable deficit of \$150 million if it is necessary to make certain that we do not have this kind of cutback in services.

In short, Mr. Speaker, as Tony Westall, formerly of the *Globe and Mail*, now of the *Toronto Star*, pointed out in an article the other day, what this Budget reveals is a "fiscal fraud." For quite some months this government has been on a propaganda tirade—that is not an exaggeration—a propaganda tirade about the unmanageable budgetary position in the province of Ontario. Now

they have proven that it could have been managed very easily.

Indeed, it could have been managed without restoring to Tory cutbacks in basic services to the people. I give this government fair warning now that with every power that is at our disposal here in the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature we are going to fight to have these cutbacks removed so that we can provide the necessary services to the people of this province. If they are carrying a heavier tax load, at least they are going to get something for the taxes that they are paying.

Let me turn to a final comment on the Budget itself, Mr. Speaker. This is, in a sense, something of a speculative comment, but I suggest to you that there is solid ground for the speculation. I want to suggest that this government may well have presented us with a Budget which is founded on a basic miscalculation.

What we have been presented with is a Budget which is not expansionary, but a Budget which is contractionary, a Budget which is based on a low real output rate. It is operating on the assumption that the productivity rate in the province of Ontario is going to be a real output rate of 4.5 per cent.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the Canada Economic Council, in specifying the level of economic development needed in Canada to be able to meet our needs and to provide enough jobs, says that we must have a productivity rate of 4.5 per cent for the nation as a whole. If we are only aiming at 4.5 per cent in the province of Ontario, it simply means that with the low growth areas included in the picture, the national productivity rate is going to be less than 4.5 per cent, and we are going to be in a contractionary period in spite of all the claptrap we hear from Tories, including Mr. Stanfield, and others of the inflationary threat.

Indeed, just let me document it briefly in passing. I was interested to see in the paper last week a quotation from a very reputable body of economists, the National Institute of Economic and Social Research in London, England, which does a continuous study of the economies of most of the countries in the western world. Their comment with regard to Canada was this:

The productivity gains achieved in 1968 are unlikely to be repeated, and further, any tightening of monetary or fiscal policy in Canada could well mean a real output growth for 1969 of less than four per cent.

That statement was made before there was another tightening of monetary policy through an increase of the interest rate to seven per cent a few weeks ago.

In other words, there is very good reason to believe that we are going to have a contraction and that this Budget is aiming at a contraction at a time which could have very serious and dangerous consequences. Indeed, the government's rather cautious pattern of growth, far below the province's potential, is underlined by the fact that the government is willing to tolerate an unemployment rate of 3.5 per cent.

There was a time back in the mid-1950s—and economists will confirm this—that an unemployment rate of 2.5 per cent was a desirable and achievable objective. But this government has foresworn that kind of thing. It is concentrating more on inflation rather than unemployment, in spite of the growing body of expert economist advice that the social costs from inflation are much less than the social costs from unemployment.

That is, particularly true in Canada, Mr. Speaker, because once again experts like Mel Watkins, and others who are engaged in a continuous study of the Canadian economy, remind us that what can be done by Canadian governments to cope with the problem of inflation is relatively ineffective. Whatever governments may do is more than cancelled out by the whole impact of the American economy that we are so closely integrated with. That is true of the federal government. How much more true it is, then, of any provincial government! In short, a government budget which is preoccupied with inflation instead of focusing on unemployment is missing the real point.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by the economists, that a one per cent cut in the unemployment rate means an increase in the gross product of some four to five per cent. Translated into dollars that simply means that a one per cent decrease in the unemployment rate produces \$1 billion more wealth in Canada. And \$1 billion more wealth in Canada means close to \$0.5 billion more wealth in the province of Ontario itself. \$0.5 billion more wealth in the province of Ontario is a broader tax base through which you can maximize your revenues, instead of reducing them.

Another point—the government's whole rationale for getting out of the capital markets in Canada and going to the capital markets in Europe (but even that, they are going to foreswear this year, so they tell us) is for

the purpose of leaving the capital markets for the private sector of the economy. Mr. Speaker, there is reason to believe, once again, that the private sector of the economy may not use the capital market enough to fill the gap that has been deliberately left by the government.

There is an increasing tendency for capital in industry to be drawn from the Canadian scene and to be attracted, for reasons that I will not go into now, to the European scene.

It raises the whole question of the relative balance between public investment and private investment. This government has deliberately said, "We are withdrawing; we are cutting back in our services; we are not going to expand our housing programme. We are going to withdraw from the capital investment field to leave it for the private investors." This at a time when, as Galbraith warned us years ago, the desperate need in the modern society is not for the things that the private sector will give us, where there is a profit—the desperate needs in a modern society is for public services that only a government is going to give—the low-cost housing which is not profitable; the reforestation to rebuild our natural resources; the recreational facilities; the parks; the anti-pollution programmes.

All of these things are not going to be done by the private sector of the economy. They have to be done by this government and yet, the government is withdrawing.

To conclude this aspect, Mr. Speaker—by using the \$175 million in Medicare money that is available, by using some of the tax options which I have listed, by accepting a modest manageable deficit (if indeed it becomes necessary), we could have avoided the cut back in high priority services to our people. We could have provided to the taxpayer a greater return for their unprecedented tax load. We could have cushioned against the drop in our wealth production and assured productivity levels which would have maximized our revenues and avoided the waste of having tens of thousands of people unemployed. We could have done all those things, but we have not, and that is why this is a thoroughly bad Budget from the point of view of the average person.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn from the Budget itself to the question of the white paper and tax reform. The government has added to the tax load and as a sweetener they said, "Two years from now we will relieve you, we will take some of the pressures off by finally establishing a greater degree of equity

into our tax structure." I was rather interested in going back to proposals which we in the New Democratic Party put in my Throne debate speech last December here in this Legislature. Let me read you a couple of paragraphs:

In our opinion, the ideal tax is one which places most stress on reformed and broadened income and wealth taxes and de-emphasizes property taxes, sales taxes, flat rate premiums and other regressive forms of taxation.

And a little later:

There are strong arguments for continuing to collect a fair share from corporate surpluses particularly when the large proportion of them—

That is, the corporate surpluses

—go across the border and if untaxed, simply benefit either foreign shareholders or foreign governments at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer.

These were the basic propositions we made last fall in the presentation of a whole blueprint for tax reform and an equitable tax mix.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, obviously we welcome the government's white paper and its proposal to move towards some tax reform. On the argument as to whether or not the government is bluffing, for example, when they propose that two years from now they are going to establish their own income tax, let me say flatly, right here and now, I am not going to engage in this speculation. It is irrelevant as to whether or not the government is bluffing. The point we have got to recognize is that the people are getting weary of federal-provincial feuding over their money, the people's tax money.

Mr. Speaker, I have an equal regret that there is a new dimension being added to this feuding between the federal and provincial governments. It is being added by the provincial Liberal Party. It spent a good deal of its presentation on the Budget yesterday with the leader of the Opposition trying to rationalize and explain how much of this government's money came from that beneficent uncle, Ben Benson, up in Ottawa. What a fatuous kind of analogy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The federal treasury pays one-third of the budget of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Ben Benson is not handing back some money that is his. He is handing back money that was raised from the people of the province of Ontario and the

country as a whole. Having paid the taxes, the people expect the federal and the provincial governments to sit down and to use it to meet their services—cut out the feuding, instead of adding another dimension to the feuding.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I would agree that we should avoid the balkanization of this nation. I would agree that in our fiscal policies we should seek the kind of co-operation which is going to have an integrated approach, taking into account the whole tax load imposed upon the people. But, Mr. Speaker, if the federal Liberals are going to say to the provinces, go and raise your own money, the provincial Liberals cannot complain when the governments do precisely that.

Heaven help me that I should find myself defending the Tory government, but when they are right, I will defend them. And on this occasion, they are right.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): So seldom—

Mr. MacDonald: It is a good thing that I do not have to come over, there is too much between us—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): All righteousness will win in the end!

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. It is a good thing, in our view, that Ontario is taking a lead on tax reform. Indeed, a year ago, we told this government to stop stalling and waiting for Ottawa to get at its tax reform, because if there is anything slower than a Tory government, it is a federal Liberal government. Get at the proposition of tax reform from the point of view of the province of Ontario, because you have a great deal within your own control. If the province of Ontario moves, it will force Ottawa to get moving. In fact, that is precisely what the *Toronto Daily Star* (I think it is a Liberal paper) said in its lead editorial the day after the Ontario Budget. It said the main import of the Budget was that Ottawa had to get going on its tax reform because Ontario had started to move. If Ontario can come up with a progressive, equitable base for income tax—and we shall do our level best to make certain that they do—then there is some prospect that the Liberals in Ottawa might be persuaded to come up with a more equitable one than they are now contemplating. Because, I repeat, the Liberals can be more Tory than the Tories when it comes to fiscal policy at the Ottawa level.

What the average taxpayer wants is a tax system that is as fair as possible, as quickly as possible, and stop the delay. He does not want to live on promises any longer. The soundest foundation upon which to build unity in this country is an equitable financial basis that will meet the needs of the people across this country and give them some equality of services. Fiscal separatism is what we heard again yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, that is a propaganda slogan that is about as sterile and as bankrupt as the Prime Minister's (Mr. Robarts) propaganda slogan about a Machiavellian fraud in reference to Medicare. I hope both of them are cleared out of the way so that we can get on with the job.

While I welcome this tax reform, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should have any illusion that it is the answer to all our inequities as some of the friends in the press—friends of the Tory government—have presented to the people of the province of Ontario. I want to draw your attention to this, to a few examples—the capital gains tax. The government said that it is contemplating the U.S. model.

We have a lot of this country that is being Americanized but there is one further thing I do not want to see Americanized and that is our tax structure. I suggest that what we want is not a capital gains tax on the U.S. model, but a capital gains tax on the Carter commission model, namely, that a dollar is a dollar. Therefore a dollar of capital gains will be taxed as a dollar of income, and not treated as a sort of special little reserve on which there will be a lighter tax, if it is a gain, than on the regular income.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what this is is mere tokenism. The government itself said that if we cannot get Ottawa to move, or if the other provinces do not move, what we can do can be purely nominal. Well, I am very fearful, because once again, I repeat, the prospects of getting the federal government at Ottawa to move on some genuine tax reform in view of the flat statements from many spokesmen, including Prime Minister Trudeau that they are opposed to a capital gains tax, is not a very optimistic prospect. Therefore, this government is very well protected against action. If Ottawa is not going to move, they are not going to move, except as a mere token gesture to the principle of capital gains.

Secondly, the government already states in its Budget statement that if we get an effective capital gains tax, then we can trade the inheritance tax off against it. In other

words, there will not be any great accumulation of wealth if we have an effective capital gains tax and, therefore, we will emulate what has been done out in Alberta—refund all the province's share of inheritance tax in the fashion that some of the western provinces are doing—to create a tax haven.

Mr. Speaker, there is interesting illogic there. If there is any great accumulation of wealth at the inheritance level, the capital gains tax was not effective. So, you keep the capital gains tax and do not, at this early stage when you are only talking about blueprints, indicate that you are going to trade the inheritance tax off for a capital gains tax. That is the second weakness.

The third weakness is the whole question of the sales tax, Mr. Speaker. We in the New Democratic Party initially opposed the sales tax because it is a regressive tax. Its major impact is on those who have the least capacity to pay, and its impact on those with ability to pay is marginal.

Some economists who have always argued that you can make a sales tax more progressive; I will not say a progressive tax, but you can make it less regressive, let us put it that way, by extending it to services. Particularly those services used chiefly by those who have a capacity to pay. In this way you will get a wider tax base, a more equitable tax base, and you will get more revenue.

The fascinating thing, Mr. Speaker, is that I find on page 70 in the government's white paper on tax reform, this rather interesting warning, that as far as the sales tax is concerned, to the extent that Ontario finds it necessary and desirable to derive additional revenues from sales taxation, therefore it must come primarily through rate increases, not a widening of the base of the tax.

Now, what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Simply, that we have fair warning from this government right now, that a year or two years from now, the average taxpayer is going to be gouged with an increase to six or seven or eight per cent on the sales tax on an inequitable basis, instead of moving to get some equity, some progressivity into the sales tax base. I give you fair warning, Mr. Speaker, that this is an issue that we will come back to and fight.

In short, what we have is a white paper which is a blueprint for tax reform. But it has many deficiencies. The New Democratic Party is in favour of tax reform and we will fight for it, but we are also going to fight to make certain that some of those deficiencies are removed.

There are two other very great weaknesses, Mr. Speaker, in this white paper. The first one is that there is no solution at all to the crisis on the municipal front. And this really is incredible.

For ten years now the province of Ontario has become increasingly obsessed with the crisis on the municipal front, the crushing burden of property taxes. Yet, even in a blueprint for tax reform, what does the government have to offer? We will remove, they say, some more of the pressure when we have some revenues available. We have seen their reluctance to raise revenues in the areas which would make it equitable.

They are not going to reach 60 per cent of the cost of education until 1974. There is no rationalization of the grants structure, only some statement to the effect that there will be more unconditional grants so that the municipalities will be free to spend them as they see fit.

We in the New Democratic Party say this is not good enough, the government has not met one of the major needs in the province of Ontario—the crisis of the municipal front and real relief for the property tax.

We have pioneered in this Legislature the question of a municipal foundation programme which can and will do this. This is not a new concept. We already have it operating in the province of Ontario as far as education is concerned. It is in operation in the province of Nova Scotia. Why will not this government move to say to the people of the province of Ontario that they are going to remove the inequities between the tax capacity of varying municipalities, that they are going to assure a minimum level of services, and we are going to assure a tax burden that will be more or less equal across the province of Ontario based on the equalized assessment.

But there is no pattern. It is a vague kind of a programme even though we have lived so long with this kind of crisis. Combined with this, Mr. Speaker, is another point—the tendency of the government to move towards the growing paternalism in its whole attitude towards the municipalities.

The Provincial Treasurer at one stage in his budget warned that they were considering setting up a budget bureau to be watching like a hawk how each of the municipalities decides to spend its money.

We already have the Ontario Municipal Board, which supervises the municipalities with regard to capital expenditures. We now have the threat of a budget bureau which is going to second guess the municipal fathers

who are elected to do a job on behalf of their people—second guess it on behalf of this government.

In short, Mr. Speaker, to put it in the vernacular, big daddy at Queen's Park is threatening to wield the big stick.

I listened with interest to a controller in the city of Hamilton on TV on Sunday, a man who is well known for his Conservative associations, say that he certainly did not want to see the OMB and its restrictions on municipalities at the capital level matched by this sort of gestapo—that was not his term—but this careful watching over and usurping of the rights of elected people at the local municipality.

A greater paternalism regrettably, Mr. Speaker, is coming at a time when the municipalities in the province of Ontario are growing up in the sense that we are moving towards regional government. We will have larger units that are more viable economically to assume their responsibilities and to fulfil the local autonomy which had to be taken over by Queen's Park, in many instances because the local municipalities simply could not do a job. Now they are growing up, but they are growing up under the threat of living under the paternalism of Queen's Park.

This government decries Ottawa for its attitude of no consultation, of not sharing the tax burden fairly, and at the very same time they are decrying that attitude with regard to Ottawa they are exercising it with regard to the municipalities in the province of Ontario.

Do you really mean it? Why do you not practise what you preach? Why is there not consultation with the municipalities? This government decries the federal government pre-empting tax fields, like the social development tax, but what does this government do in this Budget, Mr. Speaker? They have pre-empted the motel and the hotel tax field after the city of Toronto has been trying to expand its inflexible and narrow tax base by seeking that tax for quite some years. Why do they not practise what they are preaching?

This government, for example, says nothing about its willingness to share that basically equitable tax, the income tax, with the municipalities, even though the Smith committee indicated that this should be considered in the light of the inequity of property taxes. But there is no suggestion that they are going to do it. In short, Mr. Speaker, this government is not willing to grapple with the problem and solve it, even though they are presenting blueprints which the people are

kidded into believing are going to provide the real answers. They are an illusion, not reality.

We have before us a Liberal amendment. I would like to have seen it stronger. But it is an expression of opposition to what this government has done and therefore we are going to support it, with the exception of the last clause which is an elaboration of this propaganda slogan about "fiscal separatism". We cannot live with that; I indicated my views earlier.

May I have one further word of explanation, Mr. Speaker? We in this House live with an archaic set of rules which, for reasons that completely mystify me, permit a sub-amendment to the main amendment on the Throne Speech but deny it on the Budget, the other omnibus debate. Why? I defy anybody to give any rational explanation.

I think it is time, perhaps with your intervention, Mr. Speaker, that the unanimous approval of the House should supersede our archaic rules. I think I am quoting one of your earlier observations when I say it is time that we break out of this archaic strait-jacket. Therefore, I want to move a sub-amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), that the amendment be amended by eliminating section 6, and by substituting for it the following:

This House regrets that the government has, by its misguided schedule of cut-backs, its refusal to call upon additional and more progressive revenue sources, its delay and superficiality in implementing genuine tax reforms, and its paternalistic attitude to the municipalities, failed in its prime obligation to minimize the tax burden upon the ordinary citizen of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: While I appreciate the submission made by the hon. member for York South, the rules of the House do not allow at this time a second amendment to this particular amendment by the official Opposition. If there is any expression of opinion by any other party of the House, I would be glad to receive it. Otherwise, the motion is out of order and, of course, will not be received or put to the House.

Mr. Reilly moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: At the moment our guests in the galleries are: In the west gallery, from Leaside high school, and in both galleries from Moorefield Public School. Earlier this afternoon we had—and perhaps still have in

the Speaker's gallery—students from Durham College of Applied Arts and Technology, Oshawa; and in the east gallery, students from Frank Oke Vocational School, Toronto, and in the west gallery students from John C. Althouse Public School, Islington.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports:

The annual report for 1968 of the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology.

The public service superannuation fund auditor's report for the year ended March 31, 1968.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's ninth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the town of Mississauga.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Maimonides Schools for Jewish Studies.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to reduce the cost of life insurance by removing the prohibition in Ontario law which prevents an insurance agent from advising a holder of insurance as to methods to reduce his cost by changing the insurance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier now that the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has returned from Ottawa.

Can the Prime Minister report on the continuing discussion with the government of Canada regarding Medicare?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no reports to make to the House other than that some discussions have taken place.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Attorney General if he can tell the House how many charges have been laid and how many charges are pending in Ontario with regard to delinquency in the payment of the property tax rebate?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. I do not have that information.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if there is any way that it can be gathered. It will surely be of some interest in the next few weeks and we would like to know just how the statute has been received across the province.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I may be able to get some information. We do not ordinarily get the statistic of charges laid. Perhaps we can get something close to the figure, but I do not have that information.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps the information might be available more conveniently through The Department of Municipal Affairs.

I have another question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Can the Minister explain the delay in the investigation and laying of charges against the provincial returning officers, which was announced yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there was no delay in this investigation. I wish to emphasize that, but I would not do the leader of the Opposition the disservice of taking any implication from his question because I fully understand that he is not aware of the background of this matter.

I may tell him, however, that the nature of the offences was financial. The investigation necessarily involved a review of the audits in the various offices with a subsequent police investigation of the books and interviews with the individual witnesses, of which there were a large number. This was all initiated immediately it came to our attention. The investigation was by its nature very time-consuming but I reiterate, there was no delay either in the investigation, in its inception, the way it was carried on or the laying of the charges after it was completed.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Dipping more deeply into the pork barrel.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition has a question from the other day of the Minister of Education, and the hon. member for Peterborough has a similar question which perhaps he would place after the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, that has been pending for two or three days.

Does the Minister intend to make a statement to the House concerning his appointment of a committee on the aims, objectives and needs of post-secondary education in Ontario? It was rather fully reported in the *Globe and Mail* some days ago.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister enlarge on the report in this morning's *Globe and Mail* that he has decided to appoint a committee to study post-secondary education? What groups will be represented on the committee? Will Doctor Wright be the chairman? Why is the committee using the contracting out system of examining the educational system and when can a report be expected?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I recall some few weeks ago I indicated to the member for Peterborough, and perhaps the leader of the Opposition, that it was our intention to move ahead with this study commission. There had been certain discussions leading up to the decision as to just how it would function and the terms of reference. I would say that the story that appeared in one of Toronto's leading metropolitan papers a few days ago, was somewhat speculative in nature. I shall be making a statement on this in the very near future.

Mr. Nixon: Was it incorrect or just speculative?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say that like a lot of speculative stories there is a certain germ of some things that may happen and some things that may not happen.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: If it is intended Dr. Wright should be the chairman of this committee, I am wondering whether his name has been placed either before the committee of the presidents or the Ontario council of university faculty associations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think really this is a matter that I shall deal with when

I make some further statement with respect to the proposed commission.

Mr. Nixon: We will watch the papers.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister.

How many students were deprived—

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, how many Ontario students.

Mr. Ben: Sorry, how many Ontario students were deprived of summer employment by foreign students on tobacco farms in the province?

Secondly, what action is being taken to assure Ontario students that they will receive job priority in the tobacco industry this summer?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is impossible to state how many Ontario students were deprived of summer employment by foreign students on tobacco farms in the province. I really do not know whether there were any.

The problem, of course, with this type of summer employment is that it is not really very popular with our Ontario students and we have had a great deal of trouble making sure that the farmers who want this labour have people there.

I have some statistics here that might help you understand. There were requests filed with The Department of Agriculture for 2,500 students from foreign countries. The Department of Agriculture only enrolled 1,100, so the difference would be 1,400 jobs that would be available for Ontario students. On the broad picture, we think that everyone who was prepared to accept this work was given an opportunity to do so.

The problem with this is that the farmer has a great interest in seeing that his crops are harvested, and this is the responsibility of The Department of Agriculture and Food. The Minister of Agriculture and Food has to ensure that the labour is there.

As I say, it is not the type of work that our students particularly like, and thus you cannot always depend upon an indication that people want jobs when the jobs are available. Very often the people are not there.

I do not think we need be unduly concerned about the fact that jobs were taken from Ontario students under this programme. I would say in connection with the whole

question of student employment—and I have made several comments about this in the House in the last few weeks—I would hope within a relatively short time to be able to lay before the House just exactly what we are proposing to do.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, what prompted this question was the remark that was in the paper and which the Prime Minister repeated. Namely, that the Canadian students or Ontario students are not inclined towards this type of work.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Right.

Mr. Ben: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, where does the Prime Minister get his information that would bring him to this conclusion? It surely is not a bed of roses picking tobacco but—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The hon. member has asked his question. Now it is up to the Prime Minister to reply.

Mr. Ben: There is another part of the question. Surely the Prime Minister is not intimating that Ontario students no longer have the backbone for picking tobacco—

Mr. Speaker: Order! That is not appropriate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think we can quite easily establish the fact that this is not number-one priority work for students. In other words, if they can get something else this is going to be last on the list as far as they are concerned. That is one element in this matter. The other thing is, we must take into consideration the needs of the farmer, because he must have an assured supply of labour. Otherwise this whole thing can be completely disastrous as far as he is concerned, because the crops when matured do not sit in the field waiting for somebody to pick them.

This is the problem and I cannot give any specific statistics, but I think the experience the Minister of Agriculture and Food has had and the farming industry itself has had, indicates that this is not number-one priority work. So that if there is a chance of doing something else this work does not get done, and we are attempting to ensure that the farmer has the labour he needs when he needs it.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier of Ontario.

Will the Premier give any assurance that a grant for a rest home in Essex county will be given consideration by the Treasury Board?

Does the Premier not believe that a rest home, urgently needed, should have priority over a \$13 million pavilion at the Canadian National Exhibition grounds on Lake Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I am being put in the position of "when I stopped beating my wife" in the latter part of that question. I would simply say that this government has a lot of projects covering practically every facet of human activity. As far as the rest home in Essex county is concerned, it was in January of this year, I believe, they made application. It was pointed out to them at the time that statistically they have 26 beds per 1,000 of population 60 years of age or over and the provincial average is 27. Therefore, it was felt that this project would not be given immediate approval.

You ask if it will be reconsidered by Treasury Board. In actual fact, this decision is not made by Treasury Board. It is made by those people who are concerned with provision of this type of help to older people and we have to have some standards by which we approve these projects. Otherwise we would probably get into severe imbalance in the provision of these facilities in different parts of the province.

In regard to the latter part of the question, I would like to make it clear that when this figure of \$12 or \$13 million is used, it refers to the total cost of the project as we presented it. This will not all come out of this year's budget. I believe the current budget has an amount of about \$1 million in it for this project, and it probably will be spread over at least three fiscal years. In other words, the \$13 million will not be raised in one fiscal year. It will be spread over a period of time.

We think it is a perfectly proper project, otherwise we would not have embarked upon it. I suppose, really, to follow the reasoning contained in this question, we would have some really odd comparisons made in how we might choose to spend the funds. As I say, we have a wide range of activities and projects in the government that we must support and we think that this one is completely justified. We do not think that this project will in any way endanger the ultimate approval of a rest home in Essex county or, indeed, in any other part of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question of the Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The implication was politics of the worst kind.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What! Politics in this Chamber? You would not ask us to play that?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am just recognizing it, I am not commenting.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, well, thank you.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Prime Minister in several parts.

Were Dr. J. K. Reynolds, chief executive officer in the Prime Minister's office, and members of his family occupying the guest house at Upper Canada Village during the May 18, 1968, holiday weekend?

Did they have a supply of firecrackers and detonate them up against the guest house?

Was this the cause of the fire in those premises?

What was the cost of repairing the buildings, and what amount was received, if any, from the insurance coverage?

Did the fire marshal, or his officials, make an inspection of the premises and the damage?

Did the fire marshal or his officials prepare a report subsequently?

Was it sent to the commission?

Was general manager Peacock requested or persuaded by Dr. J. K. Reynolds to cover up this report?

Why did the general manager or other officials withhold such report from members of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission until forced to produce it by demand of the commission members?

Will the Prime Minister table this report?

If not, why?

Will the Prime Minister inform the House fully of all the circumstances, and explain why the incident is not mentioned, for the information of the Assembly, in the current annual report of the commission for the year ending December 31, 1968?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that this is a proper question to be placed on the order paper and I ask that it be placed there and it will be answered in due course.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Prime Minister's request.

I have a question for the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Speaker: We are proceeding by Ministers. The hon. member has a question of the Minister of Health which he might now place.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. It is all related to one matter and it is in four parts:

How much is Mr. Joseph Sedgwick being paid by The Department of Health to act as consultant in the Brockville inquiry?

Why did the department not use one of the government's own lawyers?

Why did the department feel the necessity to have a lawyer representing it in hearings before the health committee?

Does the Minister not have confidence in the integrity of the committee?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Sedgwick's bill will no doubt be rendered when he has performed the service. I believe those matters are all discussed, if not arranged—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I gather the hon. Minister will be pleased to proceed with his answer if he is given the courtesy of a hearing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, matters of this kind, as I understand it, are arranged with The Attorney General's Department. The department could not use one of our own solicitors because one of the two unfortunately is ill in hospital and our remaining solicitor is already overworked. We asked the lawyer to hold a watching brief in order that we would have an objective overall view.

The fourth part of the hon. member's question, sir, does not merit a reply.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has no right to ask a point of clarification on a question which he has not asked. The hon. member for High Park has the floor. Has he a supplementary question?

Well, if the hon. member wishes to raise a point of order, he may, but he said a point of clarification.

Mr. Trotter: It is a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister said Mr. Sedgwick had a watching brief, and we were informed at the last meeting that Mr. Sedgwick wants to cross-examine, which is more than a watching brief.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He is a doctor. He does not understand legality.

Mr. Lewis: He understands more about the law than about medicine.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for High Park has no more questions of this Minister, I believe?

Mr. Shulman: I was about to ask if the Minister would accept a supplementary question on the first part of my question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member wishes to ask a supplementary question with respect to the Minister's answer to the first part of his question. The Minister says he would hear it.

Mr. Shulman: Am I to understand from the answer, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Sedgwick has been hired without knowing what his fee is going to be?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I answered that question, I think, quite clearly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not certain it is a point of order. Perhaps it is. My colleague in his answer stated that the Attorney General had been consulted about the supplying of counsel to The Department of Health. I think this is a part of the answer, and I would simply state that the reason that we did not supply counsel from The Attorney General's Department in this particular case was that a civil servant in the employ of The Department of Health was being, we expected, questioned before the committee.

We felt that we might appear to be defending the department if we supplied our counsel, and we felt it wise not to have even that suggestion or appearance by providing counsel from The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Attorney General is not aware that his department has supplied counsel to the committee and apparently in

that case they felt it would be quite impartial.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is an entirely different matter. We certainly wish to supply counsel to the committee so that it might have advice and counsel in questioning. We did not wish to have the appearance even of defending a colleague's department.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member any further supplementary question? The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has a question of the Minister of Health?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): In the new hydro generating station at Court-right, the solid particles prevented from escaping as air pollutants will be dumped eventually into a large, dry lagoon. What measures are being taken to prevent these pollutants from being blown by the wind over the surrounding area?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the dry ash will be dumped into the lagoon in wet condition and will be kept wet. When the lagoon is filled it will be sodded and a new lagoon started.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has a question of the Minister of Transport?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, the question of the Minister of Transport reads as follows:

Why will the Minister's department not honour temporary licence suspensions as ordered by judges in various courts in the province and upheld by Mr. Justice W. J. Henderson of the Ontario Supreme Court on February 8?

Under what authority is Mr. R. H. Humphries, registrar of motor vehicles, ignoring The Criminal Code in this matter?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): The Highway Traffic Act, in sections 20, 21, 21b and 21c, provides for mandatory driver licence suspensions in the event of convictions under The Criminal Code for criminal negligence, driving while intoxicated, driving while ability impaired, dangerous driving, failure to stop at the scene of an accident and driving while disqualified, respectively. Under The Criminal Code, the court has authority to prohibit a person from driving a motor vehicle during any period not exceeding three years. Under the criminal code, the court has no authority to suspend a driver's licence. The authority to suspend a

driver's licence is under The Highway Traffic Act. The two authorities are separate and stand alone.

In the specific case referred to, the mandatory licence suspension was applied according to the law as contained in section 21 of The Highway Traffic Act. It is true that Mr. Justice Henderson upheld the decision of the provincial judge as regards the criminal code prohibition, however, I understand he made no finding respecting the validity of the mandatory licence suspension applied under The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question of the Minister. On November 21 I had asked the following question:

Will the Minister amend The Highway Traffic Act to permit a wider use of the discretionary powers as a result of the question of the legality of the wise decision of magistrate Joseph P. McMann in giving an intermittent licence suspension to a man who pleaded guilty to an impaired driving charge.

At that time the hon. Minister mentioned that this involved an offence under The Criminal Code of Canada, section 223, and not The Highway Traffic Act.

Which is the right answer, Mr. Speaker? May I have an answer, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister, I presume from his silence, feels that both questions asked by the hon. member have been properly answered by him. The member for Parkdale has a question of the Minister of Tourism and Information?

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, the question is for the Minister of Tourism and Information. Can the Minister indicate if there is any truth to the Canadian Press wire story of March 10 that:

The Ontario government's decision to levy a five per cent tax on hotel accommodations, and a ten per cent charge on meals and liquor is part of a plan to put Ontario's and Quebec's tourism industries on a closer footing, Gabriel Loubier, Quebec's Minister of Tourism, Fish and Game, said today.

If so, is involvement by Ontario in such a plan not disadvantageous to our tourist business, that is, would it not make us less competitive?

The second part, Mr. Speaker. Is the story correct when it states:

He, (Mr. Loubier) said he met with James Auld, Ontario's Minister of Tourism,

last November and received assurances that Ontario would adopt a policy of fair play and loyal competition.

If so, would the Minister comment on what is meant by this statement?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on the first part of the story because I have not seen what Mr. Loubier said, although I have written asking for information on this. I would just say that it is correct that I and some of the officials of my department met with Mr. Loubier and some of his officials in November. We discussed a number of things, including the joint promotional programmes which Ontario and Quebec and, in some cases, the Canadian government travel bureau have.

He spoke to me about the unfavourable comments he was receiving, in Quebec from his hotel industry about their tax. I said to him that I hoped we would not have one, but I was not as optimistic last November that we would not have one as I had been a couple of years before.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister has not checked with Mr. Loubier as to what he said when he promised the House, through you, Mr. Speaker, that after seeing what Mr. Loubier did say that he would comment, then the inference—as I point out, Mr. Speaker—in this report is that there appears to have been a deal.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would let it rest as a question, which is what it is at this time.

Mr. Trotter: I want to know if it is going to be answered, I think this is extremely serious, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked if the hon. Minister would do so, and we will wait for the hon. Minister's answer.

Mr. Trotter: I might ask, as a supplementary, the Minister should know whether or not he made a deal with the Minister of Tourism in Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not asking a question he is making a comment.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I must comment on that. That is totally ridiculous. The hon. member knows that the Treasurer sets the Budget policy of this province. I make deals with no one in any field other than tourist promotion, as I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has a question from the other day to the Minister of University Affairs, and one to the Minister of Education. He might place them now.

Mr. Pitman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. Minister—will the Minister investigate the circumstances of the firing of Mrs. Fiona Nelson by the Toronto Board of Education?

In view of the board chairman's statement that if her principal had not hired her late in the season, she would have been rejected, would the Minister investigate the hiring practices of this board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We had a letter from Mrs. Nelson, I believe it arrived on Friday, requesting a board of reference. There are some uncertainties relating to the facts of the situation which we have not, as yet, been able to determine. When we have made this determination, I will be in a position then to decide whether, in fact, a board of reference may be granted.

Mr. Pitman: The Minister did not say whether he has found out if the Toronto board has complied with section 17 of The Schools Administration Act, indicating to Mrs. Nelson exactly what her terms of contract were last spring? This would, I think, refer to whether she would get a board of reference or not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I say, there are certain facts that are not yet firmly established and which we are endeavouring to establish before I can make this determination.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the Minister would comment on the second question. Is it acceptable to The Department of Education that a board should reject a teacher because of what comments she has made about a board while a private citizen? Is this acceptable to the Minister of Education as a hiring practice in the jurisdiction of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it really relates to a hiring practice. I do not think any of us in this House object to the free expression of opinion on various situations. As I say, the question of whether a board of reference is granted does not relate to that particular situation; it relates, I think, as to whether she may or may not be on a probationary contract. This is what we are endeavouring to determine at this point.

Mr. Pitman: My second question, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat hoary with age, I am

afraid. Would the Minister clarify newspaper remarks that he will call in the police if students create disturbances in any Ontario university? What will be the responsibilities of (a) the university authorities; (b) the Minister, (c) the Attorney General's office in making this decision. What would the Minister describe as constituting disorder?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, really, what paper or what news report the hon. member for Peterborough is referring to. I did see one or two reports myself and, in that I had not made any statement or any speech on the subject for at least a few days, the only thought that came to me was that perhaps this originated with a certain radio programme that was aired about a week ago last Sunday. I asked for some indication as to what in fact was on the tape as to what I did say and—as I read the information here—one of the discussants, if this is the term that can be used. I would point out that it was not the one who convinced me that shoes were a necessity in this particular jurisdiction with its particular climate. This referred to, I think, a question placed by one of the people on this panel with respect to Sir George Williams.

One panelist said, "What measures is the province or your department taking to prevent it happening, if it did get started here?"

This was the same type of situation they were referring to as at Sir George Williams. I believe that I said (and I always find when I read answers or hear tapes that sound all right when you are saying these things, the number of dangling participles and what not one discovers in what one said), and I—

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister gets worried too, eh?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I said it depends on the type of situation. I said at Windsor—because this was shortly after Windsor—and I have said on several occasions before, that neither government, nor university nor the public can tolerate destruction or violence of this kind. We have to resort to the laws and those who enforce them, and it was my own personal point of view that if this situation—relating it to something comparable to Sir George Williams—did occur in this province, that this would be the reaction to that type of situation.

There was no reference to my calling in police because I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I have the statutory authority to do so. There was no reference to the administra-

tion. And while the Attorney General does a very excellent job, in my view, in maintaining law and order in this province, there was no reference to the Attorney General in this particular situation, either.

Really, it was no different from what I said at the University of Windsor and, I think, on two or three other occasions over the past six or eight months. But it became somewhat loosely translated, I guess, as it appeared in the press.

Mr. Pitman: I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has allayed some of the fears of students in the province. My supplementary question would have been simply, would he regard this order as a peaceful demonstration in view of the fact that he said destruction, I think. I suspect that that question is perhaps not—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I used the term destruction; I used the term violence; and I think we all understand what that means. The Minister has been involved in many peaceful demonstrations which have become, to a degree, part of our way of life. I do not think that these will disappear from the scene, whether they are university students, or high school students, or any other segments of the public. I said to a group of students, the other day, that in educational matters the only person I find now who cannot demonstrate in these situations or protests, probably is the Minister himself.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. When will the new grant regulations be available for school boards in the province? The second is, does the Minister expect the per capita grant to be increased?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the grant regulations are very complicated; they do not relate specifically to *per capita* grants *per se*. I hope that the grant regulations will be available to the board very shortly, and at this time I shall endeavour to make some explanation to the members because there will be some alterations.

However, I have also said to the trustees and to the directors' association that they should look at their budgets very carefully this year, that they can anticipate that the amount of support will not be significantly increased and that they should budget accordingly.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the Minister expand on what he refers to as shortly?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Shortly, Mr. Speaker, I would think in this instance means within the next six or seven days, perhaps.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask of the Minister a supplementary question? Does the hon. Minister recognize the additional cost to many municipalities in the province as a result of the delay in receiving the new grant regulations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, after a very careful check with some areas that have raised this point, we question whether there is any real cost increase as far as the municipalities are concerned.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask, as a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister prepared to make a grant equivalent to the additional cost to those municipalities that may be involved in this additional cost?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East has a question of this Minister from the other day and one today.

Mr. T. Reid: (Scarborough East): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The first question to the Minister of Education is: What steps are being taken immediately by the Minister of Education to update the curriculum in grades 7 and 8 in connection with the study of the uses and abuses of tobacco, resulting from new evidence supplied by the Donwood Foundation that 90 per cent of people using tobacco become hooked?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have not really seen the new evidence supplied by the Donwood Foundation but I would say that as perhaps the hon. member well knows, in the health education aspect in the intermediate division, grades 7, 8, 9 and 10, there are curriculum materials and so on available and suggestions to the teachers regarding all aspects of healthful living, including the hazards of smoking. In fact, we have introduced this in grades 4, 5 and 6.

We point out the wisdom of introducing this matter to children during these early years of their lives as the needs are determined by the individual teacher. This is already built into the curriculum, Mr. Speaker, at the present time. Of course, as more up-to-date information becomes available, whether it is from the Donwood Foundation or any other research group, that is statistically correct and is helpful in these situations through the programme consultants. This

further information is also made available to the boards throughout the province.

Mr. T. Reid: May I ask the Minister a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Is the Minister aware that in the curriculum outline of his department for grade 9 that the discussion of smoking comes under loss of appetite?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of it because I think it is not unrelated to it. The fact is that it is mentioned and it is there to be covered.

Mr. T. Reid: I take it that is one of the hazards of smoking then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are some who would say this.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would request the Minister to watch "News Magazine" this evening and comment on the views expressed there.

The second question is: In view of the statement in the *Globe and Mail* of March 6 that a grade 2 teacher in a Toronto school has to leave her job when she is four months pregnant, what steps if any is the Minister going to take to protect the rights of women in the teaching profession?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is protection already, as perhaps the hon. member is fully aware, in the legislation under Section 35: "a board may provide for maternity leave for a teacher not exceeding two years for each pregnancy and specify when such leave shall be taken."

This change took place, Mr. Speaker, I believe in 1965 or 1966. It was done after very thorough study of other jurisdictions, including other provinces, as to what the policies would be there, because I think there are two rights here that are involved. There is obviously the right of the teacher but there is also, I guess, the concern that one must have with the new arrival within the family and so it is felt that providing for the maternity leave of two years, this would supply or provide ample opportunity for the new mother to be with the child and still go back if she so desired into the teaching profession.

There has been some difficulty, of course, determining as to what should be the point of departure. I am no expert in this field, Mr. Speaker, however, I think there is some sense in trying to have the date coincide, say, with the end of a particular term, that is, Christmas

or the mid-term break we are coming to, or, of course, the end of June.

I think a number of boards endeavour to do this. There are some boards which are now discussing—and it is only, I gather, in the discussion stage, I am not fully conversant with this—that perhaps one way of arriving at this would be through the consultation of the physician of the individual teacher perhaps in conjunction with the physician of the board as to what would be an adequate or a reasonable date for determination of when the leave of absence should take place.

Mr. T. Reid: Would I be correct in deducing from the Minister's remarks that he personally does not believe it is bad for young children to see a pregnant woman teaching in a school?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get involved on this discussion. I think that one anticipates that we all exercise, and hopefully the member himself, some degree of reasonableness in all these situations, and to set down any hard and fast rule to me of course is not really too worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A question of the Minister of Education:

Is the Minister aware that Peter K., a student at Welland Eastdale Secondary School, has been expelled, as he claims without just cause, and according to The Schools Administration Act without redress or appeal?

Will the Minister consider intervening on behalf of Peter K.?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as with all these questions that relate to students and teachers, my information, of course, must come from sources that I cannot specify being within the department, so I must pass on information that I have available to me.

I understand that the student in question, Peter K., was in fact suspended last October by the principal under the authority of The Schools Administration Act. I also understand that suspension would have been lifted except there was no, shall we say, acceptance by the student as to the rules governing the particular school.

In February, I understand this young man again requested, or at least requested perhaps the first time, I am not sure, the suspension be terminated and the new Welland county board of education reviewed the re-

quest and informed him in a letter dated February 21 that the suspension would be continued, but pointed out in this reply to him that under the Act the parents do have the right to appeal the suspension.

I would assume the board is now awaiting some reaction from the parents of this young man as to whether they intend to appeal the suspension.

Mr. Lewis: All the facts are wrong on that case.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just say I am giving the information available to me.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lawlor: May I ask a supplementary question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Lakeshore has a supplementary question.

Mr. Lawlor: If the parents, Mr. Speaker, are unwilling to initiate an appeal, and the lad himself is interested in having his case reviewed, then is there any procedure whereby he can have it so reviewed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that if the parents do not wish to enter an appeal upon the suspension, that the student can once again take this matter up with the principal of the school.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister had better investigate the principal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, from yesterday.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: In view of the International Joint Commission's statement last week that the situation in the St. Marys River between Lakes Huron and Superior was:

—unsatisfactory because of the discharge of waste materials (particularly oils, phenols, wood chips and iron) from two large Canadian industries, namely, the Algoma Steel Corporation, Limited, and Abitibi Paper Limited

—does the government intend to take any action to insure speedy compliance on the part of these two companies with the IJC objectives?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker,

the answer is "yes". Staged programmes already under way will be followed closely to see that they are carried out on schedule.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: What is the schedule?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. member the schedule, but it is a schedule agreed upon by the industries and the Ontario Water Resources Commission. I could get the member that schedule if he would like it.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, please.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has a question of this Minister, transferred from the Minister of Health.

Mr. Burr: A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management:

What increase in the temperature of the St. Clair River will result from the reported 500,000 gallons per second drawn out of and returned to the river for cooling purposes at the new generating station at Courtright near Sarnia?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the circulating water system for Lambton generating station, when completed and operating at full capacity, will circulate approximately 8,900 imperial gallons per second, not 500,000 gallons per second as stated in the question.

It is estimated that the overall effect of that discharge of warm water to the river will not exceed one-quarter of one degree Fahrenheit temperature rise for the normal river flow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, my question is as follows:

Why did the Minister ignore the directors of the Canadian National Exhibition, the council of the city of Toronto, the government of Metropolitan Toronto, the Toronto harbour commissioners and the federal government with respect to the Ontario government's plan for the construction of a proposed \$13 million pavilion on the Canadian National Exhibition grounds?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member asked this question. It will

give me an opportunity to clear up perhaps the misunderstanding that appeared in the press this morning.

I would just like to say that the department has worked in close consultation with the directors of the Canadian National Exhibition, the government of Metro Toronto, the city council and the Toronto Harbour Commissioners throughout this project.

1. In March of 1968 the director of special projects of the department, Mr. Ramsay, was appointed to the survey and planning committee of the CNE. This committee included Metro, city and CNE representatives.

2. On April 18, 1968, the department as a member of the technical sub-committee of the survey and planning committee of the CNE authorized a special Master Plan Study of the CNE. Metropolitan Toronto, the CNE and the harbour commission were members of this committee.

3. Meetings were held at intervals throughout the summer.

4. Prior to the Prime Minister's speech on August 16, 1968, discussions were held with the president and general manager of the CNE and the chairman of the survey and planning committee as to the province's intentions with respect to the CNE. At the same time assurances as to landfill were received from the general manager of the harbour commission, Mr. E. B. Griffiths.

5. The province hired architects and designers on September 24, 1968 to carry out the project. Thus for approximately six months before it had even hired its architects and designers, the province had worked closely with the CNE, the harbour commission and Metro on the development of its project.

6. Minutes of meeting of survey and planning committee held on Wednesday, October 2, 1968, in the Queen Elizabeth Building, Exhibition Park, Toronto, show that among those present were the chairman and 14 other people including myself and Mr. Ramsay, and I will not read their names. I quote from the minutes:

The chairman then invited the hon. Stanley Randall to speak on behalf of the province of Ontario. Mr. Randall explained in detail the growing interest the province has in the Canadian National Exhibition and its future, and outlined plans that are now being formulated and which include special land fill and the new Ontario government building on this land. Mr. Randall said it is hoped this will be ready for opening in 1971.

He went on to say that before doing this, however, it was necessary to have assurance from everyone that the government is on the right track, and this is being included in the development plans of the Canadian National Exhibition. Referring to the new land fill Mr. Randall stressed the fact that the bottom of the lake belongs to the provincial government and therefore any land fill which goes into the lake becomes the property of the provincial government.

Those are the end of the minutes.

Also on October 2, 1968, Mr. G. H. Sheppard, Mr. L. C. Powell, Dr. J. K. Reynolds, and the hon. S. J. Randall met to discuss plans for the Ontario Pavilion at the CNE with the Prime Minister.

7. Contact report:

Time: 9.30 a.m. Wednesday, November 27, 1968.

Location: Committee Room No. 3 City Hall.

Present: Metro, T. Thompson, chairman; W. Wronski. Province, J. W. Ramsay, T. Foster. Harbour Commission, J. Jones, L. Marse. CNE, L. C. Powell. CNR, R. V. Doty. City of Toronto, R. Spaxman (observer).

Discussed: 1. Conceptual form of Ontario Pavilion 71 as illustrated by photos of scale model. 2. General endorsement and enthusiasm of water-related structure and sheltering land-fill islands. 3. Mr. Jones, harbour commission saw no difficulty in relationship to Western Gap with (O.P. 71) land-fill, since it does not extend as far into the lake as the CNE master plan. 4. Meeting necessary with Craig, Zeidler & Strong and harbour commission to exchange technical information and establish: (a) configuration of islands; (b) type of land-fill material; (c) scheduling of land-fill; (d) cost.

8. Throughout January, February and March further meetings of a technical nature were held with the fire marshal and the harbour commission as required.

9. On January 31—I met with the mayor and the harbour commission. The mayor was shown details of Ontario's proposed CNE pavilion.

10. On February 25, I again met with mayor Dennison and controller Margaret Campbell and two city officials and I outlined the province's plans.

11. On February 26, the final approval to the project was given by Cabinet. So, I think we have met with the people that I think the hon. member is concerned with.

Mr. Trotter: The Minister was quoted in the paper as saying they had not met, that is where I got—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I think that the reporter asked me the question, "Are all the details of the building known to these people", and I said, "no", they would not be known to the people. The plan was known but not the details of the building until we had a chance to get it approved through Cabinet which was done a week ago last Wednesday.

Then we had all these officials you are referring to, in at 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon, at a meeting before the publicity meeting last night with the journalists at 8.30.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a supplementary question, I would like to know this. This \$13 million building that is going up, is it part of an overall plan for the waterfront? Have you any definite plans for the waterfront?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we have a number of plans that are not entirely related to the exhibition itself and the \$13 million I might say is in connection with landfill and buildings. It includes the entire concept of the government complex building at the CNE and in conjunction with that will be other plans which I hope will be unveiled shortly with the harbour commission.

Mr. Trotter: Is there any indication that the federal government will pay part of this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I would hope so. I think the federal government was somewhat at sea as to what they could do at the CNE grounds until somebody came up with a plan and said this is what we are going to do, this is the price tag, will you make a contribution?

I think right now, the federal government have an opportunity to look at it and say, well if this is the way you are going, we can participate. I think after yesterday's presentation that the federal authorities will have a chance to examine it and decide where they can fit.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): My, the city of Toronto does well from the beneficence of the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Randall: How about Montreal?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Both members are out of order.

The hon. member for High Park has a question from March 5 of the Attorney Gen-

eral which apparently has never been asked, number 830.

Mr. Shulman: Yes sir. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

Whereas the application for legal aid on behalf of Douglas Woods, the man who was convicted of theft after being induced to commit a crime by two police officers, was refused on the grounds that there was no hope of winning an appeal, and whereas the appeal has now been won, would the Attorney General please explain the refusal this week to accept Mr. Woods' application for legal aid?

Part two. In the Attorney General's opinion, is this not a miscarriage of justice?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the explanation perhaps, Mr. Speaker, is that under the present legislation a certificate could not be granted retroactively. That, generally, would be the explanation, but the committee, of course, acted I think in good faith in exercising its discretion. They have no right to grant a certificate retroactively under the present legislation.

As to whether this is a miscarriage of justice or not, I would say there is no question of that. The case was taken to appeal. Woods did have counsel. He did succeed. Conviction was set aside and, therefore, no miscarriage of justice.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney General accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Attorney General will argue with me inasmuch as the legal aid people made the mistake in the first place in believing the appeal could not succeed, and inasmuch as obviously they were wrong, we now know that, perhaps regardless of legislation, would you intervene to see that he has his legal costs paid because he has no money? Would you not agree with me it would be unfair for this man to remain in debt because the legal aid made an error?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think I would agree with the hon. member to this extent that I think the situation is one which needs correction. I am looking at the legislation. I do not think I am going to intervene at all to see that this counsel is paid. I really have not any intention of that.

I might say that we have discussed this with the officials of the legal aid committee, and I recognize that in this legislation is a situation which probably should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a question of the Minister of Labour from yesterday.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour.

Has the Minister received a petition signed by the women cleaners of the Ontario Hospital at 999 Queen Street, West, Toronto, in which they complain that they are not receiving payment equal to that of the men doing the same work in that hospital? Has the Minister investigated this complaint and what action will be taken?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that I received a complaint from these persons. The matter is under investigation and will be dealt with under the provisions of The Employment Standards Act.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister let us know when the time comes, or when he has completed his investigation?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When the matter is complete, I will see that the hon. member knows the results.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a question of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I finally come to the end of the list. To the Provincial Secretary:

Will the Provincial Secretary please explain the 15 transfers of liquor licences by the Holiday Inn Hotels on December 1, 1968, from itself to itself?

Why were these licence transfers not reported until March 8, 1969?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that on December 1, 1968, Commonwealth Holiday Inns of Canada Limited notified the liquor licence board of the province that shares of its capital stock had been issued from its treasury, and this internal arrangement required them to notify the board. The 15 transfers listed in the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario licence activities for the week ending March 8, 1969, reflect this particular transaction.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, goes back to a related question the hon. member raised in the last session, or the first session of this Parliament. In the interval between notification of this fact in December and the actual approval of the transfers there had to be certain discussions and calculations of the necessary transfer fees. The completed transfer applications were considered by the

Liquor Licence Board of Ontario on Thursday, March 6, 1969, at which time approval was given with an effective date of December 1, 1968.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question? Was the licence really transferred from itself to itself, or from somebody to somebody?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if I could repeat it again, there was an internal matter with respect to the company, and the liquor licence board required this issuing of new capital to be brought to their attention. Therefore, although it was internal so far as the corporation was concerned, it did require technically a transfer from itself to itself, although the new self was a much more expanded self than prior.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, before the order number is called by the Prime Minister, I wonder if I could direct a question to him, sir.

In view of the relative success, Mr. Prime Minister, of the television coverage of the Legislature in the last week or ten days crowned, today, has the Prime Minister any further intentions about the use of television for this Legislature in the immediate future or in the long run?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I necessarily make the assumption that it was such a tremendous success, particularly today. I think what we need to do now is to assess what has happened. This was entered into in the nature of an experiment, and we now must assess whether it has been successful. I think this will require some discussion and consultation with the networks themselves.

It is a very expensive process, I am led to believe, not for us, but for those who are doing the televising and I am quite certain there will be all kinds of ideas advanced as to what might be done in the future as the result of this experiment on these three occasions. When we have these ideas I would be quite happy to discuss them with the members of the House in order that we might decide what, if any role, television has to play in the House in the future.

It is a little difficult at this stage of the game to say even whether the CBC or CTV will want to come in the chamber again.

Mr. MacDonald: Further to this point, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Prime Minister if he would convene rather quickly

whatever he feels would be the appropriate body because I do not know whether the Prime Minister is aware that the Speaker has received a further request from CFTO. I am aware of it because a copy was sent to myself, to the leader of the Opposition, and I presume to the Prime Minister, requesting coverage of some particular debate.

In other words, there is a continuing interest in spite of, or because of, the coverage we have had so far, on the part of at least one network, therefore, some indication of a desire to continue. I would think some early resolving of this for our own guidance, as well as for theirs, would be useful.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 19th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): The Department of Correctional Services' annual report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968 was tabled in the House on March 6. It outlines activities during the year and I hope hon. members have had an opportunity to study it in detail. The chart illustrating the facilities for adult female offenders is still at the printers and copies will be made available shortly. However, the programme for female offenders is explained in the annual report.

I shall not take up the time of the House to review the contents of the annual report. However, I should like to bring hon. members up to date on some of the developments within the department since the end of the previous session of this Legislature. I shall also outline highlights of new programmes which we are planning to initiate this year.

In my estimates' speech last year I indicated the department's intention to construct a new reception and assessment centre for juveniles. Hon. members will be pleased to learn that property has already been acquired in Oakville for this purpose, and the final stage of working drawings is nearing completion. This centre will serve all training schools in the province.

It will accommodate 120 boys and girls. Immediately following adjudication in Juvenile and Family Court, all youngsters will be placed in this unit, where a complete physical and personality appraisal will be carried out by a team of professional staff to deter-

mine which facility will best meet the individual child's needs.

Construction of a new training school for boys has begun on a site on the outskirts of Sudbury. This interdenominational school will accommodate 120 boys in a "cottage type" setting. The facilities will include academic and vocational classrooms and shops, a gymnasium and an interdenominational chapel. The school is the first to be established to serve northern Ontario and will facilitate visits by parents and relatives. This also will be the first interdenominational and bilingual training school in Ontario.

Plans are well under way for the introduction of pilot projects in family counselling at two residences previously used by staff members at Grand View School for girls at Galt and at White Oaks Village for boys near Hagersville. Renovations are being made to equip these homes for visits by parents of wards at these schools. These arrangements will permit the staff to provide more intensive and concentrated family counselling, with the aim of helping the family make appropriate adjustment prior to the ward's release on placement to his or her own home in the community.

During the past year, we have continued to provide learning and experience through new media. For example, under the direction of Mr. Lee Scott, the head teacher at Sprucedale School, Hagersville, the young students produced a film. The students performed as actors, writers, directors, editors, etc., and learned how to work individually and as a team.

This film provided a valuable learning experience for the boys. The film will be shown at the annual meeting of the Canadian Congress of Corrections to be held in June.

During the summer months last year, boys from Pine Ridge School, Bowmanville, and Sprucedale School, Hagersville, participated in a variation of the Outward Bound programme. On these outings, they learned the fundamentals of camping, canoeing, cliff rescue, water safety, practical survival techniques, boating, map reading, and so on.

Most important, the boys learned to meet many individual challenges and to work together as a team. The trips also strengthened rapport between the boys and staff who accompanied them. To quote from an essay by one boy:

I have gotten to know the staff better, and the boys too. Boys and staff I hated at the school are now my buddies or friends.

I have learned how to stick things out until you have finished them.

Another boy wrote:

I learned when you start something you don't stop until you are finished, or it will take a lot longer than you expected. There are other things like teamwork. I didn't think a bunch of training school boys could get together and do something worthwhile and have it turn out so well.

Over the past year, we have continued to develop a good working relationship with universities and the communities in which the schools are located. Universities have been a valuable source of part-time professional staff. In addition, students from universities and community colleges have received field training, and have carried on research in training schools.

Many of our staff are actively involved in community service clubs and other agencies. In this connection, I would pay special tribute to those service clubs and private organizations which have participated in our programmes and the involvement of our wards in community activities.

On July 1, 1968, The Correctional Services Act—which consolidated eighteen Acts into one—was proclaimed law. It was not possible to proclaim sections of the Act which require amendments to federal legislation. To this date, these federal amendments have not been made law, although sections 19 and 20 of our Act are provided for in Bill C-150 which is now before the House of Commons and has received second reading.

These sections provide for temporary absences from adult correctional institutions of selected inmates for medical or humanitarian reasons, or to assist in other ways in their rehabilitation. They will permit us to allow selected inmates to leave the institution during the day to work in the community, or to further their academic or vocational training.

While awaiting federal legislative action, we have proceeded to initiate a pilot programme in the belief that these changes will be made.

We have, through a somewhat cumbersome procedure, which I shall explain in a moment, arranged for a number of young men serving sentences in four different correctional institutions in the province to participate in academic programmes at community educational institutions. These young men have attended high school or university classes during the day and returned to the correctional facilities at night.

We have learned much from this experiment. Although it was necessary to remove one student from this programme, we are very pleased with the over-all results to date. Most of the young men have responded well. Not only have some of them achieved outstanding academic marks, but their general deportment has clearly indicated the great potential of this programme and its value as an additional tool in rehabilitation and as a new bridge for offenders back into the community.

As I mentioned earlier, a somewhat cumbersome procedure was required to put this pilot project into effect. It is necessary under present legislative powers for us to seek the approval of the national parole board in the case of each person considered for this programme. However, this red tape will be eliminated as soon as we are able to proclaim sections 19 and 20 of The Correctional Services Act. I would like to make it clear that the national parole board has been most co-operative in assisting us in this worthwhile venture. The Solicitor General, the Hon. George McIlraith, has also been most co-operative in meeting with us to discuss matters of mutual concern.

Mr. Chairman, within three months we shall introduce a new system of incentive allowances for inmates. At present, every reformatory inmate, regardless of length of sentence, receives a gratuity of \$2 per month, up to a total of \$20, upon release. This present system of gratuities has often been misinterpreted. A false impression has developed that this is the only form of assistance provided. In actual fact, the amount of the gratuity has very often been supplemented by additional funds and/or clothing, work tools, and so on, when such is recommended by our after-care personnel. This gratuity has not, in the past, been earned. It has simply been provided as a matter of course.

Last year, I indicated in this House that I felt a new system should be initiated and that studies were proceeding with this in mind. A decision has been made. The present system has outlived its usefulness: It will be abolished.

This new incentive allowance—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): How much?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —which will be available to all prisoners in reformatories, training centres, clinics, forestry camps and industrial farms, will take the form of graded rates of allowance. A portion of each inmate's incen-

tive allowance will be placed in a savings fund and this money will be turned over to him upon his release; the remainder will be available to him for purchase, within the institution, of tobacco, some confectionery items, and so on. At present, tobacco is issued to prisoners without charge. Non-smokers receive a sum of money in lieu of tobacco, which is placed in trust and turned over to them upon release.

The new weekly incentive allowance will approximate, and in some cases exceed, similar provisions in other jurisdictions. Experience in other jurisdictions has indicated that remuneration of the kind contemplated, no matter how small the amount, plus the privileges which go with it, have a significant meaning for the inmate, and that such incentives tend to improve inmate attitudes and the general over-all climate of institutions.

Mr. Shulman: How much is the remuneration?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will control the exuberance of his verbosity—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I learned that, incidentally, while sitting in this Chamber, from a gentleman by the name of Mitchell Hepburn.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): A great leader!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In keeping with the department's statement of purpose, the main aim of the new system is to foster positive attitudes. Experience has proven that this approach to improving attitudes is psychologically sound and in the interests of rehabilitation.

I would make a clear distinction here—Mr. Chairman, I want to make this quite clear—between the incentive allowance which we plan to introduce and a system of payment of wages for work done by inmates. Industries operated within our correctional institutions do not produce goods for sale on the open market. In addition, some institutions are geared solely to providing academic and vocational training. There will be no attempt to equate the incentive allowance with wages in the outside community.

The details are being worked out and graded rates of allowance will be finalized shortly. The maximum rate will be approximately \$5 a week. The decisions as to advancement from one grade to another will

be the responsibility of a special rating board in each institution.

As mentioned previously, we have not sought to equate the incentive allowance with wages in the outside community. However, I look forward to the day when inmates in our correctional institutions will be performing full-time work and earning standard wages—paying for their maintenance in institutions, contributing to the support of their families, and paying taxes. This incentive allowance programme is a step towards that ultimate goal. Another step in this direction will be instituted with the introduction, on a broad basis, of the live-in, work-out programme provided for in sections 19 and 20 of our Correctional Services Act, which I mentioned earlier.

At present the major sanction against unacceptable behaviour in our adult institutions is the loss of good conduct remission. This means that many inmates serve longer periods of time than they might otherwise, with the attendant additional cost to the taxpayer.

While we do not intend to do away with forfeiture of good conduct remission for serious misbehaviour, we are convinced that the incentive allowance system will improve attitudes and reduce unacceptable behaviour. Fewer losses of good conduct remission would, of course, also reduce costs to the taxpayer.

Most important in human terms, this new programme will provide another positive rehabilitative tool in meeting our major objective of helping offenders to make a satisfactory adjustment in preparation for their return to the community.

Mr. Chairman, as hon. members know, the department last year assumed full responsibility for the operation of the 35 county and 2 city jails. Twenty-seven of these jails pre-date Confederation. A task force of senior officials is engaged in an on-going review of the needs of these jails and in recommending repairs and priorities for replacement. Immediate, necessary repairs and improvements are being made in most jails.

On October 29, 1968, I announced that planning would begin immediately for replacement of the Carleton county jail, Ottawa, with a modern regional detention centre. I also announced that, based on the recommendation of the task force, priority would be given in the replacement programme, to five other areas. These areas are: Halton and Peel, Hamilton, London, the Niagara region, and Metropolitan Toronto.

The assumption of responsibility for the operation of the jails has reduced the need to plan on the basis of strict county boundaries. Further study was required on the plans for the Quinte regional detention centre as a result of this change and because the original tenders on this centre were higher than had been anticipated.

The Department of Public Works has re-examined these plans and made some alterations, having regard for this department's plan to utilize the minimum security facilities in this institution for live-in, work-out programmes. It is expected that re-tendering for this unit will take place shortly.

In January of this year, I had the very great privilege and honour of participating with the Hon. Madame Georges P. Vanier and Prime Minister John Robarts, at the official opening of the new Vanier centre for women at Brampton.

This centre replaces the old Andrew Mercer reformatory on King Street in Toronto. The combination of the new facilities and the programme which employs the therapeutic community concept, places the Vanier centre for women in the forefront of correctional institutions and programmes in this field.

The most recent edition of the newsletter of the Elizabeth Fry Society contained this statement: "Indeed, the Vanier centre is a unique prison in Canada and probably in the world."

I know all hon. members will share my pride in the leadership Ontario is providing in this field.

Mr. Chairman, several other current developments are worthy of at least brief mention.

Drawings have been completed for a new gymnasium to serve the Burwash industrial farm and construction is expected to start this spring.

A new recreation building has been completed at the Monteith industrial farm and training centre. This project was built by training centre students and selected prisoners from the industrial farm at this complex and provided valuable on-the-job training and experience in bricklaying and carpentry for the young men who worked on this project.

Architects have been appointed for the Maplehurst complex, near Milton. The first projects to be built on this site will be a reformatory and a training centre. The Maplehurst detention centre, which will replace the local jails in Halton and Peel counties, will also eventually be built on this

site. This reformatory will replace the existing reformatory at Mimico, which will, in turn, be converted into enlarged clinics for the treatment of alcoholics, drug addicts, and sexual deviates. The training centre will also help to further reduce the inmate population at Guelph reformatory. It will provide accommodation for 200 young offenders who require a more secure setting than the one now in existence at Brampton.

Recently, I informed the House about plans for use by Sheridan College students of the vocational welding shop facilities at the training centre at Brampton. We are very pleased that this multiple use of facilities could be arranged. We look forward to the day when we will be able to extend this usage and to make reciprocal arrangements for inmates of correctional institutions to attend classes in various community educational facilities throughout the province.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the past year has been one of considerable progress and I look forward with optimism to the expansion and development of new and soundly based programmes to meet our responsibilities and the needs of the province in this complex and demanding field of human concern.

I cannot praise too highly the hard work, dedication and *esprit de corps* exhibited by personnel throughout our correctional system in their efforts towards achieving the department's goals. They work in a difficult field and under tremendous pressure and I want to publicly express to them my appreciation and that of my Deputy Minister.

Much credit is also due to the many community organizations and agencies and the committees associated with the department for their interest, co-operation and active participation in our work.

I hope that hon. members will concur with the programmes outlined and give their approval for the funds necessary to continue and expand our progressive work.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the short remarks that the Minister made with regard to his estimates and I will try to be brief as well.

The hon. Minister of Correctional Services is, I might say, one of the real backbones of his party and he religiously attends the sessions. On a number of occasions he has added to the crossfire with his witty remarks.

I am happy that the Minister has taken some of my recommendations of last year and has slowly integrated them into his overall plans.

Before I begin my prepared remarks I wish at this time to pay my regards to the fine work the officers and staff of the correctional services are doing. In my remarks I do not wish to convey to anyone that they are not doing their best, considering the facilities supplied.

Because the report of The Department of Correctional Services has been in my hands for only a few days, I am not going to attempt the detailed analysis of its contents that was the theme of my opening speech last year. Rather, I want to address myself to a few general introductory remarks and then proceed to a commentary on some aspects of addiction, which I have been concerned with to an increasing extent throughout the year, as I have seen society become ever more dependent on drugs of various kinds.

But first, briefly, to the report. In the area of staff training and development, the importance of which I emphasized last year in relation to society's goals, I am still disappointed at the low enrolment in relation to the total number of people employed by the department. I think that it is incumbent upon the Minister, perhaps by a letter sent out over his signature, and individually addressed to every member of the department, to stress that society's values are changing, and that only by continuous updating in aims as well as techniques of correction, can staff members hope to transmit the positive rehabilitative values that are at the core of correction.

The Minister did not dwell on this matter at much length, and I would hope that he would amplify, during his later comments, the scope and extent of the key training programmes, the ones that shape the direction of staff philosophy. I want to know if there are any artificial barriers to participation in courses that might usefully be removed, provided staff members are keen to learn. It seems to me that if a staff member is motivated to ask what makes prisoners act as they do, then he or she should be able to get some positive guidance without too much formality.

The courses ought to be easy to come by, and they ought not to absorb any out-of-pocket expenses on the part of the would-be learner. In fact, there ought to be bonuses, if there are not already, in which proficiency in active duty is complemented by willingness to capture the overview on corrections through internal educational opportunities. I would like a comment on this point.

Turning to the professional services division, and particularly to education, the rather odd

thought occurred to me that if the remarkable progress recorded in the report with regard to teaching techniques is reflected in the actual changed atmosphere in the classrooms, and if, in fact, perhaps the more adventurous and "challenged" teachers have been attracted from community schools to work within this department, perhaps some of the ideals of the Hall Dennis Report may well bear more fruit here, in this setting, than in the community where other pressures are at work against the full implementation of that report. At any rate, it's an intriguing thought.

There is a line in the corrections report, on page 14, which says, and I quote (just as it quotes from Hall Dennis):

Genuine efforts are beings made to improve motivation, broaden the curriculum and to use educational materials that are meaningful to students. In all these areas, the teachers are constantly reminded of just how significant education can be, when it serves as a key to reach and rehabilitate students.

I am also impressed by the balance that is apparently being achieved between academic and vocational work in the adult institutions. I suspect that the reason for this breakthrough is the absence of an establishment of people with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo in education. I get the feeling that the barriers to innovation outside corrections would be professional ones, rather than educational ones. Here you are shielded from some of the forces that are restricting our community educational framework, even as the cost soars.

I hope the Minister will make a note to comment later on one aspect that is not mentioned this year, and that is the contribution of visitors to the educational programme. Since it is obvious that inmates' travel is restricted, for perfectly legitimate reasons, to what extent is an understanding of the world to which these people must return fostered by regular visits of speakers and others from outside? Are such visits encouraged within the educational programme? How would someone willing to offer his services, say, in giving a talk on his trade or profession, fit into this apparently enlightened pattern of discovery that the report outlines?

On libraries, the point that interested me was that now you have taken over the county jails, as of July 1, 1968, you have also taken over their libraries and have proceeded to modernize them. Would the Minister please table a comparative list of the old and new

library books in one specific instance in a county jail, so that we may have an idea of what is now available? I attach some importance to this, since books are obviously tools for shaping the attitude of mind of inmates in what might be extremely formative periods of their lives. Without pretending to pose as experts in this field, I think it would be useful for us to look at these titles with a layman's eye, and I trust that the Minister will cause this to be done.

In the recreational programme, I was disappointed to see that scouting does not hold a stronger place in what seems to be a very varied pattern of activity. Could this be because scouting itself is undergoing such an internal change, with the traditionalists in conflict with those who would hold the boys at any cost? Has the department decided that the most worthwhile elements in scouting are being lost in the movement's feverish effort to update itself? I would appreciate a comment on this in due course.

I will say nothing on the chaplaincy this year, beyond noting that my criticisms of May 28, last, seem to have been well taken.

With regard to treatment services, I am sure that ongoing records will prove of great value. The report, quite properly remarks that evaluation is an ongoing process. However, the Minister is well aware of our concern that these most useful records do not fall into the wrong hands. The member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), has a similar question on the order paper in respect of the education data centre.

Will the Minister, therefore, assure this House that adequate precautions exist to prevent these valuable, but highly subjective records from falling into the wrong hands? One can imagine that, in this situation, blackmail would be possible in later life.

At one time, during the Education Estimates I believe, last year, the Minister of Corrections expressed some disbelief that the setting down of these records on to the computer would make much difference. But, of course, it makes them more mobile, and so very easy to copy at high speed, silently and under the very noses of supervisory personnel.

Since the Attorney General has stated that these records are not privileged in any way, as medical dossiers might be privileged, our concern has increased. We should like the Minister to make a statement about his attitude to the security of his evaluation records, and also the proper uses to which he thinks they ought to be put.

I cannot end this rapid review of the report proper without commenting on the minimum security for forestry camps. The idea of using conservation practice, not only as a possible trade, but also as a vehicle for natural learning of man's place in nature, is immensely appealing. We are delighted that the latest such camp to open has been named Camp Oliver, in honour of Mr. Farquhar Oliver, who was MPP for Grey South for over 40 years.

I am sure that this distinguished member of the Legislature must find it entirely fitting that his service to Ontario is being commemorated in this fashion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to turn to the subject of addictions, and I would like the Minister of Correctional Services and his staff members who are auditing this session, to appreciate that what I have to say is directed just as much to other levels of jurisdiction as to our own. To the federal officials concerned with The Criminal Code, as well as to our own officials in the Attorney General's and other departments, I would say: "If the cap fits, wear it"; because it is impossible to talk about this subject without crossing jurisdictional boundaries at every turn.

Let us concede right away that the safety of society is our first concern. We have to get addicts out of positions where they can harm others: the drunken driver from behind the wheel for example. It is also obvious that a man desperate for a shot of heroin is going to be more prone to armed robbery than one who has not to find that kind of black-market money. So I am not advocating any compromise of law and order.

But let us also concede that the real villains of all this business are the traffickers associated with organized crime. They are making money out of misery, and they should be hit hard.

The other approach to trafficking reduction is to make it unprofitable by continually reviewing, in the light of new medical knowledge, just what ought to be on the narcotics list, what ought to come under The Food and Drug Act, and so on.

These lists should be capable of being reviewed by order-in-council, the governments concerned acting on the advice of a skilled professional technical panel. Were this machinery in operation today, there is little doubt that we would see a more effective approach to the problem of tobacco addiction, in spite of the powerful lobbies which, having got a head start, seek to maintain the *status quo*.

However, today we are faced with mounting evidence that tobacco is far more harmful when smoked in excess and I say, in excess, than are some of the other materials which are presently illegal. I wonder in passing what would have happened if Sir Walter Raleigh had puffed at marijuana rather than tobacco, which he could just as easily have done?

There is a report in this morning's *Globe and Mail* which substantiates the fact that tobacco is an addictive drug, and I want at this point to read it into the record of this House:

An expert on addiction and its treatment stated flatly yesterday that tobacco turns smokers into addicts.

Dr. Gordon Bell, president of Donwood Foundation, quoted statistics to the American Women's Club of Toronto to support his statement: Out of 100 persons using alcohol, 5 acquire an uncontrollable desire; out of 100 using tobacco, "90 become hooked."

The founder of the Bell Clinic said that tobacco creates to some degree acute intoxication and the chronic accumulative effects are frightening. However, because smoking tobacco does not impair the smoker's ability to drive or react anti-socially, it is not considered a problem.

Dr. Bell said there is reason to believe that marijuana is less addictive than alcohol as "users of marijuana could discontinue its use. How dangerous is it? Can it be used safely in the home? And the odds are that no permanent damage will result from the experience. Driving would be impaired.

"But people should not be too upset about this vapour-trail to happiness. They should be more upset about tobacco smoking and its accumulative effect."

Dr. Bell suggested that addicts need some cause to work for, if they are to leave their needs for drugs. However, he said, there is reason for concern in the dangerous use of LSD, solvents and glue.

Members may also have seen the report in tonight's Toronto *Daily Star*, in which Dr. Norman Delarue gave out new statistics on tobacco's effects to the board of trade dinner last night. Dr. Delarue, who is a cancer specialist and assistant professor of surgery at the University of Toronto, called cigarettes "the mask of death", and said that they are killing people faster than any pestilence, plague, war or famine in world history.

Cancer of the lung kills 50,000 people a year in North America, and the rate of increase has now surpassed predictions made in 1960—figures which were not believed at that time. But even lung cancer, in terms of the actual numbers affected, has proved to be one of the lesser evils of cigarette smoking. The incidence of bronchitis and emphysema has reached epidemic proportions, Dr. Delarue says, and the death rate from these diseases—now running at 25,000 a year—will soon be higher than that from lung cancer.

Dr. Delarue also says that the difficulty of giving up smoking has been over-emphasized, and one wonders by whom? How much is "suggestion" being invoked to imply that it is a pretty hopeless business giving up? Certainly, it would be to the advantage of the tobacco industry to undertake a word-of-mouth campaign of this kind at regular intervals. Do we know whether this is happening, and can we, in fact, find out?

What I am getting at is that corrections begins, not with the Minister I am now primarily addressing, but rather with his colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), who has consistently refused to acknowledge his liability in this regard, and who has not updated the curriculum in this area—why, must for ever remain a big question mark.

And what about the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), who is supposedly looking after youth matters? Is he doing anything at all by way of an educational campaign among youth? Perhaps he could make a few definitive speeches on the matter. We are clearly plagued by the curse that Sir Walter Raleigh, by his legendary action, has bestowed upon us.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In these estimates, do we not have to stick to the estimates or can we go off on any variation that has nothing whatsoever to do with the estimates?

Mr. Chairman: I might say to the hon. member's point of order that it has seemed to me during the hon. member's remarks that he could more properly be making those remarks in what we know as the Budget Debate rather than in the debate on the estimates. We have not yet come to the Budget Debate, as such.

The hon. member does seem to be relating some of the points to the matter of correctional services but the matters he has brought

up should be corrected before people become offenders. Is this correct?

Mr. Ruston: The addiction thing that we are working on in this, is where they end up in our hon. member's institutions.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is still speaking about correctional services?

Mr. Ruston: Right. The accident of history is with us. But we might well have seen a situation in which little boys were branded with a criminal record for having been caught puffing a regular cigarette. That cannot happen now, not because we have compassion for the young, but because too many people have a stake in the success of the tobacco industry, including the Treasurer of this province, who uses the tax from this product to balance his Budget.

Just as last year, when I posed the dilemma of the moral values of society as a whole continually altering the goals of correction, so today I want to stress once more that we cannot expect corrections to take in people, as it were, clothed in sin and turn them out purged and wholly virtuous. The best we can do is to match them to society's norms, which is like taking a run at a freight train. The closer you get to it, the faster it seems to be moving and the higher it looks.

Impending revisions to our liquor legislation are obviously necessary on civilized grounds alone. It ought to be possible for reasonable people to sip a vermouth at a sidewalk cafe, or pick a wine by the vintage. It seems reasonable to sell beer in grocery stores as they have done for years in Quebec. But all these reforms assume a concurrent programme of consumer education. We hate to admit that perhaps the reason we have been slow to adopt some of these civilized European customs is that we do not have the background to drink in moderation. Perhaps we are afraid of ourselves, like a small boy let loose at the refrigerator.

It seems to make sense then, that if we are to tax liquor more highly, most of this revenue ought to go into education, and, in this context, I would call the bright and friendly self-service liquor stores now being experimented with as truly educational. We are apt to equate education with literature and films, whereas a government pilot project for a sidewalk cafe on Yonge Street might teach people the social way to drink and turn them away from hole-and-corner establishments where the waiter stands over you with your next glass of draught beer, waiting

for you to finish the one you have. Discrimination and taste can be taught in drinking, and probably by example.

We are told that young teenagers get into a great deal of trouble drinking beer and driving around, drag-racing and so on, usually in the company of young girls. Only this weekend, we had a tragedy in Metro Toronto which fell into the category of the "uneducated show-off". All of which leads me to suggest that we are not getting at the root cause of the liquor and drug problem, which is more complex than we are willing to admit. It is a combination of young people having too much time on their hands, too much money in the form of cash and too little encouragement to experience the possibilities that life affords in other directions. A government summer employment programme—a pioneer programme of the kind that the leader of the Opposition has advocated on several occasions in this House—would give youth a new opportunity to work in the open air for Tourism, for Lands and Forests, and for Highways, and would reduce the psychic dependence on "kicks" which seems to be so big in teenage life today.

Class distinction plays a big part in the effectiveness of recovery from alcoholism. There is no doubt that when a wealthy man can go to a private clinic to "dry out" in privacy, and to consult with specialists ranging from physicians to psychologists, all of whom are resident and at hand, he can go a long way towards recovery through his pocketbook alone. Everything can be made just right for his rehabilitation.

But it is a very different story when withdrawal from alcohol is made at the public expense. I suspect the corners we cut are the very subtleties that make all the difference between a truly understanding approach, and a superficial drying-out exercise unaccompanied by therapy of any kind. The public approach is crude, in part because the people who must use it do not have the necessary background to relate to other possible modes of life. On the other hand, the executive with a bottle in his desk can be counselled successfully to seek his release from tension in other, less anti-social ways, like hitting a golf ball extra-hard.

Now there is very little evidence to suggest that alcohol's accessibility as such is a factor in alcoholism. In Canada, British Columbia is first in the statistics, with 2.58 per cent of alcoholics over the age of 20. Ontario comes next, with a percentage of 2.50. But in terms of actual numbers, because of our

greater population, Ontario comes first. Yet our liquor laws are more rigid than those of Quebec, where alcoholism is not the problem it is here.

So it seems to be affluence rather than access which affords us the correlation. This is borne out by an overall increase in alcoholism in Canada of 46.37 per cent in the ten years between 1951 and 1961. That's an increase, Mr. Chairman, not a gross percentage. Problem drinkers account for 39.5 per cent of this group. Alcohol addicts who do not cause problems to anyone but themselves total 43.2 per cent—that's the largest figure. Those who are really ill with chronic alcoholism amount to some 17.3 per cent.

Most of the last-named groups do not stay alive too long. They perish from cirrhosis of the liver, or delirium tremens, or Korsakoff's psychosis, and then they become mere statistics through which it is possible to check the accuracy of the so-called Jellinek formula for determining the incidence of alcoholism in the community.

Of course, alcoholism is the problem that it is simply because we are a society on the move, and it has proven impossible to keep drinking drivers off the road. Even with the extensive policing we have today, far too many people get behind the wheel too soon after they have imbibed, and the results are often tragic, as on that recent occasion when seven young theology students, returning to Toronto from a hockey game at South River, were struck by a car driven by a man who had just come from a beverage room and had literally "hit the road", all over the road, and ended up on the wrong side, in a head-on collision with the youths. He died in the impact, taking two of the students with him and maiming four more. They are still in the hospital with severe internal injuries, and their future is a big question mark.

Now the student society of Emmanuel College of Victoria University in the University of Toronto is spearheading the drive for compulsory breathalyzer tests for impaired drivers, and I want to take this opportunity, from the floor of the provincial Legislature, of endorsing that campaign, and urging the federal government to move with speed on this urgent problem.

It seems to be that Corrections must focus sharply on the third party involvement that is characteristic of drinking while driving. The other focus, I suggest, ought to be on the forces which lead people to drink: loneliness; the lack of personal fulfillment; the inability to relate to other people except in the grossest

physical sense; the perhaps unreasonable pressures of work and expectation upon a person; and the debt problems that come through attempting to maintain too high a standard of living, just to keep up with the Joneses.

It strikes me that the Minister of Corrections must be subjected to a great deal of gratuitous advice on the subject of treatment, from sources that are narrowly motivated. What I do *not* want to see happen are the proposed reforms of the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch), which are long overdue, confused and distorted through muddled thinking, or by a deliberate muddying of the waters.

That is why I think we must give a clear lead to Corrections counsellors not to use their captive audiences or individuals as vehicles for views which might be at variance with the best interests of the individual under treatment. In alcoholism, as in all else, we must think of personal welfare and rehabilitation as soon as we have satisfied the prior public need for protection, which, of course, we have done by the time the subjects of treatment are in Mimico.

The other big issue is the prevalence of medicine-cabinet drugs and the daily pill-taking in adult society. The children see this as a regular pattern of activity on the part of the parents. The member for Scarborough East has a "Little Nurse" kit which can be bought at any toy shop, and which has a variety of sugar pills and capsules which look just like the real thing. It is so easy to graduate from the toy to the actual pharmacy prescription—quite apart from the danger of the child filling up her toy kit from the bathroom cabinet, with potentially tragic results.

If we are conditioning the oncoming generations by habituation, then it seems we are asking the ultimate drug offenders to bear the burden of society's guilt—the burden of all of us. Trafficking is something else, but consumption alone must excite our compassion. These people are, to a great extent, the scapegoats for our collective guilt in this matter. The fact that we personally have been able to resist the temptation to indulge to excess, does not release us from our having failed to educate society to the wide spectrum of satisfying alternatives to addiction.

In this respect, the addiction problem and the "minority lack of opportunity" situation—Indians, Negroes, Puerto Ricans in the States—have a lot in common. We say underprivileged peoples are not ready for emancipation, yet we deny them the means to make themselves ready.

Similarly, we condemn the alcoholic, even

as we hold back from making drinking a simple social exercise which would not invite excesses. There was not much excess at Expo '67, yet there was the right atmosphere for individual choice.

Of the 50,644 convictions shown on page 100 of the current corrections report, over half—27,427—were for offences against The Liquor Control Act. This is the measure of our failure to educate. We are already too late, in a sense, once a conviction has been registered.

The Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic, like Oxford University, is the home of lost causes. Nevertheless, like Oxford, nobody is suggesting it be done away with. It seems to be doing excellent work, within its sphere of influence, which, of course, is too small ever to lick the problem. We have, then, to think in terms of individual rehabilitation, since the act of conviction itself ought to have satisfied society's collective guilt complex.

Individual counselling is obviously good in these circumstances; but how far can group psychotherapy go without begging all the questions?

We have the same problem, I suspect, at Penetang, where the "naked in a box" experiment in group psychotherapy is proceeding. Insofar as these experiments cause people to shed their inhibitions and relate to each other in a meaningful way, they are good.

But when it comes to matching the individual once more to the imperfect society in which we live, group psychotherapy may persuade the individual to lower his own standards—yes, even the criminal can be thought of in terms of "lowering" his standards—in order to make a better match with the environment to which he must return.

I see a real danger in group psychotherapy actually undermining higher individual values in the interest of adjustment to the environment to which the inmate must return. If to say that "the saint must be soiled for Jarvis Street" is an exaggeration, it still expresses what I am trying to say.

I admit I do not know the answer, but I am certainly aware of the problem posed by conflicting goals. The consensus that emerges from group psychotherapy may, indeed, be the wrong answer for the individual in these circumstances, which is why I urge that this technique be used always with individual welfare in mind, rather than with the moulding premise.

Aversion therapy, in which physical discomfort and suggestions are related, is a repugnant form of treatment, which cuts

across all the accepted norms of civil liberties. If we regard these techniques as mere tools in the hands of psychiatrists and psychotherapists, we may be abdicating our responsibility. As watchdogs of the individual as well as the community, we may well be allowing individual spiritual values to perish for what we believe to be the common good.

A barrage of electric shocks and insulin shots, which changes the electro-chemical composition of the body, also changes the personality of the individual. The man or woman who comes out is, literally, not the same person as the one who went in.

Now, how far can we take this in the treatment area? Are we talking now about lobotomies in the public interest—about actual surgery on the worst cases? If not now, how much longer will it be before this is seriously proposed? We might be paying much too high a price for a smooth and easy-going society, if the price of our placid existence is the destruction, by electrical and chemical means, and eventually by surgery, of individual personalities.

The Minister and his staff will know that all these things are possible now, and only the lack of public sanction deters the experimenter from going ahead with "cures" along these lines.

Once again, we are brought back, as in so many other areas, to the thinking of Justice McRuer. The best thing this government ever did was to bring down that report, and, thank goodness, we have the assurance of more to come. I hope that the commission will look at the legal aspects of treatment within institutions as a function of civil liberties, and I would remind the House that these liberties do not entirely perish in confinement.

I wonder if it would be possible for Dr. Richard Steffy, who is the person most responsible for pushing back the frontiers in these more controversial areas at the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic at Mimico, to give a talk to members of the Legislature, or at least to the committee members concerned, about his philosophical approach to some of these ethical difficulties? In particular, we want to know the details of the "sensitivity sessions" that have been developed for staff members.

What does the five-week course involve? Most of all, who sets the direction, the goals? Are they individual-oriented, or do they subordinate the welfare of the individual to external considerations?

In the short time I have at my disposal, the most effective way to make my points without becoming overly technical is to carry the situations to extremes—to reduce them to absurdity. But I hope I have succeeded in touching the principal bases.

If I must be critical of the Alex G. Brown Institute, it must be to say that the public relations programme has not reached the members of this Legislature, nor, I believe, the public at large.

Interest in the problem of addictions in relation to the criminal and in relation to where society is moving is, I think, of great interest today. I trust that the institute will not push ahead and leave us all behind, because that is the way to misunderstanding. We must be kept in the picture, and two pages in the annual report are not enough.

I want to end these opening remarks by commending to members' attention, the excellent new edition of the Time-Life book "The Mind" by John Rowan Wilson. Dr. Wilson is an English surgeon, novelist and medical journalist who has been serving as assistant editor of the *British Medical Journal* since 1962.

His chapter on "Manipulations of Mentality" is the best exposition I have seen in this area, and I commend it to all who would understand the nature of the problem we are up against. Thank you.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to you again, after so many months.

I understand the very serious attack that the Minister has been under from the Liberal benches this afternoon and I think in consideration of the rough time that he has had perhaps I should give him a few compliments because I know he does not get many unsolicited bouquets.

I think everyone in this House agrees, Mr. Chairman, that there is no question that this Minister has accomplished more in his department than the five men who preceded him in the same position. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister has brought the department forward some ten or 15 years into the twentieth century in the brief time that he has had this responsibility, but before you—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Do not hold your breath.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am waiting for the other shoe to drop.

Mr. Shulman: Of course, we all know, Mr. Chairman, that the five members who have preceded this Minister, as the Minister of this department, did absolutely nothing. We are also aware that when this Minister took his position, his department was some 100 years behind the time and so, we do agree, he has brought the department forward some 15 years.

This is really the tragedy that this department is in now, he has given the illusion of progress. He has been able, by making a gesture here and making a gesture there, to delude his own party, many people in the Legislature, other parties and the public, into thinking that his department is carrying out a modern programme. It is not. It is the worst in North America.

Well now, let me just give an example. We heard a great deal today about when the federal government does this, then we will do that. When they pass a certain law then, we will start to have a workout programme. We will have people go to work during the day and come to jail at night, or go to school during the day and meanwhile, we are just going to have a little pilot programme.

We could pay a little more serious attention to his remarks, Mr. Chairman, had he not said exactly the same thing last year in reference to this miserly six cents a day which was being allotted to the prisoners. He says, "Well we have to wait until the federal government changes the legislation. We know \$2 a month is not a proper amount. We know there should be incentive payments. We know there should be payments for work but we have to wait until the federal government makes their change".

Well somehow, Mr. Chairman, that was not true and today, we have the Minister getting up and with great pride saying: "Well we are going to do something now. We are not going to pay them two dollars a month anymore. We are going to pay them up to \$20 a month. We do not have to wait for the federal government to make the change. We are going to start it in three months."

So there is just about as much truth in what he said last year on that matter as there is in his matter. He could modernize the situation today if he so wished. He could pass the legislation right here to bring us up into a proper, modern, penal system if he so wished or perhaps he does wish and perhaps he is not able to persuade that antediluvian Cabinet, which he has sitting around

and behind him, particularly behind him at the moment.

I would like to give you an example—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): I would rather you had not said that.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps I was flattering the Minister when I said antediluvian. I will retract that, hon. Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I have the front page of the Toronto Evening Conservative here. This is from November 13, 1968, and we have a huge picture from "School to Jail" and underneath it says, "Day paroles, a new life". There is a happy picture of a young man and his wife, Christina, leaving Don Jail and off to class at Victoria College. There was a great deal of publicity given to this prisoner and his name, which is here in full, Stanley Dobleowski; this again sums up one of the major faults of this Minister and his department. It is the false piety.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, last year on occasion, members in this House would get up and say, "What is happening to the poor prisoners or the poor prisoner who you have up in Burwash, who you are going to deport without giving a hearing"? If the name of that prisoner was mentioned, the Minister would rise in high dudgeon and say, is that not terrible, releasing the name of this poor prisoner so that his relatives back in Italy will read the Toronto Evening Conservative and they will know what is being done to him here in Ontario?"

What do we have when the Minister has something he wants to publicize, which he thinks will give him kudos, good publicity—and this Minister is good at that—he is better than possibly anybody else in the Cabinet—then we see huge pictures, huge publicity, articles everywhere with the name, with the picture of the prisoner. He does not seem too worried when that type of thing occurs. But I do not care about that; if he wants his personal publicity and he thinks that will help him to be promoted in the Cabinet, fine, good luck. I have no real complaint provided he does what he is talking about.

Now with great publicity, and great announcements, we are going to start a pilot programme. That pilot programme, to begin with, involved some six poor prisoners who were allowed to go to school; perhaps it has been expanded now, perhaps it is a few dozen. What disturbs me about this, Mr. Chairman, is that—

Hon. Mr. White: What disturbs me is that you are contemplating running for leadership of your party.

Mr. Shulman: That I am sure, would disturb the hon. Minister of Revenue.

What disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, is that we are so far behind here. This type of programme was begun in 1913 in other jurisdictions. I took the trouble of looking this up, this great new programme which was announced here in Ontario in the last few months. I was rather curious to see what other jurisdictions have done. I have here a review of the work furlough programme in California.

California is one of the states that is rather new to this programme and according to the tax digest of the fourth quarter of 1968, they have been carrying out this programme for 15 years only. So they are quite new to it and I would not say that they are one of the pioneers. Actually, the pioneer was Wisconsin and I quote:

The first legislation to authorize work relief programmes in county jails and similar institutions was enacted by the Wisconsin State Legislature in 1913.

We are only 55 years behind the times here in Ontario and actually, I suppose, perhaps this department is not too bad, comparably. The department I had last year, finance, was at about the same stage compared to more modern jurisdictions' legislation. But it goes on; actually we are more than 55 years behind the time:

Actually, before the Huber law was passed in 1913, a New Hampshire sheriff was carrying out the same programme of releasing prisoners to work in the community by day and to serve time nights and week-ends in the jail.

We have one dozen prisoners who will go out in this great pilot programme and have their picture taken; they go to school and they come back at night. It is very interesting to look and see what other jurisdictions are doing.

In California, which has had this programme for some ten or 15 years, during this past year had 5,900 prisoners carrying out this programme. It makes a rather sad comparison with our programme. These 5,900 prisoners are going out to work and they are not being paid some \$5 a week, \$20 a month.

They are being paid the going rate in industry and the results that flow from this are not just the simple one of rehabilitating

the prisoner, of getting him into a work standard so that when he leaves, instead of returning to crime, he will continue his work. It has so many other good side effects that it amazes me that even the Conservative government took 25 years to think about it.

Because in addition to this first major result, the prisoner's earnings are divided between himself, between the state and between his family. The major portion goes to the family as a result of which these families, many of which—perhaps most of which—end up on welfare in Ontario, are allowed to continue to exist independently with the prisoner's earnings.

To take one example, and I am quoting now. There are so many here but I will quote the top one, the first one which is Butte county in California:

Of the amount earned by a prisoner over a period of two years—total earnings of \$21,157—\$9,600 went to his family, which is adequate to keep the family reasonably well and off welfare, \$2,700 was retained by the prisoner for use in buying minor luxuries, \$2,100 went towards payment of fines that the prisoner had incurred when he was first sentenced, \$6,600 was returned to the county.

Here we have one of the major differences between a modern programme and an Ontario Conservative programme. The Ontario Conservative programme uses up our taxes to keep people in these holes; a modern progressive socialist programme uses them productively, returns them—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Socialist?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it is a socialist programme. I know you do not like that word.

Mr. Yakabuski: Is California socialist?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): That which has to do with people.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, that is what socialism means, it is to improve the lot of people. Conservatism means keeping things the way they are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Like California?

Mr. Shulman: Now, to have to explain these things to the Minister who did not know what socialism was! The great advantage here is that the programme pays for itself. Here is a prisoner, and the cost of maintaining a prisoner who is not doing this is \$3.50 a day, who instead of costing the state or the

county \$2,000 over that period of time, brought in \$6,600. He was paying for the whole system of justice. He was maintaining his own dignity. He was keeping his family, instead of their being forced to go on charity. This is a progressive system. This is what we could do here if our Minister was to understand the need, and if, more important, because I think he does understand the need, if our Minister was able to persuade his Cabinet.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): You would have us all in there.

Mr. Gisborn: There are not enough of them around to persuade.

Mr. Shulman: Some of you would be better off in jail. You would get a very good education there.

I have had an opportunity of visiting a number of jails run by this government, and it is a sad travesty of what a jail programme should be. There have been steps forward, I would not deny this to the Minister. The Vanier Institute is a great step forward. Ingleside, where certain favoured prisoners have been fortunate enough to go in the past, was a great improvement over Mercer.

But the majority, perhaps all of our male prisoners, are still treated in a way that would have embarrassed progressive jurisdictions 50 or 75 years ago.

It is not just the system of going out to work, and the reason I have spent so much time on that particular aspect is because the Minister has taken so much credit for his 12 boys whom he sent to school. He should have been embarrassed that we do not have 10 or 15 or a higher percentage of our prisoners being rehabilitated outside of the prisons, not these very few who have been carefully chosen.

Surely, mistakes are made in these programmes, and there is the odd one who will abuse it. But it is very low.

Of the 5,900 prisoners who last year were out in this programme in California, less than one per cent had to be taken off the programme because of abuse of it—abuse of various forms, alcohol, not going to work, coming late, going home to see their family, a wide variety of abuses, some minor, some major. But less than one per cent of the people involved abused the programme.

We could do the same thing here. We do not have to be running these homosexual factories, which is what they are in so many cases. We do not have to be teaching people

to be criminals, which is what you are doing every day at Guelph.

They go in innocent kids, they come out and they know all the tricks. How many people are you rehabilitating at Guelph? Ten per cent? Five per cent? I doubt if it is that many. They go in innocent, the majority of them, some 90 per cent of them. They are not taught any trade, and what a sad thing for those who are taught a trade. They are not allowed to complete it. They are not allowed to get their licence. How many plumbers, how many barbers do you turn out? You do not turn out any because your programme is incomplete, your programme is inefficient, your programme is conservative. You go through the motions at Guelph.

You have a course in welding, you have a course in barbering. You do not give the prisoners scissors, mind you, they might cut each other's throats, but you go through the motions. But the majority, some 90 per cent of the boys in Guelph do not even go through the motions. They are put to work shovelling manure, cutting grass, working in the kitchen folding, tailoring things which they have no hope whatsoever of ever doing when they get out. Making licence plates at Millbrook. What a waste! What an embarrassment it should be for every one of you across the floor.

Mr. Gilbertson: Do you mean to say we have no work programme?

Mr. Shulman: That is what I mean to say. Your work programmes are an embarrassment. Your work programmes involve practically everybody in those institutions—and I am referring primarily now to Guelph and Millbrook and Burwash—they involve practically everybody in those institutions, and that is what they are. They are work programmes to keep the men busy, to keep them quiet, until you can get their time completed and get them out on the street again.

Maybe the Attorney General will not be too competent and you will not have them back too fast.

What you should be doing and what you always pay lip service about, is rehabilitating. You do not do it. You know you do not do it. The prisoners know you do not do it. You are now starting a programme of research. I am delighted with that, but you are going to be shocked when you do your studies.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Exploit the prisoners too, you know. There is exploitation there.

Mr. Shulman: Well, of course there is exploitation.

Mr. Lawlor: They raise Holsteins for beef and twist arms to get the laundry services done for other government institutions.

Mr. Shulman: I thank the hon. member for Lakeshore for his assistance. I should explain that the two of us travelled about together seeing this 18th century way of handling those innocents who cannot vote and who are caught in the Conservative jails. For a great deal of what I say today I am indebted to the member for Lakeshore for his brilliance and erudition in drawing out from the jailers and from the prisoners on our visits.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The jailers could understand it better than some of you could.

Mr. Lawlor: You know they send back a report of everything you say.

Mr. MacDonald: They have had time to read Aristotle.

Mr. Lawlor: Do you trickle away your life reading these nice little reports?

Mr. Gisborn: Show of the week, the best show of the week.

Mr. Shulman: I have here the *Globe and Mail* for November 7, 1968, and I am glad the Minister is not backward in sounding his own horn since someone has to do it. I see here he was speaking at the Toronto Optimist Club, and I guess that is the only group he could really tell it to. He told the Toronto Optimists how a person will soon be able to go to jail in Ontario and never miss a day's work. I presume that what finally happened was that this programme, which was begun in 1913 in the various states, was finally copied and sent to the Minister and he decided that it was time. He got a kudo here from the John Howard Society, and I am always glad to give the Minister a compliment, so I am going to read this.

Mr. Lawlor: The Optimists changed their name afterwards.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must have fooled them, too.

Mr. Lawlor: They call themselves the Pessimists now.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, the Minister is always pretty good at presenting an air of progress. I would never take that away from him. How-

ever, he had a kudo from the John Howard Society and I am always glad to give the Minister a compliment, so I will read it into the record.

Further evidence of the progressive attitude of the Department of Correctional Service's Minister, Alan Grossman, has recently come to light—

I wonder how it came to light.

—with the launching of the province's live-in work-out programme.

Unfortunately no one is yet living-in and working-out, but the programme has been launched, anyway. The way it was launched was by a series of speeches by the Minister.

Mr. Gisborn: The John Howard Society is waiting patiently.

Mr. Shulman: The John Howard Society is not entirely pleased with the Minister, I may say. There are so many areas where we lag behind. One of them, an important one, if we are really seriously interested in rehabilitating outside of the work programme, is the matter of allowing visits.

I will have a great deal to say on that during the estimates, so perhaps I will just settle at the moment for one sentence. This system whereby prisoners, as a form of punishment, are sent to jail or reformatories far from their homes is a form of retribution that turns them to bitterness, drives them to crime, and is a shame for this government.

I have letter after letter begging me to have them transferred to jails or reformatories near their homes. The Minister replies—I will read some of his letters later on—I am sorry, we do not think the ability to visit is an overriding factor. Unless there is illness in the family, we are not going to transfer them. That is what the Minister says. That is what this progressive Minister says. He would not be Minister long in any American state. Even in Mississippi you could not hold your job, Mr. Minister.

Well, I could not believe—

Mr. MacDonald: Just shows how low we are getting.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Could not get any lower than that.

Mr. Shulman: I could not believe that Ontario was a model. I had the opportunity to go around and see some of the jails, some of the prisons, and I thought there had to be a better way. We know there is a better way in foreign countries. We know there is a better

way in Sweden, for that matter in all of Scandinavia, in England. But do we have to go so far?

Last November I travelled down to the States to their prisons to compare what they are doing with what we are doing and I went to Joliet. Joliet is a prison for hard-core offenders, the real toughies, and seeing the programme in Joliet makes me weep for Ontario because they are so far ahead of us in this difficult environment in solving their problems.

A prisoner would be so much better off in Joliet, with all their racial problems, and all the other matters that you have in Chicago and Illinois, he would be better off there than in our best model male prison, the best model male reformatory in this province, because they are actively interested in rehabilitation and they are doing something about it.

I brought back a great deal of material from Joliet, and I may say my first surprise was before I ever got to the prison. I went to the city of Joliet to have a hair cut and my barber—barbers are talkative down there, too—my barber said what are you doing down here, where are you from? I told him I was going down to Joliet to see what the prison was like and he said, "I graduated from Joliet." I said, "Oh, that is nice." He said, "I mean as a barber, they taught me there, I took the examination in Joliet and I passed. Over half the barbers in this area are graduates of Joliet and some 150 in Chicago."

This was a little intriguing because they do not give examinations in our prisons, in our reformatories, to allow people to go out and begin this type of work. You cannot become an engineer or a doctor, or a processor, or an IBM operator, or a licensed mechanic. You can go through the motions, there will be some teaching, but you will not get a licence.

So as a result of this talk, I got his graduation picture. This particular barber was very proud to present it to me. He graduated just a few months before he had the opportunity to clip me and this was on May 22, 1968. At that time 29 inmate student barbers, 13 from Statesville and 16 from Joliet were examined by the Illinois Department of Registration Education and of the 29, 24 passed the master barber test and off they went to become barbers.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Is that the day you lost your watch?

Mr. Shulman: I am delighted that the Minister of Trade and Development made that contribution.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member if he asked the barber how long the course took?

Mr. Shulman: I will come to that in a moment. The Minister of Trade and Development has made an interjection asking whether this was the day I lost my watch. I am glad he made that interjection because this sums up the view of the Treasury benches. They believe that once a man has been to jail he cannot be rehabilitated. The Minister is right under our system.

You send them into Grossman's jails and you will not rehabilitate them, I am sure of it. But send them down to a preventive system where these men are going to be given a proper training and they can be rehabilitated, you will not have to worry about your watch.

This prison takes the prisoners anywhere from sentences, I believe, of two years and up, which means they all serve a minimum of one year, whereas in Guelph, it is quite true, the sentences are often shorter. However, there are some people in there, of course, many people who have been in more than a year.

The course takes all of six weeks, to train a barber, and you wait another three weeks for a notice of the outcome of the test. So when those men left the prison they went out and were able to earn a living. They did not have to depend on the few dollars in their pockets and the charity of the half-way houses. Here, no matter what was done, there was no real possibility of going out and earning a trained living. They go back to whatever they were doing before, whatever racket they were in, because they do not know anything better. The superficial knowledge that they gain in these courses at Guelph, Burwash and Millbrook, is absolutely useless—you cannot earn a cent with that.

For the Minister to present the defence, which I presume he is going to from this question which he just suggested, that there is not time, is just not true. Most of these courses take a maximum of three months.

What courses are available? There is a long list of them here. The Minister of Correctional Services in Illinois is a very progressive man and he has taken steps to get the co-operation of industry, because industry is just as interested as the state in not having these people go out and become thieves again.

He approached the Volkswagen Company and the company has set up a whole shop, right in Joliet. I had the pleasure of visiting

in the shop and seeing cars repaired. They actually teach men to be licensed auto mechanics, specifically using the Volkswagen as the basic car. The guards also bring in their own cars of every make, which the prisoners work on for pay; let me say for pay that is a little better than the Minister is going to pay them even now.

As a result, these men can take the examinations and become auto mechanics. And Volkswagen have had this course at Joliet now for three years. In their advertising, and this is what they do for the inmates at Joliet, this is one of the things that Volkswagen says:

The course offered is one of general repair and once a man is employed by a Volkswagen dealer, he may continue his schooling in the many other courses available, that is engine repair, transmission repair, as well as management training.

They may get up to \$10,000 a year as a shop foreman. And, furthermore, Volkswagen went further than that and said: When you leave prison, if you have graduated from our course, we will do our best to place you.

And they are placing these men and these men are not coming back to prison. This is what we could do here but it does not just take Volkswagens, it does not just take our industry—government can do so much too.

What about our education system as compared to theirs?

An hon. member: How is it?

Mr. Shulman: Well, our educational system is sad. In Joliet, they have set up—

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): We might just question whether it is relevant.

Mr. Shulman: Is there a question from the member for Sarnia? He was mumbling there. Oh, I am sorry, he was talking in his sleep. If the member for Sarnia is questioning whether this is relevant, I hope he understands the relevancy of improving our system of correctional institutions.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to introduce the member to the member for Dovercourt.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, the member for Dovercourt was quoting the member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: And I was quoting the member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I can understand the Liberals' inability to understand the relevance of this matter.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member takes himself too seriously.

Mr. Shulman: But, Mr. Chairman, I know you understand the relevance of this matter, and even if no one else in the government benches does, I am sure that afterwards you will explain it to the Minister and to the member for Sarnia.

The educational system at Joliet is an adequate one. Not only have they been teaching public school and high school there for some 25 years, but beginning in 1957 they got the co-operation of Northwestern University and they are now teaching a university course which will lead to degrees. They started in 1957 with 12 students. They have now expanded that so that they have taken a total of 440 students in a total of 34 courses at the present time.

The classes have been in English, history, philosophy, psychology, political science, sociology, anthropology and speech, leading to a degree and scholarships. Those who complete the courses satisfactorily are allowed scholarships which allow them to continue in universities outside, to get practical training in the various fields.

It gives an example of one man here, James Williams, a two-time loser, who took the mathematics course in 18 months, as a result of which he was given a scholarship when he left Joliet, which allowed him to be accepted by the California Institute of Technology as a junior student with all costs paid. As a result, this man is going back into society as a useful member of society. He is not going to be a three-time loser. Here is a progressive sensible system, one which we could do here. The University of Toronto would co-operate, all universities in Ontario would co-operate. It just takes someone to go in and ask, someone to go in and initiate it, and this is where I criticize this department, and this is where I criticize this Minister. There are so many other courses, dozens of them. I have here details on the data processing course, and the one on typewriter repair which takes only a few weeks and allows them to go out and begin immediately as does the one on barbering.

Here is one in a slightly different field and this one appeals. It shows a little imagination on the part of the warden, and this warden deserves a lot of credit. This is a man of brilliance. He started an arts programme. We have some art in our reformatories, in our jails. The prisoner is allowed, I believe, up to \$5 worth of material a month and I will have something to say about the

Alex G. Brown, a model institution in that field, very shortly.

But whenever he does paint, nothing comes of it. It so happens, when you have a large body of men with time on their hands, there is ability there and this ability can be nurtured and brought forth, and that is what they have done here in Joliet. They recognized early, some 20 years ago, that many of the prisoners had valuable ability in the field of art and they said, "Fine, we will give you all the materials you want to buy"—no artificial limitation, the way we have here in Ontario reformatories—"If you want to spend money on that instead of tobacco, good luck to you. Go ahead and we will have an art show."

This is an annual affair which is open to the public at Joliet, in Illinois every year and has been fantastically successful. Last year's show which was on May 26, attracted some thousands of visitors; 2,700 paintings were up for sale; 15,000 visitors attended at the prison from 12 noon to 5 p.m. At the end of the day \$22,000 had been taken in all, of which money was divided among the prisoners who had organized the show and who had painted the paintings.

This money they could use either toward their eventual rehabilitation or toward buying art works or anything they liked, in prison, anything that would help them. What a sensible, sensible project. These prisoners worked all year long for this show and they were proud of it, they were happy with it. They were being rehabilitated and that money was going toward rehabilitation.

What about the prison itself? We heard so much last year and I swallowed this last year because I did not know any better. When we complained about these horrible jails, the Minister got up and said, "Well the jail was built 100 years ago and there is no way of putting Johns into the cells, the walls are three-foot thick and you just cannot do anything with them." I was silly enough to believe him. Well I found out better.

I went down to Joliet and I hope the Minister will go down to Joliet. They have kept one cell. It looks like it is from the Don jail. There is a cell with a pail in a corner, a little tiny cubicle with a cot along the side and the thick, thick walls and no toilet, of course, but slop pails. Nobody is in the cell because they keep that to show how in the old days, before the war—they mean the First World War—prisoners were kept.

I said, "Have you ever been to Ontario's jails and seen how we keep them now?" The warden did not believe me. He said, "Why do you not do something about it?" I said, "Well, our Minister says there is nothing you can do about it, the prisons were built 100 years ago. It is not possible to do anything with them and there is no money." He said, "We did not have any money and this prison was built in 1867, but we solved the problem."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I hope the hon. member can quote all these statements I am alleged to have made.

Mr. Shulman: We will be delighted to find them for you.

Mr. Chairman, I will explain. I am sorry. If the Minister is suggesting—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think you are trying to paraphrase.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister suggesting that these improvements could have been made and he has not made them when he knows how? I would be interested to hear that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess you were not listening to my speech.

Mr. Shulman: All right, Mr. Chairman—

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

(Friday, March 7, 1969)

Page	Column	Line	Correction
1998	1	17	Change to read: which, on the face of it, would lead one to



ONTARIO

STATUTES

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Grossman, continued	2109
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Roberts, agreed to	2164

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1969

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (Continued)

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, you will recall before the supper hour that, as we were having our pleasant discourse, we were interrupted rudely by the members on my right who unfortunately are no longer here—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Where are the members of your party?

Mr. Shulman: —and the Minister from the far right. The member to my right unfortunately did not understand the relevance of looking into the improvement of conditions in our jails.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): They took the member seriously; he said he could handle it alone.

Mr. Shulman: And the Minister was a little upset and suggested I had misquoted. We will come to that in a moment.

Before I go on though to the problem which we were discussing, I have here a book called "Trade Time" from the Stateville Vocational Prison School in Illinois, and this lists the various courses that can be completed following which a prisoner can go out and use these courses to earn a living.

I will just read them. Library and visual aid, toolroom, drafting, machine shop, brick-laying, welding shop, printing and lithography, advanced printing, radio and television repair, automotive mechanics, automotive maintenance of small motors, automotive body and fender repair, woodworking, refrigerating and air-conditioning, typewriter and office machinery repair, and sign painting.

These, of course, are in addition to the academic courses which are similar to our school courses.

I was relating to you how, in Joliet, one cell is kept as a museum, which is exactly the same, as hundreds of cells in our Don Jail and hundreds of cells—I guess thousands of cells—in jails across this province. This is a cell that is dark, with no toilet facilities, with no table, with just a bed. This one had a mattress, but I have been in cells in our Ontario jails that did not even have that amenity.

And the warden of Joliet prison expressed amazement to me that prisoners could be kept in that type of cell in this day and age and he explained that this was a museum that was kept open to the public to show what forms of cruelty, what forms of punishment were used in former uncivilized times.

He had not been to Ontario to see what we do here. I may say there was absolutely no difference between that museum cell of theirs and cells which we are using at the present time for prisoners.

And when I expressed amazement that he had been able to make these changes in his ancient prison, over 100 years old, and with no money, he explained how it was done. He said:

There is no reason in the world that these improvements cannot be made in your own jurisdiction. Because these walls are so thick, there is a great deal of space to work with. And you do not need a great deal of money because you can use prisoners' labour.

That is exactly what we did, we called all the prisoners together, wing by wing, and said this is the way it is now, do you want it to continue or shall we improve it? In Joliet they are impressed with our efforts to rehabilitate them. They know we are sincere. The prisoners threw their efforts in and not only did we have individual talents of every type in the prison, but because we have all these courses, plumbing, carpentry and so forth, we were able to train the people we needed, that we were short of.

We took these old cells and literally pulled their guts out, put in new plumbing, doubled each one in size, so that now every cell in Joliet has a toilet, a sink, a

bed, a table and a desk, with artificial light, of course, so that prisoners can study in their cells. They can read and they can write.

Talking about writing, just let me digress. For some strange reason, the prisoners in our Ontario reformatories are allowed a very restricted number of letters—I believe it is one a week.

And once again, we come back to this matter of rehabilitation. There is no need to restrict the number of letters a prisoner sends out. If ever someone needs contact with the outside world, it is a prisoner—particularly in our Ontario jails where they are not allowed free access to visitors as they are in more enlightened institutions.

The complaint has been that some of the prisoners become inveterate letter writers and send letters out by the dozen, but in actual experience this is not true. Less than one in a thousand has become a problem in letter writing.

Here is one restriction that could be changed today, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wanted to, which would improve the morale of the prisoners tremendously and at no great cost. If you must censor the letters, fine, put an extra censor on to read the extra mail that goes out. There is no reason why the prisoners should not be allowed to communicate. This would be a very important factor in rehabilitation.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I wish the member would deal with the telephones they installed. Has he seen those?

Mr. Shulman: No, I have not seen any telephones in any of the cells I have had the privilege of visiting.

Mr. Sopha: Visitors have to talk to inmates through telephones.

Mr. Shulman: Ah, yes, well, of course, once again this is the old—

Mr. Sopha: The greatest assault on human dignity.

Mr. Shulman: —antiquated philosophy. Avoid contact, keep the prisoners away from their families, keep the prisoners away from their relatives, and this—

Mr. Sopha: This is the tyranny of electronics.

Mr. Shulman: This is the wrong attitude. What we should be doing is getting those prisoners in contact, not keeping them away.

There are jails in this province where the prisoners and visiting relatives cannot even see each other. A type of screening is used so that the prisoner can see out to see who is visiting him, but the visitor can only see a shadow—can just see the prisoner's face.

I know of two of those. One of them I mentioned here last year and the Minister said he would see if something could be done about it. Another one I just visited a short while ago in exactly the same situation. The whole attitude is wrong.

What I am saying is: prisons are a fading idea in other jurisdictions—they are trying to get rid of the prisons. Here in Ontario we are about to embark on a programme of building regional centres.

Goodness knows how many regional centres. Goodness knows how much money is going to go into all those regional centres. First of all, we should be doing something—fast—something you are not going to have to wait 20 years for, and I understand you have a 20-year programme to get all these regional centres built because you cannot get the money out of your Cabinet.

What you should be doing now is renovating the old ones, making them liveable, making them habitable, and a great deal could be done. The Don is the outstanding example of where a tremendous amount can be done with a reasonable amount of money.

At least put water in the cells; at least put toilets in the cells; at least put in facilities so the prisoners can write and can sit down and read. You can do this with prison labour; you can do this with prison instruction; bring in a master mechanic to oversee it; bring in an architect to oversee it; but it is not necessary to spend millions and millions of dollars, and more importantly, to wait the 20 years that you are going to have to wait for your programmes.

But the disturbing thing about the whole programme is that the concept is wrong. While in other areas we are getting rid of this type of prison; while we are trying to bring the prisoner out of the prison, here we are thinking in a programme of building prisons—very true. There are going to be regional centres where ultimately—goodness knows when, with the present Minister—there will be a reasonable number of people going out to work, and a reasonable number of people going out to school. I presume this will be up in the thousands in due course, but the whole philosophy is wrong, and the Minister knows it.

I have a book here called "Modern Advances in Criminology"; it was published here in Toronto in 1964-1965, and I read from page 5:

The whole concept of the institutional control of leisure time, nights and weekends, rather than of the total banishment to prison, promises more effective community protection from certain types of criminals and reduces the proportion of offenders who have to be so banished.

Attendance centres, detention centres, the citizenship training programme in Boston, the weekend imprisonment in Belgium and in Scandinavia, and similar correctional developments are examples.

This is what we should be working on—methods of keeping the prisoner in contact with the world, in contact with his family, but controlling his leisure time so he will not get into the various difficulties which, unfortunately, these prisoners have gotten into.

Incidentally what type of prisoners can be used for this work-out programme? It is not just those convicted of innocuous offences like non-support or driving with a revoked licence. In California, they have put on this programme of sending to work every day prisoners convicted of narcotic violations, burglary, armed robbery and even sex crimes—and it has worked. It just points out the individual potential for adequate performance on his work furlough programme, regardless of what the crime was that was committed.

Now I am going to come to a subject upon which the Minister and I disagree absolutely, and yet it is vital to any programme of rehabilitation; it is sex.

Last year I rose in this House and suggested to the Minister that we would not get any adequate programme of rehabilitation unless some arrangement was made for conjugal visits. The Minister—I may not be quoting him exactly—was quite in disagreement with this. In fact he found the whole idea disgusting—I believe that was the word he used. I entered a bill to that effect earlier in this Legislature, and the one paper that reported it stated "Shulman advocates sex life for prisoners."

Of course, this is not the situation at all. The prisoners are having a sex life; they are having a homosexual life and they are going to consider having a homosexual life. There is nothing more debilitating to morale for a normal male than to be forced to get his sexual satisfaction that way.

We have to have an adequate programme of either allowing the prisoners to visit at

home or allowing their wives to visit them. Otherwise, the homosexuality in your prisons, in the prisons of all jurisdictions which are run in this way, will remain rampant. I look at what happens here in the Ontario prisons, and it sickens me. We had a situation in Burwash just a few weeks ago where five prisoners raped—that is the only word—another prisoner, a male. The response of the department was to call in the police and lay charges against these prisoners. They were then transferred to a jail, where again they are not in individual cells, where again they are mixing with other prisoners, where again their appetites are not going to be suppressed, where again other prisoners—perhaps innocent prisoners in a jail, people who have not been convicted—are going to suffer as a result of this. What an archaic outlook.

It all comes back, not that you are not treating the homosexuals correctly in the prisons—I do not think you are treating anybody correctly in the prisons—but that your programme is no good. You have to do something about this very, very serious problem. You cannot just shove it under the rug and say from the time you are convicted until the time you come out, you are not going to have any sex. It is not possible. They are going to have it in prison, one way or the other, and all you are doing is producing homosexuality, some of which will persist after they leave the prison and return to ordinary home life. It is unnecessary. It is not as though this is a wild new idea. It has been tried, time and time again.

I have a wonderful book here; I am sure even the Minister will accept its validity. It is the "Law of Criminal Correction", just published last year and written by a group of very eminent men, Saul Reuben, president of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency; Henry Whihoffan, professor of law at the University of New Mexico; George Edwards, the commissioner of police in Detroit, formerly justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan and Simon Rosenzweig, member of the New York Bar. The first edition was published in 1963, and a revised edition was published last year.

What they are doing is drawing from experience all over the United States, all over the world in fact. This is what they say—and it is such common sense—about contact with the outside world, and here is where the Minister has made his most serious error:

Prison administration support of a corrective treatment help inmate welfare in an institutional morale by keeping inmates in touch with the outside world through

radio and television and newspapers, motion pictures, magazines and books. Even more important is the personal relationship derived from visits by family and friends and from correspondence. The denial of wholesome relationships with one or more helpful persons in the world outside the prison is cruel, punitive and a violation of psychological rights. Such conditions of mental duress can be as devastating to the inmate as physical punishment.

Then it describes some of the more backward atmospheres where prisoners must only talk through a telephone or across a barrier, and it goes on:

In a few institutions, the prisoner and visitor sit together in a comfortable atmosphere without any barrier or across the table from each other.

Let me tell you how they solved this problem in Joliet, that of visitors smuggling in contraband, which is the reason for the maintenance of isolation. Every visitor who arrives there is searched, regardless of who they are.

I arrived at the prison, where you go past a machine that gives a clink if you are carrying a weapon. After you are past the machine, a guard searches you from top to toe. You are forced to leave everything in your pockets that might be of contraband use inside the prison, such as a lighter, even cigarettes, and then you pick them up on your way out. This is the answer. When the visitor is allowed in, he is allowed contact with the prisoner he is visiting. This is a more sensible way of doing it. But they go on:

The most liberal country in regards to visits permitted within the prison is Sweden. In open institutions, lengthy visits are permitted each Sunday, unsupervised in the cell. Prison cells in Sweden, unlike those in the United States, have solid walls and doors. Several other countries permit conjugal visiting of this kind, among them Chile, Argentina and Mexico.

In several countries certain categories of prisoners are allowed to have their families live with them. The wardens explain the practice very simply: these policies support family life and morale. In the United States, about one half of the persons committed on felony convictions are married. Although it is usually said that such a plan would be contrary to the mores in this country, the statement is not self-evident. Family life is as cherished here as elsewhere, rather it appears that visiting before spouses and

visiting in general is part of a trend toward more relaxed supervision, especially for minimum-custody prisoners.

As prisons improve in their classification methods and they are able to provide better physical facilities, visiting would probably become more informal for many prisoners. In federal prisons handshaking, embracing and kissing by immediate members of the family may be permitted within bounds of good taste. The California adult authority now has tacitly permitted in two institutions extended private visits by spouses, during which sexual contact may be occurring. Perhaps the better solution for the United States is the expanded use of prisoners' furloughs home, next discussed.

Well, they are coming to grips with the problem. There is a problem and our ignoring it is not going to make it go away. It is just going to go off in the channel, which we really do not want.

You should do one of two things. You should either allow conjugal visits, or you should allow furloughs home for good behaviour. And there is nothing wrong with it if we get away from the concept that this nation has held for so many years, that prisons are for punishment. If they are for punishment, then everything I have said is invalid. But if they are really for rehabilitation, if it is not just lip service that you have been giving to it all this time, then check the major problems.

Do not pretend, which is what you have been doing. Do not pretend by making a gesture, in allowing a few prisoners to go to university, because you are not even touching the problem. I am sure that you and your deputy are aware of this; I am aware that you are both highly versed in the problems. If it is a matter that you cannot convince the Cabinet, then get up and say it and we will criticize you no more; we will understand you are doing your best. But if you do not understand the problem, then we are going to have to continue to badger you and be asking you to do something, because your prison system here is the worst.

What improvements can be made, what should we do? I have another great book here that has just been published. It is called, "The Crime of Punishment." It was written by Carl Meninger, M.D., who has spent a lifetime studying this very problem. He must have been in Ontario because the prisons he describes, and scenes he describes, and the abuses that he describes in this book come straight out of our jails.

Case after case that he mentions here, we have similar cases in Ontario. And he says here, in his final chapter:

Way back in 1870, a hundred years ago, a group of remarkable men set down a statement of 22 principles for the running of prisons. And here are four of them:

1. Reformation, not vindictive suffering, should be the purpose of the penal treatment of prisoners.

2. The prisoner should be made to realize that his destiny is in his own hands.

3. Prison discipline should be such as to gain the will of the prisoner and conserve his self respect.

4. The aim of the prison should be to make industrious free men rather than orderly and obedient prisoners.

This is where we have gone wrong, because the first aim—and the wardens will confess this to you—is to produce orderly and obedient prisoners. Their great fear is a riot, because it brings down public complaints. MPP's come visiting and there are questions in the House. Of course, it is important, we do not want riots in the prisons, but that should be a secondary consideration. The important thing should be to rehabilitate these men so that they do not come back time, and time, and time again, which is what is happening now.

So, get them out of the prisons. The ones you have to keep in, treat like human beings. Teach them a trade that they can use when they go out to earn a living. One more thing, which is really what Meninger wrote his book about, is a thing called the "diagnostic centre". This is where we have failed, again in Ontario.

Let me quote from Dr. Meninger:

In my opinion the most promising improvement in recent years is the diagnostic centre. Most prisons have reception wings or units where a certain amount of diagnosis is carried on, but there are only a few reception centres operated as separate and distinct facilities, and not all of these serve as a candidate's reception and diagnostic centre does.

Facilities of this type combine personality evaluation, social investigation, psychological testing, industrial and vocational appraisal and guidance or assignment, and many other functions. In other words, a group of social scientists, including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and others, are permitted to make an unpressured examination of the offender and

of the situation in which his offence was generated and executed.

His personality assets and liabilities are carefully appraised and compared to the assets and liabilities of the social environment in which he has lived. In Kansas sentences have already been pronounced when the prisoner is referred to the diagnostic centre for study, but the sentence can be, and frequently is, changed by the judge when there are indications that a better disposition might be made, one which would offer more towards the prisoner's rehabilitation and society's safety.

He goes on to explain that as a result of this study each prisoner is put in the slot where he is most likely to be rehabilitated. Compare that to Guelph. Six weeks ago the member for Lakeshore and I drove to Guelph. We went down to the detention cells and to each prisoner in those cells and we said, "Why are you down here?" They explained the particular infraction of the regulations that had brought them down here. In answer to, "What do you do when you are in the prison?" it was revealed that not one of those prisoners was taking a trade. They were all working, working at some foolish work, work to pass the time, something to keep them busy.

We said, "How did you happen to be doing that?" They said, "The first day we came to Guelph they explained to us what the various things were that were available and they asked which we would like to do." Three of those prisoners had expressed a wish to do one of the various things and they said, "We are sorry, that is filled up, there is only room for ten in there and that is all filled." So, they put one into the kitchen peeling potatoes, or they put another into the laundry carrying the clothes.

So here this little effort at Guelph and at other institutions—a gesture is all it is; it cannot compare to a true diagnostic centre. Mr. Minister, if you really seriously want to do anything about rehabilitation, forget about one of your regional centres and take that money and hire the staff you need and put them in a proper diagnostic centre. It will save you an awful lot of clients over the next 10 or 20 years, far more than the finest and most beautiful regional detention centre in the world. This is one thing we need; this is where you have fallen down.

Let me say a word now about staff. The Minister is fortunate; he has a dedicated staff. This has become very obvious as we have gone around the province. From the

Deputy down, I have the impression that practically everybody is doing their best, but you do not train them properly. You are training them in the wrong way; you are training them towards holding the prisoners. There are one or two exceptions, let me say, but basically they are a good group of people.

They do not get enough money, the pay is too low, as is true of so many departments in government. You cannot hope to attract the professional types which you need to really put into use a practical rehabilitation programme, unless you change your priorities. Put a little more into staff—hire the psychologists, the psychiatrists—but the money you are willing to pay is so inadequate that it is impossible to get an adequate staff; it is out of the question.

Why should they not go over to Buffalo where they can get twice as much? Why should they not go to other jurisdictions? Of course, they are not going to stay here. You have got to pay more. If you cannot get the money out of Treasury, divert it within your own department; this is a prime need.

I have spoken for longer than I had expected but I want to say that a diagnostic centre is not a rare thing. I have here a book from Dr. Arthur Hoffman, a state criminologist. How many criminologists do you employ by the way?

Dr. Hoffman is a state criminologist in Illinois who set up a diagnostic centre for that state and tremendous work has been done there. Tremendous help has been given to their Attorney General in cutting down the number of people who return.

In conclusion, let me say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, gestures are not enough, you have not really scratched the surface, you have not even tickled the surface.

If you really seriously want to solve this problem and not just want to get a few nice clippings in the press, make the changes you have to make, get rid of your prisoners. I do not really think you want them; treat them more humanely; allow them to have proper visiting, more frequent visiting; allow them to write letters; allow them conjugal visits; allow them to go out and work; allow them to go to school; allow them furloughs home; you are not going to have more crimes.

Sure, you will have a few people complaining that you are coddling the prisoners—those horrible things they did and look what they are doing now, they are coddling them—but this should not be your interest. Your interest

should be to cut down the rate of crime in this province and you are the one man who can do it. You can do it by treating the prisoners in a way that will rehabilitate them, not just keep them locked away like vegetables. Thank you.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, the two hon. members who have just spoken are entitled to have dealt with some of the questions they presented to me.

First, I want to thank the hon. member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) for the complimentary remarks with which he started off his address on these estimates. I must say that I have always found him to be constructive in his criticism.

I must say that when he has had some matters which concerned him about some of our institutions, he has brought them to my attention, and I have done everything I could to satisfy him that if they were not being done in the proper fashion, they would be corrected. That is the kind of criticism I think a responsible member not only should engage in, but it is his duty to engage in it.

He has asked some questions, and the hon. member for Essex-Kent, in asking his questions, did not engage in any gross exaggerations or, as one of the hon. members opposite sometimes put it, in hyperbole to make his point. He asked some questions about staff training and he stated he was a little concerned about the fact that there was a low proportion of our staff who were taking staff training.

I would refer him to page 13 of the annual report. I am sure he will see that there is a total of over 700 of our staff engaged in some sort of training in addition to those in in-service training.

He also asked whether visits are encouraged, especially in relation to education. I would advise the hon. member that—and he would find this, too, in the annual report, page 61—it is indicated that over 4,000 visitors visited during the year. In connection with education, I would also be pleased to advise him that we invite speakers from the community and, especially at our women's institutions, use volunteers who are interested and responsible and, of course, knowledgeable in these matters.

We also have speakers from unions, from management, from art galleries and various facets of our community visit various of our institutions to explain those matters and lecture at the institution to the staff and the

inmates on those matters which it is deemed advisable to make them knowledgeable.

He also asked the specific question about just how effective or to what extent the changeover in our takeover of the county jails produced more books for the county jail libraries. Am I right, is this what the hon. member asked?

I have a list here and, to date, since taking over the county jails, there have been 4,265 new books issued to the county jails. I might also state that all of our institutions, jails and reformatories have been supplied with catalogues of books in various languages, French, German, Polish, Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian and so on. I am sure he will find this list very informative. I will send this over to the hon. member.

There is also a list of books which are provided to the inmates. There are two catalogues, one which has a psychedelic cover manufactured by one of the inmates.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member also concerned himself—and quite properly, if he is worried about this particular subject—about the confidentiality of clinical records. That is, he was concerned about whether these are made available to people to whom they should not be made available. I want to assure him that these are definitely kept confidential.

The department's policy is that no data from such records are released without the written consent of the inmate and, in some cases, only because of a court order. As a matter of fact, I think it was last year or two years ago, I was served three or four times with subpoenas to deliver up some records because the lawyer who was defending a client in a murder case insisted on our department making available the social history evaluation by the clinical staff of our department for the help of his client.

We refused to deliver them up, because in our view this could upset the whole purpose of our treatment programme. Obviously, if it becomes apparent to the inmates that this could become public property the whole programme would lose its value. However, in this particular case, a Justice of the High Court called—I do not remember his name, I do not think it is important—and he said he hoped he would not have to issue an order but he would do so if it were necessary. He asked us if we would consent to have someone come down from the department and make the records available in his chambers, where the Crown and the defence attorney could look at the records and decide

whether, in fact, some of it should be produced.

I am merely pointing this out in order to establish just how we stand about keeping these records confidential.

In this respect we have had some difficulties. There is even within the department—

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Did the Minister comply?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I complied with that order. I mean, it was a Justice of the High Court.

Mr. Ben: It was not appealed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well—I am advised it was a county court judge. I think when a man is defending someone on a charge of murder that if the county court judge feels it is important enough, particularly when the records are not being made public and they are being considered within the judge's chambers—in a case like that, I think it is understandable that we should make an exception. In any case, if the judge had issued an order, certainly as a Minister of the Crown, I am not going to disregard the court order. I would not do it.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the Minister a question? On this very important point, do I understand that simply because a judge ordered the Minister to do something which he had deemed in his own conscience and in keeping with the philosophy of his department, to be wrong, the Minister did it without taking it to a higher court? Is that his philosophy? "We won't do it, but if we do it we will do it in secret and won't tell anybody"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The first question the hon. member asked was whether I would feel it incumbent upon me to produce such a file if a judge ordered it. My answer is yes.

Mr. Ben: Without taking it to appeal?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My answer is yes. I am not a lawyer and perhaps my colleague, the Attorney General, may disagree with me. I do not know. The member has asked me my opinion and I have given it.

Mr. Sopha: Did the Minister ask the Attorney General at the time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. As a matter of fact, I am reminded, I spoke to the Deputy and I think I spoke to the Attorney General at the time. That is right.

Mr. Sopha: And the Attorney General advised you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was his view that under the circumstances I should do this.

Mr. Ben: And he told you to reveal those records?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Mr. Ben: My goodness! Pretty soon you will be selling them like you sell licence registrations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we do not sell them. The hon. member asked a question and I gave him an honest answer.

Mr. Sopha: That pair will never get a badge for defending civil liberty.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My son, just today, passed his bar examinations. I presume he will take those cases, rather than his father. I am not qualified to do it.

I was beginning to point out, when the hon. member stood up on his feet and asked a question, that this has been a problem within the department because there are even professional people within the department who feel that some of our non-professional people should not even be able to look at these records.

For this purpose, in September, 1968, a staff committee was appointed to examine this question and recommend policy which will provide maximum safeguards for the inmates and society within the framework of existing legislation. The committee included representatives of the professions of law, medicine, psychology and social work. The final report is expected to be in the hands of the Deputy Minister about the middle of this month.

The hon. member asked about the aversion therapy that is being carried out for pedophiles. I think he asked whether Doctor Steffy would be made available for questioning by members of the Legislature. I am sure that if we asked Doctor Steffy to appear before the committee on correctional services he would be pleased to come. If the Chairman requests that, that can be arranged.

The hon. member for Essex-Kent also referred to the fact that he did not think there was enough information coming out of the A. G. Brown Memorial Clinic, that there was not enough reaching the public at large, and I agree wholeheartedly with him. But there is not a thing I can do about it. We have done all we can. We have even an annual conference on addictions to which are invited

world-famous lecturers. All the members of the Legislature are invited every year to attend this. Quite frankly, I do not remember seeing anyone there. I hope some of them have been there and I just missed them.

We have done all we can. In this respect I recall the former leader of the Liberal Party, now Senator Thompson, who, and I was very appreciative of what he said, thought that the department was doing a tremendously difficult job and not getting enough credit for it. He even suggested (if you go back in *Hansard* you may even find it, and I am sure you will) that if necessary we hire a public relations firm. I remember he even mentioned that he would not mind if we got—I think he said—McKim and Co. to do the job, because he thought we should allow the work that was being done to be better known to the public. There is nothing we can do about it. We do everything we can to let the public know what is going on in our institutions.

Now I suppose I should thank the hon. member for High Park for the kind remarks he started to make. As I mentioned, I was waiting for the other shoe to drop—

Mr. Sopha: If you were, you are the most naive person present.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was waiting for the other shoe to drop. It dropped of course.

I would say that the very, very faint praise—very faint praise coming from the member for High Park—considering his usual type of criticism—is a complete endorsement of the work of this department. I cannot think of it any other way.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is the kind of logic we expect from you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now he also suggested that we give an illusion of progress and that we—in fact the exact words he used were that we were deluding people. Now he is in fact suggesting—

Mr. MacDonald: Can you not quote some of your thank-you letters?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, I could quote a lot of them. He is, in fact, suggesting that we are deluding such experts as the Elizabeth Fry Society, the John Howard Society, the Canadian Association of Corrections and most other knowledgeable people in the corrections field in this country.

As a matter of fact, if he has followed the correctional journals in the last four or five years, he will have noticed that, whereas a

few years ago these correctional people stressed the view that more responsibility should be taken by the federal government, more of this work should now be taken over by the provincial government because, as they put it:

Because of the progress made in the province of Ontario, these views are changing and there are many aspects of this work they now feel should not be taken over, but that some of the work being done by the federal government should be taken over by the provinces.

So, if I am in fact deluding people, I am deluding some pretty good experts. Now he also made—

Mr. Ben: You are very good at it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He said that we keep passing the buck to the federal people, that we say: "We cannot do this until the federal people pass certain law". Now I do not know why this is so difficult to understand. I pointed out last year and the year before, that for five years we have been making representations to the federal government.

Mr. Shulman: You said the same thing about the money you were paying them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, no. I think if the hon. member goes into *Hansard* he will find out that we wanted to have it as part of the same programme. To be fair, we were asking the federal government to pass this legislation and we wanted to put into effect legislation here which, in conjunction with enabling federal legislation, would allow us to do the things the hon. member was talking about.

The federal government, now has, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, a bill before the House of Commons, and we cannot do these things except in the cumbersome fashion I mentioned in my opening remarks.

Mr. Shulman: You have gone ahead and raised the pay—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, because we know this bill is going to be passed.

Mr. Shulman: You mean to say, that you are doing something illegal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is in second reading and it will be three months before we put this into effect. In the meantime, we are setting up the machinery for it.

Mr. Shulman: Are you suggesting that if this bill is not passed you will not raise the prisoners' pay?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well that may be possible, because it may be difficult.

Mr. Shulman: It is yes or no, are you going to break the law?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a hypothetical question; the fact is it has received second reading in the House of Commons and it will be passed.

Mr. Shulman: It is exactly the same situation—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not the same situation. We need this legislation. If you will read those two sections of The Correctional Services Act, for which we voted, which was unanimously passed by this House—we have held up the proclamation of those two sections 19 and 20, because we cannot legally put them into force until we get federal legislation which is now forthcoming.

That was fairly simple I thought and I think it is fairly simple to the hon. member too, but I think he was deliberately trying to confuse the issue.

Now there is one thing that does bother me particularly. That is the suggestion that this arrangement we had made with this young man in Don Jail to go to university during the daytime and come back to Don Jail at night, that we used it for publicity purposes.

This is absolutely not so. He was warned personally that one of the conditions of allowing him to do this was that he was not to speak to any newspapermen.

Mr. Shulman: He did not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He did. He not only spoke to them, but he posed for a picture.

Mr. Shulman: He was walking out of the jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh well, we put all sorts of restrictions at the jail to make sure the newspapermen could not get to him. But they got to him. An enterprising newspaperman got to him and we did not—

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe he is like the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and we did not have anything to do with that at all. In fact, we were much upset at it and let me point out—

Mr. MacDonald: He fights off publicity all the time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I do not fight off publicity, but where it is not good for the rehabilitation of the inmate, we would never do such a thing.

Let me point out too this was something like the situation in Brampton, where we have these young boys going to the local schools. A newspaperman got wind of that at least two months—I think it was two months before this became public and we pleaded with him not to make this public.

We pleaded with him and he agreed to it, but he said: "If I find out that there is any possibility of this getting out, I am not going to be able to hold this. As a newspaperman I cannot do this".

Well then we prevailed upon him to give us an agreement that before he would do that, he would advise us. Two months later he advised us. He said: "I have been tipped off that there is a radio man locally who has heard about this and he is going to break the story". We therefore issued a press release so that we could get the story clear and there would be no misunderstanding about what was happening; so there would not be a garbled story.

Mr. Ben: You mean you did not give him a scoop after he said—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. Ben: You mean you did not give him a scoop after he said he would do you the favour of sitting on the story.

Mr. Shulman: He will not trust you again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, he put this story in when he thought he should and at that time we knew he was going to do it and we issued the press release at the same time.

In our view, we are moving faster in this jurisdiction than any other jurisdiction on the whole North American continent.

Mr. Shulman: That is self delusion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Faster than any other jurisdiction in the whole North American continent.

Mr. Sopha: Too bad the television is not here for the commercial.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think in respect of the Vanier Centre for women that would probably be true, and I quoted the Elizabeth Fry Society in that respect.

There is always this bugaboo coming up every session about the licence plates being a make-work project which does not teach anybody anything. The same question is asked, the same answer is given, and I suppose we will have to do it again.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): It is just an inadequate answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, I think the licence plates are made by most of the jurisdictions in the United States, probably even Illinois too. I do not know.

Mr. Shulman: Wrong, wrong. They will not allow it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not wrong.

Mr. Shulman. They will not allow it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right, we will talk about Illinois in a few moments. The licence plates are made at Millbrook where we have the very difficult cases, where we send those who will not take any instructions at any institution.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Aside from the sex cases, those are the behavioural problems that get to Millbrook from every other institution.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the Minister a question at this point?

Would he give us the figures for the number of alcoholics, drug addicts, and others that are in there at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will give me a chance—drug addicts, sex deviates, arsonists, and the escape risks and the ones who are behavioural problems in the other institutions.

Mr. Ben: Aside from the last category, how many of the others—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which others?

Mr. Ben: The ones I think to be slightly abnormal. The pedophiles, the drug addicts, the alcoholics.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As of March 2, there were, in Millbrook: behaviour problems 64, sex deviates 61, drug addicts 27, escape risks 45, arsonists 15.

Mr. Shulman: Your very figures belie what you just said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They do not belie it at all. If the hon. member will just give me

a chance to make my case. There is nothing wrong with making licence plates. A lot of these people need to learn good work habits. They have to learn what the chances are. When they get out of that institution, they are going to be employed in factories.

They are going to have to get up in the morning, they are going to have to learn to do a morning's work, that they get so much time out for lunch, and they are going to have to go back in the afternoon and work. And when they do a day's work, they are tired, they have supper, have a couple of hours of recreation and go to bed. These are good work habits.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister allow a question? Can these prisoners not learn the same good work habits by going into a machine shop, and learning how to use machine tools, or to work on a car, as they can by going in and punching licence plates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I thought I made it quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that this has been tried with most of these people. They will not take instructions from anyone. Every sanction has been tried against them to keep them within the discipline of an organization. They will not take instructions from a correctional officer; they will abuse a correctional officer. They abuse the rules, they abuse the regulations and they have to go into our only maximum security institution.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): You abuse them. The overwhelming majority at Millbrook are amenable people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, I am talking about the behavioural risks, the danger risks, the arsonists, and so on. And certainly the sex deviates.

Mr. Ben: Oh, come on—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment, please. The fact is we do not have any place to keep sex deviates at this time, except in a maximum security institution. I have pointed out to the hon. members that we are making arrangements in this changeover of the whole system, at the Maplehurst centre and the Mimico clinics, to provide for all of the sex deviates to go to Maplehurst.

We have to have our priorities, so the ones we are dealing with now are the ones that are the greatest danger to the public, the pedophiles. These are the ones that are being treated, that are brought out of Millbrook in the last portion of their sentences and are being treated. This is the priority. Of

course, we would rather have the sex deviates at a clinic, and this is what is going to be provided for them. We cannot do all this overnight. We have to, as I say, look after our priorities.

Mr. Ben: You said that in 1965, too.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, 1965. Well, this is 1969. There are a lot of other things we have done since 1965, a lot of other things.

I think I have already dealt with the matter of attempting to get cheap publicity. I do not think the hon. member used this word, but I know that I could take some lessons from the hon. member in modesty and aversion to publicity. I do not think he should have brought this up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let us get to Joliet, this great haven.

Mr. Shulman: It is not a cure haven.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the place where they cure everybody. It has the most modern system in the world.

Mr. Shulman: I think it is a good place compared to your institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What the hon. member did is an old trick. I have done this circuit. I have been around—

Mr. Shulman: What did you learn?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What have I learned? I learned that there are some places where they have some programmes which we might try and some which we are already doing. I have seen a lot of places where they could very well try some of the things which we have been doing, and they have not been thinking about for years.

I do know this, that whereas we have, in our statement of purpose, aimed towards the objective of having no institution which will accommodate more than 200, these same so-called progressive jurisdictions, are presently building institutions to hold 2,000-3,000 people.

Mr. Shulman: There is nothing inherently evil about that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is. Yes, there is. It just proves the hon. member has not done his research. I have been to Scandinavia, too, and the year I was there—I think it was three or four years ago—they had just completed a prison for, I think it was 2,000 or

2,500 people. Any responsible person in corrections will tell you publicly that it is the worst thing in the world to have a large institution. This is our problem with Guelph.

Mr. Ben: They are probably all capitalists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because where you have large institutions, there is, of course, apt to be a preoccupation with security. This is the big problem, and our problem is to attempt to reduce the size of the institutions.

Mr. J. Renwick: The Minister is not comparing Guelph with the institutions which you have referred to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. I was talking about the matter of size.

Mr. J. Renwick: It depends entirely upon the internal organization as to how it operates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was talking about the fact that we had an objective which we are working towards, and rather successfully, to reduce the size of institutions. Other jurisdictions have not even thought about it because it is too costly. And comparing one jurisdiction with another can be very, very tricky.

Mr. J. Renwick: The member for High Park was very selective.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know he was selective. He chose a very good one in Illinois.

Mr. J. Renwick: You said he chose the correct one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me tell you about Illinois. You see, what he did was choose one institution in the state system of Illinois, but forget all the other institutions. I would compare—

Mr. Sopha: What is this, a tour of American prisons?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our Brampton training centre would compare very favourably with Joliet or any other institution. I think we have now five training centres similar to Brampton.

Mr. Sopha: You are wasting our time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not wasting anyone's time. The hon. member was giving the impression that Illinois had great progressive programmes which we do not have here.

Mr. Shulman: Obviously the Minister did not hear my speech. Perhaps he would like me to repeat it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, do not bother. I heard it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was an obvious attempt to give the impression that the whole state of Illinois was doing this. In the first place he talked about—

An hon. member: You were not listening.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was listening. In the first place he talked about Joliet, which is a state prison, and then he said they keep an old cell, an old jail cell. A jail is not a state reformatory. This is what the hon. member was doing—he kept confusing jails and reformatories in the minds of his listeners, not those of us who are aware of what is going on.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what he was doing. He said that they kept an old jail cell to show what jails were like before.

Mr. Shulman: This was in Joliet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In Joliet, which is a reformatory.

Mr. Shulman: I wish you were as good at your job as you are at semantics.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member said a jail cell. He could go into our institutions that have individual cells.

Mr. Shulman: They all have individual cells.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, we have individual cells and if he thinks that lavatory service is a great and important thing, they have them in our individual cells. The hon. member need not bother. I got his point.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Sit down. You have made your point.

Mr. Shulman: I would not want him to be misled or to mislead the House. The point I made was that there was no longer a single cell in all of Joliet which does not have the amenities of water, a toilet, a table, and lighting. The warden of that place

pointed out that it was all done by their own individual labour within the reformatory, the jail, the prison, call it what you will. You have not done it here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have it in Millbrook.

Mr. Shulman: You have not done it in the old buildings where you could have done it right here in the city.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Neither has Illinois. Well, now, am I hearing differently? The hon. member just said he was pointing out that it was only in Joliet.

Mr. Shulman: I went to three of the prisons in Illinois.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment!

Mr. Shulman: Joliet consists of a complex of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been in Cook County jail.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order! It is very interesting to hear that the prisoners in Joliet have more amenities by way of private accommodation than members of the Ontario Legislature.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Talking about carpets, now toilets—how about hot and cold running chambermaids.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I could read to the hon. member, but I will not bother, about an investigation now being held in the Cook County jail which I saw myself—I do not want to criticize other jurisdictions; they have their problems. Of course, the hon. member could go to some jurisdiction and say they have a good programme in this particular area and then compare it with some programme in our own jurisdiction—

Mr. Shulman: You should compare us with the best and not the worst.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the hon. member please let me finish! I listened to him for over half an hour. We are moving towards not only equalling, but exceeding, the best.

Mr. Shulman: You are too slow.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We took over the jails in July, 1968, and the hon. member is talking about making some changes. We have been making changes in those jails ever since we took them over.

Mr. Shulman: Inadequate changes; merely gestures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a fruitless discussion.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Perhaps we could permit the hon. Minister to reply to the points raised by the two lead-off speakers. Let him answer the question, then we will get on with the estimates. The hon. Minister, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, let me repeat that the same discussion about the jails went on last year. It was said we were going to take them over; we took them over. We have 35 county and 2 city jails; 27 of them pre-date Confederation. We are carrying on a programme of renewal, replacement and renovation. It is being carried on actively now. There are many jails in this province which, since July, 1968, have had a lot of money put into them. New ones are planned in some of the areas and, as far as we know, we are the only jurisdiction in North America (aside from, perhaps, one or two of the small Maritime provinces), of any reasonable size, which has taken the forward step of taking over all the county jails. No state in the American union has done this, in spite of the pressure from all correctional people there for 50 years. We have taken them over to integrate them into one system.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Sure, because they were in such a deplorable state.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it is the same on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, I think that deals with most of the questions that were asked.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, since we last discussed the Minister's estimates, I have observed the innovation that was earlier referred to—some comment has been made by my friend for High Park about it—and that is the innovation introduced into the jails of the method of communication between visitors and the inmates.

One observes now that when wives and those permitted to come and visit people in custody—and they appear to be a very restricted group—apparently there has to be either a relationship by marriage or by blood. I have never quite understood that aspect of the regulations, but certainly the number of people to whom an inmate may be exposed from outside of the jail is severely limited.

However, one observes that when they come, they observe their relative or husband

through a glass partition and communicate with them with an instrument that resembles a telephone. Of course, the impact upon me is at least twofold. In the first place, it is the tyranny of technology. Somebody in the civil service, in the Minister's department, was captivated by the introduction of technology and decided with a capital G and a capital T that it would be a Good Thing to introduce it. The other side of the coin is the assault on human dignity, the dehumanization and depersonalization of the inmate and the person on the outside who has not committed any offence at all.

Look at it from the point of view of the indignity heaped upon the innocent person outside. It assaults one's sense of reason and humanity when one conjectures in the mind of the person—the mother, the sweetheart, the wife, the child, who has committed no offence against the law at all—to go into a public institution, a government institution, and be asked to speak to the person they have come to see through a telephone while looking at him. That, of course, is part of the creeping process throughout society of the tyranny of technology, which inflicts itself upon all of us.

Then the second aspect of it, of course, is the impression given one of the importance of the institution. The institution is all, and the individual is nothing; he recedes into unimportance compared to the regulations, the designing of the device, its installation, its becoming part of the bricks and mortar, the institution. In other words, those who work for the Minister see the institution as being all important. It must be terribly efficient; it must function in an orderly manner. The Minister is going to get up and say—I am not even inviting a reply from him; I am merely reporting what I see as I make those frequent visits to the jail. He is going to get up and say it is in the name of holy security—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am not.

Mr. Sopha: —that he puts this glass partition between the two and they address each other through the telephone instrument. But again it is the pre-eminence of the institution. That is what we do with individuals: we bring them into the institution and impress upon them the importance of the institution in their lives; they are subject to the institution, and when they come into one of the jails they are subject to that brick fortress in which he keeps them and to all his staff and the organization. That, too, is part of the process of the assault on human dignity. There is the

true impact. I thought it was an abomination when I saw this thing introduced. A couple of years ago, it was another little device. Somebody in the civil service in that department dreamed up that everybody who comes to see an inmate has to sign a name.

You know, I said to my friend from Huron-Bruce that you had to sign your name to see a person, and I thought if I have the time and the courage to go there as counsel—it would take more time than courage—I might refuse to sign my name and then talk to Mr. Grossman about deprivation of the right to see my client. That would be an interesting conflict, because the right to see your client is a pre-eminent right in the law to Mr. Grossman's regulation. If I refused to sign my name and said, "To hell with you; I am not signing your book. Now you take the steps, Mr. Governor, to prevent me from seeing my client."—but I have not got the time to engage in those nice questions of civil rights. I am too busy here to do it.

The last thing I want to tell you, the last indignity was that when I was told—let me carefully say and let us underline it in *Hansard* that it was not the governor of the district jail in Sudbury who told me; it was not that excellent servant, Mr. Farquhar. He did not tell me. I was told by a governor of a jail—and I did not say district jail this time, you see, because I do not want them to track me—a governor of a jail told me that when they put in their infernal electronic devices, those devices of communication between the visitor and the prisoner, they offered to tap them if he wanted. It was a sort of an option, like getting power steering on your car. Yes, offered to tap them so that the governor and those who worked under him could listen in on the conversation, and he, being an honourable man, refused.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who made the offer?

Mr. Sopha: The people installing them at the behest of your department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is wrong.

Mr. Sopha: It is an option throughout Ontario. Maybe in Huron they tap them and in this other one I am not identifying they do not. So you had better watch out what you say if you do not know you are tapped, that you are wired to the governor's office. For all I know maybe in some of them they have got loud speakers for listening. But in all seriousness—I just illustrate, and the Minister will say I use hyperbole; of course I do—it shows the little concern for the dignity

of the individual; how they trifle with dignity in the whole piece.

If he but had the sense—and I am not calling for any reply from him—he would give the order tomorrow to rip those glass partitions out, take out all those telephones and toss them in the garbage can—

Mr. Ben: Sell them second-hand.

Mr. Sopha: —and do what the member for High Park said, build a sitting room—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, I thought the member meant search them.

Mr. Sopha: —and the visitors could come to see the people incarcerated in an institution, let them sit down in human dignity and have their conversations within the time limited. And if he was really sensible, if he was really progressive and far-seeing, while they were visiting them he would offer them a cup of tea.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I must deny right off the bat that our staff thinks more of the institution than they do of the people in their care. This is entirely wrong. It is entirely different from the approach which the whole department has been taking, and it is against everything they have been taught.

Now, in respect of the telephone system, I should tell the hon. member I agree with him. We are not happy with them. As a matter of fact, if he would only visit some of the jails we have been renovating recently, he would find a new system in effect.

We are testing some of the systems. With regard to signing your name, he must remember we are still running a penal institution, a penal system. I do not think you could do this without knowing the person who is coming into the institution.

As a matter of fact, the hon. member referred to the member for High Park, taking some of his advice. You will recall the hon. member for High Park said that when he went in to Joliet, everyone was searched and had everything removed from their pockets.

We do not do that. You walk into our institutions and you walk out of them. The least we can do is ask you for your name so we know who is going into the institutions in case something does happen.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister, during his reply, mentioned an institution in Scandinavia which has just

been completed with a population of 2,000 or 2,500. I wonder if he would identify that? Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember the name of it. I will find out for the hon. member because I brought home some pamphlets.

Mr. Young: And the other question in connection with that: What is the internal organization of that institution? Does the Minister recall whether it is broken down into smaller community groups within the large institution, or is it simply one of these monstrosities that have been talked about all evening?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, honestly, Mr. Chairman, I cannot recall. I have visited so many institutions that one gets mixed up in my mind with another. I will tell the hon. member one of the problems. You get a picture of Scandinavia and you know they are very progressive in many areas, so that you cannot imagine they would do some of these things. I was shocked at one building—I think it was in Sweden—miles away from—

Mr. MacDonald: When was it built?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, now it would probably be about ten years old. It was about four or five years ago I was there. It was built 40 or 50 miles, if I recall, from the city. And there was a tremendous outcry at the time because they were going to build it near the city—I think it was Stockholm. The people in Stockholm said they did not want this kind of institution near the city. So much for the progressive approach. It depends on what is happening at the time.

And they were forced to go out and build it away out some place where they should not have, which is, I presume, what happened in Canada in some of these instances when these problems were faced.

But the hon. member knows they have a different approach, their mores are different. For example, the hon. member mentioned homosexuality. When I visited a training school in one of the Scandinavian countries—and I cannot remember the name of the country and even if I did I do not think it is important to mention here anyway, because, as I say, they have their ideas—there was some situation in one of the training schools which I thought was rather strange.

I asked the supervisor if he was not afraid of homosexual activity amongst the youngsters. He said: "Why, of course not, why

should we be? This is part of the experience of growing up."

So to compare jurisdictions can be a very deceiving thing. It does not really give you a true picture.

Mr. Young: This is a boys' institution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a boys' training school. As a matter of fact, I will tell you something about one of the adult institutions, a very old prison in one of these countries, where some of the cells are open and they visit each other.

I asked the same question and he said: "Well, we do not concern ourselves with that. That man's morality is his own business. If he wants to visit the inmate down the corridor, that is his own business."

Well, of course, the hon. member will appreciate that, aside from the fact that their mores are different than here, that would also lend itself to reducing the security problem in that institution because there is more permissiveness in this area. And these are some of the problems we have to consider when you are comparing one jurisdiction with another.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I was wondering, was there a surplus of money left over last year from the Minister's estimates? Was he looking for some things to do to spend some money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That sounds like a trap.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not fall into traps too easily.

Mr. Shulman: I was wondering because I have here a little book which this department put out, not to members of the Legislature, but to every member of the staff of The Department of Correctional Services, called: "Excerpts from Legislature of Ontario Debates".

The first session of the 28th Legislature, 1968, Tuesday, May 28, Wednesday, May 29 and Thursday, May 30, printed by The Department of Reform Institutions. I was wondering, what was the purpose of distributing this particular book?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The purpose of that is precisely what we have been talking about here for years. We do this every year. I think it is a good thing for the staff and it went to every member of the staff of the de-

partment. I think it is a good thing for them to know what is going on in this Chamber tonight.

I think they should hear, they should read about the debates, what concerns the members of the Legislature, what their Minister is answering on their behalf, and what people are saying about what is going on in their institutions. I am sure the hon. member will agree this is a good thing. It was not a matter of surplus money, there is money for this in the estimates.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, what disturbs me is the letter that went with this particular book, which went out to every member of The Department of Correctional Services. I quote from it:

This is of particular interest, as it will show the attitude towards the duties and responsibilities of the staff by various members of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think that is any different, Mr. Chairman, from what I have said. I think they should know this. I think if the hon. member finds something to criticize in the institutions—I do not know if that is precisely what was in the letter sent out—but if it was, I see nothing wrong with it.

There is nothing wrong with letting the members of the staff know what the members of the Legislature feel about the way they are operating the institutions. This part of the educative process of the staff, in the change in the approach, and hoping that some of them will change their attitudes, they have to know that people are interested, that people are watching, that they are listening. I do not see anything wrong with that.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me what this cost and whether it was a total reprint of the debates, or was there some extract made?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We made sure it was a total reprint.

Mr. Shulman: And what was the cost?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that for the hon. member, we do not have it here.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, there was some discussion last year about members of the Legislature visiting various institutions, and perhaps I should not criticize the Minister's attitude at all because some of the Ministers on that side of the House do not like their institutions visited at all.

But you may recall at the time I asked the Minister whether the remarks of the members were to be written down or if there were reports to be made back to the department. So let me ask the Minister again so there will be no misunderstanding, is there any special procedure that is followed when a member of this Legislature visits one of the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, what was the hon. member's specific question?

Mr. Shulman: Does the Minister have a certain procedure—has he told his staff, for example, it is important that prompt and accurate information be relayed to the inspection and jails branch as soon as the member has left? Would he have said anything like that, for example?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I think there is something like that in the institutions. We would like to know what comments were made and what criticisms were found in the institutions.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Chairman, last year I asked this type of question and the Minister certainly led us to believe that nothing of this sort took place. Now, perchance, a copy of the instructions finally fell into our hands and I hardly think it is the duty—and perhaps the Minister will disagree with me—I hardly think it should be the responsibility or the duty of any of your jail personnel to be writing down any conversations which we, as members, have in that jail and reporting it back to you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Conversations with whom? With staff?

Mr. Shulman: With prisoners or with staff. Specifically with prisoners.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, let us clear that up. They have *Hansard* from last year and this is where the confusion arises. This is *Hansard* from May 30, 1968, at page 133, I am quoting the hon. member for High Park:

Mr. Shulman: I would like to ask the Minister a question. I was quite amazed when I visited last weekend to one of the institutions to find that a letter had been sent to this institution and presumably to the others under the control of this Minister, stating that if members of this House visited and questioned prisoners, that guards were to listen and to write down what the members of this House had asked the prisoners and to report it back to the department.

I would like to ask the Minister what is the purpose of this particular surveillance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the hon. member quote such a letter to me.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister denying there is such a letter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to see the letter.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister denying there is such a letter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, how can I deny something the existence of which I do not know? I do not know whether it exists or not. I would like to know if such a letter exists.

Mr. Shulman: I can assure the hon. Minister there is such a letter.

What the hon. member is talking about is two different things. If he is talking about instructions to staff to listen to conversations that members have with inmates then that is entirely irrelevant. No such instructions were issued, certainly not with my knowledge, and I am certain this would not have happened.

They are asked to report back any incidents as a result of the visit of any MPP and to let us know what criticisms they may have had of the institution. I think that is quite within the purview of the Minister to know what is going on in one of his institutions.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, let us just get this straight. I have the letter, which I will read in a moment, and it is worded in such a way that either—

Mr. Ben: What is the date?

Mr. Shulman: Dated November 3, 1968. It is worded in such a way that either interpretation could be made. But the interpretation that is being made, at least by certain jail governors, is that as soon as the MPPs leave, the prisoners, who have been interviewed by those MPPs in private, are called down and asked "What were you asked? What did you say?" This goes into the report which goes to the Minister.

I, for one, think this is highly uncalled for, improper and should be stopped immediately. I will read the letter and it certainly is open to interpretation both ways—or, perhaps, misinterpretation.

Re visits to the jail by members of the Provincial Legislature.

I am sorry; it is dated October 30, 1968. I saw it on November 3, 1968. It was up on the bulletin board.

Mr. Ben: They were keeping it a secret.

Mr. Shulman, In the governor's office, but he was absent. Anyway, it is a long fairly lengthy letter and I could not copy it all. I copied down points five and six.

5. The governor or the officer in charge in my absence will advise the administrator by phone and follow with a complete written report.

6. It is important that prompt and accurate information be relayed to the inspections and jail branch as soon as the member has left.

(signed) D. W. Simmons.

Now may I suggest, inasmuch as this letter is slightly ambiguous, that I trust the Minister will explain. I am not sure why he wants a surveillance at all. If it is necessary as soon as we leave you know about it, I presume this is so in the next jail in the nearby area which we are visiting can be alerted. If you have to have that alert (red alert, I guess we will call it), I will not argue too much with you. But will you please make sure that the jail governors cease calling the prisoners down and questioning them as to any conversations which we have had.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, first I would point out the hon. member is referring to what he claims is a letter. It was not a letter, but it was dated October 28.

Mr. Shulman: This one is dated October 30.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. But the hon. member will keep in mind that he asked the question in May. In other words, what he is talking about now is something which occurred after May, 1968. So it bears no relationship to his question at that time. I am advised by my officials here that what happened was that this was a paper discussed at a meeting of the governors of the jails in Toronto. They discussed numerous matters at this meeting. The hon. member has read out two portions of that. This was apparently posted at that jail by the governor. It was apparently written by the governor.

Mr. Shulman: Who is governor Simmons?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This was apparently written by the governor and I am advised that this was just a matter for discussion at the governor's conference—

Mr. J. Renwick: Visits of the members of the Legislature!

Mr. Shulman: Do you mean the governors decide? This is interesting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no. This was a—

Mr. MacDonald: Correction.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—seminar for the governors in Toronto.

Mr. Shulman: Who gave the seminar?

Mr. J. Renwick: Who submitted the paper?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We did! We were training—

Mr. J. Renwick: On the visits of the members of this Legislature—

Mr. Lawlor: Is this a result of a new visiting activity?

Mr. J. Renwick:—that the governors of a jail have a seminar to discuss the visits of the members of this Legislature to their institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have an annual meeting of the governors.

Mr. J. Renwick: And you spend your time discussing the visits of the members of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it concerns all visitors.

Mr. MacDonald: It does not surprise me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It concerned all visitors. As a matter of fact, what we were doing was pointing out that the MPPs had special privileges, which other visitors do not.

Mr. J. Renwick: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Minister would read the whole of the document into the record.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right.

Peel County Jail regulations, procedures and instructions—

This is what the hon. member is reading. This is dated October 28, 1968:

Re Visits to the jail by members of the Provincial Legislature.

1. Everyone unknown to you, including members of the Provincial Legislature, must properly identify himself. On being admitted, all visitors must sign the jail visitor record except those that are visiting prisoners and they must sign the prisoners' visitors record.

2. A prisoner's file will not be available to any visitor except on the authority of the administrator of jails.

3. Specific questions may be answered as to information normally given out to persons (prisoner's name and why he is being held).

4. Psychological or psychiatric reports are not to be made available. If a question arises, refer them to the Minister of Correctional Services. It will be in order to state that psychiatrists do visit the jail when necessary.

5. The governor or the officer in charge in my absence will advise the administrator by phone and follow with a complete written report.

6. It is important that prompt and accurate information be related to the inspections and jail branch as soon as the member has left.

7. When such a visit occurs I expect everyone to be courteous and to use common sense. Of course, this is expected at all times.

This is signed by the governor.

Now, let me correct what I said a few moments ago. This was the governor's interpretation of the decision taken at the seminar, and he posted it.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this is policy—that whenever members visit, that immediately a phone call comes through to the appropriate authorities, giving details? Then this other investigation takes place later and the correspondence follows. This is policy of the department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The policy of the department is that if there is any occurrence about which the MPP makes an issue—to let us know about it.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit me a question. For the sake of clarification, are you saying that the governors established this policy?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said that there was a seminar. I think we have one annually, or a semi-annual seminar at which we have the governors. The hon. members will keep in mind that we have just taken over some, I think, 800 additional staff and it is most difficult to get them all to accept the new approach and to integrate them into the system. We have these seminars twice a year. This was a discussion that was held at the seminar and my deputy advises me that as a result of this seminar, apparently, the governor posted this as his interpretation of what went on at the seminar.

Mr. Bullbrook: Am I not correct in assuming from what you read—to me, it is absolutely reprehensible that a conference of

governors should be discussing visitation by members of the Legislature. But I cannot understand this, Mr. Chairman. The governors have themselves decided that after the visitation they will report elsewhere, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no.

Mr. Bullbrook: To their superiors?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. Firstly, I should point out to the hon. member that prior to the governors coming into the system they did not really have to allow an MPP into the jail if they did not want to. You can appreciate that.

This was a decision of policy. I am not saying that what he said was not, in effect, the policy of the department. This is the policy of the department—they are to report back the results of any discussions they had with an MPP when he visits the institution.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, why the need for such great expedition? Why? Why is it so absolutely necessary that after a member makes a visitation—as you say, it is of absolute necessity and paramount importance—they get this documentation back to your department forthwith? Why? I am interested in this. Let me finish if I might.

I take no great personal issue with your department, but why this great need? If Jim Bullbrook walks into the county jail at Sarnia and visits his good friend the governor and discusses things with a prisoner, why should that governor (Fraser) have to get it back to your department forthwith? What do you anticipate Jim Bullbrook is doing there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What we anticipate is the possibility that if you allow too much time to elapse, the information, the questions which you may raise two weeks later—or a week later—may have become entirely garbled. The department wants it when it is fresh because a lot of things change; inmates are moved out, things of that nature. The MPP was there today; he raised this question, let us know about it. If it is something that should be changed we will change it. If the MPP asks why is this done, we will say, "Since you were there, this has been changed because you asked about it". If not, we will be able to say this is what happened at that time.

In other words we want it as expeditiously as possible. There is nothing sinister about this.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we are getting a mile off the mark here. The accusation that was raised by the hon. member for High Park was that the regulations of The Department of Correctional Services required governors and all employees of prisons and reform institutions to eavesdrop, in effect, on conversations between inmates and MPPs who visited and to report these conversations.

To date he has not produced any evidence that this is the instruction of the department, but it does not concern me whether he has or not. What I want to know is does the department, in fact, as he alleges, instruct eavesdropping of conversations between inmates and members and are the inmates compelled to report and are they brought down?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman; what is the point of order?

Mr. Ben: I just point out the accusation the member made.

Mr. Shulman: At no point, and at no time did I allege anyone was eavesdropping; let us get that straight. Apparently the member for Humber as usual has been mixed up.

Mr. Ben: I am not mixed up.

Mr. Shulman: So let him make his own alleging. What I alleged and what—

Mr. Lawlor: He is the most mixed up member in the Legislature.

Mr. Shulman: Well, we cannot help that.

Mr. Ben: Why do you not go and see a psychiatrist?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Would the hon. member for High Park state his point of order?

Mr. Shulman: On the point of order—but first I must express my deep sympathy to the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) for whom, daily, we shed a tear. However on the point of order—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Shulman: May I finish my point of order before you start your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Humber was quite correct and I read this into the record. He asked last year—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I finish my point of order before he starts his point of order?

Mr. Chairman: Well I thought you had finished, but the hon. member for High Park may finish. I had asked him to and I thought he had.

Mr. Shulman: On this point of order I wish to say I did not at any time suggest there was eavesdropping. What I did say was that after members had left, the prisoners involved were called down and asked what had transpired between them and the member. And the Minister himself, in his last comment, when he was saying why they had to have an immediate response, said that two or three days later, a prisoner may have been transferred.

In other words he admitted tacidly, right there, that in effect the prisoners are questioned. I think this is very, very wrong.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member has made his point. The hon. Minister has a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that is another—well I cannot think of anything—it is a Shulmanism. That does not mean we want to know because a prisoner may be transferred. For example, suppose the hon. member had raised a question about the treatment of a prisoner and we want to find out whether, in fact, this is what had occurred.

It has nothing to do with what the hon. member said to the prisoner. We want to know if that happened before the prisoner goes—whether he is released or discharged—it has nothing to do with listening in on a conversation.

As a matter of fact, that is the import of what the hon. member asked last year, and which he asked again, stating that members of the House visited and questioned prisoners, that the guards were to listen and to write down what the members of this House had asked the prisoners—now if that is not eavesdropping I do not know what is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! I would point out to the members of the committee that the Chairman has not yet been given the opportunity of calling vote 401. The hon. member for Sudbury carried on with his speech before I called it.

Now vote 401 of the estimates is broken down by departmental activities. Is it the wish of the committee that we deal with vote 401 under these various activities, or do you wish to have a wide ranging debate on 401 in its entirety?

Mr. Sopha: The latter.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: May I rise—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury was up first.

Mr. Sopha: Fine, thank you. Well then, on this subject of the visit of members of the Legislature, may I enquire through you of the hon. Minister what is all this fuss about the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) visiting his constituents in Burwash? He represents—and I am glad he does—the people employed and resident in that farm and he would be remiss in his responsibilities if he was not attuned to their desires. So what is all the fuss about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no fuss. As a matter of fact, that is precisely what I said. I said that because of the particular situation at Burwash village, I would think it was not only the MPP's right, but his duty.

Mr. MacDonald: When you revised and made an exception for your programme that is what you said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said that as far as visiting his constituents was concerned, it was not only his right but his duty if they wanted to see him. What I did say was that if it was a political meeting in one of the institutional buildings—if he wanted to speak on institution property—he would have to get permission from the superintendent who, if he felt it was a political meeting, would refuse it. But it had nothing to do with visiting the village and the people in the village.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me complete one point and then you can carry on. Just to show you how the Minister is, in a very nice fashion, confusing this issue. Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for Sudbury East—who has been sick for a week but will be here tomorrow and can carry on the battle himself—first made the request, he offered to have the Minister come to the meeting.

The Minister has a letter to prove that he offered. I think it was a letter, or in a personal conversation with the Minister. So the Minister is now giving second thought to the charge that it was going to be a political meeting—which was the excuse for banning it by the governor—because he recognizes his position as wholly indefensible.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I was the one who raised it in the absence of my colleague from Sudbury East. The members of his own party were silent and I raised this.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is quite correct. Carry on.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Sudbury East will be here tomorrow and when he gets up he does not need to be crowded into—

Mr. Chairman: Does someone want the floor?

Mr. Sopha: Well I wanted to complete this. I am being deprived of free speech here.

Mr. Chairman: All right, the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Sudbury East, I recall, said he would be very pleased to have me come up and talk to certain members of the staff, whom he alleged were dissatisfied with the working conditions. Now this has nothing to do with the fact that permission was asked by some member of the staff to the principal of the school on government property, on institutional grounds, to hold a meeting.

The principal then wrote a letter to the gentleman who had requested the use of the school and said that, in view of the fact that this appeared to be a meeting of a political nature, he had better ask the governor's permission. The governor was never asked permission after that. And I pointed that out in my answer to the hon. member for East York.

Mr. Sopha: The whole thing has been distorted. Now, properly, under this vote, we are discussing the rights of members of this Legislature to call on these institutions. All right. Now, we come to an even more intimate exercise of the rights in respect of the member for Sudbury East visiting his own constituency. And I am not emphasizing the holding of a meeting. The NDP love to hold meetings.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no problem.

Mr. Sopha: Let them then. There is no problem with me there. But, what I am concerned about is that, he tells me, you took the grocery store away from Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is another story. We are talking about visits.

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment. That supports my thesis of the importance of the institution. The institution must be run in an efficient, orderly, corporate-management fashion. Now, I know that institution very well, and somebody in your department—you are probably not even aware of these decisions, they are made down in the lower echelons—decided that the store at Burwash should be closed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am fully aware of that.

Mr. Sopha: Now, to get a loaf of bread, a case of Coke or a package of cigarettes, these people have to travel five or six miles into Estaire. And if they forget to get them, when they go into Sudbury to shop. Now, why should not the member, in order to redress those grievances, have free access to the institution. And if, in the carrying out of his responsibilities according to the dictates of his own judgment, he wants to meet with people, then what is the necessity of getting permission from the person correctly called the superintendent—not the governor, as you say—in that institution. Why cannot he go into that school, that building no longer used as a school because the children have moved to Estaire school?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have not moved yet.

Mr. Sopha: They have not? Oh, I thought they had. They are going to.

Or the church, or any place else convenient, to meet with the residents of Burwash. Those people are voters, constituents of his, and it only blurs the issue when the Minister gets up and talks about political overtones and gives all sorts of sinister implications to the exercise of democratic rights, the carrying out of responsibilities of a member.

If the hon. member for Sudbury East wants to do that, he is not Shulman snooping, trying to get something on you. He is carrying out, in the way he does things, his political responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nobody refused the hon. member for Sudbury East, nor did I even say that he would have to ask anyone's permission.

Mr. Sopha: Well, what was it? It was in the *Sudbury Star* that you announced that he would have to get permission.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know; I never saw the *Sudbury Star*. The whole

question arose from a question of the hon. member for York South, who asked, presumably on behalf of the member for Sudbury East, why some of the employees—the hon. member for Sudbury East never came into it if I recall—could not have a meeting at the school. It had nothing to do with the hon. member of this House at all.

Mr. MacDonald: My question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, as I recall.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, does he have it there?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not have it, but I know why the hon. member for Sudbury East could not hold the meeting with his constituents.

Mr. Sopha: My colleague from Sudbury East has told me this himself, and I want to say here that I am very grateful to my colleague that he showed such concern for Burwash. Because when my friend from Nickel Belt had responsibility for Burwash, I sort of had to share responsibility with him, listening to complaints of your custodial officers.

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): Not at the time.

Mr. Sopha: But now the member for Sudbury East has an affinity for these things and gladly handles them.

Mr. Demers: I had to follow you to repair your mistakes.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, indeed. I admit that, because none of us are perfect.

Mr. Demers: Except you.

Mr. Shulman: To complete the point I started to bring up when all sorts of other members became interested.

It might be of some interest to you, sir, that when I was visiting jails, because of the exigencies of time, it was usually necessary to visit three or four in a day and I usually picked a Saturday or a Sunday, because the Legislature was not meeting. I try to visit three or four, snooping, as the member for Sudbury has suggested, to try to improve the lot of both the prisoners and employees of the hon. Minister. And, because there are so many places to be visited, I usually visit jails within a reasonable geographic distance of each other, travelling from town to town. I

thought it might be of some interest to you, sir, that the same routine always occurs. When I arrive at the first jail, there is considerable surprise—surprise is the word—and there is usually a delay of about 15 minutes while, I presume, there is some consultation occurring within as to what should be done with this visiting Martian. Ultimately I get in and I am shown through the jail, and the governor or whoever is on duty—usually not the governor, because it is the weekend—is usually very courteous and very helpful with information. Then I proceed to the next jail, which is possibly 50 miles away, but never at the second, third or fourth jail is there ever any delay. For some reason—and I presume it is because my secretary has sent them a copy of my itinerary—they are always expecting me when I arrive at the other jails in the area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the hon. member never heard of the grapevine of the penal system?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I certainly have, and this, Mr. Chairman, is the real reason why the governors must report within five minutes of the member leaving the jail. It is so that the Minister or his staff—whoever is on duty at those horrible hours on weekends—can get on the phone to the other jails and say, "Look out, somebody is coming; clean up the roof, or whatever you have to do. Here he comes; get the governor there and make sure the right answers are given."

This is the reason, this is why it is so wrong, and this is why the Minister should rescind this order, because it is only going to redound to his embarrassment. You are going to have innocent, simple members, like some of our Liberal members, coming down there who really are not snooping at all. They just want to see what a jail looks like, and really it is a shame that they should be lumped in with we snoopers. So, could I suggest to the Minister that perhaps when you send out your next directive you list the members of the Legislature who have to be spotted as they go around the province, and perhaps the others could be allowed to visit in peace?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401. The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: In an age that loves statistics, I often wonder if any follow-up was ever made in respect of the success of the very extensive Alcoholics Anonymous programmes in the institutions. One realizes readily that, whatever the intensity of the attachment to the programme in the institution, there is at

least a geographic separation from alcohol, and I wonder whether any statistics were ever compiled of people after they were released from the institutions to ascertain what numbers exhibit a permanent rescue by the programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that there is no follow-up.

Mr. Sopha: You cannot give us any idea of how effective it is?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Apparently not. I do not know; it is worthwhile now that the hon. member has mentioned it. I will go into it a little deeper. It may very well have something to do with the usual problem you have when a person has been discharged from the penalty which the law has placed upon him, that once he has been discharged you cannot follow him up unless he volunteers. But it may very well be, I imagine, that people who are involved in the sort of programme Alcoholics Anonymous is involved in, that they may be prepared to give us this information. I will go into that further; it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. Sopha: Supposing a pilot project is started, and you identify, say, 25 people who have been in your custody for two years and have attended the meetings, then follow them for periods of one, three, five and ten years, to ascertain what success has been achieved.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I say, the suggestion is a worthwhile one, and I will go into it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have been popping up and down like a popinjay. I would like to let the Minister know that I for one, who has visited a considerable number of these jails, take severe exception to having my conversations with prisoners reported or my conversations with a fellow member. I think there is a certain confidential relationship there. We should feel perfectly free to speak among ourselves without having eavesdropping from your side of the fence, and the same with our conversations with prisoners. I take the severest kind of exception—I cannot put it too strongly to you—that if we interview prisoners and then you come down after we leave and dredge up the prisoners and force these prisoners to give to you the information that they have given to us, it is undermining—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We never said that. I never said that.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the Minister deny that is the policy?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do deny that is the policy. I said we ask our staff to let us know about any complaints or any comments made about the operation of the institution or the treatment of its inmates, and I distinctly said here on a number of occasions that we did not ask them to report to us any conversation or expect them to even listen in to any conversation between a member of the Legislature and an inmate.

Mr. Lawlor: Let me be crystal clear about this. Does the Minister mean to say that it is not the department policy to interrogate prisoners who have been questioned by us after we leave?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Definitely and positively not. If the hon. member could produce such a case, I will take the necessary action to see that disciplinary action is taken.

Mr. Lawlor: Very good.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, first of all I am glad we got that cleared up because it was I who accused the hon. member for High Park of making that innuendo and asked him to substantiate it. He denied having made such an innuendo, and I am glad that it is cleared up.

Now, there are a lot of questions I would ask, getting back to vote 401, if I may, with your permission, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, under maintenance there are a lot of expenditures which total \$321,000 and I would like to know specifically what these expenditures were for. Now, Daisons Publications Limited—what was that expenditure for, who is the president of that company? Did the hon. Minister have occasion to take a trip to Europe with the president of that firm?

Then Might Directories Limited—what was the expenditure there? And what use does the department have for Might Directories? Is that located in the Minister's riding? National Cash Register, \$40,000. Was that a lot of cash registers? I will start with those three questions.

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member point out where he is finding those figures on the estimates?

Mr. Ben: Item S5, Department of Reform Institutions, in the public accounts.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is dealing with the previous year's public accounts.

Mr. Ben: Well, that is right.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps we could bring out the questioning pertaining to these estimates and relate them to public accounts if the hon. member wishes. But we are not debating the public accounts of the previous year at this time. We are debating the estimates for this year.

Mr. Ben: I think, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I misunderstand the hon. member.

Mr. Ben: No, perhaps I may all of a sudden have had a lapse of memory, but I was always under the impression that in voting moneys we could always look back to the public accounts to determine how much was spent the previous year so that we would be satisfied that the amount which was voted this year is the proper amount.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. member could direct questions to determine whether or not similar amounts have been spent, but he outright questions—

Mr. Ben: Well, perhaps I was guilty of not having a preamble to my question. I wanted to get back to vote 401, I apologize to the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we will take a preamble on it.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am looking at determining whether—

Mr. Chairman: Is the member talking about maintenance?

Mr. Ben: I am talking about maintenance, that is correct. It comes under vote 401.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3?

Mr. Ben: Which would include the main office.

Mr. Chairman: Right.

Mr. Ben: I am curious about some of the expenditures that were made last year and I want to know what they were for so that I can satisfy myself that they should be voted tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Assuming they are in that item.

Mr. Ben: I assume that they are in that item, the \$388,000.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3, vote 401.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to answering certain questions of the hon. member, I just want to know whether we are going into the public accounts and going over all the expenditures of last year.

I think it is quite in order, if I recall the procedures here, to ask why a figure has been increased or decreased. But to go back all over last year's estimates again, we are going to be here for three months just on these estimates.

Mr. Chairman: This was the point I was trying to bring forth, that the hon. member has assumed, for example, that Might Directories is included again this year in the \$388,000, but we do not know that. I think the hon. member should direct a specific question to the Minister: Is Might Directories expenditure, as in last year's public accounts, included in this year's estimates? Or what is included in the estimates?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the only opportunity that the hon. members, other than those who sit on the public accounts committee, have of looking into the operations of a particular department to determine whether or not the Minister is living up to his own billing is when the estimates come up.

Now, for instance, in this particular instance, last year there was an expenditure of \$321,000 for maintenance under the main office vote. This year we find an amount of \$388,000—an increase in excess of \$60,000. That's over 20 per cent.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, I should be entitled to determine how the money was spent last time. I am curious, for instance, why \$40,000 was spent for National Cash Register. That buys a lot of cash registers. The answer could be, Mr. Chairman, they set up a course in one of the institutions to teach girls how to work at a check-out counter of Loblaws or Dominion or Steinbergs, and I would be very interested in knowing that.

As far as Might Directories are concerned, I do not know. Are they running elections in the correctional institutions now? Do they need a voters' list? I do not know. But surely I am entitled to find out why these amounts are being spent, especially in view, as I say, of an increase in excess of 20 per cent.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. member is entitled, as he suggests, to determine from the hon. Minister the reason for the increase in the total estimated expenditures as compared to the previous year, but I do not believe the hon. member can investigate the previous public accounts without specific questions on this year's estimates.

And he may direct a question to the Minister of what accounts for the increase. Is a similar expenditure in this year as was made the previous year? That sort of question would be in order.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I assure you—everyone else is whispering to me—that this is the procedure we have followed for years now. It is custom and usage in this House—even the hon. Minister acknowledges that we have questioned the operation or the expenditures for the previous fiscal period that have been available to us.

Unfortunately as it works out, it is a year back. It is not last year's, it is a year previous. We are always one year behind. If we cannot question it, why are they given to us? Why do we spend all the money to put all these figures together and give them to us?

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think the hon. member may bring out the answers to the problems he has, but he may not debate the public accounts for the previous year.

Mr. Ben: I am not debating.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister did not come here prepared to give details on last year's expenditures, he is here to present his estimates for this year.

Mr. Ben: You want to bet?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I obviously do not have—

Mr. Ben: We always have in the past, we have always asked about those expenditures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely the hon. member would not expect my staff to come prepared with the details of last year's expenditures, plus this year's expenditures?

Mr. Ben: We are not in a position to question the Minister on them, because they have not as yet been finalized because the fiscal period does not end until the end of this month.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, to make it clear; for the year 1968-69, surely the hon. member would not expect my staff here to

be prepared with the figures of the expenditures of 1968-69 and 1969-70, which we are discussing here?

Mr. Ben: I am sorry, I apologize through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister. I am referring to the fiscal year ended March 31, 1968, which figures we were given in this bound volume in the usual blue Tory colour. This is the only period I can refer to, it is the only period that to date is audited, I imagine, and published.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am having enough trouble, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you right now, with the new system which the Treasury Board put into effect in our new estimates, trying to explain the expenditures as they are in their present estimate, 1969, the money we are asking for, without going back two years to try and tell the hon. member what the expenditure in each item was for.

Mr. Chairman: Why does the hon. member not ask the hon. Minister for details of this year's estimated expenditure of \$388,000?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry but I insist on my prerogative as a member of this Legislature, who was a member at the time the funds were voted for the 1967-68 fiscal year, to know how those funds were spent.

Mr. Chairman: Well I must rule —

Mr. Ben: Surely I am entitled to know whether this Minister properly spent those funds.

Mr. Chairman: I must rule that type of question out of order. That type of question is out of order. We are dealing with these estimates only.

Mr. Ben: When do we get an opportunity to ask these questions?

Mr. Chairman: Any such questions would be out of order, dealing with the previous public accounts.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Humber has gone to specific items. I wish to do so too, but for the moment, the debate, as I understand it, is free-wheeling and I would like to return to that aspect of the debate.

Mr. Ben: Excuse me, I thought I was dealing on a point of order. I have not finished with it. I have not even had an answer. I thought you were rising to speak to this particular point.

Mr. Chairman: No, the hon. member did not rise on a point of order, but the Chair ruled that the debate of last year's public accounts would be out of order in the estimates committee.

This is the committee of supply. We are dealing only with the estimates for the year before us which is 1969-70. During the discussion, if any member wishes to relate this year's estimates to similar expenditures in the previous Public Accounts, this would be in order or to ask the Minister to substantiate a 20 per cent increase or some such similar figure.

But to ask the Ministers to explain expenditures in the previous Public Accounts would be out of order in this committee.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I wish to contest your ruling, I want to make sure that we have the point down, in its proper perspective so we will know what is being challenged.

It is my contention that, as a member who is being asked to vote funds—the taxpayers' money—to the Minister of the Crown, I have the right to determine that he spent the last sum voted to him properly—that it was justifiable. Because, if he has been spending money in the past unjustifiably, then I feel that I am entitled to deprive him of funds this particular time.

I also say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in the past it has always been the practice to relate the estimates to the last public accounts that are available to us.

Mr. Chairman: To relate them, I will agree—

Mr. Ben: Yes, and in the past it has always been the practice to ask the Minister what particular expenditures were for. I have done it in the past and I say that is custom and usage and therefore, if we understand the point, I do challenge the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: What is the hon. member saying?

Mr. Ben: I am saying that I have the right to ask the hon. Minister a question touching on the purpose of an expenditure as recorded in Public Accounts for the last fiscal period reported to this House.

Mr. Chairman: Well the Chair has a rule that any discussion or debate on the public accounts for the last fiscal period is out of order.

Mr. Ben: I do challenge the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Specific questions relating to those Public Accounts, unless they are related to this year's estimates—

Mr. Ben: I am so doing. I pointed out to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the last fiscal period because we never have it. We are always two years behind. Our fiscal period ends March 31 so that we have not yet received an accounting from the auditor or the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1969.

It still has not ended. And always we have had before us the Public Accounts for the period two years back and it has been the practice to so correlate our estimates—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to set a precedent which you may not want to live with, but the information for which the hon. member has asked has been provided for me because the accountant happened to have it. I would be prepared to give it to him, but I just do not want to put Mr. Chairman in a position wherein he may be faced with this all during the estimates.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I think you should rule on this point.

Mr. Ben: It is a point and I think that we should get this thing settled.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the Chairman's point is simply this: that the committee of supply does not sit to debate the Public Accounts of a prior period. The members of the committee of supply, I believe, should be at perfect liberty to refer to any previous public accounts in detail and to relate those Public Accounts to this year's estimates.

But, we are dealing with the estimates for this fiscal period, 1969-70 and if the questions are directed to the hon. Minister by way of information relative to this year's estimates, then I believe they should be in order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I just comment on this? I think that the manner in which you have presented it is correct. The proposition of debating the Public Accounts of two years ago it seems to me is an impossible one.

But, with respect, if the hon. member for Humber wants to relate any specific expenditure that is in the Public Accounts for the year April, 1967, to March 31, 1968, then he could ask a question as to what is the rela-

tionship, how come there has been a significant change or something of that nature. That way, you are not debating the public accounts of two years ago, but relating them. That, I think, is what you said and I agree with it.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I might comment on the point that has been raised, I am sure you will recall even in your own term as Chairman, the frequent occasions on which the references to the Public Accounts have been made.

Perhaps in your mind they have always been related to estimates that are presently before us. I am sure that it is the custom, however, to refer to the thick book of Public Accounts when discussing the estimates and the relationship is inherent in the very fact that the two are discussed together.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is correct. For example, the hon. member for Humber was talking about maintenance, which is item 3 under vote 401. Now his question was pertaining in one example to Might Directories expenditure which appeared in, I think, the 1968 public accounts book he has before him. Now the hon. member is not even aware of the fact that there is any expenditure to Might Directories under the current estimates. He does not know that.

Mr. Nixon: Well, he is asking if there is.

Mr. Chairman: Well, he did not ask that question though.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that I concur with the statement that was made by the hon. member for York South.

Mr. Chairman: Well, where do we differ then?

Mr. Ben: We differ that when you were discussing the matter with me, you were implying that asking a question is a debate. I find a distinction—

Mr. MacDonald: Can we write off the last ten minutes—

Mr. Ben: You see I suggested that I can ask the hon. Minister what he spent the money for, but I cannot start discussing whether the money was properly or improperly spent because that then would be a debate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think it could be improperly—

Mr. Chairman: Well, perhaps we could deal with it this way. We are dealing with the estimates for the 1969-1970 fiscal period. We are dealing with vote 401. We are having a free wide-ranging debate on vote 401. We are not restricting the members to any particular item within the vote. Now the hon. member for Humber had risen and asked certain questions pertaining to maintenance, which is item number 3 under vote 401. Will he pursue his questioning and we will determine whether he is out of order.

Mr. Ben: If I get the answer, then I cannot attack this expenditure—that would be a debate. But I want to know what it was spent for, that is all. Then, I will go further.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have the information. I will be pleased to give it to the hon. member, but as I say I do not want to go against your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: No, but what was the hon. member's specific question?

Mr. Ben: What were the expenditures involved? For instance, Daison Publications Limited. What did we get for \$6,000? Might Directories—what did we get from them—and National Cash Register?

Mr. Chairman: That sort of questioning, in the view of the Chair, is not in order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I am sorry. Let it go on record I challenge the ruling.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, surely it is not necessary for us to have to challenge your ruling, but if the member wishes to pursue this, I will support him in it. Surely the nit-picking approach that has been taken, particularly by the NDP, is one that is, I would say, going to waste the time of the Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps we can have time out for a Liberal caucus.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister says he has got the answer. Let us have the answer and let us get on with the business.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Ben: The NDP say government is not answerable to the elected representatives. Let us get that on the record.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, go on.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: Better get a psychiatrist—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The Chairman has made a ruling regarding the debating of the previous public accounts. Now the hon. member had asked a specific question to the hon. Minister. It may, or may not, be related to this year's estimates. I will permit the hon. Minister to provide the answer, but I do not want this to be taken as any precedent that we can debate the public accounts of a previous year.

Mr. Shulman: The Chair has been challenged—do you ignore it?

Mr. MacDonald: He has reiterated his challenge—

Mr. Chairman: Well, all right, the Chairman has made a ruling. All those in favour of the Chairman's ruling will please say "aye"; those opposed will please say "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it. Call in the members.

The Chairman has ruled that prior public accounts may not be debated *per se* in the committee of supply.

An hon. member: That was not the point.

Mr. Ben: Point of order. The question was that you denied me the right to ask a question of the Minister, not to debate it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is out of order.

The Chairman has ruled that the public accounts of a prior period may not be debated in the committee of supply.

Those in favour of the Chairman's ruling will please rise—

Mr. Shulman: Point of order, before you take a vote.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Mr. Shulman: Before you take the vote, I request that the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) take his seat. He was present when the bells began to ring and we have been instructed by the Clerk in our lessons that any member who is present when the vote is called must be present in the chair at the vote.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has put the question to the committee.

Those in favour of the Chairman's ruling—

Mr. Shulman: You have not ruled on my point of order, Mr. Chairman:

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

Mr. Shulman: There is a point of order. You cannot take the vote until all the members are present who were present when you first called the vote.

Mr. Chairman: I rule there is no point of order.

Those in favour of the Chairman's ruling please rise; those opposed to the Chairman's ruling will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 51, the "nays" are 17.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I challenge that count. I wish you would get the advice of your advisors. The rules of this House state that—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Shulman: —a vote may not be taken if a member who is present when the vote is called leaves and is not present when the vote is taken. He must vote.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There are two things I did not get involved in a moment ago. I think there is a double complication. Once the vote has been started, no point of order can be called. However, no vote can be called and be in order if a member who is in the House vacates the House to avoid voting.

An hon. member: Who is not here?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Nixon: Well, do you know why he left the House?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know why he vacated.

Mr. Chairman, the rules of the House, as taught to the members in sessions called by the Clerk of the House for the benefit of new members, are to the effect that when a vote is called, the member in the House at that time should stay for the vote.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: How you resolve that conflict, I do not know.

Mr. Chairman: Speaking to the point raised by the hon. member—

Mr. Sopha: May I speak to the point of order before you rule?

Mr. Chairman: I am not going to rule. I want it clarified.

The Chairman is not aware of any member who was in his seat—

Mr. MacDonald: Your attention has been drawn to one.

Mr. Chairman: This is the information I request. Who was the hon. member?

Mr. Shulman: The hon. member for Sarnia was in his seat when the bell began to ring and when you called the vote.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia was in his seat, it has been suggested, when the bell called but he did not take his seat for the vote. Is this the suggestion?

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: And the suggestion is that the rules require that he take his seat.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that is the rule—

Mr. Sopha: With respect to the point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman—

An hon. member: One at a time.

Mr. Sopha: No, the statement of the member for York South was articulated with even greater clarity than the statement of the member for High Park, and *Hansard* will bear me out. The member for York South made a definite accusation that the member for Sarnia was in his seat and left the House, to use his words, "to avoid the consequence of voting on this challenge." He has made a serious charge impugning the honour of an hon. member, and he should either establish with evidence that this is so or withdraw it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Liberal Party is so confused, they have obviously got to indulge in some tactic—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The issue before you, Mr. Chairman, is the rule—

Mr. Sopha: Do not waffle.

Mr. MacDonald: —of the House that a member who is in his seat when the vote is called, must be here to vote.

Mr. Sopha: That is not what you said. That is not what you said.

Mr. MacDonald: That is precisely what I said.

Mr. Sopha: All right.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that this interpretation could become ridiculous. It would mean that the House could not vote until we chased around and dragged out some member from somewhere.

Mr. MacDonald: Are you suggesting that some of the rules of the House are ridiculous?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, but it would mean that we could never vote. If I understand it, it would mean that we could never—

Mr. MacDonald: I raised one this afternoon—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I finish my remarks? I may be confused; I may be wrong, but it strikes me that the application of the interpretation—

Mr. MacDonald: An intelligent one.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: —made by the leader of the NDP would result in this fact, that this House could never come to order and vote unless it had chased some member around the city to try and find him.

Mr. MacDonald: All I can say is that if the hon. member for Carleton East thinks that the rules of the House become rather absurd on occasion, I agree with him. But those are the rules of the House, and I am trying this afternoon to get us to escape from one which has no rationality at all. So perhaps we are a victim of living with these archaic rules.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, on the same point, may I say that this—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: We will hear them one at a time. The hon. member for Grey South.

Mr. Winkler: This decision has been made. I do not think that there should be any more debate. These extraneous political speeches are unnecessary.

Mr. MacDonald: This is not an extraneous debate.

Mr. Winkler: It is so, and you know it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I must agree that the rules of the House have always stated that if a member is in his seat when the division bell rings, he is obliged to vote. And there is a point on record where the Sergeant-at-Arms was sent to bring about the attendance of a recalcitrant member at the point of a sword. But I do not think that is the point here. Let the hon. member for High Park swear that the member was in his chair, because nobody has substantiated his allegations.

This is the point before us—he made a charge that the hon. member was in his chair and left the House to avoid voting, and that is casting aspersions on the hon. member. There is not another member in this House who has substantiated the allegations of the hon. member for High Park, that in fact the member for Sarnia was in his seat at the time the bell rang. Not one. And this, to me, is the point.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, on this point of order. I wonder if I might just refer to the rules of the House as supplied to every member in this House at the time that he takes his seat. On page 85, under Divisions, it states quite clearly:

Every member who is in the House when a motion is put from the Chair is required to register his vote on it. But a member who was not in the House when the motion was put and enters subsequently is not allowed to vote.

That is the rule.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was out before the motion was put.

Mr. Deans: That is the rule.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It is the opinion of the Chairman that this matter of raising the points of order is developing into a debate, and the Chairman is going to apply rule 106, which reads as follows: "When members have been called in preparatory to a division, no further debate is to be permitted".

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401.

The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister please tell us how he proposes to spend the \$388,000 which he is asking this

House to vote under the caption "maintenance"? What are the expenditures that he proposes to make? Who will they be paid to and in what amounts?

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. member has now posed a proper question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I disagree with you, Mr. Chairman. How can I tell him with whom we expect to spend the money when we have not even been voted the money?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, first we get the money, and most of the money is spent on tenders. The tenders have not gone out yet, because we have not got the money. I can answer the question as to what we want the money for.

Mr. Ben: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Printing of stationery, advertising, rental of equipment, purchase of equipment, furniture, personnel services—the usual thing for the maintenance of a head office.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is bringing disgrace upon this House when he makes his asinine statement that he does not know what he is going to spend it on because he has not got it yet. Surely, one of his clerks must have sat down with a pencil and paper—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. I did not say I did not know what it was going to be spent on. The hon. member had included in his question, with whom I was going to spend the money, and I could not tell him that. He did ask that. Of course, he is entitled to know on what we are going to spend it.

Mr. Ben: Well, give us what you can answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I gave you the answers.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The Chairman recalls that during the discussion of the estimates in previous years a similar type of question was usually answered by the respective Ministers suggesting to the committee that, last year we spent so much on this and so much on that, that this year you were going to spend 20 per cent more, or were going to spend less.

And I think that roughly the details of the total expenditure may be given in estimated form, related to possibly the previous

expenditures of a prior period. Now this, I think, is what the hon. member for Humber is getting at in the first place, but his questions were not put in that manner.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is that there is an increase of \$31,200 over the estimates of last year. And accounted for as follows: increase in staff training and development courses, conferences and conventions—\$12,300; replacement of furniture and equipment—\$8,500; increase in purchase of books \$4,400; furniture for additional staff—\$3,500; general price increases—\$2,500; with a total of \$31,200, which is what the excess is in this year's estimates over last year's estimates.

Mr. Sopha: That is more than 7.5 per cent.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Humber have another question?

Mr. Ben: Yes, I do. Mr. Chairman, if I may, on the same point, I would like to know a little more specifically, what kind of printing does the department anticipate having to buy. I would like to know, for instance, are they anticipating buying cash registers?

Do they, in fact, buy cash registers—because they spent \$40,000 a couple of years ago, in the last fiscal period, for cash registers? In regard to furniture, what kind of furniture? Is he going to put it up for tender, is he going to buy at the market price?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Steel or aluminum?

Mr. Ben: I might even be interested in that, to find out whether he is supporting the lumber industry of this country or the bauxite industry of Jamaica, Mr. Prime Minister?

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member direct his specific questions to the hon. Minister?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is asking us to vote \$388,000. Would he please tell us what he desires that \$388,000 for?

Surely he must know, or at least his staff have advised him that they need X thousands of dollars to replace the furniture that was outdated, or destroyed in a prison, that he needs Y thousands of dollars to print brochures to teach a particular course to the girls in Ingleside or some other place. That he needs Z number of dollars to buy typewriters to replace typewriters that have gone out of service. Surely we are expected to be able to ask him. "What do you want this money for?"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All I can tell the hon. member is we are having difficulty, as I said earlier, because the estimates are made up differently this year. They are made up by programme, and the \$380,000 is divided into various programmes, so we would have to go into every programme and every item that is needed for those programmes. That is why it is a difficult question to answer just off the bat. That is why I can give him what the increase is for, the amount that is required by way of increase. But I cannot give him specifics, because the estimates are divided into programmes. He might address a question to the Treasurer of the advisability of going back to the old system of the estimates, because it is making it difficult for a Minister to answer this question in this way, the way that the hon. member requires it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the estimates are, I would point out, divided in the estimates book, under the various programmes by activities. There is a maintenance item in each one of those programmes. I do not know whether the Minister has the information for the individual programmes or not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well the individual programmes, sir, are in the estimates book—five programmes.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I want you to understand that I am not trying to go on to the previous question. But I have enquired from my colleagues here with reference to the public accounts of this province, and I have been told that they have not as yet, that the standing committee has not as yet, sat down to go into the public accounts for the fiscal period ending March 1, 1969—as is only natural because the period has not ended.

Therefore, neither I nor the standing committee on public accounts know how the money was spent during the current fiscal year—that is, the one ending March 31, 1969. Therefore, to me, it sounds rather ridiculous for the Minister to suggest that all he should do is to explain what the additional moneys are for this year—i.e. the money above what was spent last year.

Because we do not know how the money was spent last year, we do not even know how much of the money was spent last year. Now, for the Minister to get up in this House and say: "Well, the way the accounts are, the different departments, I cannot tell you what the money is for"—it just make one incredulous.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I cannot tell. When the hon. member wants to know how much of it is for furniture, how much of it is for rugs—this is what I presume the public accounts committee is for, to go into those kind of nitty-gritty details.

I will tell him this, that the \$388,000 is accounted for as follows—as he can see in the estimates book: \$31,000 for general administration; \$72,500 for professional services; \$109,000 for administrative and financial services; \$119,500 for personnel services; \$56,000 for information services. And that is as far as I can go in respect of detail. If he wants to get beyond that, I think the public accounts committee is the place for him.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, all I can say in reply to that is to assure the hon. Minister—and this may come as a shock to him—but I believe to my knowledge, and I stand to be corrected, that everybody who has been elected to this honourable House can read.

We, therefore, can read, and I would like to believe that all of us have read exactly what the Minister has read out. But does that tell us what the \$119,500 you are asking for under the caption: maintenance for personnel service is for? And should we just give it to you in blank because you say you need \$119,000 for that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member seriously suggest that I should tell him in one of these programmes, for example, in maintenance for general administration, that we plan on buying 114,000 fountain pens, 12,000 pencils, 1400 pads of paper, and all this sort of thing?

Mr. Ben: If, in fact, you know that, the answer is yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course I do not know that and I would not have that information.

Mr. Ben: Well, you must know what you need \$119,500 for instead of \$119,000 or instead of \$118,000. Surely your advisers there have said to you: "Mr. Minister, we do need, under personnel services, so much money for pencils and typewriter ribbons, paper etc."

Surely they have said to you: "Mr. Minister, we need so much money for the replacement of desks, etc". Otherwise, from whence, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, do you get these figures?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what the public accounts committee is for.

Mr. Ben: Oh come on, the public accounts committee is to find out what you spend it for, but we are supposed to vote it to you and you do not want to tell us what you want it for. Boy, oh boy, this government has really flipped its lid.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 401?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister tell us the amount that is allocated to research in his department and where in the estimates it can be located?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Under professional services. Do you want to know the precise figure for research? I take it the hon. member wants to know that?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised it is \$116,900.

Mr. J. Renwick: Where is that item?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is included in the professional services programme on the same page.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is that under vote 401?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well it must be in order then. I wanted to ask the Minister what contribution his department is making toward this difficult question of sentencing by the courts. I notice in the annual report that there are a substantial number of statistics about the incidence of offences and the number of persons sentenced, and the classifications of sentencing.

I would like the Minister, if he would, to tell us whether his department in terms of the correctional services, the rehabilitation services, which he prides himself on, is making any contribution back through the system to the point in the system where the sentencing takes place, so that the courts when passing sentence, may have the benefit of the results of this penal institutional system which the Minister administers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is speaking about financial contribution, because there are other contributions. Members of staff attend seminars and conferences on this. If the hon. member is referring to a financial contribution—

Mr. J. Renwick: No, I was thinking more in terms of the research programme of this department and whether or not any part of

it deals with the impact upon the sentencing system in this province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Only in so far as the \$30,000 grant to the centre of criminology would contribute to any studies they make in this field.

Mr. J. Renwick: Then I do not know. I suppose in modern terms this is called the interface between two departments—between the Attorney General's department and the system of the administration of justice and your department. There is a point at which a person is sentenced and at that point the person comes under the custodial care of your department, and whatever services you then provide for him until such time as he returns to society.

What bothers me is that there appears to be no research facility in the province, that I am aware of, relating what happens to a person after he has entered custodial care, been released from custodial care and returns to society, in terms of the kind of research which would be of assistance to those who are sentencing in the courts.

I think I have raised this matter in different contexts from time to time, but I happen to be one who disagrees with the proposition that only judges should pass sentence in courts. I want to know whether or not there is any close co-operation between your department and The Department of the Attorney General in terms of studying and assessing and making a contribution toward the difficult question of sentencing. Otherwise, we are going to perpetuate a system by which over a long period of time people are tried—the trial of any person in the court takes a considerable amount of time—and the man or woman comes up for sentencing and, apart from a pre-sentence report procedure, the sentences take place very quickly without any adequate consideration, without any understanding of what has happened to other persons who have been sentenced and gone through the framework that the Minister administers.

I want to know whether or not the Minister plans, under his research programme, any definitive way in which an assessment and an evaluation can be made of the sentences which are passed and what the impact of those sentences is on the persons who come under his care and what the ultimate result is in terms of the return of that person to society.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can only say that Professor Hogarth of the centre of criminology

is presently engaged on a study of this nature, and they get the paramount of financing through our grant and grants from the Attorney General's department. We are constantly engaged in discussions with the centre of criminology in an exchange of information.

I might also say to the hon. member that we have made further advances in setting up a proper system of the collection of information as between the federal government and the provinces, which will go a long way towards this struggle. The specific matter of research on sentencing I think, by and large, is in the hands of the centre of criminology at this particular time with our assistance and co-operation. We are also doing some research under our own director of research, but not specifically in this particular area.

Mr. J. Renwick: In a very primitive way, do the judges of the high court, for example, or the provincial judges ever visit your institutions in a routine way—I do not mean a casual visit, but in a planned way—in order that they can have some assessment even at that level of what happens to the person whom they sentence in the courts to your institutions? Or is it just this blind face that falls between the sentencing procedure and what happens to the person when he enters your institution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as the adult courts are concerned, there are a number of seminars a year—five seminars a year—in which our staff engages. The Deputy Minister particularly participates in these seminars. We have set up a system of visiting our institutions, and we have also set up the same system with the juvenile and family court judges, who have been visiting our institutions. We also discuss matters with them along the same lines so that they will understand the results of their sentencing. I think this is what the hon. member is driving at. This is one of the things that did concern me in the earlier years in this department, that there did not seem to be this kind of communication between the judges and our department.

In other words, the judges were sentencing in many instances without the knowledge of the result of their sentencing—just what kind of an institution the offender was going to, what the programme was, and so on.

Quite often, for example, you will go into a court now and you will find our charts, our adult institution charts. If it is in the juvenile and family court they will have our training school charts showing the structure and the

system and the programmes in effect at the various institutions. And we have just recently—as a matter of fact, just a few weeks ago—finished a visit of many of the judges to our institutions, and I am just being reminded that on page 60 in our annual report reference is made to this particular programme and, as a matter of fact, a photograph I am told of one such visit.

Mr. Sopha: Of course, all of us—and it is raised in the very opposite way by the member for Riverdale—at the other end of the process have many times been perplexed and bewildered by the difference in the length of sentences given for the same crime in different courts by different judicial officers and the geographic differences in sentences given in various parts of the province.

Down in the Prime Minister's home town right now they are having a terrible thing about shoplifting. I do not think that is *sub judice*; I think that has been resolved. It has been decided by a couple of magistrates, apparently, that shoplifters in London, so far as they are concerned, are going to suffer imprisonment. Now there may be more shoplifters in London than there are in more law-abiding parts of the country, for all I know.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Vested interests.

An hon. member: They are trying to keep up with the Robarts, I would say.

Mr. Sopha: It may be that the quality of the goods in the affluent society of London is more attractive to those who divest other people of property. However, that is merely an illusion and does not get to the heart of the matter, which has been discussed in this House every year for the decade that I have been here. That is the problem of making some advance toward the establishment of the principle of making the punishment fit the offender, rather than fit the crime. Punishment ought to fit the criminal, to change the words of Gilbert and Sullivan. Often one is successful, I am saying through you to my good friend, the Attorney General, in getting the ready and sympathetic ear of a court—none of this is funny, I say to the Minister of Correctional Services, it is not humorous—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What vote is it on?

Mr. Sopha: You get a sympathetic court and, if time is available, you are able to acquaint that court in somewhat detailed fashion of the characteristics of the offender before it. I had a very recent case involving

a petty appeal and, in a leisurely and unhurried atmosphere with the aid of a psychiatrist, one was able to make the judicial officer aware of the peculiar characteristics of this offender. And something was done in that sentence, with the co-operation of this department, that may lead, one is hopeful, to the rescue of that unfortunate individual. I must say his family is more unfortunate than he is; it is difficult to evoke sympathy for a crime of that nature.

But that is merely an illustration of the larger problem raised by the member for Riverdale. One asks oneself when do we ever take a step on the way to progress of establishing some uniformity in sentences in this province and put the matter in the hands of perhaps some independent tribunal. So far as I am aware in all I have ever read, the California experiment has been a success, where sentencing is done by an independent body from the courts entirely. They are people who are trained in criminology and correctional techniques. We should not hesitate to borrow from successful techniques that have been employed elsewhere. But, still we stumble on in the same old traditional ways here where the lawyer, frequently, is put in the position of feeling that he is doing the utmost service to his client if he escapes being tried by a judge known for his severe sentences.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I wonder if I might ask the hon. member a question? It seemed to me that I read in the paper yesterday of a sentence in the state of California of 99 years. Was that given by the tribunal that the members speaks of?

Mr. Sopha: That was not in California. That was in another state.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Wrong estimates, too.

Mr. Sopha: It was in the state of Tennessee. The other side of the nation. That distracted me from my point, which was, that frequently lawyers manage their cases so they will escape being tried by particular judicial officers. I have even heard, from a reliable authority, that many lawyers in the city of Toronto try to avoid, at all costs in certain types of crime, coming before the Attorney General's old pal, Tupper Bigelow. Oh, yes.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): What has this to do with vote 401 of this department?

Mr. Sopha: Well, it has to do with the reform and rehabilitation of these people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Bring it up with the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: I will tell the Provincial Secretary that is exactly what is wrong. If the Provincial Secretary is not concerned about the high rate of recidivism in this country, there are people who are. Most of the people that this Minister gets in Burwash, designed exclusively for them or operated for them, are people he has had in before, not once but often two, three or four times.

That is what we are concerned about—seven, eight, nine hundred of them in Burwash at all times, recidivists, supported at public expense. Many of them escaping and being tried in the Sudbury courts.

If you go there every day you will see Mr. Volsetta dealing with the Minister's charges who escape. The Minister has gone one better, he was not content with the escapees, now he has laid criminal charges or invited the police in. He is now going to burden the Sudbury courts with the trial of alleged crimes in his institution.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is entirely erroneous.

Mr. Sopha: It is not erroneous at all. The Minister sent for the police; it was he who sent for the police.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is erroneous.

Mr. Sopha: It is not erroneous at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order—

Mr. Sopha: Let him wait. On a point of order, do I not have the right to make my remarks?

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. Minister has risen on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member has been talking about is very interesting. There may be some things which he is talking about with which I may agree, but that really has nothing to do with my estimates, except in a very, very indirect fashion.

In respect of his last statement, which was repeated by the hon. member for High Park before and I did not make mention of it, I was hoping it would pass, it is a matter which is not only *sub judice* but the information they have given to this House is completely erroneous. We did not lay any charges at all.

Mr. Sopha: You sent for the police.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if somebody wants to lay a charge in one of our institutions, do we not have to bring in the police so they can lay the charge?

Mr. Sopha: A demonstration of failure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member not think we should obey the law?

Mr. Sopha: It is a demonstration of your failure; the failure of the operation of your institution; you are such a colossal failure that you had to send for the Ontario Provincial Police to correct your failures. That is the painting on the wall that we see.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, for a man who professes to be in favour of rehabilitation—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is the mark of your rehabilitative procedure, a total failure. Now you have to call on the Attorney General's legion to assist you.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Well, all right, if it offends some; I submit to you that this is entirely relevant and it has always struck me, in ten years of membership, that as soon as somebody gets up and starts to make a contribution to improvement, invariably he is out of order. But, if you stand in your place and speak in a droll and commonplace manner on banal things, you are always in order here.

We are very concerned about the rate of recidivism. I put it before you tonight, one approach we might make is that somebody initiate some studies of experiments elsewhere in order to ascertain the value of the establishment of some other system of sentencing offenders. Sentencing should be based entirely, entirely, on the personal needs of the offender and on nothing else.

As Mr. Justice Laidlaw said, 15 years ago in the Wooller case which is most oft quoted when you go before the courts on a question of sentence, "retribution and punishment are no longer entitled to much notice." Rehabilitation and deterrents are the two factors, and especially rehabilitation, based on the belief, my final words, that there is no human being who is so completely beyond the pale that society and especially those charged with the administration of a department as this, finally give up upon his possible reform.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 401?

The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want again to draw to the attention of the Minis-

ter and to the attention of the Attorney General that every time we debate this question of sentencing, there comes a point at which it ceases to be the responsibility of either one of them to provide any effective interchange; either of information on a very primitive level, let alone the kind of concentrated research work which is required to find out what effect the sentences have, in terms of either deterrents or rehabilitation, on the persons who have been sentenced. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister in his report refers to the project on the study of recidivism, then I think that that kind of a study has got to be related directly to the sentencing procedures in the courts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree with that.

Mr. J. Renwick: Now, the Minister drew my attention to page 60 of his report where a certain number of the juvenile and family court judges were visiting the training schools which come under his jurisdiction. I know of no instance where there has been any planned manner by which the judges of the high court of this province visit the institution.

There has been no planning, even on that primitive level, of understanding what takes place. I know, also, of no basic study in this province, about sentencing. There are no books.

There are thousands, literally thousands, of books available, but there are no books available which provide any guidance to counsel who has to speak to a sentence to be imposed in the courts of the province, so that he can draw to the attention of the judge who is going to impose the sentence, the likely effect, in the circumstances of the particular individual, of the sentence that will be passed.

What happens? You can go into any court, and you can hear anyone, any counsel standing up and mumbling the same trite phrases, in mitigation of sentence before the court. The judges do not have, at their disposal, a collection of studies which indicates to them the way in which they should impose their sentence; nor do the lawyers in this province; nor do the counsellors, and the social workers or others who are involved in this problem in the juvenile and family courts.

I have taken this from the point of view of the Attorney General. But, I simply say that its impact bears entirely upon The Department of Correctional Services. It is what happens in those institutions and what happens to the persons when they leave those institutions, from which the knowledge can

be gained that will permit us to totally revise the sentencing procedure of the courts. I adopt what the hon. member for Sudbury says as to the structure of it, but you cannot simply re-structure the sentencing system without, at the same time, having the basic research done as to what happens to the people who go through this Minister's system.

I have given up a long time ago ever expecting it to be done at the federal level, so far as the federal penitentiaries are concerned. But, certainly with the information and the number of institutions under this Minister's control, I would like to see next year a very substantial amount of money voted under the estimates of this Minister for the purpose of carrying out that kind of a study.

Until we totally re-orient the system of punishment in this province, we are going to perpetuate this interminable expense and cost. I adopt almost totally one of the sentences in the opening part of the report in the statement of purpose, which says "Inherent in all of the department's operations is the principle that what serves no useful purpose should be discarded".

And I am suggesting that there is a very substantial amount of the Minister's department which, if the money was spent on research, and the kind of research that I have been talking about, could be discarded, and in substitution for it a system which will be rehabilitative, which will be deterrent, which will enable a person to return to this society, and which will enable that person not only to return to this society but not get on the treadmill of returning through the system.

This is the kind of thing that this department has to start basically with. Or are we going to be going on year after year looking at the estimates of his department in terms of the institutional structure which has become such a common framework for him to present his estimates within?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member not agree that this is precisely what we are doing? We are first, contributing a grant towards the centre of criminology so that they can carry on this work. We have, for the last four or five years, set up an increasingly progressive programme of visits by the judiciary to our institutions.

We have sat in with them at their seminars. I was a member of the first conference on sentencing, probably the first non-

judicial person at the conference, because I appreciated precisely what the hon. member has stated. He is quite right. Sentencing has a great bearing on rehabilitation.

Now we have just recently—my Deputy has sent me a note—we have just recently sent some information along to Chief Justice Gale on the clarification, and so on, on certain sentencing matters. We have to be careful of this because I do not have to tell the hon. member, who is a lawyer by profession, that the judiciary guards its privileges very carefully and is not too easy to approach by someone who is not a member, neither a lawyer nor a judge.

But we have found a great deal of co-operation where we have spoken to the judges on these matters, and I think what the hon. member was referring to as a primitive type of research, that is, visiting institutions, is most important.

I think it is more important than some of the lofty research that is done by some people—without in any way downgrading the need for this kind of research. But I think the first thing the judges should do is see the institutions and study the programmes which are in effect so that they will understand what they are doing.

I have even sat on the bench with a couple of judges on several occasions to find out for myself. There were things I had to say to some of the judges with whom I had a personal rapport, so it was not a matter of a sort of formal approach to a discipline which sometimes does not look too kindly upon an "outsider" giving advice.

We are very conscious of it in this department. We have discussed certain matters with the Attorney General. We have an ongoing inter-departmental committee. They meet constantly. What the hon. member has referred to is something that has been concerning us, and I think we are approaching this at a fairly rapid pace. Now, not rapid enough to satisfy myself, and I am sure not the hon. member, or anyone else, but we are doing it as quickly as time will permit, having regard for everyone's duties. But let me close by saying I agree with the general principles outlined by the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I think this deserves a final comment and that was certainly quite a commentary by one of the Lieutenant-Governor's advisers that was made about his humility in approaching a member of the judiciary of this province, by one, he said, who was neither a judge nor a lawyer.

I would suggest to him that judges in this province, if they ever were, are not beyond communication, and he might well drop some of the attributes of Uriah Heep and go up and look them in the eye and say whatever he has to say to them. They are servants of the public, the same as many other people in other areas of the public domain.

Now the other thing to be said is there was quite a shift in the Minister's attitude. Originally it was: what has this got to do with my department? A simple answer is that surely he must be concerned about the bitterness which resides within the individual and depresses his spirit when he is in his institution doing two years less a day for passing a bad cheque, and then runs into the next fellow who has come in doing six months for the same offence—one quarter of the time for the same crime.

Indeed, the Attorney General had a magistrate, as they then were, who has now departed this life, sitting not far from Toronto, who apparently believed in the maximum for everybody that came before him. Everything the Code allowed he heaped upon them, and there are many like that.

The Minister of Correctional Institutions need not look to the Attorney General in order to get assistance in this matter of sentencing which is immediately, vitally, intensely related to rehabilitation of the offender, because I suspect the Attorney General does not know how many servants he has out in the province who believe in stiff sentences and how many, on the other hand, are inclined to be moderate and lenient.

He has not the vaguest idea, but out there in the province he has some individuals who are no doubt before the judicial officers in a great variety of cases asking for heavy sentences. On the other hand, no doubt he has got many very humane individuals who are very moderate about it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest the hon. member leave this to the Attorney General's estimates when I will have an opportunity perhaps to answer it. I do not think I have in my colleague's estimates.

Mr. Sopha: All right, I will leave that point. I made that point. I nailed that point down by saying that in my view he cannot get help from the Attorney General. But it is of crucial importance in the operation of this department and the expenditure of public money.

I am going to suggest tonight that the place to do it is in the grant to the centre for the study of criminology, which is a meagre, pitiful \$30,000, and they might well be commissioned with much more adequate funds than that to make a study of this system in other jurisdictions.

I have mentioned California—no doubt there are other jurisdictions where this is employed. I suspect that in Europe it has fairly widespread use. But this is a plea in retrospect—the time is long past for commencing this system in Ontario, even for a limited period of time to see how it works out.

We know that the present system we employ is hopeless; that it contributes to failure; that we have individuals going in again. Let me refer to another—I have had so many personal experiences—let me refer to another type; the type of individual who does not want to go to the Minister's institution because he will not learn a trade. The member for High Park adverted to that. I have had personal experience—

An hon. member: They want to go to Kingston.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, they want to go to Kingston—where the individual on a charge of armed robbery asked the judge when he sentenced him to two less a day to increase it. He said give me four so that I can go to Kingston and continue my trade.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member does not really believe that, does he?

Mr. Sopha: What?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That that is the reason the man asked to go to Kingston.

Mr. Sopha: I have no doubt about it at all. I have no doubt.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is not the reason.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now that we are getting statutory revisions here you will find there will be no more requests with this.

Mr. Sopha: Do not bother me with this trivia.

An hon. member: Do not confuse him with the facts.

Mr. Sopha: I will put the facts of this case.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Will you keep quiet until I can put them? Is that asking too much of you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, for all this period of time I think it is.

Mr. Sopha: This individual was engaged in taking a welding course at the CVT in Sudbury when he fell into trouble. He fell into it with two other companions, whom I suspected were the initiators of this scheme to rob a restaurant. He was daily attending the welding course at CVT.

He told me pending the trial that he was very anxious that he go to an institution where he might complete that course. The day he came to trial, when the judge sentenced him to two years less a day, he got up and said: "Would you increase that to four years, because I am probably going to go to Burwash and I cannot continue that course."

And the judge said properly: "I have passed the sentence, that completes the matter." And of course they led him away. Within two or three days—a very short space of time—he escaped from Burwash. I saw him in the Sudbury court.

When Magistrate Falzetta, as he then was, asked him why he escaped, he said: "In this very courtroom I asked the judge to give me four years so I could go to Kingston. The reason I escaped is that I now know you will give me enough that I will go to Kingston and be able to take the course".

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do not believe everything you hear.

Mr. Sopha: I have no doubt at all—the Attorney General can shake his head all he wants, the Minister can sneer all he wants about it—but I have no doubt at all about the veracity of those facts. That is what these people who have experience of the institutions think about them; that is the knowledgeable attribute that they have about the type of institutions that you run.

Well, that is the kind of thing that we are delighted to share with the member for Riverdale, because he knows whereof he speaks. That is the type of thing we want to correct on this side. We want to see this province make some major advance toward rehabilitation by the employment of this device of making the punishment fit the criminal and be adjusted to his peculiar and personal attributes.

This is one way of doing it and the Minister can talk all he wants—he falls into that same banal, commonplace, repetitive phraseology that we hear coming from those Treasury benches over there—that it is the best in the universe. Everything is always the best in the universe.

If this Minister says it, he says it in the light of knowledge that the recidivist rate in this province is among the highest in the western world.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not true.

Mr. Sopha: Among the highest in the western world!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where did you get that from?

Mr. Sopha: Far higher than the United Kingdom. And another statistic—there are more people per capita in jails in Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In Canada.

Mr. Sopha: In Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In Canada.

Mr. Sopha: Ontario leads the way in convicting people—we are leaders in the nation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have more people in Ontario, that is the important thing.

Mr. Sopha: Leaders in the nation—on a per capita basis. Somebody said—was it the member for High Park or my colleague from Windsor—that it was far higher than the province of Quebec. I put the statistics on the record last year to demonstrate that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wonder why.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the convictions and jailing of people in this province—and I measure my words carefully—under The Liquor Control Act, are a national disgrace. They are a disgrace, and you know the first person, Mr. Chairman, who agrees with that? The Minister of Correctional Services. He is on record as having said that. Ontario leads the way in the numbers in their jails.

I beg leave to say to you, sir, that these comments have been put forward constructively tonight where they should be put forward—not in the Attorney General's estimates. I do not want to talk to the Attorney General about it at all, until the Attorney General comes in the House and demonstrates to us, that which he has never done. He has never demonstrated at any time that he has

in his department any system of uniformity of sentences. He has none.

I know he has none. As far as the operation of his lieutenants are concerned, he does not know what is going on. He does not know what is going on. He would not have the vaguest idea of what kind of sentences Clay Powell was asking for Myer Rush. He would not have the vaguest idea because nobody would tell him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps you could wait for my estimates so that I might have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Sopha: Nobody would tell him what they were going to ask for Myer Rush, and I am not commenting on the sentence he got. The Attorney General would know when Clay Powell or Rendell Dick told him, or when he read it in the paper.

But he does not participate in any real sense at all in the prosecution of criminal offenders in this province. That is done by people in his department and I will be the most surprised person in the House if he suddenly comes in this year, gets up in that high and mighty fashion tonight and for the first time in his career, announces to us that he has got some policy about the retrieval of human beings through the device of uniformity of sentence and sentencing according to their personal needs for rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 401 carried?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, Vote 401 is the Minister's advisory council. I see by the estimates it seems to be down some, and I was wondering how active this group is? Are they really spending enough time on this? What is the situation on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a very active committee, Mr. Chairman. This gives me an opportunity to pay tribute to that committee; they have provided me with a considerable number of reports when I have requested them to do some research on the advisability of a particular type of programme, I suppose as many as four or five reports a year. They are very active.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I was wondering though, since his estimate is down, if they are as active as they have been in the past and will it be possible for these reports to be made available to the members of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the hon. member say in his view that the expenses for this committee were down?

Mr. Ruston: From the last year's estimates, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What were they in last year's estimates?

Mr. Ruston: \$31,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told this is again caused by the new programme. Last year's estimates included all of the committees, and this year specifies just for the Minister's advisory committee on the treatment of the offenders. As far as the reports are concerned, those are privileged to the Minister. They are not made public.

Mr. Ruston: How about staff training and development? Last year your estimate was \$232,000. What is the amount for this year on staff training and development?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: \$277,000.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to research briefly. Could the Minister indicate what are the terms of reference or the aims or objectives of the major research projects that are being financed by his department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will have that in a moment.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, in the interim might I pose a question to the Minister relating back to the topic raised by my colleague.

I know some of the gentlemen who sit on this advisory committee, and I think they are very fine gentlemen and doing wonderful work on behalf of the citizens of this province. But I would ask of the Minister, have there been any new appointments to this advisory council in the past few months or are there any vacancies? And further, are they on a *per diem* basis and has this *per diem* basis been increased since the inception of this council? What is the amount of payment for their work?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The *per diem* allowance is \$35, and I think that was increased last year from I think it was \$20 or \$25.

Mr. Paterson: Is that plus expenses?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Plus expenses.

In answer to the hon. member's question about research projects. A major project

which the research branch has undertaken is the setting up of a systems and operations programme using computer facilities. This will allow for quick and easy access to offender statistics and departmental programmes and will be of great value to the department as a whole, as well as to the research branch.

Ongoing evaluation of two types of treatment methods within the training school system. A programme of behaviour modification using positive reinforcement techniques. Proposed research to evaluate the effectiveness of halfway houses. At the University of Ottawa, under the direction of Doctor Tadeusz Grygier, a study of personality changes in correctional treatment, and a study concerning the factors associated with recidivism after release from the Brampton training centre.

A follow-up study of men who received corporal punishment in our institutions during 1951 to 1955. A preliminary examination of educational adjustment within the training school and after graduation. A broad study of training school students including events that precipitate admittance to training school, and community reaction to children who have graduated.

A study of the correctional officer—the recruitment process, selection criteria, in-service training, staff training course, duties, and attitudes towards rehabilitation (in co-operation with The Department of Civil Service personnel research branch). A study of attitude change of inmates as a function of sensory deprivation at Trent University. (I hope you do not ask me to explain that one!) A study concerning affiliative tendencies under anxiety arousing circumstances which might assist in identifying those inmates who would best benefit from group therapy and those who would best benefit from individual therapy. This is being done at the University of Waterloo.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move on to another area involved in what I assume is professional services. Is the Minister giving any consideration to the question of the rights of people who are within his institutions? I think it has been traditionally correct to say that when a person is sentenced and is in custody, he immediately loses all his rights. I think that is true in the Minister's institutions.

I am thinking, for example, of the study which is being made of the election law at the present time. Is the Minister giving consideration to appearing before that committee and suggesting that persons in custody in his institutions should be given the opportunity to vote in provincial elections? I am thinking about the question of whether or not he is giving consideration to any relaxation in this and what are the dangers involved in relaxing this inhibiting method by which prisoners are restricted in the amount of mail that they may send out from the institutions?

I am thinking about the internal punishments administered within the institutions of the Minister and whether or not there is any method by which a person subjected to punishment in a secondary sense, within the institution has any outlet by which he can appeal or get relief from punishments which, to him, may appear either severe or unjust or improper? Is there any review procedure being established within the institution?

Those are three areas that I use to illustrate the point, which seems to me essential at this time, that the Minister begin to give consideration as to what are the rights of people in his institutions. Or do we accept the outmoded, outworn and ancient view that a person sentenced by a judge in a court, in the province of Ontario, is automatically deprived of all his rights? Or are you, as part of your rehabilitative procedures, going to provide a person with at least some semblance of the dignity of a person who is entitled to certain rights when he is subjected to custody within your institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: First, Mr. Chairman, I would think that the rights, if you call them that, of an inmate in an institution are inherent in the statement of purpose which we have. I think in general this states that he be treated in a humane fashion. Nothing will be done which retards rehabilitation, and anything being done just as a matter of course without proving its usefulness will be done away with.

As far as I can recall, we have never given any thought to the effect of a prisoner losing his voting rights. I presume this is the only reason the hon. member would ask it in so far as its effect on his attitude which, of course, concerns us—a great deal. The whole matter of attitude is an important point in rehabilitation. I must honestly say that, as far as I can recall, we have never discussed this at all.

I will tell the hon. member that the matter of censoring mail has bothered me from the

first day of taking this job—it is a difficult task. It is the most difficult problem to resolve, because there are a great number of problems involved. I think I have gone into this before, the question of whether a letter which is going out may cause a great deal of trouble for someone else or even for the inmate himself. The well known “Dear John” letter—the hon. members know what that means.

There are various things which could happen which are on the positive side, if one could call it the positive side, in so far as retaining censorship is concerned. I am still not satisfied that it is absolutely necessary I must tell you that there is some disagreement amongst the staff. We have been debating this and I think there may be some changes, but I cannot guarantee that.

Mr. Shulman: Why only one letter every two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are two letters a week. I do not know where the hon. member gets that one every two weeks. And an inmate can have special extra letters if there is a good reason for it. This is fairly generous.

Mr. Shulman: Why should they be restricted?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, in a penal institution, you have to have some sort of organization, some sort of discipline, and everybody just cannot do everything they want to. You have only so many staff, too, and if you are going to censor letters you are going to have to have the staff to censor the letters.

This is another good reason, of course, for reconsidering this, but the fact is that why not 50 letters a week, you know, if you want to put it that way. There has to be some sort of rule making it possible to handle the machinery of the operation of the institution.

I think that is fairly generous, two letters a week, plus any additional letters which he feels are absolutely necessary. It is not difficult to convince the staff—if he wants to write a special letter for a special reason they let him do that generally. This might be increased, I cannot guarantee that.

I might say over and above all this, we have discussed with Mr. Justice McRuer some of these matters, the general aspect of the rights of an inmate and some other aspects of it. Out of this may very well come some changes, I am not too sure. I am not unmindful of the fact that the hon. member

for High Park does not really feel that inmates have any rights at all. He has made this public statement. I do not know whether he still remains with his statement or not, but he has pointed out that in his view they did not have any rights.

I do not know, beyond what I have told you, if there is anything I can add to that. It does concern us insofar as these matters which I have mentioned to the hon. member.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister give consideration next year to including in the statistics which he publishes with his report, the classifications and nature of the punishments which are meted out in his institutions, so that we can have some opportunity of finding out whether or not there should be an appeal procedure?

I happen to think there should be. I think there should be. I think that if you are in custody in an institution where there is a tendency for the one person in charge of the institution to dominate the discipline of that institution that punishments can be meted out which verge upon unreasonableness and can cause injustices.

For whatever it is worth, I think there should be some method by which a person who is in one of the institutions should have a procedural method of appeal. Then a good part of the Minister's concern about the mail might very well disappear.

Of course, the other item which I guess gets lost in *Hansard* never gets any consideration; the suggestion was put forward a year ago, that at least the person who is in an institution should have the right to communicate in uncensored form with the member of the Legislature for the riding which that person comes from. That was one suggestion that was put forward.

Of course, there is always hanging over the whole operation the question of whether or not the government is ever going to move and to make provision for an ombudsman, who, in one of his functions—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There is always the consideration of every department of government.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would be glad to yield the floor to the Prime Minister. I did not catch a single word of what he said.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): That is the member's fault.

Mr. J. Renwick: Does the member for London South want to come into the debate too?

We wait until 25 minutes to twelve, before the member for London South wants to open his mouth and come into this debate.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale has the floor.

Mr. J. Renwick: What we are trying to get at? The member for London South thinks these things are very humorous—

Hon. Mr. White: No, I think the member is very humorous.

Mr. J. Renwick: And the Prime Minister is obviously not interested in the topic. Now let us get down to what I am talking about and let us make it perfectly clear that, in the way in which this government operates its reform institutions or its correctional services, they think that the person who is sentenced has no rights. And I am saying to the Minister—

Hon. Mr. White: As a matter of fact, the issue is proved by the fact the member has only four of his own members there.

Mr. Nixon: What does that prove?

Mr. J. Renwick: What has that got to do with 'it'?

Mr. Nixon: The member for London South is getting over-defensive.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am simply asking whether or not the Minister is giving any consideration to studying, to restoring to persons who are in custody in his institutions some area of his rights in terms of his dignity, in terms of his inherent dignity, and in terms of the rehabilitation procedures which he is carrying out?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the whole purpose of our system and I do not know whether the hon. member really believes that we treat the inmates in such a fashion that they feel they are not dealing with people who care about them as human beings. Our whole purpose is to restore to them their human dignity.

As a matter of fact, you just have to go to some of the institutions, like the Brampton training centre where they have a somewhat therapeutic community—they have their own committee and they bring recommendations, some are recommendations which have been adopted by the department.

As far as the question of censoring is concerned, I do not know what the hon. member

means by that. Does he mean that we should not look at the letter which goes to an MPP? Because we do not touch a letter which goes out, in any way, shape or form. The censoring he refers to is that the letter is perused. Letters coming in and going out are perused and are left untouched. I hope he understands that.

And I agree with the hon. member that it would be much better for the dignity of the inmate in our efforts to rehabilitate him if we could do without the censoring. Of course, there is a reduction of someone's dignity if he has to have every letter looked at.

But saying that does not mean that it is that simple to put into practice, because there are a lot of manipulative people looking for an opportunity to use these things for their own ulterior purposes, and it is a very difficult problem. In respect to the right of review, they always, of course, have the right to write the Minister. And the hon. member may rest assured that if the letter in any way, shape or form, leads me to believe it is worthy of an investigation, a real investigation—because I get many, many letters—then it is investigated.

Aside from the fact that there is a possibility of some abuse somewhere down the line, which is most unlikely but could happen, I say generally speaking, the inmates in our institutions, our wards and our charges, are used in a very, very humane fashion, and I want to make that very clear. Because this is the whole purpose—I repeat—the whole purpose of our system, to try and give each person back his dignity.

The restraints we put upon this dignity are put into effect, not because we like to do it, but only because it appears necessary in running a correctional system. Insofar as various institutions are concerned, different systems are in effect. The same policy does not apply in all institutions. It depends upon which institution you are in, because of the fact that you have minimum security, medium security, and maximum security.

There are all sorts of programmes—a tremendous number of programmes going on in the province, and all designed to give back a great deal of dignity to the inmate in the institution.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister says—while I watch these phrases roll out of him—that the chief purpose, no, the sole

purpose of our institutions is the rehabilitation of the individual.

Well, one wonders about his dedication to the principle when one sees him evading the responsibility for ascertaining the causes of the bitterness that the people come to him with, the bitterness residing in the cynicism with life, and with the process that has sent them there. And it is not solved—it is really not solved—by this Minister and the Attorney General arguing whether it is relevant. I leave that.

In response to the point raised by my friend, I have often wondered, in the realm of human rights, whatever happened to that one of privileged communications between solicitor and client, in connection with censorship.

The individual is still a client; he may be subject to appeal. He goes into the institution and he wants to make a communication to his solicitor, so that hoary privilege of the common law—indeed the only privilege that really exists, the privacy between solicitor and client—goes completely out of the window, as those communications arrive in the office with the censor marks upon them. It might be helpful if they are censored, but perhaps the censor could add some comments to it by way of assistance to the prisoner and his client, through his own experience.

But the member for Riverdale, again, is dead right. Mr. McRuer might well look at some of the interferences in this area of these institutions with the rights of individuals—and that might be an early one—so that all a prisoner need do, in short, is to say to his custodial officer, “I want to write a letter to my lawyer and my member of Parliament,” and perforce the letter goes forward completely untampered by anybody in the institution. These ought to be two areas where there is complete and free communication.

But one gets the feeling each year in discussing these things—I make no apologies to anyone, for this is the area I earn my living in, and I have a responsibility to lay out the benefits of my experience before this House and be judged upon their worth. I am content to run that risk—that this affable Minister will, compliantly and in very friendly fashion, say these things will be looked after—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have never been called affable before.

Mr. Sopha: —they will be looked at, and nothing is ever done. No progress is ever made, but we are assuaged by his winsome

ways, year after year, of appearing to agree with us.

Well, all right, there are two areas. We will look next year and see if that privilege between solicitor and client has been restored without the hindrance of the custodial officers, and we will see if those plate glass windows disappear from the institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have never said that they would.

Mr. Sopha: Well, we will see if they do.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: All the offenders are going to be home free.

Mr. Sopha: I beg your pardon, whatever you say is always very important.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said, then we would not need any custodians at all.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that is what Mr. Frost said. Now we have retrogression in the Conservative Party.

Let me comment on that very briefly. Mr. Frost always said, “You need not bother about these people. All we have to do is to require people to be good and, if they are bad, we will get the police after them.” And we have gone full cycle—the present Prime Minister appears to agree with that thesis.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is not what I said at all.

Mr. Nixon: How about saying let us adjourn.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, because this is so interesting—

Mr. Nixon: I knew you were interested in it. Every one of your comments indicates how interested you are.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sitting here enjoying the debate. This is a supreme example of the way you handle the estimates.

Mr. Nixon: Well, are you punishing us, or what?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor Walkerville): Is 11 o'clock not late enough?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sitting here listening.

Mr. Nixon: He is obviously enjoying it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We are sitting here doing the listening, so what is your objection?

Mr. Nixon: My objection is that it is a quarter to 12, and I think we should call it a day.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, well, come on. Let us go on and hear some more—the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I would not want to leave the Prime Minister disappointed. Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am never disappointed.

Mr. Shulman: You may have a great disappointment coming, Mr. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not hear that last quip.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Prime Minister, I am beginning to worry a bit about you. I have a letter I would like to read now, Mr. Chairman.

This letter came from Burwash, and the reason I am beginning with this particular letter is because of the comments of the Minister in reference to censorship, and may I say I am not bringing it up because of the complaint of the prisoner in this letter.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: I am referring to censorship. Is censorship under this vote, or the next vote. If it is under the next vote, why have we been discussing it all this time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Discussing what?

Mr. Shulman: Censorship.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are we discussing censorship?

Mr. Shulman: Have you not been discussing censorship?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am asking the hon. member, I did not think he was discussing censorship.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They have been discussing and we have been listening.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to discuss censorship, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I understood the hon. member for High Park to refer to matters pertaining to reformatories, and I just want to point out that it does come in the next vote. Now, if it is censorship generally—

Mr. Shulman: The matter I am referring to is censorship.

Mr. Chairman: You are quite in order then.

Mr. Shulman: I have a letter here from an inmate of Burwash, which came out through the back door, and this is the reason I am bringing this letter up. Not because of the complaint that is involved in this letter—this may or may not have any merit, Mr. Chairman—but in reference to the fact that the Minister may have certain thoughts as to what his policy on censorship is, but once it filters down to his various institutions, I am convinced that his governors are following up his policy, which he is stating here in the House. Anyway,

Dear Mr. Shulman:

I am an inmate of Burwash reformatory writing about a situation that has been bothering a lot of us for some time now.

The date on this is October 20, 1968.

As you probably know, this institution is divided into several camps, the main camp holding approximately 300 inmates. Two of the outside camps hold 40 inmates each, and have televisions. You can probably understand that not everyone that wants to, can go to the outside camps. What we would like to know is, why do these privileged 80 inmates have television and we do not.

Now here is the point.

We have tried to write to you about this before, but the superintendent would not let the letters go out. So this one is going out the back door. Also some of us have asked the superintendent if we could pool our money and rent televisions while the hockey season is on, but he would not go for this either.

You are known to be a fair and just man, unlike the present Minister—

I had better repeat that, I do not think the Minister heard it.

—unlike the present Minister, and we are hoping that you could spare a little time to come up here and look into the situation for us.

signed—

Perhaps I should not mention the name of the inmate; he might have some difficulty.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am bringing this up is not in relation to television, which does not impress me as a terribly serious complaint, but because obviously the censorship that the Minister describes and the

ensorship that the inmates have to undergo are very different matters.

Now, I am asking the Minister, will he instruct his governors or his superintendents of these various institutions that in future, on any matter, regardless of the subject that an inmate wishes to write to an MPP, that there will be no censorship—and by censorship I mean restriction of the right to send such a correspondence?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the situation right now. That is precisely their instructions, and they know it. So, I do not have to issue any such directive.

I am little surprised. The hon. member says he had to receive a letter through the back door. Incidentally, he is being an accessory to someone breaking the regulations, someone could really get into trouble. I am glad he did not read the name.

An hon. member: Charge him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, will the hon. member please tell me whether he has found any difficulty getting letters through the front door? The hon. member has had a great deal of correspondence with inmates at the institution, why would he feel that he has to have one of them through the back door?

Mr. Shulman: Well, perhaps the Minister will realize the significance of the ones which I did not receive; I would not know about them. I am sure the Minister would agree with me on that. Of course, I am aware of the ones I get through the front door.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I take strong exception to that. I take strong exception, not only to the implication, but to the charge that any of the superintendents disobey instructions, particularly in respect of this very important matter.

And if the hon. member would care to lay it on my desk, I will investigate it and he will have to take the consequences of the investigation. Is he prepared to stand up and take responsibility for making that charge against the governor, against the superintendent?

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister give me his assurance there will be no disciplinary action against the prisoners?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know why, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member—any hon. member in this House—would think that the Minister would take any kind of disciplinary action against any inmate in any institution for having written a letter of any kind to anybody. Unless he broke the rules of the institution without good cause.

Now if this man had found the only way he could get his letter out was this way, of course he would not be punished. But if, in fact, he did this just in a mischievous manner—which I strongly suspect he did, then he would be punished because he has broken the rules and he has broken a very important rule.

I strongly doubt that this happened. There is no necessity for it. There are hundreds of letters coming out from Burwash and all sorts of letters to MPPs. The hon. member for Sudbury East gets a lot of them. The hon. member for High Park himself must. I do not know how many he has. He has a regular machine for letters. He sends them to me without even signing them. His secretary signs them for him. I doubt if he reads most of them.

Mr. Sopha: I get a fair number.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So how in the world can you suggest that there was somebody holding them back? It is really unworthy of a member of this House to make such a suggestion; it really is. We have people having a difficult time operating these institutions.

Now insofar as the TV is concerned, so the hon. member will not take credit, as he has attempted to do in some of his letters, when something is done for an inmate he answers their letters in such a manner that what comes back to us, is that he in fact, was the one responsible for this—let me tell him that as of today—before I heard his question—all of the inmates have TV available to them and they are going to be connected tomorrow night. Now I presume the hon. member will send a letter back and say, see we got you TV.

Mr. Sopha: Do you mean to say the inauguration was the infliction of the member for York South on them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No it was not connected at all.

Mr. Shulman: I had already contacted an inmate earlier this week, telling him I would raise it in the House and I could assure him that he would have television before the week was out.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401; the hon. member for Lakeshore was on his feet.

Mr. Lawlor: Well I want to diverge a bit in this debate from what has been discussed at the moment. I wanted to give a bit of a résumé of what happens at the beginning of

a sentence in, say, Guelph Reformatory and then to turn to the end of the sentence, when he comes to after-care treatment.

The whole area of what happens to people released from our jails and prisons very much concerns me. So I kind of want to go from *alpha* to *omega* in a sweep and leave out much in between and then come back as we reach the various heads under the estimates. But I wonder whether I really want to do that tonight and—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I suggest the hon. member is on Vote 402. He is now talking about a specific programme, the rehabilitation of the adult offenders and this comes in vote 402. If we are going to keep any semblance of order we have to stick to some order. He is really on vote 402.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401?

Mr. Lawlor: Very well, I am quite prepared to get launched on this. Let us take the position at Guelph Reformatory—the hon. member for High Park and myself have visited Guelph Reformatory, to take a case in point.

I take it as the case in point because this is where in southern Ontario the first offenders go, to be parceled out in the rather arbitrary and sometimes cruel way in which it is done there. But sticking to Guelph itself, I think it is fair to say—and this a rather nebulous thing—that irrespective of when you go there, the atmosphere of that place is directly detrimental to any type of rehabilitation whatsoever.

I think the Minister himself indicated this afternoon that he regrets that somewhat. I think he feels the oppressive, repressive, restrictive, punitive dragooning almost quasi-military atmosphere that surrounds Guelph. It is no place to even begin the process of rehabilitation and that is precisely the place in this province where they are supposed to begin.

The prisoners in the institution—one is struck by this immediately upon going in the door—the prisoners have a general air of resentment and embitterment and this is just the contrary psychological attitude that you are seeking to engender. I say that you regret this institution yourself. You did not bring it into being, the buildings have been there for a long time. Somewhat ameliorative steps have been taken over the years.

In other words, the prison population has been reduced to where it stands at about 780 at this time and I understand that your inten-

tion is to continue to reduce that prison population at Guelph. But in the meantime, and in between, all you are doing there, as far as I can see, is breeding future crime.

It is very hard to put your finger on why that is. I suspect it has something to do with the guards and yet, they seem to be a humane enough lot when you are talking to them. There is a general air of oppression, nevertheless, throughout the building. The sheer size is, of course, the chief contributing factor, apart from this training of guards.

If such is the case of the 700-and-some-odd prisoners who occupy this place constantly, if that is the situation, then I would suggest that your very first and highest priority, even higher—and I am prepared to debate this with you—than your proposed new reformatory, where you are going to place short-term recidivists to the number of 200 and no more, as you say in your annual statement, that an even higher priority than doing that, would certainly be to take care of the recidivists, since Guelph created them.

In other words, if you are going to get rid of recidivism, it is not by dealing with recidivists in the second institution, but by doing something in the atmosphere in the first so there will not be recidivism at least to the extent and degree that is taking place in this province.

Now last year the debate about Guelph took the form of some rather malicious interior goings on there. I remember we tried to tie the Minister down, Mr. Chairman, on the running of a gauntlet. It looks as though that whole situation has been cleaned out and we hear no further reports and our recent visitation gave no indication of any vindictiveness or that particular kind of viciousness operative within the reformatory itself.

Perhaps, then, we do serve some function. We have a strong belief that this will not take place in that institution or any other institution in the province again and will not, provided that the members in this House are willing to take a sufficient interest to see that it darn well does not. That is our role as I see it.

The curious thing about the guard situation at Guelph is the way you train the guards. Now are the guards throughout the rest of the province being exposed to the curious twist in the psychology at Guelph? You set forth in your annual report that it is crucial, that it is the centre of your whole rehabilitative programme that there be a good healthy association and inter-relationship between guard and prisoner.

I suggest at Guelph there is no such relationship. Then this is double damned, you know, and condoned by the fact that you send all of the guards of Ontario to fester in this attitude and they go out to their institutions, although curiously enough, the contamination does not seem to take too well, because the guards, as we found them in other institutions—Millbrook even—seem to be rather more nonchalant, give-and-take types of fellows. The feeling of discipline and rigidity is not half as great, where there are human beings.

But that other institution does breed a certain attitude and mentality—whether it is reflected off resentful young prisoners down to older guards, or back the other way, by way of impositions, restrictions, cutting off of privileges and keeping them always under the thumb, including the business of mailing and the reception of visitors. All these things working together in that initial, primary-stage institution can do nothing but poison the whole atmosphere of this province with respect to the criminal population of the future. You are doing little to alter it and that is the nub and the focus of your first intent.

Break up that institution, spread it out, give a greater area of custodial care. How many people at Guelph, for instance, participate in your vaunted programme of group counselling and therapy where human beings can talk to each other and get it off their chests, for the first time in their lives, probably? Not very many. You may reply you cannot lead a horse to water, but on the other hand the whole atmosphere of the institution is detrimental to any such give and take communication.

The place is a fake, and I think you should get rid of it. Thank heavens the whole guard situation is being moved out of there, according to your report, to Toronto to, I think probably, Mimico, which lies within my bailiwick. The training will be done in closer rapport with the university facilities—criminology, psychological care, sociological studies, bringing people into rapport in a way which is completely, as far as I can see, lost in that particular institution.

That is the beginning of the thing. You are going to have to move in there rather rapidly to break up that complex—the place is a festering sore—and retrain your guards there in an atmosphere which will lead to rehabilitation. It will avoid such a heavy load on the purse of this province with respect to welfare cheques for the families and with respect to the continued reinstalling

and looking after prisoners in our institutions. It is away out of hand. The initial institution, the primary focal institution, in the whole thing is disarranged and disarranging.

Swinging to the other end of the thing with respect to the after-care treatment, you know we discussed in the House in private members' hour the problem of bonding. I just wonder what this Minister has done, if anything, with respect to those men who come out of these institutions in lamentable condition, coming out with a maximum of \$20 when a room in Toronto costs \$13, \$15 to \$17 a week. If a fellow wants a drink after his long incarceration or to spend any money at all on food and clothing and shelter, he is going to be broke in a week at the most. He is thrown out on to the general public—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not send a man out with \$20 when he looks as though he will need more assistance.

Mr. Lawlor: We will get to that when you give your specific assistance items. But it is certainly not very extensive and that is the basic figure which many receive. They get to some of the half-way houses in some cases, but by and large they are thrown back on the population, and in a most indefensible way. They cannot get a job in many factories in this province because they have a blanket bonding situation and if it is discovered about a man working in a factory, in welding or anything he might have picked up at a reformatory or training school, he is instantly dismissed.

The position of the insurance companies up to this time has been an instantaneous, automatic refusal to consider bonding at all, and it is only lately—the Minister shakes his head—but again I come back to him—it is only lately, I say, due to Larry Pennell up in Ottawa that overtures have been made to the insurance companies—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do not think I had anything to do with it?

Mr. Lawlor: Are there ongoing consultations between yourself and the insurance companies at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There certainly are.

Mr. Lawlor: Very good, I was not aware of this at this level. I know federally they are working at it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And they started before Larry Pennell.

Mr. Sopha: Please, Mr. Justice Pennell.

Mr. Lawlor: If that is the case, I know at the federal level they have set up some machinery for discussion.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: The thing has not gone very far yet at a federal level. I would like to hear the Minister explain just what they are doing in this area. I know the discussions at the federal level are very tentative. The federal government, the Liberals, have rejected the business of a fund being set up by the government as a blanket fund. Apparently they are not prepared to accept that, but they are prepared to put some pressure on the insurance companies to grant bonds after careful screening which, I suppose, is some kind of a start. But when you note that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: I mentioned factories throughout the province refusing to take people on staff because of criminal records. I mentioned department stores and clerical businesses, the whole range of secondary industry of that kind, where—for instance, Eaton's, I understand, has an application form on which you have to make disclosure as to whether you are bondable or whether you had a previous criminal record. There are people excluded, I believe. I tried to check that this afternoon, I am not sure, but the other great department store in this city does the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Try Hazen Argue.

Mr. Lawlor: You are cutting down the future range of a person's possibilities. He is driven back, I am suggesting to you, from industry into the commercial field. He cannot get a job where there is any handling of money; the banks will not touch him, the financial houses will not touch him. Who will touch him? How can he rehabilitate himself, particularly if he is a white-collar individual? He is driven down to menial tasks; he will not face those menial tasks. He thinks: "If this is what society wishes to do to me, then I can make an easier living at crime. If I have a half an ounce of it, I can be a 14-story man and I am simply not

going to put up with this. If I have to pay penalties for it then I will revert, I will take my chances."

I am saying that the after-care seems to me to be terribly inadequate, so much so that it is almost designed to put a man back into a life of crime when there is no reason for it. Legislation can be passed in this House saying that industry and companies may not demand such disclosures on the part of individuals and that they may not demand a bonding situation. If you cannot negotiate that then the government, as with the automobile fund, should set up some funding to cover such individuals. You may exclude certain ones; on the other hand you may include a great many more. They will be protected, industry will be protected, by this government.

I suggest that the loss in that fund would be absolutely minimal once it was set up, and it will obviate a great social ill. It will obviate sending them back, because they are driven by economic necessity into crime due to the failure to provide such facilities and services.

That is the *alpha* and *omega* of my remarks for the nonce under this particular heading. Under vote 401, though, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of particular and specific remarks to make. If there are other members who wish to speak, I will make them at some other time, otherwise I will make them now.

Mr. Nixon: This would be a good time to leap in.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to come to the matter of salaries, which I had hoped to leave until tomorrow, but I guess we have time tonight.

An hon. member: The member has already spoken to that.

Mr. Shulman: We on this side have been complaining that salaries in this department, particularly of professional workers, are far too low, which is why the Minister is having problems in staffing his psychology, psychiatry and other social work departments.

I received a letter here fairly recently which points up the errors that are made in setting the salaries as well as—

Mr. Sopha: How does the letter begin?

Mr. Shulman: "Dear Dr. Shulman"—as well as the low salaries and the inequities in salaries. It is from Lucerne, Quebec.

Dear Dr. Shulman:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I sent to the Honourable Mr. Allan Grossman, Minister of Correctional Services. As I do not expect he will take any action, perhaps you will look into it.

There is the copy of a letter addressed to "Mr. Grossman" dated September 13, 1968, and I will read it in full because it spells out the problem.

I have just received two circulars advertising for social workers to join your Department of Correctional Services and work at one of the juvenile training schools.

One position offers a salary range of \$7,500 to \$9,000, the other, a supervisor's position, offers \$10,000 to \$12,000 and asks for at least four years of acceptable social work training. "Acceptable" meaning at least two years in psychiatric or medical social work with supervisory responsibilities.

I know your deep interest in developing an effective Department of Corrections. However, I find the salaries being offered to a social worker, compared to a psychologist, are extremely disturbing.

In order to document my extreme concern about your salaries, I refer you to the *Hansard* report on the estimates of the then-called Department of Reform Institutions, May 28 to May 30, 1968.

On page 169 of that report—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: All original thought here.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could keep the Prime Minister in order so that we could at least get some reasonable debate going here without his constant interruptions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Because of the interruptions, Mr. Chairman, I will start this letter again. It is dated September 13, 1968. I think it is quite important that I get the letter in its total context to the Minister. I would not want these interruptions to throw him off.

Dear Mr. Grossman:

I have just received two circulars advertising for social workers to join your Department of Correctional Services and work at one of the juvenile training schools.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, is it not possible to keep the Prime Minister in order?

Mr. Sopha: I thought maybe he was intercepting the Minister's mail.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Shulman: We are having a very serious debate tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The member for High Park has the floor.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Dear Mr. Grossman:

I have just received two circulars—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You know, that is the third time the member has called me "dear" tonight.

Mr. Shulman: I want to make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that the "dear" is in quotation marks.

Dear Mr. Grossman:

I have just received two circulars advertising for social workers to join your Department of Correctional Services and work at one of the juvenile training schools.

One position offers a salary range of \$7,500 to \$9,000, the other, a supervisor's position, offers \$10,000 to \$12,000, and asks for at least four years of acceptable social work training. "Acceptable" meaning at least two years of psychiatric or medical social work with supervisory responsibilities.

I know your deep interest in developing an effective Department of Corrections. However, I find the salaries being offered to a social worker compared to a psychologist are extremely disturbing.

In order to document my extreme concern about your salaries, I refer you to the *Hansard* report of the estimates of the then-called Department of Reform Institutions May 28 to May 30, 1968.

On page 169 of that report, following numerous questions about staff shortages and salaries being paid to professionals, you quoted the salary range for psychologists "As of October 1, 1968, the salary range for psychologists will be \$11,943 to \$14,349. These are starting salaries, they run up a category from \$12,692 to \$15,445."

Just before this remark, you said that your director of social work is in constant touch with schools of social work. Later you corrected yourself and said director of psychology.

The point I wish to make in this letter refers to the huge gap between starting salaries of two professional groups, both requiring a master's degree as minimum qualifications and both in serious shortage across the province.

As a person with a master's degree and presently working in the correctional field in a private agency in Ontario, I could be easily interested in a position with your department. However—

Mr. Demers: Signed: "John Brown, Ph.D."

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The member is not supposed to be talking, he is not even in his own seat.

Mr. Shulman: I continue:

However, knowing that a professional colleague with the same training would be receiving over \$4,000 a year more than myself, I find it impossible to even consider making an application.

This letter is for your information and I hope early reconsideration of the salary ranges for professional social workers.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) Richard F. Ramsey, B.A., M.Sw.,
McGill University, 1965.

Hon. Mr. White: Would the member mind reading that again?

Mr. Shulman: Not all, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to. "Dear Mr. Grossman—"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to interrupt the hon. member because I did not want him to read it all over again, but again I appeal to you as Chairman, to keep some semblance of order. This comes under the second vote, Vote 402. It does not belong in the main office vote at all. It is for the rehabilitation of the adult offenders, where we have salaries for social workers and all the others.

Mr. Shulman: Are you making a ruling?

Mr. Chairman: No. The Minister may be correct, but the debate under this item has been permitted to wander so far that I could not control it at the moment if I wanted to.

Mr. Shulman: Well, will the Minister make any comment as to why there would be these discrepancies in salaries?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows perfectly well that I have not anything to do with the setting of

salaries. This is done by the civil service commission in negotiation with the civil service association and the government.

Mr. Shulman: Am I to understand that the Minister has made no representations about the salaries within his own department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say I did not make any representations nor did I say I did.

Mr. Shulman: Well, did the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This would be a matter which is not a matter for public debate. What I discuss with my Cabinet colleagues is strictly a matter of confidence. All I am saying is, it does not come within the purview of my department. I would like to get \$100,000 a year for each one of my correctional officers, let me put it that way. There is not that much money, so the salaries are set for the government as a whole in the various classifications by the civil service commission.

Mr. Shulman: Well, let us pursue this salary matter a little more, Mr. Chairman. How many psychologists, social workers and psychiatrists, in that order, is the Minister short at the present time in his department?

Mr. Grossman: It does not make any difference.

Let me put it this way, Mr. Chairman. We take all the qualified social workers and psychologists that we can get. I do not think this is going to be the answer to the problem of rehabilitation. This has been said before and said by the hon. member's colleague, the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown); he does not think much of professional staff for helping people in this kind of difficulty.

What we need are good, trained, regular staff, good, trained, correctional officers. Some good, trained professionals to train the correctional officers and all the others. In other words, a good approach and a good attitude.

But we will take any psychologists or any other professional help that the hon. member can produce for us. Now if he is talking about competing with others for salaries and so on, there is always some other place where you can get a little more money. But what we want in our work are dedicated people who are prepared to work for the salary schedule laid down by the civil service commission.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I have not had an answer to my question but I will go on to the next one. How many psychologists, social workers and psychiatrists are you short of at the present time in your department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get the information for the hon. member. I will give it to him tomorrow.

Mr. Shulman: All right. What is the starting salaries for psychologists, social workers and psychiatrists in your department?

Mr. Chairman: Has vote 401 been carried?

An hon. member: Not yet.

Mr. Chairman: How did we get to 402?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: I have not the slightest idea, sir. Vote 401 has not been carried.

Does the hon. Minister have an answer for the question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are about 20 categories here. Does the hon. member want me to read them all?

Mr. Shulman: Just have the one category for psychiatrists, which will—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Psychiatrist I—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just table it and let him read it himself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Psychiatrist I, starting at \$294.50 to \$328.

Mr. Shulman: A week, a month, a year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Starting at \$294.50 a week to \$328 a week. Psychiatrist II, \$349.25 a week to \$392.75 a week. It goes all up—the rate of salary range here—the highest I see begins at \$454.25 a week and goes to \$519.50 a week. And that is not hay, even for a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Shulman: It is overpayment for a Cabinet Minister, but not too good for a psychiatrist.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is a psychiatrist not a medical doctor?

Mr. Shulman: He is a medical doctor plus six more years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member like me to tell what his colleague for Woodbine-Beaches thinks about medical doctors?

Mr. Shulman: Sure, go ahead, tell me what he thinks if it will make you happy.

Mr. J. Renwick: What has that got to do with the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, he is making a big fuss about not having enough psychiatrists and psychologists and so on. This is not going to save assistants.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I am not clear. Would the hon. Minister please explain to me why some men start at \$300 a week and some start at \$500 a week? What is the difference between a psychiatrist I and psychiatrist V?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Qualifications, experience and the particular work they will be expected to do.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): I am amazed that the member cannot observe the reasons when he has been going the rounds of the mental hospitals. He simply wants to take up the time of the House.

Mr. Shulman: This system is very difficult to understand.

Mr. Dunlop: Apparently. Apparently for you.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Would the hon. member indicate where he is on vote 401?

Mr. Shulman: I am on salaries of staff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is on vote 402, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: It is vote 401, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401 is main office staff, and the hon. member is not on that.

Mr. Shulman: Are there no social workers in the main office?

Mr. Chairman: Let us stick to vote 401.

Mr. Shulman: Well I think I am on vote 401.

Mr. Chairman: No, that is for the institutions.

Mr. Shulman: All right!

Mr. Chairman: On vote 401?

Mr. Shulman: Why is the grant to the centre of criminology so low and how many criminologists do you have on staff?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We consider everybody in our system to be a criminologist.

Mr. Shulman: Including the cook?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is the way we feel about it—from correctional officer to cook and the laundryman and right up to our Deputy Minister.

Mr. Lawlor: That is a bit ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No it is not ridiculous.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not ridiculous. The hon. member for Lakeshore himself was talking about the need for rapport and understanding between the inmate and the guards, as he called them, the correctional officers. These are the people who are going to do the most valuable work. They are criminologists in my view.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many criminologists in the technical, internationally accepted sense of the word are on the staff of this department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sorry, I did not hear the hon. member's question.

Mr. Shulman: The question is, Mr. Chairman, how many criminologists—and by criminologists I mean, using the term technically in the internationally accepted term—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is that?

Mr. Shulman: Someone who has been trained in the institute of criminology to do the work in the prevention of crime through The Department of Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I think that is a very vague question, Mr. Chairman, and it would be impossible to answer it. I do not know what he would mean by a centre of criminology or criminological institution. It is meaningless. It is a meaningless question.

Mr. J. Renwick: I imagine it rules out the cook.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, why is there such a small allotment given to the centre of criminology?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, it is a matter of opinion of what is small and what is large. Some people would think \$30,000 was a lot

of money. Some people apparently think it is not enough. I mean, the hon. member would have to ask me a more specific question.

Mr. Shulman: All right. Why is less than one per cent of your budget, less than one-twentieth of one per cent of your budget allotted to the study of criminology?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because we have to divide up the money that is available to us in various ways. We just do not give them a percentage of our budget. You could say the same thing about giving a percentage of our budget to the Elizabeth Fry Society or the Salvation Army. That proposition is ridiculous.

We gave them a grant of \$30,000 because we felt this was a sufficient grant for our department, having regard for all the circumstances. They get another grant from The Department of the Attorney General. I think altogether they get about \$100,000. They operate on more than this. This is the grant from our department. I think it is a very generous grant.

Mr. Makarchuk: Surely, Mr. Chairman, considering that you are now spending over \$43 million, you could well afford to put more than \$30,000 into trying to prevent or decrease or cut down this particular expenditure. It seems to me that your priorities are all cockeyed if you are only going to spend \$30,000 in order to prevent the thing. In the meantime, you will go ahead and spend something like \$43 million or \$46 million to sort of continue the similar situation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know where the hon. member would get the idea that this \$30,000 is all we are spending on rehabilitation. All the money is being spent for rehabilitation. This is a grant to a particular institution which is doing a certain amount of research and there are other institutions which get grants, not only from my department, but from other departments. To suggest that we do it on a percentage basis would be just ridiculous.

Mr. Sopha: Could I say a word to the hon. Minister? What depresses me is that he does not appear to understand what criminology is. You see, he says, everybody in the staff including the cook and everybody in the institution is a criminologist.

An hour ago he and the Attorney General were singing a chorus, joined once for one refrain by the Provincial Secretary, in which

they ruled out entirely the attitude of the prisoner when he came to the institution as a result of his treatment in the courts. They all joined in one chorus and said, as they are prone to do, they said—

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is nonsense.

Mr. Sopha: —they said, what has that got to do with these estimates? They all joined in. That is what I found so offensive from that triumvirate at that time. Now he turns around and says: "We are all criminologists." Well, the answer is, he does not know. Criminology also deals—for his information—with the sentencing policy of the courts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agreed with that.

Mr. Sopha: That is in the body of knowledge and I want to, before we go home, I want to make it clear that when we are talking about rehabilitation and the emphasis the Minister puts on rehabilitation in his department, we will reach that goal much more quickly if we do not have to suffer those mischievous interventions from the Attorney General and the Provincial Secretary as we did earlier. It is about time they were told.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

The hon. member for Cochrane South has the floor.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know the number of full-time chaplains that this department employs, how these chaplains are appointed and what particular duties are expected of them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are 17 full-time staff chaplains on active duty in The Ontario Department of Correctional Services, and three vacancies. Two applications are at present being processed. The hon. member can stop me when he thinks he has enough information. One hundred per cent of the staff chaplains have now been professionally upgraded to chaplain 2 positions, by virtue of training courses planned and executed by the department in co-operation with the department of university extension. University of Toronto.

An hon. member: That is far enough.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All but one of the staff chaplains, who is disqualified by lack of a university degree but has served for many years with the chaplain services, have been

approved by the Canadian Council of Churches to work in public institutions. The department has successfully pioneered and sponsored the co-operative training for the specialized ministry in connection with both Roman Catholic and Protestant chaplains. Another first, I may add, for this province.

In addition to the full time staff, the department values the services of 20 part time chaplains, and the weekly ministry in county district and city jails of some 300 denominational clergy and commissioned officers of religious organizations. This past year, the Salvation Army continued its invaluable ministry in all our adult institutions, and a grant of \$33,500 was made to this organization in recognition of such services. Does the hon. member want more?

Mr. Ferrier: I am all ears.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In recent years, the training of clergymen for the specialized ministry in corrections has not, until now, been undertaken by the theological colleges and seminaries in the Dominion of Canada. In the last three years the theological colleges have selected students to study under one of our senior trained chaplains, in one of our units in their last academic year of training. To meet the need of pastors, chaplains and theological students, The Ontario Department of Correctional Services, in co-operation with the Toronto institute for clinical pastoral training, extension department university of Toronto, has organized clinical pastoral training at both the Ontario Training Centre in Brampton and the reformatory in Mimico, and has offered the following courses: (a) Seminars in inter-personal relationships and corrections. (b) Seminars in group dynamics for chaplaincy personnel and related professional workers. (c) Clinical pastoral training for clergy in related professions. (d) Intern chaplaincy. (e) Seminars and supervision for field supervisors of theological students.

These course were attended by 121 students. Since 1963, The Ontario Department of Correctional Services has, by lending its facilities and its trained staff, sponsored this training for the specialized ministry in correction. This total of 121 students have benefited from these courses and at present, applications from additional students are being accepted for a 12-week summer course at the Ontario Training Centre in Brampton. This centre has been uniquely recognized in that it is now accredited by both the association for clinical pastoral education, United States of America, and the Dominion-wide Canadian Council for supervised pastoral education.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to direct the hon. Minister's attention to item 4, Minister's advisory council, on the treatment of the offender. In your report there are 10, I am sure, very estimable citizens, of whom we know a goodly number. I would like to know what this council really does.

Before I ask that, though, perhaps I could ask the Minister, have you ever visited Joliet? You see the very low sum in any one year for this particular council; does this council make recommendations to you? Does it travel around. Does it know conditions? Do you pay for it? The travelling expenses would not permit going very far.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They can go wherever they think or deem necessary.

Mr. Lawlor: Have they ever gone outside this country to the United States to visit?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Some of its members have.

Mr. Lawlor: Some of its members have. Have they ever gone as a body, as far as you know?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not entirely. As a matter of fact, I am just as happy that they have not because it would be very costly for 10 of them to be travelling around the world. They, within their own committee, have specialists in certain areas and these will usually take whatever trip is necessary to get the information that the committee is seeking.

Mr. Lawlor: How many individuals in the last year, for instance, have visited institutions outside this country. Do you know?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I could not give the hon. member that information, obviously. It is the sort of detail you would not have on hand. All I can tell the hon. member is that they are a very well qualified group. They have visited institutions, studied systems, done a lot of reading and a lot of work in the field of correction. They are experts in the field.

Mr. Lawlor: That is great. I am not satisfied with the running of your department, and you have got this very highly qualified body, a number of them I know personally. I am just wondering what they do. Whether they urge you, spur you on to greater efforts. Do

they make recommendations? How do they qualify in particular in this regard?

Mr. J. Renwick: They are all criminologists.

Mr. Lawlor: They are all criminologists, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, about two hours ago I answered this question, I think, for the hon. member for Essex-Kent. I explained matters. I explained what they did with their reports. For the hon. member's benefit I will explain it again.

It is obvious to me that there is a filibuster going on, but I will be glad to give you information until the cows come home. Mr. Chairman, I have just been handed a note saying that in the last study, which MACTO prepared for me on the recommendations regarding the incentive allowance, members of the committee visited 22 jurisdictions. As I said earlier, the reports are to the Minister and they are privileged to the Minister.

Mr. Lawlor: How often does this advisory council meet?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Two days every month.

Mr. Lawlor: Have they, on any occasions, out of their own initiative made recommendations. Or is this just an acceptable thing in your department that they should so initiate recommendations to you as to reforming?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have, on some occasions, initiated their own recommendations, but in most instances have, at my request, reported to give me advice on what they would advise in respect of a particular programme. For example, the matter of censoring letters, I think, I am not too sure. I think I gave them this one. I think I have a report on it. I asked them to do some work on this incentive allowance. There are many others. The matter of taking over the county jails. Over a period of years they have done a tremendous work. For the amount of work that they have done for this province, I cannot speak too highly of them; they deserve all the credit in the world. If there is any committee that is doing a job just as public-spirited citizens, it is this group.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the model penal code which has been drawn up, the fourth section of which has to do with the treatment of

criminals after they have been convicted. Has any effort been made by his department to take advantage of this model penal code and to co-ordinate the treatment under the suggestions in the code with our Ontario system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who has written a modern penal code?

Mr. Shulman: Not modern, a model penal code. It was set up by the committee of the state Legislatures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know, I have read so much material I could not honestly answer the hon. member. We read a tremendous amount of material, a great deal of it from the Canadian Corrections Association, and generally speaking we follow their recommendations.

As a matter of fact in some instances, we go beyond it. For example, the Canadian Correctional Association has given an ideal complement for an institution, I think, as 400 and something. Ours is 200.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, before I leave that I wonder if the Minister would mind getting a copy of the model penal code. There may be some suggestions there which would be of benefit to him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course. We may have it in our library. If we have not, we will see that we get one.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, during my preliminary remarks I made some comments about visiting institutions and specifically conjugal visiting. Would that some under vote 401?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All these questions have been under 402, really, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry. Did you answer yes or no?

Mr. Chairman: No.
Vote 401 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, before we get into vote 402, I must say I have been delighted with this very brilliant examination of the functions of the department tonight.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to go to the order paper. Perhaps I might draw particular attention to orders 15, 16 and 17 on today's order paper. Then I would like to go to the committee of the whole House. There are certain private bills I would like to put through the committee and into the position of third reading in order that they may have Royal assent because they involve various activities in the province that perhaps the sponsors of these bills would like to get on with. If there is any time after that we will return to these estimates. On Thursday we will come back to these estimates.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Premier when he intends to return to the Constitutional debate?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will have to see where some of these other matters go first, but I would hope to give at least 24 hours notice before we return to that debate.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.45 o'clock a.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 12, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

**THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969**



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 12, 1969

Extending sympathy on the passing of Mr. Arthur Brydon, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Renwick	2167
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, first reading	2168
Off-shore mineral rights, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	2168
Fire safety, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Jackson	2168
Licence seizures, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Bullbrook	2169
Zenmac Metal Mines, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Stokes	2169
Land acquisition, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Gisborn	2170
Pavilion on Toronto's waterfront, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Trotter	2170
General Welfare Assistance Act, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mrs. M. Renwick	2172
Student unemployment, statement by Mr. Robarts	2172
Licence seizures, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Bullbrook	2174
Tobacco Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, second reading	2176
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. White, on second reading	2180
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deans, agreed to	2199
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2199

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the proceedings of the House commence this afternoon, I would like to express my own personal sorrow and that of my colleagues in the death of a member of our press gallery, Arthur Brydon, who died yesterday.

Arthur had been here for a good many years. He first came in 1955 and then left for a few years. He reported the Norris commission on labour relations on the Great Lakes, and he came back in 1966 as chief of the *Globe and Mail* bureau here in the gallery.

We all had opportunities to know this man personally. He was a journalist for whom I had a great respect. I found out over the years that he could hold a confidence when it was necessary to discuss some things that could not necessarily be put on the record. I found his reporting to be fair, honest and true; and I shall miss him, not only as a professional newspaperman doing his duty in this gallery, but as the personal friend he had become to me. On behalf of my colleagues and all of us I would just express our sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition, I would join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), in making some remarks about the late Mr. Brydon. It is true, everything that has been said about his competence as a journalist and the fact that he was able, from his position in the press gallery, to, I suppose, as well as evoking statements making news, get some of his own ideas across in discussion.

I have always felt that the germ of ideas that have come from Mr. Brydon have shown up perhaps in my speeches, and speeches that I have heard on other sides of the House as well. I think he had a true feeling for democracy in the legislative process. His ready wit always went down very well, sometimes when things were a bit edgy otherwise.

We on this side, certainly, had great respect

for his journalistic ability and his great humanity, and we shall very sorely miss him.

I want to extend our condolences to Mrs. Brydon and the family.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), and the Prime Minister in these words out of respect for Arthur Brydon. He was a very perceptive reporter. I was honoured to be included amongst those who were friends of his. I had known him since about the time of the Norris inquiry.

I think that one of the things which struck me very much about Arthur Brydon that he was able to bring a certain note of the whimsical into some of the writings which he contributed to the *Globe and Mail*.

I remember particularly that he referred at one time to the member for Riverdale as a noted television cartoon figure, Roger Ramjet. It was that kind of delightful perceptive knowledge which endeared him to those of us who knew him well. To those members of this caucus who did not have the opportunity to know him that well, they have, nevertheless, formed in the short time that they were able to meet with him, a sense of the extreme high quality and excellence of his craftsmanship which he brought to his profession.

We here join in wishing our warmest sympathy to his widow and to the members of his family.

Mr. Speaker: In our galleries today, we have visitors, in the east gallery from King Senior Public School in King City, and Millbrook High School in Millbrook, and in the west gallery from Wilson Heights Junior High School. Later in the west gallery we will have visitors from McDougall Central Public School in Parry Sound.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, this bill gives effect to the changes which were announced by the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) on March 4, details of which may be found on page 31 of the Budget statement. I am quite prepared to read those to the House if the members so desire, but I suspect that is not necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Can the Premier confirm a meeting announced by the government of Quebec involving Quebec, Manitoba and Ontario in a discussion of off-shore mineral rights; and second, does Ontario agree with the position expressed by Quebec that all natural resources belong to the province whether off-shore or not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In answer to the question, I believe I was asked something about this the other day. As you may recall, it was last November when the Prime Minister of Canada made some proposals concerning the off-shore boundaries of the provinces, particularly in relation to Ontario, that is Hudson Bay and James Bay.

Just recently he wrote to me, and I presume to the other two provinces concerned in this matter, and enclosed maps. It has been suggested that we get together to examine the proposition that the federal government has made. We will take part in this meeting.

I might point out, of course, for the information of the members, that this will not be the first time that Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba have got together to discuss this. It was discussed during the time that Mr. Lesage with the Prime Minister of Quebec, and when Mr. Roblin was the Premier of Manitoba.

As far as the second question is concerned, I would not really like to declare at this stage of the game that I either agree or disagree. There are some rather tricky legal matters involved here, although it may be that the provincial position is fairly clear.

In trying to establish really what Hudson Bay was, in fact, we did get some legal opinions to the effect that it is not an international water, it is an inland water. But I would not commit this government to a position one way or the other at this stage.

I want to look over the proposals, examine them and then we will come to a conclusion of what we think is right on behalf of the people of this province.

Mr. Nixon: By way of clarification, Mr. Speaker, was it not a part of the original federal proposal that the part of Hudson Bay and James Bay actually enclosed by the three provinces would, in fact, be shared by the three provinces, and only that area to the north—that is in the northwest territories enclosure—would accrue to the government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker. I think the member is confusing some propositions that we developed as provinces, that were not even presented to the federal government. We drew some lines out into the bay, and reached some tentative agreements. The federal government under some statute or other, can change the boundaries of the provinces with the consent of the provinces themselves. At one time we thought that we might make the proposition to the federal government until we went to work on drawing some lines. But that proposition was never made to the federal government.

The federal government has now come back with another proposal which has no relationship to that first proposal at all.

Mr. Nixon: Does the federal proposal draw lines or share productivity?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What the federal proposal does is to draw a very jagged line, so many yards or miles off the coast. In other words, the present boundary is, I believe by statute, the low water mark of Hudson Bay and James Bay, and would then be the low water mark, I suppose, of Hudson Straits and perhaps Ungava Bay, but we would have no concern in that.

The proposal made by the government of Canada just moves that line off shore, a certain distance, as they have done on the east and west coasts.

Then there is some proposal that revenue from anything underneath might be shared in some proportion to be agreed upon by the provinces, but it is all in the nature to date of a proposal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Prime Minister.

Which departments of the government are responsible for fire safety inspections and the enforcement of fire safety standards in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is quite a list. The fire marshal's office and The Department of Justice are responsible for approving new construction financed by the province such as hospitals, schools, welfare buildings, and are the advisors on fire safety to other departments.

The Department of Labour is responsible for safety measures, including fire safety in industrial commercial buildings.

The liquor-license board and The Department of Tourism are responsible for enforcing The Hotel Fire Safety Act, depending upon whether the hotel is licensed by the liquor control board or not.

The Ontario Hospital Services Commission is responsible under the terms of The Public Hospitals Act for enforcing fire regulations in the maintenance of hospitals.

There are similar responsibilities under various branches of The Department of Social and Family Services. For example, under The Charitable Institutions Act and The Homes for the Aged Act, The Department of Health enforces fire regulations under The Nursing Homes Act. The Department of Tourism and Information is responsible for fire regulations under The Theatres Act, and The Department of Public Works is responsible for Ontario government-owned buildings.

The prime responsibility for fire safety in the province rests with the municipalities. The Municipal Act and Planning Act give municipalities the authority to enact fire safety bylaws. In addition, The Fire Marshals Act gives municipal fire chiefs and fire inspectors the authority to inspect buildings for fire hazards within their own area.

Perhaps I might table this or send a copy of it to the hon. member if he would like the details.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Sarnia wish to place his question to the Minister of Transport?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the present established state of the law, why are officials of The Department of Transport seizing licences where part-time driving privileges are permitted by the courts? Should not the department wait for a final judicial review of the legal validity of such part-time driving privileges?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there is a mandatory suspension required under The Highway Traffic Act upon conviction of certain Criminal Code offences. This provision is not presently under review by the courts. Therefore, The Department of Transport has no alternative but to apply the provisions of The Highway Traffic Act.

The language of The Highway Traffic Act, in sections 20, 21, 21b, 21c, is such that the suspension is automatic and in effect whether the licence is seized or not. An appeal from the decision of the hon. Mr. Justice Henderson dealing with the discretionary powers of prohibition of the court under the Criminal Code has been filed by the Attorney General.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Are you not agreed that the seizing of the licences by your departmental officials is really an invasion on the equity in justice as dispensed by the individual member of the court?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I stand by the clear and unequivocal answer I gave to the original question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management; and the Minister has answers, I believe, to questions asked the other day.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes. What action does the OWRC plan to take to stop Zenmac Mines from allowing raw tailings to escape into Lake Superior at its zinc concentrator operation at Selin, Ontario?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, Zenmac Metal Mines Limited operates an approved tailing impoundment, the effluent from which is monitored on a regular basis. Raw tailings are not allowed to escape to Lake Superior. The company has taken appropriate steps to maintain control and reduce suspended solid level which recently approached the commission's objective.

Mr. Stokes: Will the Minister accept a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: Is the Minister aware that there is about 100 tons of raw tailings sitting on the ice in the bay at Lake Superior at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, no I am not aware of that, nor are OWRC. As I said earlier, this has been checked periodically and we are not aware of it at this time.

Mr. Stokes: Will the Minister check into it at this time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I will.

I have an answer to a supplementary question from the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park is not in his seat so I presume we will have to hold that.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: May I put it on the record, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I think the hon. Minister said he would either send it to the member or give it in the House, and perhaps since the member is not here he might send it to the member.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Might which?

Mr. Speaker: You might send it to the member.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East has a question.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Lands and Forests:

With what company or companies of land developers is The Department of Lands and Forests negotiating to acquire park lands at the Fifty Point project at Winona?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Hamilton East, The Department of Public Works do all the negotiating for land purposes for our department. We understand that someone has optioned this land in question, but we are not aware of those who hold these options.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Previous questions regarding this particular park and progress in negotiations have been answered by the Minister of Lands and Forests. Why the refusal of a direct answer in this particular case?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would mind repeating the question?

Mr. Giborn: My question is that several questions have been asked in the last few months regarding this particular project of the Minister of Lands and Forests in regard to negotiations to acquire land, and we have received answers. Why not an answer to this particular question from the Minister of Lands and Forests rather than the reference to The Department of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I mentioned to him, all land acquisition is done by The Department of Public Works and as I mentioned to him about a month ago when he posed a similar question, I told him at that time that the price of land being asked for was very high and it was very difficult to recommend to the parks integration board the acquisition of land at such a high price.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale is now in his seat and he has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Will the Minister comment on a statement made by Toronto officials as reported in the early edition of the Toronto *Daily Star* today to the effect that the provincial government's unilateral decision to build a pavilion on Toronto's waterfront will slow down the overall development of the Toronto harbour area?

And is it true that fill will be diverted from the outer harbour to the provincial government building?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I think the officials quoted were Captain Hawkins, who is director of the development of the Toronto Harbour Commission, and our own Mr. Jim Ramsay, director of my special projects department. Fill is going to be diverted from the outer harbour project for the provincial government project.

The article, I might say, further quotes Captain Hawkins as saying that the Toronto outer harbour project is well ahead of schedule and he did not expect the delay to be a serious factor.

Going back to 1964, there was quite a diversion here for the CNE, and despite it the outer harbour project, according to Captain Hawkins and the harbour officials, is well ahead of schedule so we do not expect any problems.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I would like to ask the Minister whether in actual fact no extra work is taking place on the Toronto harbour, except that instead of diverting fill in the outer harbour it is now being put where this proposed building is likely to be. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I think they will be doing the fill job in both areas. Let us say they are getting 50 loads a day out of the outer harbour, they will probably divert 20 of them to our project here. We think that between the two we can complete the project as scheduled.

Mr. Trotter: But there is no extra work being done really in the overall situation as far as this year goes. Is that not correct? It is just an announcement?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have not got started on the project yet. We expect to have our first truckload of fill down there by the end of this month, so we have made the announcement and the job is now underway. The contract was let with the harbour commission, I might say, so I think if the member waits for a few days he will see that the extra work will be taking place down at the new CNE centre.

Mr. Trotter: Well I hope so, but I doubt it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will send the member a photograph of the first activity.

Mr. Trotter: Do that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on what may be a point of privilege, it may be a point of order. I am not too sure.

Today, I submitted to your office two questions. They were both rejected. I can well understand perhaps why you rejected the question in regard to the government's hiding the result of the inquiry into the dumping of the acid into Hamilton Bay, but I am very, very concerned about your turning down the question that I asked in regard to the need to assure a decent income level for the blind.

I was wondering if you could tell me your reason for your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I would certainly be delighted to tell the hon. member. The word "decent" does not express, to me at least, any income

level at all. "Decent" is not an adjective which is normally associated with income levels.

If the hon. member would use words which would indicate what he meant in monetary or economic terms, then I think the question is perfectly all right. I have no objection to the word "decent", but it did not mean anything as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Deans: May I enquire, sir, if "reasonable", then, would have been more acceptable?

Mr. Speaker: "Reasonable" might have been acceptable, yes.

Mr. Deans: I then fail to see the difference between the—

Mr. Speaker: I see a great difference because "decent" does not express anything as far as income level goes. If it were standards of living that might be different because "decent" would be—

Mr. Deans: No, but it is, sir—

Mr. Speaker: No, it is income level.

Mr. Deans: Income level and standard of living are related.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but it is the income level that we are talking about at the moment. The hon. member has put the two of them together. It should have been a very simple thing because I usually try to help the office staff by suggesting something and I did suggest something, but—

Mr. Deans: I was not in my office.

Mr. Speaker: But the hon. member was not available perhaps, or we would have had no difficulty.

My problem was that the word "decent" normally is not associated with an income. It might be with a standard of living. I have no objection to that.

If the hon. member wants a reasonable answer to his question, he must make his question intelligible to the people at the other end. It might have been intelligible the way he put it. If I had been at the other end it would not have been to me. So therefore, I thought the best thing was to have it clarified.

Mr. Nixon: What happened to the old pipeline?

Mr. Deans: It makes a great deal of difference, Mr. Speaker, because then I have to try to reason out whether or not what I am asking is intelligible to you rather than to the Minister to whom I am directing it.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): The member for Scarborough Centre has a question.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member for Scarborough Centre wishes to place her question, the Minister is now in his seat.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

How does the Minister see "categorized" for purposes of "income" under The General Welfare Assistance Act a recipient in receipt of a cash gift of about one dollar a week, or approximately four dollars a month for the department's purposes? In the Minister's view, would it be correctly defined under section 11 (11 q) on page 9 of regulations to The General Welfare Assistance Act where small gifts are not to be included as "income"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the determination of what constitutes a casual gift is left to the local welfare administrator. While an amount as small as mentioned, received irregularly, might well be considered a casual gift, the very nature of its being paid regularly each month might raise some doubt after a period of time in the mind of an administrator as to whether it is what is considered in the layman's language as a gift or regular income. The good judgment of the administrator in each case, I trust, would prevail, and I would hope the tendency would be to lean in favour of the recipient.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask if the Minister would see that it might be correct then to put it under this particular section if it were for a matter of months say rather than a matter of years; if the small cash donation was a matter of months, Mr. Speaker, rather than a matter of years. Could I have clarification of the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the question was in terms of months or years. As my friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) would say, "Many a mickle makes a muckle"; and it depends on how much time was involved. The individual case would have to be determined. If the hon. member has a special case in mind I would be very glad to check into the matter.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, before the

orders of the day, at resumption of these sittings after Christmas, I mentioned that this government was deeply concerned about the growing problem of student unemployment; and this was raised by the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Ben) this week.

I said at that time that a Cabinet committee had been established to help deal with this problem, and that in due course I planned to lay before this House the details of a programme to promote the expansion of summer job opportunities for students in all parts of the province.

Before proceeding to put the plan before the House, I would like to spend a moment or two to explore the dimensions of the situation that we see facing us in this area.

Last year, there were more than 600,000 students enrolled in our universities, our colleges and our secondary schools, and we estimate that about half of that number were in the market for summer jobs of some kind or another and for varying periods. Despite the fact that Ontario employers provided summer jobs for over 270,000 people, more than 54,000 university, college and secondary school students were not able to find jobs. This means that about 17 per cent of those students who sought work last summer had to go without jobs because there simply were not enough jobs to go around.

Of those who had to remain jobless, about 8,100 were from universities and colleges. A similar number had completed their secondary school education and planned further studies. And 37,000 were still enrolled in secondary school.

This year, we expect the number of students seeking summer work to increase by at least 10 per cent to a total of 357,000. We expect the largest increase will be in university and college students. About 20 per cent more of them will be looking for summer jobs this year than last.

It is clear that unless substantially more is done this summer to expand employment opportunities, at least 60,000 of our young people could experience the frustration of a jobless summer this year. I think we can expect the social and economic implications associated with this rising rate of student unemployment will grow proportionately.

There is no doubt in my mind that this problem will be with us for some time to come. There are a number of factors at work which indicate that student unemployment will continue to rise unless a conscious effort is made by both private and public sectors to combat it.

The number of students in our educational institutions continues to increase; the rate of student retention is rising; the proportion of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs available is shrinking; and, finally, summer jobs still represent the major source of income for those students who must help pay their way through university or college.

Certainly, if part of the cost of higher education is to remain with the student—as I believe it should—then he must be given the opportunity to help pay for his studies. And it is important that the public—employers, homeowners and parents—should be made aware of the serious dimensions of this problem, because recognition and delineation of the problem is the first step that one must take to solving it.

As I mentioned earlier in the session, we do not believe that the answer lies in “manufacturing” or “creating” jobs for students in the government service. However, we do believe that as an employer we should set a good example by hiring as many students as can be meaningfully and usefully employed by government departments.

This year, the departments of the government will be hiring about 6,400 students for the summer. In addition, about 1,600 summer jobs will be provided by our various boards and commissions, bringing the total to just over 8,000. This number represents about one student for every ten permanent employees, a ratio that we hope other employers will use as a guideline.

I also mentioned earlier this year that we have been working closely with the federal department of manpower and immigration in an effort to develop an effective system of matching students with summer jobs. Rather than duplicating the job placement facilities of the federal government, we have co-operated with them in arranging for students to be registered and placed in the following manner:

(a) University and college students will be put in touch with prospective employers through the facilities of student placement offices which will be on campus;

(b) Secondary school students will be pre-registered by the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration in their schools, and then placed with employers through the facilities of local Canada manpower centres.

In addition to our role as an employer and our efforts to develop an efficient placement system, we also feel that we should help to expand summer job opportunities for students in the private sector, particularly for post-secondary students who are more in need of

job opportunities to help them finance their further education. With this in mind, we have developed a public education campaign which was launched earlier this week with the mailing of an information kit and a letter from me to the presidents of more than 300 employer associations across Ontario.

I have also met personally with a number of major employer associations and have asked them to support this campaign by encouraging their members to hire more students this summer. I understand that some of these associations plan to mount their own campaigns directed towards expanding summer job opportunities in their particular industry.

Next week, I plan to send out letters of personal appeal to the presidents of more than 30,000 Ontario companies in a wide range of industries. These letters and accompanying literature will bring facts about student unemployment to the attention of potential employers, and ask them to review their particular situation to see if they can do a little more this summer.

Next week, we plan to discuss this problem with trade union leaders in an effort to enlist the support and cooperation of organized labour.

Towards the end of March, we will begin to extend this activity with newspaper advertising which will be aimed at motivating the business and industrial community to hire more university and college students this summer. We plan to present the features of the university and college students that are most appealing to employers, namely, their capacity to learn, their eagerness to produce quality work, and the possibility of their return to their employer when they graduate.

It is our aim to try to convince employers that students are a good investment. In fact, the theme of the campaign is: “Hire a student this summer. The most important investment you’ll ever make”.

Additional newspaper and radio advertising will be directed to homeowners and small employers as we approach the summer months. In addition, we shall be asking the news media to support this campaign as a public service.

It is clear that if we are going to be successful in dealing with the problem of student unemployment we must find out more about it. We must know what industries are providing summer jobs now, and where job opportunities can be expanded in the future. We should know more about those students who are unsuccessful in finding summer jobs, and why they are unsuccessful.

In this connection we plan to develop, over this next year, much more extensive and reliable information about the extent and nature of student employment and unemployment.

In the meantime, I am confident that by working with the federal government, by working with employers, by working with homeowners, we can go a long way towards helping our young people to help themselves.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of clarification, it is implicit in what the Prime Minister said that there will be no placement facilities under the direction of that Cabinet committee at all.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, we went into this very carefully and, as you know, the federal government has a pretty sophisticated set-up which really extends all across the province for placement purposes. By coordinating our programme with theirs we can use their facilities and avoid that duplication.

Mr. Nixon: Did the research as carried out by the Cabinet committee turn up the number of jobs available for students in the government service in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been aware of this for some years. I have pointed out the number of jobs that we have provided. We will hire every student who can be employed, as I say, meaningfully.

We do not think it is a good thing for either the government or the student to engage in simply a make-work situation. But every department, of course, has been alerted to look over its functions and activities in the summer time in order that we may uncover all the job opportunities there are in the government service. We intend to do this, and we have been doing this for quite some years. What is new here is the extension into the private sector.

It occurred to us that if every employer in the province was aware of the problem; if he made an effort to even employ two or three—you do not have to employ a great number of students—but if you get enough employers aware of the problem and they are prepared to do what they can within their own framework, little though it may be, if you get enough employers we can go a long distance towards making sure that those who want to work—the students—will have work to do.

Mr. Nixon: Should these young people apply for provincial government jobs through

Canada manpower or how should they approach the government of Ontario? The government is bound to be the biggest employer of young people—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, it may be the biggest in terms of the number placed with a single employer.

Mr. Nixon: Right!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The applications will come through the Canada manpower recruiting centres that we have, but they will also come in as they have done for many, many years. I can recall when I was Minister of Education that we dealt with a whole flood of applications for jobs from all parts of the province. No doubt that will continue to go on.

Mr. Nixon: It would be wise, then, if they applied directly to the various Ministers.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, we will put it all together wherever they apply. That is the point.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I see the hon. Attorney General is in his seat. I wonder if he would permit the question that I have lodged with you?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, we are still before the orders of the day, the hon. member may place it.

Mr. Bullbrook: To the hon. Attorney General.

Other than establishing the occupation of a field for constitutional purposes:

What interest of justice is served by appealing the decision of Mr. Justice W. J. Henderson relative to part-time driving privileges?

Does the Attorney General agree with the position taken by The Department of Transport, notwithstanding the present established position of the law relative to part-time driving privileges, seizing convicted persons' licences where such part-time driving privileges have been given?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have had little time to consider this, but I can quickly answer the first part of the question. Certainly the interest of justice that is being served on the appeal is to have the law clarified and settled on that point as to whether that is the way the Criminal Code should be interpreted and if that power exists. There is a clear interest in getting that clarified.

As to the second matter, it is a matter of policy, I take it from the way I heard the question, which falls within the ambit of my colleague, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett).

If the hon. member wanted any further clarification on that I would have to have time to look at these sections together.

Mr. Bullbrook: I wonder if the Attorney General would entertain a question in connection with the first part?

Since the field has been occupied under sections 20 to 22 of The Highway Traffic Act, could not the purposes of the courts relative to part-time driving privileges be advanced by a pure amendment to The Highway Traffic Act now permitting such part-time driving privileges?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is the sort of thing I would like to study. There is no question but what the province has the jurisdiction to deal with the qualification of drivers on its highways in the control of traffic.

I think it would perhaps be possible to amend the Act, but whether that should be done—I should certainly want to study that before I said how far the amendment should go. That is a matter of policy, which I should like to study and perhaps discuss with my colleague before I give an opinion on it.

Mr. Bullbrook: I was wondering if the Attorney General would entertain one more question. It seems to me the purpose in asking these questions, Mr. Speaker, is that the present state of the law, as shown by Mr. Justice Henderson's decision, is that these provincial judges do have this power.

I am wondering why the Attorney General would not comment on the seizure of licences by The Department of Transport after the exercising of the discretion by the provincial judge. It seems to me it is an invasion, by the administrative part of government, on the judicial function.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is a neat point, Mr. Speaker. I think a certain section of The Highway Traffic Act gives the provincial judge the power to adjust that suspension—

Mr. Bullbrook: It gives the Minister power.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, it gives it to the Minister. What we are dealing with here, let us distinguish that, was a decision by a provincial judge on a section of the code—a conviction perhaps for impaired driving or something of that sort. The code says: the

justice dealing with that case may, upon conviction, prohibit the—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Prohibit!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Prohibit the driving for any period. The provincial judge said "I shall prohibit for a period", and within the period he gave a period of relief for certain daylight hours. Mr. Justice Henderson upheld that on appeal. We are appealing to have that clarified, and that deals only with a section of the code, I think that was the first part of the question. I think it is well that that should be clarified.

The further question was, first of all, do you agree with the pursuit of this driver? The Highway Traffic Act says there is an automatic suspension if you are convicted under that section of a federal Act, the Criminal Code. The law is there. There is no discretion. The suspension is automatic. So my colleague, I presume, feels he must follow it since it is the law. It is in our Act, in the provincial Act and he must follow it.

My hon. friend says, do you not think we ought to somehow amend our Act to bring these things together. I would like to study that. I think that is fair.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I hesitate to take the time of the House, but if I might on a point of order, I was absent from the Chamber last night after the division bells had ceased ringing. Comments were made in connection with my absence. I do not intend to take issue with either person who made the comments.

The comment, however, made by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), did impute my motives. I would suggest that those comments were entirely out of order and I refer you, sir, to page 26 of "Lewis" and page 456 of "May", 17th edition, relative to the imputation of motives that are not avowed in the House previously.

However, I would ask you on a point of clarification what really constitutes a division in this House, because I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, looking at "Lewis", page 128, section 13, and if I might read it to you. Divisions, 106:

When members have been called in preparatory to a division, no further debate is to be permitted.

107 (a) Upon a division, the ayes and nays shall not be entered upon the minutes unless demanded by five members, and on

questions of adjournment of the House, or other debate, the members only shall be entered.

(b) On the question being put, every member in the Chamber with the exception of the Speaker must record his vote.

The problem that I have as one member of this House is, what technically constitutes a division? It seems to me as you read here when members have been called in preparatory to a division no further debate is to be permitted. That seems to me to infer that a division is the recording of the votes of the House after the division bell, so called, has ceased ringing, and that if we are in our seats at that time then we are obliged to vote.

On the other hand, section 107 (a) says:

Upon a division the ayes and nays shall not be entered upon the minutes.

That anticipates that a division is actually calling for the ayes and nays. Going further:

On the question being put every, member in the chamber with the exception of the Speaker must record his vote.

That anticipates to me that the division really is after the division bells have ceased ringing. I ask you to clarify for me perhaps—certainly not today, I do not anticipate that—what in your mind constitutes a division; whether a division is at the time of the taking of the ayes and nays, or when the motion is put before the House subsequent to the bells having been rung.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that the incident to which the hon. member refers took place while this House was sitting as committee of the whole House. Mr. Speaker was not present although he had access to a verbal report of the proceedings—verbatim report.

I will be glad to take the hon. member's question under advisement, but it appears to me that the hon. member is directing himself probably to the wrong area of inquiry, because so far as the division is concerned, the procedure of the House at that time was not particularly interested in division. It was the taking of the vote that counted, and the taking of the vote is that upon which the rules are based.

If the hon. member has read the rules, it is abundantly plain what happens. But I am sure I will be able to produce something which will be of assistance to him and to all of us, because these questions arise from time to time and it is well that we might

have our minds refreshed from Mr. Speaker's rulings on the proper procedures.

So, as the hon. member suggested, it will take a little time to consult the authorities and see if we can get something which will be of assistance to us all.

Orders of the day.

THE TOBACCO TAX ACT, 1965

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue) moves second reading of Bill 78, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to read the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Taxation with respect to The Tobacco Tax Act. I believe their findings eventually are based on the political viability of such a tax, and it says that:

While it cannot be based on any reasonable grounds, still it is obvious that the citizens of the province are prepared to accept it as a tax.

And that they—at that stage when it was at a level of six per cent I believe—said that it could even be raised.

Well, in the last year, because of the budgetary periods, the tax on tobacco, as I understand it, has gone from two per cent to six per cent and now to eight per cent, two increases within the 12 months.

I want to comment on the fact that cigarettes were, at the time of the six per cent levy, providing 88 per cent of the income from the tobacco tax. Now, with this two per cent increase the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) is predicting that the income will rise by another \$16 million.

I suppose it is easy for members on all sides to say that this is readily received and accepted by the citizens. Somebody has said that smokers would still rather pay than quit. I had thought, with the two per cent increase announced overnight, that there would be a good many smokers around the province who would say: "Well, that is it. I have been thinking I should quit, and now this is enough perhaps to make me decide to do so."

However, there does not seem to be any particular report of that, and when I contacted the tobacco marketing board which is very active in my own constituency, they said that the only effect they noticed was the price per pound on the auctions at the tobacco market dropped three cents the first

day and a further two cents the subsequent day.

Whether or not it has regained its original price, which was quite advantageous compared with previous years, I am not in a position to say.

I think, however, that those people in this Chamber and in the community who are prepared to say that this increase in tax is acceptable because people should not smoke anyway, are thinking that this government is using the increase in tax and the tobacco tax itself as some kind of a lever to make the citizens decide, for their own good, to stop smoking.

I say that if this is the case it is unacceptable. It is obviously being used as a source of revenue, and considerable revenue if the reaction is going to be as predicted by the Minister responsible for the bill that is before us today.

On the other hand, we cannot lose sight of the fact that one half of the price of tobacco in the form of cigarettes is made up of federal taxes in excised form, and we all recall the circumstances that are recounted once again in the report of the Royal commission when the federal government raised the tobacco tax by a fairly large amount.

I think it was an overnight six to eight cent increase which brought about a considerable amount of smuggling of tobacco because it was worthwhile for those people who are interested in these projects to get them over from the American side where the tax is something less than half what we pay here and to bootleg them on the side.

I do not suppose this increase is going to bring into being any extensive resumption of smuggling. It is, however, going to extract from the community \$16.5 million which is paid probably in the same amounts by smokers whether they are affluent or otherwise. As a matter of fact, the increase in tax does not apply to the \$2 cigars that some of my colleagues pass around from time to time, and the tax is left at the original level on cigars and pipe tobacco.

I think in quoting from the Royal commission, one of the interesting observations that was made, from page 280, is as follows and I quote:

Over the whole scale of incomes, that tax [that is the tobacco tax] is bound to be broadly regressive.

I think this is accepted. There is no doubt it is the man in the street who pays 90 per cent of the \$16.5 million; he will pay 90 per

cent of the \$16.5 million increase, and its regressive features are very apparent in that connection.

We, on this side, cannot support the increase in the tax, even though there is every indication that the community is prepared to accept it without particular complaint. It is simply a package in the increase in sales tax in general, and they are in the same family which is extracting from the average citizen a very large new imposition of taxation which we feel is regressive in nature.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that the Liberal Party is not in a position to vote for this bill on second reading.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, in a range of taxes here having to do with commodity taxes, the prevailing policy of the Tory government remains as ever the same.

In Elizabethan times the only great range of tax which was imposed was sumptuary taxes of all kinds—luxury taxes and taxes directed against sinful behaviour so that through the taxation system you may twist men's morals more to your liking.

This is, I suggest, an illegitimate ground for tax and I shall have Smith bear me out in a moment. The weight of sin in liquor, the weight of sin in tobacco, the weight of sin under the amusement tax and dancing late at night and so on, falls heavily upon the heads of the sinners as this government sees them.

It seems to me, a somewhat outmoded approach to the problems of taxation. But where the nub comes, as has been mentioned by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon), lies in the smuggling.

We are beginning to reach a level of taxation in the tobacco field where the government is going to encourage smuggling from other jurisdictions in a widespread way so that it is presently undermining, or reaching the point of undermining, I think, its own tax levies in this regard. There is a marginal utility in this as in everything else, and they probably have stepped over the line. We will have to watch it very closely.

I think some of the remarks Smith at page 281 Volume 3 has a wider application than just to the tobacco tax, although it is directed specifically to that tax. He says:

The criterion of equity provides no support for a discriminatory tax on tobacco, such expenditures on tobacco bear no constant relationship to individual incomes.

The tax on this habit cannot be justified by the principle of ability to pay.

He goes on, jumping down a little further, saying:

People need not smoke and can avoid the tax by abstinence, but that is irrelevant to a discussion of the justification for imposing a tax. To describe tobacco as a luxury begs the question. How can luxuries be usefully defined? Why are not all luxuries taxed? Discussions of these and similar questions though diverting, are unhelpful in supporting a tax.

It is suggested that in light of the evidence concerned with smoking and with health problems, the government should discourage the use of tobacco through taxation, but even if the health hazard were irrefutably proved, we could not support a tax on the ground of controlling human behaviour.

Taxes on tobacco, after all, are imposed first and foremost to raise revenue, and it would be anomalous to levy what is intended to destroy its own base.

From that point of view there is a good deal to be said to scouting at least in the most delicate way any further imposition on the tax. I think, speaking for this party, that for the nonce and time being, we will not oppose the passing of this bill.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I believe that in this situation it is worthwhile to add certain comments to those made by the leader of the Opposition.

Once again this government has seen fit to impose a range of tax increases on consumption goods. I would remind the members of this House that the total increase of the sales tax revenues in this year will be from 19 per cent of last year to 21 per cent of the total provincial governmental revenue. This is the sort of example of tax increase which we find regressive and, therefore, most repulsive as some attempt is made to bring about a far more equitable system of taxation than that which we have now.

The day after the Budget, my friend and colleague, the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight), showed me a package of cigarettes which he had purchased, and while the increase in taxation was two cents on that package, in fact the price increase was five cents to him.

My friend and colleague, the member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston), mentioned a situation whereby certain large volumes of cigarettes were charged out by manufacturers and

jobbers the day before the increase in taxation. If they were delivered they would take the benefit of any value change without tax increase, but if the tax on tobacco was not increased they would then be able to do the paper work and get these items back for future delivery at convenient times.

This is the sort of approach in taxation that we think is most inequitable—this idea of taxes on consumption goods being used as game to increase the provincial revenues. While giving certain asides as to value judgment on the items being taxed, it is surely a means of only attempting to fool some of the people some of the time in this kind of situation.

We regret very much the taxes of this sort have been increased and that the burden of this taxation increase finds itself in the form of a sales tax. While the amounts of revenue to be increased in all of the taxes we are discussing this afternoon will be some \$180 million, in fact the burden of these increases in taxes—by coming through a sales tax change—are going to be in regressive areas.

Once again, the persons with modest incomes who in finding certain areas of pleasure or relaxation are paying the taxes, and more can be said about that as the amendments to The Retail Sales Tax Act are debated.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that changes in this tax form are regressive, that they will be used further to increase prices of items beyond the basic amount of increased tax. I further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as a result, this tax should be opposed by the House and hon. members should vote against the same.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further discussion? The hon. Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to accept the proposition that this is a regressive tax. When economists use that word, they are referring to an unavoidable tax, and one can conjure up all kinds of illustrations of regressivity, whether one is talking about property taxes or less progressive income tax structures.

The reason the property tax is regressive is because the property holdings of less prosperous citizens represent a larger proportion of their incomes than for the wealthier class. That word "regressivity" is used in its full and correct meaning in describing the imperfections and the disadvantages of property taxes, and so on.

This is an entirely different situation. It may be that an average income earner smokes the same amount as a more prosperous citi-

zen, but surely he can avoid the imposition of this tax by smoking less or by rolling his own cigarettes or some such thing.

So I think it is not appropriate to call this a regressive tax as such. That is the reason, I suspect, that the member for Lakeshore has been able to announce that his caucus is supporting this particular increase and in doing so, of course, he is keeping the faith. He is keeping the faith because he was one of the members of the select committee that supported the recommendation to be found on page 250, which reads as follows:

There are several arguments in favour of this tax.

That is, the tobacco tax.

It is clear, simple, certain and easy to administer. Perhaps most important is that there is wide public acceptance that tobacco should be an object of taxation, and any reasonable increase in the tax rate is likely to yield more revenue to the province.

I say the member for Lakeshore supported that select committee recommendation. If my memory serves me correctly, the Liberals did too. I am a little bit surprised that they would not be voting for this particular bill today on the strength of that previous assertion.

Now then, sir, a couple of interesting aspects have been mentioned by the Opposition speakers. In the matter of smuggling, you will recall when the American cigarette prices were much lower than Canada, certainly smuggling, particularly at the border points, was a very real consideration. I remember very well in those years Canadian cigarettes cost 25 cents and a package of Chesterfields in Detroit cost a dime or a little more when bought in cartons. It was a great impetus to smuggling along the border.

No such impetus exists today, certainly not of the same magnitude, because one buys a package of cigarettes in downtown Detroit at 35 or 40 cents for 20 cigarettes. The premium paid by the Canadian smoker in Windsor is much smaller than it used to be.

So far as neighbouring Canadian jurisdictions are concerned, I point to page 28 of the Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton's) Budget statement in which he says:

I would like to mention at this point that I propose to bring our tobacco tax rates on cigarettes directly into line with those already existing in Quebec and Manitoba.

So, the smuggling aspect, I think, will not be difficult administratively. It is not a meaningful problem as I see it.

The leader of the Opposition has mentioned that tobacco prices in auction decreased fractionally the day after this announcement was made. One would have to embark on a very extensive economic study to see what other variables were at work there.

The imposition of this tax in the past has not resulted in any long-term decrease. I remember well when the federal government increased its tax radically—about 1950, if I remember correctly—and it nudged some number of smokers, of whom I was one, from ready-mades, I think is the term we used to use, ready-made cigarettes into tailor-made cigarettes. I hope I am remembering my terminology properly.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Roll your own!

Hon. Mr. White: Roll your own!

I was one of those who bought one of the big five-length machines, but after a month or two I must confess I went back and regained my previous habit. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that whatever temporary interruption there may be in revenues, they will not be long-lived, and I think that that particular objection has very little merit.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that sums up my rebuttal to the remarks made by the members opposite. The tax on each cigarette purchased by a consumer is increased from three-tenths of a cent, to four-tenths of one cent, effective March 5, 1969. This will produce \$16.5 million in revenue.

The very fact that it has had rather wide public acceptance, as the leader of the Opposition acknowledged, is the intuitive assessment on the part of taxpayers, that this is a very appropriate source for this substantial amount of revenue.

Mr. Speaker: The motion by Mr. White is for second reading of Bill 78.

Mr. Nixon: No. I would like the ayes and nays.

Mr. Speaker: There is a dissenting voice. I heard the dissenting voice.

The House divided on the motion for second reading moved by hon. Mr. White, which was agreed to on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Ben
Apps	Braithwaite
Auld	Breithaupt
Bernier	Bukator
Boyer	Bullbrook
Brown	Deacon

AYES	NAYS	AYES	NAYS
Brunelle	Edighoffer	Rollins	
Burr	Farquhar	Root	
Carruthers	Gaunt	Rowe	
Connell	Good	Rowntree	
Davis	Innes	Simonett	
Davison	Knight	Snow	
Deans	Nixon	Stewart	
Demers	Paterson	Stokes	
Downer	Reid	Villeneuve	
Dunlop	(Scarborough East)	Wells	
Dymond	Ruston	White	
Evans	Smith	Whitney	
Ferrier	(Nipissing)	Winkler	
Gilbertson	Sopha	Wishart	
Gisborn	Spence	Yakabuski	
Grossman	Trotter	Yaremko—71.	
Guindon	Worton—21.		
Hamilton			
Haskett			
Henderson			
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)			
Hodgson (York North)			
Jackson			
Jessiman			
Johnston (Parry Sound)			
Johnston (St. Catharines)			
Johnston (Carleton)			
Kennedy			
Kerr			
Lawlor			
Lawrence (Carleton East)			
Lawrence (St. George)			
Lewis			
Makarchuk			
Martel			
Morin			
Morningstar			
Morrow			
McNeil			
Newman (Ontario South)			
Peacock			
Potter			
Price			
Mrs. Pritchard			
Randall			
Reilly			
Renwick (Riverdale)			
Mrs. Renwick (Scarborough Centre)			
Robarts			

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 71, the "nays" 21.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. Mr. White moves second reading of Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I am going to make some brief introductory remarks to elaborate on the intent of this bill. Then with the permission of the House I will conclude the debate by rebutting any arguments that are offered—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: I will keep my introductory remarks of this bill as concise as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister might let the Opposition quiet for a moment before he proceeds.

Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. White: The vote did not indicate that.

I will keep my introductory remarks on this bill as concise as possible, recognizing many of the comments associated with the bill were made by the Treasurer when he presented his Budget on March 6. A few words of explanation will clarify the intent of the revisions contained in this amendment.

A significant change involves the repeal of The Hospitals Tax Act, and its integration with The Retail Sales Tax Act. This integration was recommended by both the Smith and the select committees. It will simplify the work of the vendors because some of them have had to comply with the two statutes in the past, and this nuisance will be eliminated in the future.

It will be better for the vendors who are affected, and better for the administrators, more efficient both for us and for them. All of the provisions in The Hospitals Tax Act will be contained in The Retail Sales Tax Act, with two exceptions. The provision for annual licencing at the cost of \$1, and the \$1 maximum on the tax on entertainment will be discontinued.

The amendment to the Act will require one permit only for each vendor under The Retail Sales Tax Act.

Under The Hospital Tax Act, many forms of entertainment are currently enjoying exemption from the tax. Exemptions are provided for events held by various organizations and associations for recreational, religious, charitable, educational and other purposes. Exemptions are also extended from time to time to theatrical or musical performances where the performers and management are residents of Canada. Hon. members will recall both the select and Smith committee recommended these exemptions from tax should be terminated.

The bill before the House provides for the discretionary power for these exemptions to continue, but in line with the recommendations referred to, it is proposed that the exemptions be reviewed during the next 12 months with the object of phasing out each one at an appropriate time, but not later than March 31, 1970.

Where the purpose of a particular exemption has a special merit, then it is appropriate that the subsidy being provided from public funds be by grant rather than by exemption from tax. Those members who were on the select committee will recognize this very important principle that special benefits be provided regularly, overtly, in full view of public scrutiny, by way of a grant rather than having a tax exemption, whether we talk about property tax exemption or some other tax exemption embedded in a statute or embedded in a practice beyond the view of the citizens and tax payers.

The bill will give effect to the principle of differential rates under The Retail Sales Tax Act, and will result in three categories

of sales—exempt sales, sales subject to 5 per cent tax, and those subject to 10 per cent tax. The 10 per cent rate now applicable under The Hospital Tax Act will be extended under this bill to include the consumption of all liquor, wine and bottled beer, whether or not entertainment is provided.

Retail sales of these products will be taxed at the 10 per cent rate, which will also apply to all meals, including take out meals, if a meal ticket exceeds \$2.50. In recognition of the rise in the price of meals in recent years, the tax on meals from \$1.51 to \$2.50 inclusive will be withdrawn, thereby removing the tax completely on meals up to and including \$2.50.

The net effect of these changes should provide approximately \$42 million in additional revenue for the fiscal year 1969/70.

Under this bill, the exemption on production machinery will be removed April 1, 1969. This exemption has caused many problems in interpretation, and as the additional tax may be written off, usually over a period of years for federal and provincial income tax purposes, the net increase in tax by the removal of the exemption will be less than the amount of the tax we expect to derive from this source. For the fiscal year 1969/70, we anticipate this change will yield an additional revenue from the sales tax.

Mr. Nixon: That is the net effect, \$38 million.

Hon. Mr. White: That is the additional revenue from the sales tax.

Mr. Nixon: Not reduced by the other?

Hon. Mr. White: Not reduced. The reductions are shown in those other categories.

The bill makes provision for a definition of services and the tax on telephone and telegraph services will be brought under that provision, instead of being embraced in the definition of tangible personal property, as is the case at present.

We anticipate, at this time, to limit the extension of the tax on services to transient accommodation. This is a service tax in most jurisdictions of North America, and we propose to follow the approach commonly used elsewhere in Canada and the United States in applying this tax. This change will be effective April 1, 1969, and should produce \$13 million in the coming fiscal year.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a brief condensation of the legislative changes contained in this bill.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the basic situations governed by this bill, of course, many of them deal only, with the changes which are required in order to transfer responsibilities from the Treasurer to the Minister of Revenue. These need not be discussed as they are mechanical, and as they simply allow what has heretofore been a small colony to achieve independent status as a Ministry in itself.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that if we look at the various changes which are proposed and set out for us in the résumé of the Budget, that in these six areas of taxation change there are some areas with which we definitely have issue.

The Treasurer has suggested that some \$180 million of new revenue was going to be achieved through the various taxation changes that he has brought to pass, an amount which the leader of the Opposition has referred to as equaling some \$100 per household in the coming year.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in these tax changes which are proposed we once again come up with the question of regressivity. In the approach that this government has had to those who wish to smoke or drink, to those who wish to go to an entertainment, or to a movie, to operate a boat or various other pleasures, this seems to me to smack of what the *Globe and Mail* referred to in its comments on the liquor changes as "brown paper baggery", and this is "brown paper baggery" at its worst.

I think that a government which increases its revenues in these areas only because the willing camel is able to bear slightly more of the load, is moving to cause tax changes which must be regressive in that sales taxes basically are regressive. As I have stated in the comments in the second reading of the previous bill with respect to tobacco tax, certainly this government has opted strongly in favour of taxation changes in sales tax as this amount of share in the revenue of the province increases from some 19 per cent to some 21 per cent.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that the decisions made to raise revenue from these areas are based solely on the desire for an increased amount of money. But they do hit in their approach at areas of relaxation and areas of leisure activity which I believe are regrettable.

In the approach to transient accommodation and in the approach to continuing the effect of the hospitals tax, I suggest Mr. Speaker, that the government is being unfor-

tunately influenced by the amount of revenue that they can get from this tax, rather than attempting to change some of the taxation approaches to encourage tourism or entertainment or the arts in one form or another.

By foregoing that amount of revenue, we could develop sufficient interest in various performing art functions, in the use of live musicians, in various types of entertainment, in the development of, to a point, a form of tax haven in this area. If this were done I suggest it would be a high-paying proposition because any revenue lost would be more than overcome by increased amounts which tourists would spend in our jurisdiction, and by increased amounts which would accrue to the provincial revenue because of the expenditures which they would make on items which we otherwise would have taxed.

Now, we have noted the rate differential in tax, we have noted the approach with respect to the increased exemption in the amount of meals to the value of \$2.50, and the leader of the Opposition has spoken on this item in his reply to the budget address which the hon. members heard on Monday.

There are, of course, certain areas in this bill and in the changes which it proposes that we find most unfortunate. They deal specifically with the decision to impose a tax upon production machinery.

It was interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, to note that there were those not only in this Legislature, but in the press, as they reported the terms of the Budget, who suggested that much of this added revenue was going to come from the pockets of the businessman.

I think that it is apparent to any of us who have looked into the economic results of this form of taxation that the changes that the corporations are going to have in the tax burden that they must assume are going to be passed on to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. Speaker, we note that these changes which had been proposed and which were in effect under the federal legislation, have been removed. When in the Budget papers the Treasurer refers to the removal of a substantial grey area of doubt on page 27 of his statement as we had it presented to us, I suggest that, in fact, there was no substantial grey area of doubt in this case.

Surely the matter is clear. If we are to impose taxation, we are only fooling ourselves if we presume that this form of tax increase is going to be otherwise dealt with, than to be passed on.

Business men have already written, I think, to many members of this House. I have re-

ceived certain letters from persons who have entered into contracts and who are attempting to compete in world markets in the production of various forms of equipment. The burden of these communications is that this form of tax is a most unfortunate one. It is one which goes, albeit to a small degree, to impinging upon what is otherwise our ability to compete in world markets.

Surely any form of taxation, any form of government intervention which unnecessarily complicates the selling potentialities that the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), has, is an unfortunate tax.

We can do much better than this, and this kind of an approach which will be passed on and is not coming out of any magical source of revenue is one which we will oppose.

Mr. Speaker, on the taxation changes that have been proposed, as we have said, there are many areas which are only mechanical, but the ones which are most important deal, I think, with the imposition of the transient tax and the continuation of the hospital tax, when we might do better by considering avoiding these taxes and receiving far greater sums through increased tourism; and in the second part by the imposition of these taxes on production machinery, which of course, will be passed on.

In the third area that we might refer to, of course, we have the imposition of these taxes on, again, the person of moderate means.

The legislation which has just received second reading takes some of the pleasure out of smoking. In this bill we deal with changes in amusement taxes and in admissions to the local theatre that will no doubt be changed. In these three areas, we believe that this government has unfortunately failed to come up with a proper approach to attempting to increase taxation without imposing an unfair burden on those persons who are least able to pay.

It is, of course, apparent that the most fair and equitable form of increased taxation can only result from some form of changes in income taxes, if these be required to raise increased revenue. To make the changes in the form of retail sales tax amendments, I suggest, is indefensible. The simple fact that it is an easy tax to change, and to take the simple approach that the willing horse will continue to bear the burden is not good enough. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we in the official Opposition will oppose this bill.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, in rising to join this debate, may I say that my remarks are

going to be long, involved, dull as you can possibly make them and difficult in places. If others feel that they wish to withdraw from this particular form of torture, please let them do so. I am in a forgiving spirit, but I intend to go into this rather thoroughly today. May I say, too—

Mr. Bullbrook: What constitutes a forum?

Mr. Lawlor: We have got a strong Liberal contingent. It is always nice to lecture to the Liberals.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, at the inception, let us get something straight between ourselves and the Minister of Revenue—for us who sat on that committee all summer. What we predicted would start has begun. The Minister now says: "You fellows went for it; either we did it in an enlightened way or I pulled the wool over your eyes. Or we had a stalking horse—camouflaging the thing—but we gave you the syrup, the bitter pill and we sugar-coated it." You can use all the phrases in the world, but I want it clearly understood *hic et nunc* that I do not feel in the least bound by any decision, recommendation, overall policy, conclusion, or any other thing that I took, or we did, last summer.

An hon. member: Do not compromise either.

Mr. Lawlor: As a member, in both capacities it seems rational and fair at this time of the day or night, that we would have reached those conclusions. That is, that both now and then seem rational. Then I shall abide by them and, as in the case of the tobacco tax, I shall throw some light and come down in that direction. On the other hand, if the decision appears to be questionable, I do not want to be held for the crimes of my lurid youth for the rest of my life. I may have had a moment of weakness last summer—a dizzy spell, stayed up too late the previous night with the Minister of Revenue. But now as I come to that precise issue, in the cold light of day, on further reflection and consideration, a new wisdom may have set in. Please do not toss in our teeth, time after time, the business that: "You agreed."

I do not care whether they did or not. I am not going to agree today, and may not agree tomorrow. It is not a question of any flippancy in this regard. I feel that it is obnoxious to have your freedom thus restricted. As a private member of this House, I served one function in the committee, to the overall benefit of the province, one would

trust. That was one function or capacity that was performed at one time. I suggest that I perform a different function or capacity, standing here this afternoon, particularly when most of the things before were never deeply discussed, much less agreed upon.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): The member is bifurcating himself.

Mr. Lawlor: We live half-lives, you know—even you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member must have a guilty conscience, because no one here seems to have brought up the matter.

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. Minister has been intimating and shuffling around over the issue for days, and he raised it this afternoon, right off the bat, the first time he got up in a major debate. Here he is with his lasso, that he is twisting around over his head, and we can see it coming—he is going to catch you in this noose. I am not going to be caught in the noose. I am sure my Liberal friends over there are not going to be caught in any of his nooses, either. He can do what he likes.

I was saying that this was particularly so when what we are being faced with here this afternoon in a number of these headings were not things we achieved in committee at all. It is action that ran directly counter to a good deal of the thinking in the committee and to our final proposals in that committee. Members who permit themselves a rather easy latitude as in the way they have gestated through the task force, the work of our committee in area after area.

Hon. Mr. White: It the hon. member will permit, I claim the same privilege that he has claimed.

Mr. Lawlor: I extend it to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. White: I am changing my mind, on second thought.

Mr. Lawlor: That is your third thought, in that case. This bill, which is a very intricate bill, has no one principle, Mr. Speaker. It has at least four separate and distinct principles under completely different heads of taxation, and the matter must be dealt with thus diversely. I have to address myself to the four heads, of course, the whole area of tangible personal property taxation, and in this area the Minister has produced—and this is one of the grave defects—he has gone overboard in the direction of double taxation in a number of areas.

If I may just illustrate that particular point—and the most overt example of it. It is written right in, sticking up like a sore thumb in the middle of the Act on one point here, but it goes further than that. The whole taxation of production machinery is a pyramiding tax. It is a tax which involves, maybe double—add it up—maybe by the time it turns over, it could go into more than double taxation. But in any event it goes into double taxation.

In section 5 paragraph 24, of his tax, the Minister says the purchase of tangible personal property to provide a taxable service is not exempt from the tax imposed by this Act, and then he goes on to say that no taxable service is exempt from tax imposed by this Act, by reason of the fact that the tangible personal property used in providing the taxable service is tangible personal property in respect of which a tax has been imposed.

There it is as clear as a bell. Usually he is a little better than that. Usually you can get it under wraps a little bit better, so that it is hard to see just where the double taxation feature comes into play. But this is almost scandalously venal in its frankness. In any case I pointed out to the Minister—I am most interested to see how he receives that—that particular point and the whole matter as to the position of double taxation.

The second field—and really there are four fields I am going to deal with—is the amusement tax that was called, by a misnomer, the hospital services tax which was imposed many years ago, I believe in 1948. It only lasted two years with respect to hospitals. After that time, they found that the tax did not even begin to meet the need. It was a drop in the bucket as far as hospitals were concerned. It went into general revenues and the hospitals had to be financed in a completely different way, but it would show the certain purblindness even in 1948, thinking they could use an amusement tax to finance hospital construction.

The second area has to do with transient accommodation, and the third area is production machinery. The final area is taxation on the purchase of beer, liquor and meals over the sum of \$2.50.

I would point out that this Act does give a very much broader definition, as perforce it must to be effective, of the term purchaser against The Retail Sales Tax Act. Also, I would have the legal members in the House peruse the definition of sale. It has a much

wider application, too, and I am just wondering if it is definite enough.

Taking the first point of reference, namely the amusement tax, there are a number of features about this tax that are bothersome to say the least. As everyone knows, or soon will know, this tax is a graduated one. It starts at 76 cents, and the six cents is against 76 cents. Then it goes up until it reaches 90 cents. There are four or five stages.

Over 92 cents it then goes to a ten per cent base, and you enter a differential field here. Smith did not recommend the differential. He thought the tax on amusements ought to be on the same level as the five per cent sales tax on all other sales. He could not see the reason for discriminating and placing a special imposition upon men's amusements, but I made remarks upon a Puritanical instinct which was quite evident in this Legislature at an earlier time today.

The graduated feature of the tax I suggest, ought to have been scrutinized more carefully and possibly altered. In other words, what has been done here was that instead of using a good deal of intelligence in revamping the old Hospital Tax Act, it has just been, by-and-large, taken over holus-bolus into the sales tax without too much aversion, not balancing out the various imperfections and possibilities of the previous statute, and perpetuating stupidities of various kinds. Since they were going to do a job on it, it might have been evened out and made sensible at that time.

As I say, most economists do take exception to the differential feature in the staging of the tax as it is being done here. I wonder, when the Minister comes to reply, what justification he felt there was for this particular move at this time, and under that heading, in order to anticipate his remarks, I would like to mention what Smith has to say on it, at 287:

In our view, the major objection to the present hospitals tax is that it is blatantly discriminatory. It discriminates broadly against one class of expenditures, a class that incorporates a large portion of those events that comprise the formal culture of our society. Indeed, the existing tax laws of the province are such that a strange anomaly results.

I would like the Minister to straighten me out if I am wrong. We have not had a great deal of time to spend working over this bill's niceties, so I could be off the rail here and there. But coming to these strange anomalies

of which he speaks and which we, I thought, were trying to rectify, my contention is that you are perpetuating the same anomalies under your revision here today.

Indeed, the existing tax laws of the province are such that strange anomalies result.

A book containing the libretto and score of an opera such as the *Barber of Seville*, can be purchased free of tax. A record of the same opera attracts the five per cent sales tax, but a live performance by a company such as the Met can be enjoyed only after paying the ten per cent hospitals tax. Video tapes of that performance could be broadcast and enjoyed in thousands of homes free of any tax.

Now they have altered that. They have not brought it before us yet, as far as I can see, but they are going to start the taxation of video tape.

But a movie of it, shown in a cinema would be taxable if the price of admission were more than 75c.

The present hospital tax is discriminatory in another sense. The wide range of exemptions create obvious inequities. Canadian theatrical or musical performances can be enjoyed without tax.

Again, you perpetuated that. You have written it out in identical wording into your Act, and that is all to the good.

I am not opposed to giving a preferential position to Canadian talent. Do not misunderstand me on that score.

Canadian theatrical performances can be enjoyed without tax, but not those of foreign artists unless the proceeds are used for charitable, religious or educational purposes.

A tax is paid to see daredevil car drivers unless their performance is part of a recognized grandstand show. Old "Satchmo" may blow his horn to an untaxed nightclub audience, but he may not sing. If he does sing, the first ten dollars the patrons spend will be taxed.

Hon. Mr. White: All of those anomalies are being eliminated.

Mr. Lawlor: I think not. In any case, some things are not being and I will come to them in a moment.

At "a concert performance, his audience is taxed whether he sings or not."

I think that is probably eliminated. I do not see it repeated.

The various degrees of professionalism of hockey teams may be explored to determine whether tax will be charged, or if it has been collected, whether it will be refunded. The whole business of amateurism, the protection of amateur theatre, amateur sport, etc., seems to me to be left in a most questionable condition under the new wording. Well, we will come to that in a minute when we come to that clause or the wording "or otherwise".

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: We will come to the text on it and thrash it out then.

A one dollar admission charge for an evening movie is taxable, a 75-cent matinee ticket for the same movie is not. They do not change that.

An hon. member: All of those arguments are—

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, administrative reasons is it now?

Although many of these inequities could be removed by a rationalization of the statute, we think that the exemptions testify to a realization of the unfairness of taxing certain forms of entertainment at the high rate of 10 per cent.

He goes on in his conclusion as indicated:

But we reject the notion that a special tax should be levied on certain forms of amusement and entertainment levied at a rate higher than is applicable to most consumer expenditures. The tax is unfair. The exempting of many events similar to those that are taxed makes it inexcusable. In our view expenditures made for amusement and entertainment should be taxed under the general sales tax like any other consumer expenditure.

It seems to me there is a great deal of validity in what the man says under that head.

May I take particular exception to a very specific point, Mr. Speaker. The Minister, under The Sales Tax Act, in swinging The Hospital Tax Act into that statute, has reserved to himself personally—and in effect this is what the score is—absolute discretionary powers of determining who falls in and who falls out of certain categories. This is applicable with respect to the performances under the amusement tax sections of this new bill, section 6. Actually it reads—and we

will come to the point we were discussing a moment ago—

—where special circumstances exist—

Whatever on earth that means—

—whether of a religious, charitable, or educational nature or otherwise, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may, upon the application of the vendor made to the Minister at least ten days before the tax would otherwise be paid, exempt the purchaser from the payment.

Let us take it in two steps. The first step that I am concerned with just for a moment is who the government may exempt through the discretion of the Lieutenant-Governor. A lawyer reading this will say that "or otherwise" is *ejusdem generis*; it is in the same category, the same sort of thing.

I am suggesting that that would not give them power to go out and exempt amateur events of various kinds. Nor as far as I can see is there any other section that gives you that permission. Certainly not as encapsulated into the new Bill and carried over from the old. They must be doing that under "or otherwise" business and I question sincerely their right to do so, as it is neither a religious, charitable nor educational enterprise.

Maybe they could put the odd one under the educational head, but then again I suspect that many of the theatricals being put on these days could scarcely be defined as educational except in an indirect and obverse sense.

The second point about their discretion is that when they come down to refunding, in subsection 3 of the reimbursement provisions, and in subsection 4, where he, as the Minister, solely and entirely—no Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council any longer—has absolute discretionary powers to exempt under that section.

I suppose, government has to be run one way or another, but it seems to me that the range of clunking down hard runs against the concepts of democracy, the concepts of McRuer that the Minister ought to be subject to an appeal of some sort from the Minister; at least be given a hearing, an argumentation, as to the validity of it one way or the other. But he does this in the secrecy of his own heart and that is a rather arbitrary way and though Smith takes no exception to it, as such, I feel that we, as members of the Legislature, not only should point it out but perhaps spend a few moments, as I have, railing against it.

I would like to, in some extent, on this issue mention that I do not think the range of exemptions has been obviated at all. It bears out this discretionary point. At 282, Smith says:

The taxes payable on the price of admission to such amusements as cinemas, theatres, sporting events, and concerts, a number of exemptions limit the generality of the tax. Events sponsored by a wide range of religious, educational, charitable, or community organizations.

I do not know how he managed to work that "or community organizations" in there—

—may be attended free of tax as may amateur athletic events and exhibitions and grandstand performances presented by such organizations as the Central Canada Exhibition Association, the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair Association, and the Canadian National Exhibition.

Whether a particular event qualifies for exemption is left to the Treasurer's absolute discretion.

Similarly, a theatrical or musical performance in a place of amusement may be exempt if the performers and the managers are Canadian. In this connection it has become departmental practice to exempt performances by Canadian companies even if foreign guest performers take part.

I would like to know what has been done under the present situation to rectify the more invidious features of these exemptions, and whether the Minister does not feel that the kind of discretion that is being imposed on his shoulders on this occasion is, perhaps, too onerous for him to bear, if not diametrically opposed to the civilized institutions we support.

That, basically, is my presentation so far as the amusement tax is concerned. On the whole I feel that Smith is perfectly right, that the differential feature is questionable, simply as a differential feature, and that, as he recommends, The Hospital Tax Act be repealed and all expenditures for amusements and entertainment be taxable under the sales tax, with all kinds of moves to eliminate these anomalies and discrepancies that have been pointed out here in the last few minutes.

As to transient accommodation, it is one of the areas under the sales tax that we discussed and that offers the opportunity to the government to move in on services. The selection of this particular head is curious when

one can think of any number of others that have not been touched upon at all.

In other words, I, of course, have given some thought to the sales tax touching the service called advertising and the business of some form of tax in the service of real estate brokers; that of the stock exchange people. But transient accommodation—the motels and hotels who allow people to stay, having more than four people staying there for a period of less than a month—has been singled out for special treatment, and the rest ignored.

Of course, they were not nearly as powerful a lobby before us at the time. I will never forget the impact made by the stock exchange people. They did not have any contrary delegation, of course, to oppose their designs. For the moment I think I have said enough about this. I think we should turn our attention in due course to that field and have a thorough investigation made.

I notice that New York, since that time, has imposed a tax in face of all their blandishments and threats to move it off to New Jersey.

But to return to the point. The transient accommodation does have—as my hon. friend from Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) has indicated—adverse effects upon the tourist industry. I wonder if the dollars flowing to this province through tourists would not well repay the abnegation and elimination of this particular tax. It is an irritant, and for all the benefits you are going to derive from it I suspect that that tax, too, should be severely stunting.

Now to come to the big head of the day—production machinery. Mr. Speaker, I intend to use four authorities. These are, perhaps, the most formidable mustering of authorities and I am not going to apologize for taking the time of the House because this is the crucial nub of this bill. Whatever else one can bow one's head before, on administrative grounds or otherwise, production machinery is going to take a great deal of explaining from the Minister. The authorities I wish to use are Smith, Kenyon Poole, Carter, and John Due—Due being the international and recognized authority on this subject. That being the case, I suppose I may as well get started.

The imposition is made in section 5, paragraph 8. No mention, of course, is made of production machinery; it simply deletes the provisions of the present Retail Sales Tax Act and amendments thereto and brings production machinery under the base.

To be fair to the Minister, I think one thing should be clearly understood by this

House before getting into the niceties of this thing. This is that while there is no question in the world that to tax production goods, the whole range of production goods, would be a most regressive, invidious, and backward move in tax policy, there may be some simulacrum of sense in taxing that one area of production goods called production machinery, equipment and parts. That is a very narrow field where I suppose some argument is that the cascading effect is perhaps not as great.

Certainly I would think that the Minister would agree after our deliberations. I mean there are certain things we can all accept in common, I would trust, and the universal feeling under this head is that the taxation of production goods is insensible, retrogressive and regressive of the interests of the economy. I would trust that the Minister would have no visions of moving into that particular area.

Smith says at 227 that he thoroughly opposes, as do all the major economists. True, to some extent he mixes up production goods with production machinery and seems to address the same remarks to both, but then he also segregates. He talks about it specifically in paragraph 67. He talks pretty generally in paragraph 66. He says:

It is not administratively practical, however, to make the exemption of intermediate or producers' goods complete. Ontario exempts all goods that become physical ingredients or proponent parts of finished retail goods.

In addition, all machinery directly used in production is presently exempt. But items sold to producers that do not become embodied in the final product, such as office equipment, motor vehicles, building materials, and some non-production machinery, are taxable.

It has been suggested that perhaps one-fifth of the sales tax revenue comes from the sale of such non-exempt goods to producers. In principle, all goods purchased by business firms should be treated uniformly.

May I pause at this point, Mr. Speaker. You see, the task of the committee was that Ontario, under its sales tax, specifically sets out that production machinery and equipment would not be taxed. The reverend Treasurer, by a little niggling here and there, has gradually been taxing more and more of things which are generally considered in the industry as production machinery and

production equipment, and there have been quarrels with the manufacturers' association.

So the thing has resided in the high and lonely discretion of the Treasurer up to this time, and now flees to another head, which I do not think is any more sensible or discerning. The Treasurer has encroached and overlapped with the federal people in this field and brought some things under taxation which he ought not to have done—I mean by any rational discernment—and exempted other things which he ought not.

This is invidious to industry because it places different competitors or competitors within the same industry, often in variance with one another, in an unfair competitive position. Its impact on the international economy is similarly disastrous so far as marketing goods and in knowing what equipment machinery is subject to tax, and to add other duties, and the range of those taxes.

So there are complications at the national, at the provincial, and at the international level which are involved. But it goes beyond that.

The Treasurer has an Act, he has certain contour lines laid down. He ignores or avoids the application of those contour lines within his own Act so he trespasses over them to other territories, which leaves business in a state of indetermination as to what tax they pay and which one they do not, and all the administrative nonsense that arises out of that.

So he said let us bring ourselves under the tutelage of big brother. The federal government has an excise Act, a sales tax Act. Let us bring ourselves in this regard into conformity with them so that business enterprises will at least know with some degree of forecasting and determination what kind of equipment is going to be taxed when they buy it in the production process.

Did we do that under this bill? No, we did not. We went off on another tangent. We are now ignoring the federal situation competely, deciding that the the problem is such an irritating issue in trying to ferret out and set aside and allocate which one is which and which is taxable and which is not.

In a brusque gesture of contempt one evening the Minister of Revenue, looking over his shoulder at the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), said, "Let's throw the gauntlet at them. Let's cover the field. Bring them all under the tax and then we will not have any further trouble." Except that the dislocation, as far as

the federal government is concerned, remains as bad or worse.

There is no accommodation between the two parties at all. The business community, I guess, not left too much in the dark at the provincial end; they just have to pay the tax. But they have to have their accountants determine for them whether or not the tax is payable at the federal level over against the provincial. And while it may remove some area of doubt, at the same time it is not the source of rational and discriminatory judgment that we sought to make in committee.

Having said that the Act itself, the principle, whatever the dislocations administratively speaking are, the thing at its heart is bad. It is said to be bad by everybody who has anything to do with it and not least by Smith. So I return to the text:

In principle, all goods purchased by business firms should be treated uniformly. The provision of office equipment, motor vehicles and building materials affects the cost, and consequently the retail price of goods sold by manufacturers, just as much as did the direct costs of raw material and production machinery. The major difficulty in providing complete exemption from producers' goods is administrative complexity.

In particular, many currently taxed producer goods are sold at retail to consumers as well as to producers. There would, therefore, be great difficulty in distinguishing purchases made by manufacturers for production and those made for personal use. Effective enforcement would involve high administrative costs.

The result, however, is, that in addition to the pyramiding effect of the tax on the non-exempt portion of the cost of production, there is a doubling of tax upon the sale of the product to the extent that taxes again collected on the portion of the price equal to such previously taxed cost.

And then he goes on:

In addition to Ontario, the province of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island exempt production machinery generally. Quebec provides a partial exemption.

I must confess that, if you have looked through John Due's book on sales tax, and seen what Quebec has done under the heading, you cannot help dismiss the taxation of production as being a most self-defeating ordinance.

Quebec provided a partial exemption and Newfoundland, Saskatchewan and British

Columbia provide no exemptions. The Ontario provisions exempt:

Machinery and apparatus and parts thereof as defined by the Treasurer that, in his opinion, are to be used by the purchaser thereof directly in the process of manufacture or production of tangible personal property for sale or use.

What an omniscient man we have in our Treasurer, and now in our Minister of Revenue, that with all the intricacies of production apparatus he can tell, with the finesse and nicety not given to entrepreneurs themselves who know the industry, where the weight falls, to tax or not to tax.

Retail sales tax regulation No. 22 also defines machinery and apparatus and parts thereof as those that come in direct contact in the manufacture and production of tangible personal property for sale, but not including certain general classifications listed in the regulation. Numerous rulings and arbitrary decisions are required to be made as to taxability as there are many purchasers that do not easily fit into the listed categories.

The tendency is in those fringe areas to tax rather than to exempt. We think that the definition should be expanded so that at least the following classifications of machinery and apparatus and the parts thereof are exempt: Laboratory testing equipment, machine shop equipment, machinery repair and maintenance equipment, handling equipment for use during production process, and small tools supplied employees without charge for use in production.

It goes on in that vein.

One could go on for quite a bit more with Smith in this particular heading, but even following his recommendations in this regard as to what ought to be taxed, certainly certain exemptions should have been considered but, because of the economic consequences which are well known to the Minister of not so exempting the impact will fall on the consumer. It will mean again the old business that has been discussed time after time here, that the tax on the machine will be added into the cost of production. Then it will be rounded to the next dollar so that there will be an increase in that, with its inflationary impact. It's self-defeating in its whole economic consequence. To thump this point home, let me quote from a man who was hired as an economic consultant by the Smith committee, and by whom a number of brochures have been produced, a Mr. Kenyon E.

Poole. Kenyon Poole's tract on a sales tax study is an excellent piece of work that the man has done. It thoroughly damns what the Minister is doing, even in the restricted area that I mention.

Hon. Mr. White: Just one man's opinion!

Mr. Lawlor: I will read it for for the Minister so that he can size it up this afternoon and know just how iniquitous he is being in imposing this tax.

The Ontario Retail Sales Tax provides that tangible personal property purchased for the purpose of being processed, manufactured in, fabricated into, attached to or incorporated into tangible personal property for sale is exempt from tax. The Ontario provision on direct use follows that of the federal government in some indirect use; but as to what, in fact, is direct use it certainly does not. The Ontario provision, since the tax, is defined as applying to tangible personal property; sales of real estate are excluded from the tax. Materials consumed are extended directly in the process of manufacture; production of tangible personal property for sale is exempt from tax; moreover, machinery and apparatus used directly in the manufacture of tangible personal property for sale are exempt. In general, provisions restricting exemptions of producer goods to direct-use-physical-ingredient and the like weaken the logic of excluding producer goods from the tax. The only argument in favour of taxing producer goods is the need for revenue, without regard to equity or to the economic consequences.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): That is the argument they are using.

Mr. Lawlor: May I just repeat that? Those words should be emblazoned across your brow, sir.

The only argument in favour of taxing producer goods is the need for revenue.

The government has just proven to us, here the other day, with their ostentatious and sometimes questionable cut-backs — largely questionable in fields of service to the people of this province—that revenue is not their chief consideration in this regard.

What on earth the chief consideration is escapes me, but if it is not revenue then the only argument in favour of taxing producer goods is the need for revenue without regard to equity or to economic consequences. It would be preferable to get the revenue from

a higher state of tax on final goods, or by limiting exemptions that make little or no sense.

I am trying to not be the devil's advocate, but a fair lawyer before the courts. It is always wiser to crow if there happens to be on the same page an argument in favour of someone else just to mention it in passing. He goes on to say here:

However, an important justification for including some producer goods may be found, as it has in Ontario, in the compliance and administrative problems involved in excluding.

So much for the moment from Kenyon Poole. At the end of his book he is beginning to sum up his recommendations and on page 97 he says:

An implication of the otherwise very discernible procedure integrating the federal and provincial sales taxes.

That is what I thought we are trying to do, and which is a commendable thing to seek to do. An integration process would to a considerable extent eliminate staff and administrative difficulties, and save the people of this province a good deal of money in the process. He goes on:

By the same token taxability, where exemption or exclusions ought to be granted, would likewise create curious distortions under a federal-provincially aligned sales tax system. Great care would thus have to be taken to eliminate producers from the sales tax where the personal property involved is a physical ingredient, merely a catalyst, directly used in production, or machinery not directly used. Not only does violation of this principle create haphazard tax shifting and incidence, thus creating distortions of resource use domestically, but it also raises total production cost with adverse effect on the nation's balance of trade position. The ideal policy with respect to exemptions may be expressed as follows:

Every effort should be made to maximize the scope of exclusion of producer goods from tax, while exemptions of tangible consumer goods and services should be handled to a minimum. Most of Ontario's present exemptions, except for food, accomplish little by way of contributing to equity among income groups, and are hardly worth the administrative costs they entail. However, the food and children's clothing exemptions are, as they stand, that

gratuitous boon to thousands of families who are quite able to pay the tax.

So much for Poole under this particular head.

Carter says, in the 5th volume of the Royal Commission on Taxation, page 69, and again, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for reading at this length.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Is the member going to end up rescuing the government again?

Mr. Lawlor: I assure the member that will not be so.

Mr. Sopha: There are quite a number of us waiting.

Mr. Lawlor: How could the member ask that, Mr. Speaker? Here I am, inveighing against this distorting tax—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Carter says:

When taxes are levied on producer goods—that is goods used in the production and distribution of consumer goods and service—the effective tax burden is borne between different goods and services, because the relative importance of the tax on producer goods in final selling prices is not constant. Taxing producer goods will, if the tax is passed on, result in higher consumer prices, reduce the sales of goods and services provided by capital-intensive methods relative to the sale of goods and services produced by labour-intensive matters. If the tax on producer goods is not passed on in higher consumer prices, the expected rate of return on capital-intensive projects will be reduced. In either case, the value of Canada's future output is likely to be reduced.

On the other hand, and here the Minister of Trade and Development is always talking about our great trade potential, the Minister of Revenue is working directly contrary to the best interests of the other Minister. I think it is detrimental enough to the best interests; you do not have to add to the load. This is what has happened here. In either case, the value of Canada's future output is likely to be reduced.

On the other hand, the exemption of producer goods raises difficulties. In those cases where such goods can be either consumed directly by individuals, or used to produce other goods and services, he gives us a range of three different kinds of goods, and splits them up and gives his various reactions

to each of them in turn. I was going to go through it in detail but decided I will not. The overall effect is, in part, a rejecting and jettisoning of this sort of tax. I will just read the final paragraph on the next couple of pages.

Finally, even if it were administratively feasible, it is argued that the wide exemption of producer capital goods would mean a narrowing of the tax base and therefore a substantial loss of revenue. However, we consider that an increase in the tax rate on consumer goods, either with or without the widening of the base, for consumer taxation, would be preferable to the general taxation of producer capital goods. Furthermore, such an increase would be partially offset by the removal of tax on tax effects. Exempting producer capital goods would make it possible to attain a greater uniformity of tax burden on consumers, or to achieve any desired departure from that uniformity with a greater precision. To reduce the hidden tax element on imports and import-competing goods, and to reduce or eliminate the distorting effect on the choice of production methods, we therefore recommend that the exemption of all production machinery and apparatus should be restored immediately.

I would have thought that that was pretty conclusive. I shall wind up this piece of rodomontade today by quoting from John F. Due, "Provincial Sales Taxes", the book that everyone quoted from in this particular regard. Objections to taxing other producer goods, on page 82 of his book issued by the Canadian Tax Foundation:

There are several objections to the taxing of these producer goods. Since their costs enter into the costs of the finished products, they are to a certain extent being subjected to multiple taxation, in the same manner as they would if ingredients were taxed. The basic reason for freeing materials from tax is the fact that their cost enters into the cost of the finished product. And the same justification for exempting them applies to other producer goods as well. Failure to exempt these goods causes the same type of pyramiding as is encountered with manufacturers' sales tax. A tax upon industrial and farm equipment is an artificial penalty upon replacement of old equipment and upon modernization and business expansion. It places a discriminatory burden on the firms in the province, in competition with firms in provinces such as Ontario.

He is speaking of the Quebec situation.

—which provides exemption of various producer goods. The position of Canadian exporters relative to those of other countries is weakened. Some firms can shift the tax more easily than others, and it thus, in part, rests in an inequitable burden on the onus of the firms.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the various arguments that I would bring forward in order to seek to persuade the government not to engage in this fallacy; not to go forward with the tax which, in the best and most authoritative opinion that we can muster, is retrogressive. It is not so much retrogressive, it is just stupid over against what has been said. We never did discuss it, as I say, in committee, so we cannot be hung up on prior commitments. On the other hand, it quite escapes me why the government would feel it wise or even feasible to launch into this particular area.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak against Bill 79 I would like to discuss two areas. One is to throw additional information upon the instance of the sales tax and its regressive nature. For this, I would like to refer to the Royal Commission on Taxation, volume II, page 246. This is the Carter report, sir; this is table 6-2, effective tax rates for the total tax structure for 1961.

It can be argued of course, as the Minister knows, that 1961 is almost nine years past, and therefore the statistics might not be too relevant. But I suggest that until new statistics become available we must work on the basis of these 1961 figures.

Second, the relative comparison of the figures, I think, will probably stand up over quite a long time. If one looks at the provincial and local tax section of this table, labelled sales and excises, one finds the following instance of that type of taxation. One finds that people in the under-\$2,000 income category paid 8.2 per cent of their income into sales and excise taxes at the provincial levels across Canada. For the income group \$2,000 to \$2,999, the instance is 4.5 per cent. For the income group \$3,000 to \$3,999, the instance is 4.6 per cent. For the family income class \$4,000 to \$4,999, the instance is 4.3. For \$5,000 to \$6,999, it is 4.7. For \$7,000 to \$9,999, it is 4.5. For \$10,000 and over it is three per cent.

The argument is a very simple one, and that is that the incidence of taxation via the sales and excise tax at the provincial level in Canada is not equitable; it is not a fair tax.

For example, one finds, at the extreme, the under-\$2,000 family income category pays over eight per cent of their income in this type of tax, whereas the \$10,000 and over group pays only three per cent. That is what Carter means by a regressive type of tax.

The Minister notes that these are 1961 figures. I would remind him that the Ontario retail sales tax was announced by the Treasurer in his budget statement of March 9, 1961, and was enacted, with some amendments, to become effective on September 1 of that year. What this means is that in 1961 in these figures, the Ontario contribution to a national regressive sales tax at the provincial level was not fully felt. I therefore argue, on the Minister's own terms, that the increase in regressiveness of the taxation system of Ontario would make Ontario's relative position today worse, in terms of the regressivity of that tax, than it was in 1961.

I think this should be underlined repeatedly by members of my party and by members of the New Democratic Party when we discuss increasing various types of sales taxes.

There is another general issue, and it is found on pages 33 and 34 of Kenyon Poole's study, entitled *The Retail Sales Tax, an Economic Study*, prepared for the Ontario committee on taxation, which the Minister is very much aware. To underline again this point of regressivity as one increases these taxes, even though one attempts to reduce them somewhat in the differential sales tax mechanism, I think what Poole says is significant in this debate. He says this:

It is useful to call attention to the implications on the effect of the tax on the distribution of income on the direction in which shifting of the tax occurs. It could be imagined that regardless of how the tax is shifted the after tax distribution of income remains about the same.

In other words, the distribution of income of consumers might prove to be not greatly different from that of the productive agent. The fact that the bulk of consumers are also workers lends support to this view.

What Poole is concerned with is what is called technically the question of backward or forward shifting of the sales taxes. But Poole goes on to say:

Nevertheless three important points make this a somewhat too easy solution.

What he means by this is that to assume that the after-tax distribution of income is not very much different, if at all different from

the distribution of income before the new taxes are imposed, must be modified. He says this:

First, to the extent that profit receivers and bond-holders are in the upper bracket and wage earners are in the lower, the distribution of backward shifting is important for after-tax distribution of income.

Second, wealth-owners living off their capital are unaffected by backward shifting.

Third, frictional unemployment attributable to reduced output in the taxed industries effects the wage-earner more than it does the salary worker or management.

What Poole is concerned with is—and he goes on, later on on page 34, to explain this in greater detail—that while the intention of an increase in the sales tax is to tax consumers of the commodities, what can happen in fact, depending on general economic conditions and the state of the particular industries, is that the tax is shifted backwards to the productive factories.

Now I would like the Minister to spend some time in his reply to the Opposition's comments telling us whether or not he thinks the increases in the various sales taxes will result in backward or forward shifting, and if he has any idea of what the consequences would be. I suggest it is very important to have some idea of whether the shifting will be backwards or forwards. If it goes backwards, sir, then the redistribution of income is away from the lower and middle income group and in favour of those who are profit receivers, bond holders and high management people.

I think he should try to explain to us something about the incidence of the shifting as a consequence of increases in retail sales taxes.

The second aspect of Bill 79 which I would like to argue against, sir, is the application of the retail sales tax on production machinery. For this I would like to refer to general theory and also to a specific manufacturer in Ontario. Carter, that is the Royal Commission on Taxation, volume five, on page 80, notes as follows in his discussion of producer goods:

With the exception of certain kinds of goods [which he elaborates], all raw materials, partly manufactured goods, machinery equipment, apparatus parts and supplies should be exempt from tax when purchased for the production of taxable goods and services, or for the production of goods and services exclusively exempt from sales tax.

So Carter again comes down very strongly against this type of tax and particularly, I believe, on this tax as applied to production machinery.

As the Minister knows, in Appendix E of that volume, Carter divides what he calls producer goods into three broad categories. One of those categories, his second category, is producer capital goods used in manufacture or production but not in distribution. Again Carter recommends the exemption of these production goods. By the way, Mr. Speaker, this recommendation is developed for taxes at all levels.

We find Carter justifying his conclusion on page 189 of this volume in which he refers to:

The taxation of category two, production goods, does entail significant tax on tax in consideration of international competition.

So Carter is concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the problem of forward shifting of the tax on production machinery and also the question of the competitive position of the industries which are affected by this tax. And these industries tend to be, of course, those which are capital-intensive rather than labour-intensive.

Finally, quoting from Carter on page 190:

It has been said that the taxing of production machinery and apparatus impairs our international competitive potential and has a disincentive effect on the expansion, mechanization and modernization of production facilities.

Carter on that page, the Minister knows, goes into further detail in supporting that contention.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will perhaps heed some of the theoretical arguments which Carter places in his way on this particular issue.

As the Minister also knows, in Poole's study again, near the beginning, page two, the author comes out very strongly for the same position as Carter. And again, Poole comes out on the two levels, Mr. Speaker. He comes out against this type of tax on capital-intensive goods, to use the formal terminology:

On the grounds that it is both inequitable and inefficient and leads to pyramiding of the tax.

I will not go through that quotation any further, the Minister knows where it is on page two.

The theory then, Mr. Speaker, is, I think, important because unless the Minister can

refute the premises of the theory against the tax on investment goods and on production goods, then I think the premise of his tax, the basic premise of his tax, must remain questionable.

The issue is a simple one. Economic theory holds that if you want to increase the productive capacity of your economy you should give incentives for the accumulation of real capital, because that is what produces goods and services. Or as some economists talk about it, sir, it is called reproducing capital. For a government to tax this type of reproducing capital is to fly in the face, I believe, of the principle of equity, because of the possible backward shifting; and to impair the ability of other industries to compete on an international basis, because of the forward shifting.

Perhaps the Minister could follow this argument with me. It seems that some people would like to argue that a tax on producer goods, capital goods, is bad because it results in a redistribution of income away from lower income groups. In other words, the tax is passed on either to people who are wage earners or to people as consumers. Yet at the same time they refer to the inability of these industries to compete internationally because they have to raise their prices to pass on the tax.

What bothered me, on theoretical grounds at least, is that the people who make that argument cannot have it both ways. In other words, if a manufacturer is afraid of his international position then he perhaps has to keep his prices lower to compete and thereby absorb the tax to some extent himself rather than trying to pass it on to the consumer, because the consumer will shift from his goods to the goods of some other producer.

But I suspect it is possible to argue both ways at once in this if you analyze the effect of this tax on an industry by industry basis in Canada and Ontario.

In other words in some industries, perhaps those which are in a more monopolistic position in the Ontario economy, will be able to shift the tax forward or shift it backward, leaving their profits at the same level or close to the same level. But if that industry in Ontario is in a highly competitive position on an international scale, in other words there are imports of similar goods from the U.S. which are not subject to this type of tax and which for other reasons might have lower cost of production, things are different. So I think what the Minister would have to examine are those industries for which the in-

crease in the sales taxes for which he has been primarily responsible are, I believe, inequitable; and in other areas where the result is that certain industries are less able to cope with international competition.

In this last regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a letter to my colleague, the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman), from the president and general manager of Auto Specialties Manufacturing Company (Canada) Limited in Windsor. I think this is a very good letter. It is very closely argued and I would like to give the Minister the advantage of hearing the brief that was attached to the letter and addressed to the "Honourable Charles MacNaughton". It is dated March 5, 1969. I think this letter should be in the records of this Legislature. The letter is from D. S. Wood, the executive vice-president and manager of the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association of Canada. The letter reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

In the papers accompanying the 1969 province of Ontario Budget, in the section headed foreign demand, you make the statement that "One of the major sources of growth in the provincial economy in 1958 was foreign demand for Ontario-manufactured goods and natural resources. The main customer for our products is the United States . . ."

Automotive exports continued to be the mainstay, registering an increase of 50 per cent during 1968. The continued export growth of Ontario motor vehicles and parts has resulted in a dramatic shift in the structure of Canadian exports. Motor vehicles and parts have become the largest single export commodity, surpassing both wheat and pulp and paper.

To continue—

Mr. Deans (Wentworth): For whose benefit is the member reading it?

Mr. T. Reid: The Speaker's benefit.

Mr. Deans: What is the purpose? He has a copy, too.

Mr. T. Reid: These two quotations, Mr. Speaker, are from the hon. Treasurer's Budget statement. The letter continues as follows; the person who wrote the letter is Mr. Wood:

The sales tax that you announced in your 1969 Budget speech is to be applied on April 1 to the tools of production and this jeopardizes this export growth. The automotive parts manufacturing industry must sell in the highly competitive United States

market. We must meet United States' prices for our products. A sales tax on production equipment is accepted by all economists as an inhibiting factor; it inhibits growth, it inhibits necessary renovation. Both growth and renovation are necessary in the automotive parts manufacturing industry if only to keep pace with our United States competitors. It therefore inhibits our opportunity to make employment.

Mr. Wood continues:

You state that the tax on production machinery and equipment will raise additional revenue of some \$38 million and add: We feel that the withdrawal of this exemption will remove a substantial grey area of doubt and the administrative inconvenience both to the government and the private sector.

Mr. Wood continues his comments:

\$38 million is a high price to pay for removing a grey area which indeed was easily removable by simply adopting the federal government's administrative procedures that have been tried and proven over the years. It is a price that will probably be more than counterbalanced by the loss in corporation taxes which would otherwise accrue from a healthy and competitive industry. In short, it will create revenue on the one hand that will be more than removed by the other. It does not make economic sense. Our industry is deeply concerned about this provincial government move into a tax field only recently vacated by the federal government; vacated because it was proven to be uneconomic and inhibitive. We are concerned for many of our parts manufacturers who are heavily committed to capital expenditures for equipment which will not arrive until after April 1. As we are a major part of the automotive industry which is undoubtedly most directly involved in the effect of this tax, we have been asked by our members to arrange an interview with you.

What my colleague, the member for Kitchener, said about the tourist industry I think is true also in a number of other industries, although perhaps to a lesser extent—that the loss in revenue to this government or governments generally on a lower rate of growth in this very vital sector will cut into the increased revenue resulting from the new tax. And if you really netted it out you would probably find that one should subtract from the \$38 million a figure that might amount to a loss in corporation tax revenue of anywhere

up to \$15 or \$18 million. So the true net effect of the imposition of this tax on those firms which will be affected in terms of international competition, could well result in a realistic increase of something much less than \$38 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by repeating that I hope the Minister will be able to quote economists, as opposed to taxation experts, in support of the tax on production machinery. In theory it is wrong. If he is concerned with economic growth, a lower rate of inflation, a higher rate of employment, in this province, it is wrong to put a tax on investment goods on production machinery. That can only result in a lower rate of growth than would otherwise be the case and I suggest that this will affect the government's revenue adversely as a consequence.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this go by without passing a few remarks concerning the principles that are embodied therein.

One matter that is of concern to me that has not been raised by any of the previous speakers is the matter of the consolidation of The Hospitals Tax Act within the embodiment of the retail sales tax. I am afraid there might be some grey areas as a result of this consolidation that possibly the hon. Minister might clarify for the edification of the House and the people of the province.

I refer specifically to the principles as embodied in section 1 of the Act concerning admission, that is, entry, into places of amusements and the subsection 7(a) definition of places of amusement. I do recall the hon. Minister's indication that certain exemptions were available.

In looking at subsection (a) this includes a phrase that an athletic contest or other performance is stated or held and an admission is charged, and the tax might apply thereon. I relate this particular principle to a number of areas of public or private amusement or recreation. It is this definition that I would like to speak on and possibly have clarified by the hon. Minister in his winding-up comments. I could relate this specifically to the game of golf. Is a golf course, as such, a place of amusement or is it a recreational activity?

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): A place where they seek skill but never find it.

Mr. Paterson: Is it an athletic endeavour which is embodied in the Act?

Mr. Ben: No, it is a frustration.

Mr. Paterson: Is it a performance or an exhibition? One would suppose it would depend on who is playing and with whom he is playing.

I did have the presence of mind to submit a note to the hon. Minister to try and seek a clarification on this matter.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The Minister shoots in the low 200's.

Mr. Paterson: He did indicate to me that an annual membership in a club for recreational activity was not taxable and that he would seek further clarification as to whether daily rates paid by, I assume, the great masses of our population were taxable or not. I trust that I will receive this information.

This same principle I am trying to enunciate could apply to any number of recreational or amusement-type activities in our province. I trust that the Minister can comment on this particular matter.

The second area of concern to me is the principle of imposing the five per cent tax on transient accommodation. This tax, along with the amusement tax, increased liquor and the removal of the gas tax exemption for pleasure craft, is seriously going to affect our tourist industry in this province. It is going to affect not only the tourist industry but the convention industry on which many of our larger hotels rely.

I think, as a result of this, it is going to be passed back to municipalities from those who attend these conventions and ultimately the taxpayer to a nominal degree. There is the factor of travelling salesmen, representatives of companies paying this tax; this cost will go into the basic selling cost of wholesalers and manufacturers, and ultimately this will no doubt reflect at the consumer level.

I think, due to the seasonal nature of our tourist industry as such, that room accommodation already is slightly higher in our province than in many areas to the south of us due to the nature of our climate and so forth. This additional burden of taxation may diminish the returns to our province.

I might also seek a clarification from the Minister on the principle of taxing meals at \$2.50. I would assume that if one person picks up the tab for five \$1 meals this would apply on the total amount. Thus the little man is not really exempt, as was suggested the other day.

Hon. Mr. White: No. If it is on one check, it is taxable.

Mr. Paterson: The strange part to me is all these factors, especially those included in this particular Bill, have been initiated by the Treasury Board on which the Minister of Tourism, no doubt, plays a very prominent role. I feel that in due course he is going to come under very severe criticism for his activities and the imposition of these further costs and detriments to our tourist industry.

Possibly the major area of concern, which not only affects many people in my riding but the whole province, is that of the imposition of tax on production machinery. Possibly at this initial stage we could look on it only as a tax on industry itself. This again is going to be a built-in cost at the very basic level of our economy, and it will no doubt soon be reflected in higher prices to our citizens and eventually lessen the competitive nature of the industry in world markets. I would hope it would not but it possibly could lead to layoffs in many of our industries.

It is these three basic matters that are of concern to myself and my colleagues and I, too, will not vote for this bill.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a few comments toward this Bill 79. I am one of whom the Minister of Revenue cannot say that I have gone along with any tax increase he has given. Until this government has shown me ways in which they have tried to cut down their administrative expense, I will oppose any tax increase which they try to bring in.

First of all, I would like to look at this matter of the five per cent tax on production machinery. It just does not make common sense.

A year ago I spoke on the sales tax to adjuncts to machinery. Now they have added insult to injury and have imposed or are trying to impose, a five per cent sales tax on all production machinery. If the Minister took a moment to consult the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), down here under the press gallery, he would not think of putting tax on the production machinery on a farm. He would not tax the sow before she had her litter of pigs, or the ewe before she dropped her lamb; but the profit as a result from this is what you should be looking at for tax.

The same thing applies in production machinery. You are going to drive people out of business. This is definitely going to be an inhibiting factor, both for the expansion of industry and for bringing in new industry. Anyone using a little bit of basic common sense could see this. Right away you look at

the short term effects of it. In effect, you are going to maim or kill the goose that has been laying the golden egg.

Specially, I would like to speak about the brief which you received from the automotive parts manufacturers. They have pointed out here that they are the largest single producers of export trade of secondary manufactured goods. Since the Canadian-U.S. auto pact has come into being they have created 15,000 new jobs in the province of Ontario; so much so that in my own locality, four out of seven working people are employed in some section of the automotive industry.

We have companies in our area which were relatively small before they got into the position where they could compete with U.S. companies for the production of auto parts. Now we have our tire factories—Uniroyal, Goodrich, General Spring, DERNERS, BOWERS—all competing with U.S. firms on a production basis and producing enough—let me cite as an example—padded dashes in the city of Kitchener—to supply three times the number of cars manufactured in all of Canada. Where are they going? They are going to the United States.

These people cannot properly compete with U.S. markets if the Minister is going to hamper them with additional taxes on their production equipment. It does not make sense.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): What about the ten per cent federal tax?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They took it off. You are away behind; you were back in woods for a couple of years.

Mr. Good: Exporting is one of the things that we in Ontario have been able to build up over the past number of years. In Ontario since the establishment of the Canada-U.S. auto trade pact, it has been estimated that over 200 plants and expansions have been built and that this has resulted in \$450 million worth of capitalization and \$15,000 new jobs. Now you are willing to jeopardize this continued expansion to get your five per cent sales tax on production machinery. I am not a political economist but to me, using plain common sense, it just does not add up.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support further the remarks of the member who has just spoken. It is in respect to the five per cent tax on machinery.

The Minister of Trade and Development has indicated to us in this House several times the great benefit the federal free trade agreement of 1965 has been to the automotive in-

dustry in this province. Certainly, any tax imposed by this government will force work to the U.S.A., due to economy and undesirability of the economics involved.

Several firms in my area will suffer unduly from the five per cent tax on production machinery and equipment and certainly it is very regressive. I need only read a portion of a letter which I have received from one of the large tool companies in my riding which briefly states the position of a company which will be subjected to this tax, if implemented. It mentions the tax imposed by the federal government and the persuasion that was brought on the federal government to remove this 12 per cent tax. It goes on to say:

It is evading the issue when the Provincial Treasurer says that the five per cent tax will only amount to some two and a half per cent since the tax becomes a deductible item from gross profits.

First, your effectiveness is measured by our pre-tax return upon capital and therefore, in our estimating and quoting we must take into account fully the five per cent tax.

Secondly, if this tax is administered, as was the federal tax, then it will cause very considerable clerical work, both in the plant and in government supervision. All of us maintain two rooms for the repair of tooling and manufacture of new tooling and equipment. It will be necessary for elaborate records to be kept, not only of each toolmaker's time to determine what proportion of his time is spent on new tooling, subject to tax, or repair, presumably not subject to tax, but also usage records of all incoming raw material.

Very frequently the same material is used for component production, not taxable, and tooling, presumably taxable. This will all add up to our cost. I would also expect that the tax inspectors will have to be employed to check on all our records. Whilst I also deplore all other increases in tax, particularly in the doubling of the capital tax together with the addition of this to corporation tax, I recognize that some increase in revenue is required. However, the singling out of production equipment will only lead to a reduction in investment and force more work south of the border.

To be very brief, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the Minister recognized the implications of this tax and for these reasons, I indeed hope that he will join with the leader of the Opposition in voting against this tax.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, there are not too many new points that could be brought up in this particular discussion. However, I shall try to stress some that I think ought to be stressed, particularly with reference to the tax on manufacturing of machinery.

I cannot but help recall the speech of the hon. member for Sudbury, when he grappled with the problems of northern Ontario and the crying need in that particular area for secondary industry. The Prime Minister and the Treasurer almost echoed his words. Therefore, if they agree, as they appear to agree with the statements—or, I should say, the plea—made by the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), one would think that perhaps they might even give a financial inducement to people who would settle up north and bring in manufacturing equipment to set up these secondary industries.

But what do they do? They put a tax on it. I have mentioned earlier in this session, Mr. Speaker, the large forgiveness loans that were made to certain corporations, extremely large corporations, whose incomes were in the tens and, in fact, hundreds of million dollars net. It occurred to me that the majority of these loans were in the area known as southern Ontario, the stretch from the Ottawa River right through to Sarnia. But there were very few, I think there were only about five or six out of all of those that were given, that were for northern Ontario. To me it was a sort of sin that not enough consideration was given to the northland and that more industry was not settled in that particular area.

From my point of view, the imposition of this tax is not going to help us to get any more industry up there. In fact, it may hamper it. I find it a deplorable method of raising funds because, to me, it is basically at the expense of the north.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I cannot but help recall what happened in the province of Saskatchewan, because of the fact that the hospitals tax is now being merged, so to speak, with the sales tax.

After the CCF government came into power in Saskatchewan, they had at that time, I believe, a one or a two per cent sales tax. If my memory serves me correctly Mr. Speaker, it was a one per cent sales tax. They immediately changed the name of that tax to the education tax and increased it to three per cent.

A few years later, Mr. Speaker, they changed the name of that tax to a hospital tax and increased it to five per cent. If my memory again serves me well, it ended up

being a six per cent tax. I may be incorrect in that the first change of name goes to a hospital tax and subsequently to an education tax. But the fact remains that their justification for raising the taxes was labelling it with a name to tug at the heart strings, so to speak.

I ask myself what devious scheme has this Minister in mind to enable him to increase the sales tax by simply subsequently labelling it with a new name? Are we going, in a year or two, to find that the sales tax has been changed to a hospital tax? And this Minister telling us from now on all the moneys gathered under this new hospital tax is going to go to subsidize OMSIP or HIRB or Ontario Hospital Commission to construct new hospitals? Is he then going to increase it to about seven or eight per cent? Or is he going to change the name to education tax and again increase it to seven or eight per cent and say all this money is now going to be used for education? I do not know, but certainly I am extremely suspicious.

I cannot but recall when the Minister was introducing his Budget and he made the statement that there was not going to be an increase in the sales tax. He was greeted with desk thumping from all the government benches. But then when he stated that the hospital tax was going to be done away with—merged, it was—with the sales tax; and there was going to be an adjustment of the tax, and an increase in revenues was going to be brought about—my goodness there was absolute dead silence. I think the Minister at that time must have thought he was walking through a morgue.

So I am extremely suspicious of the conduct of this government. We on this side have always considered sales tax to be regressive, because it is always the little man who suffers. Just as when they raise the taxes on cigarettes and liquor, which some deem to be vices. There are others in the community who get their only enjoyment out of life in having a cigarette or a drink. Whether we approve of that or not does not make any difference.

Now we are going to find that—we have already—found that we are going to suffer in this regard. I am just wondering what else is going to be brought under sales tax.

For instance I note in this bill, Mr. Speaker, as has already been mentioned by my colleague the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson), that golf courses are not covered. I notice also that miniature golf courses are not covered. I notice that pinball arcades are not covered. I was sit-

ting here trying to figure in my own mind where the Minister drew the distinction.

First I was of the opinion that the amusements were essentially spectator items, such matters as football games or concerts or the like, where a person is taxed as a spectator. If the person participated himself, like playing golf, he was not taxed. That is the only way I can justify it. Certainly I would consider a pinball arcade a place of amusement, it certainly is in many places. The Minister of Correctional Services says that it is! Maybe it is. The Attorney General does not agree with him, and that is for certain.

I also would just like to express my concern that this sales tax operates under the law of diminishing returns, which is the point the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) was dwelling on, and is going to reduce income to the government not increase it.

There is, Mr. Speaker, one other point I wanted to mention, and that is the tax on hotel accommodation. If there was ever a display of a dog-in-the-manger attitude by any government, it was by this government. I recall when Donald Summerville was the mayor of this city. I had the pleasure of sitting on council with him when Toronto tried to obtain power from this Legislature to impose a tax on hotel accommodation used by transients, and this government said—

An hon. member: They were saving it for themselves!

Mr. Ben: They were saving it for themselves, even though they would not use it.

As far as hotel tax is concerned, I am not going to argue the pros and cons of it, Mr. Speaker, but I think it was mealy-mouthed and dog-in-the-manger for them to deny to the city of Toronto for four years—for five years—the revenue that they are now going to be getting, because it has turned out to be lost revenue. There is no way of getting it back, and I say shame to the government that would adopt such an attitude. I hope the people chuck them out.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further members who wish to speak to this? Then perhaps the next member would adjourn the debate, it is near the hour of six.

Mr. Deans: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume this debate and go on to the next tax bill on the order paper. Then there are some bills for the committee of the whole House, and we will go eventually to the estimates of The Department of Correctional Services.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That will be Thursday evening?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Probably!

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

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 13, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 13, 1969

Presenting report, Mr. Welch	2203
Tenth report, standing private bills committee	2203
Public Finance Companies Investments Act, 1966, bill to repeal, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	2203
Credit Unions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	2203
Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	2203
Ontario Producers, Processors, Distributors and Consumers Food Council Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	2203
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading	2204
Property assessment, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon	2204
Hamilton and district school of nursing, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Nixon	2205
Processing and manufacturing of steel, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Stokes	2205
Dumping of acid into Hamilton Bay, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	2205
Dominion Day holiday, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Shulman	2205
Shebandowan, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. T. P. Reid	2206
Tax shelter programme, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Bullbrook	2206
Trefann court, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Renwick	2207
Assessment costs, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Young	2208
Water flow stoppage at Niagara Falls, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Bukator	2208
Pollution, statement by Mr. Robarts	2208
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. White, second reading	2210
Hospitals Tax Act, bill to repeal, Mr. White, second reading	2227
Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Grossman, continued	2227
Recess, 6 o'clock	2237

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have with us in the east gallery students from the Elia Junior High School; Downsview, and Blantyre Public School, Scarborough; and in the west gallery, members of Humber Valley Women's Progressive Conservative Association, from the York West riding. We also have with us in Mr. Speaker's gallery, the members of the Northwestern Ontario Association Chambers of Commerce who come down each year to remind the members of this House of the existence of that great part of Ontario, and I am sure that the members, even if the Ministers are not, are very happy to see them with us today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the 63rd annual report of the Ontario Municipal Board for the year ended March 31, 1968.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's tenth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Bobier Convalescent Home.

Bill Pr 13, An Act respecting the City of Kitchener.

Your Committee would recommend that the following Bill, having been withdrawn, be not reported:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC FINANCE COMPANIES INVESTMENTS ACT, 1966

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves first read-

ing of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Public Finance Companies Investments Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The Act to be repealed requires companies raising money from the public for investment to furnish certain information to the registrar under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act. The necessary information is now furnished and supplied to the department under The Securities Act and the regulations thereunder, and the repeal of this legislation will avoid the duplication of returns by companies involved.

THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This might be described as a housekeeping bill. It updates certain sections of the Act to conform with present day operating practice.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This amendment, Mr. Speaker, removes the requirement that 90 per cent of the authorized capital stock of the corporation must be subscribed for and paid in prior to increasing of capital stock. However, effective control is not lessened since the provision requiring shareholders' ratification and the assent of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council are retained.

THE ONTARIO PRODUCERS, PROCESSORS, DISTRIBUTORS AND CONSUMERS FOOD COUNCIL ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves first reading of bill intituled,

An Act to amend The Ontario Producers, Processors, Distributors and Consumers Food Council Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Stewart, this bill simply provides for remuneration and expenses to the members of the food council.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit officers and employees of municipal corporations be elected as members of a council of that corporation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Why will it cost Ontario \$5 million more than is presently being paid, to carry out the assessment of property in the province?

Would the Minister predict the same increase in cost if the assessment were carried out on a regional basis?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the additional expenditure of \$5 million is required to bring the assessment function in the province to an acceptable standard in a reasonable period of time.

I think by way of background, I might say that the cost to the municipalities in the province at the present time is estimated to be \$15 million. The Smith committee recommended really a carrot and stick approach, and our costing of that proposal came to a total cost of some \$26.2 million.

We feel we can do it as a province for \$20 million which, of course, is cheaper than that which was suggested by the Smith Committee. I think really, what I have said answers the second part of his question.

Mr. Nixon: If I might ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, inherently why should it cost more? Are you going to need more people to carry out the assessment than there are at present? Why is that so?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, I think the hon. member is aware that the function has not moved ahead very quickly. If we are to get on with the job in the next three or four

years we are going to have to bring the staff up to strength. Assessment offices have been traditionally understaffed and there have not been enough qualified assessors. They have not been offered enough money, probably by the municipalities that they were working for. We propose to get on with this job and if we are going to do it in a reasonable period of time, three or four or five years, we are going to have to accelerate the pace.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order that I would like to raise at this moment, if you will permit me. I was interested to read in this afternoon's *Toronto Daily Star* a heading as follows: "Committee Will Urge End of Religion in Schools".

The Prime Minister may recall my having put a question to the Minister of Education two weeks ago, in which I asked him about the report of the MacKay committee. He said he had it in his possession, that it was at the printers and that he would give it to the Legislature when it was convenient.

Well, I do not know whether he has given it to the press. I suppose an enterprising journalist, that is the phrase that is usually used in this connection, has dug it out but the recommendations are here and very important. They are ones that concern this House, I suppose as much as they concern anyone.

I wonder if there is any explanation for the expanding—I would not call it policy—but let us say, the expanding custom that we hear about these important matters from several of the Ministers in the press before we hear about them in this House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister is prepared to table it. The reason he did not table it was that he told you there were not enough copies to make them available to the members. Where that report came from I do not know but—

Mr. Nixon: Well the *Toronto Star*—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We get lots of leaks in other directions too. I can only assure the leader of the Opposition that it is not the policy of this government to make such a document public although this is done in many other instances in this House. The use of the press by members of this House is not unknown, but all I am saying is that I can assure you that it is not the policy of the government to do this. I suppose the report is in the hands of the committee which drew it up, or in the hands of the staff of that committee, and the report is in the hands of the printer.

Now it may have leaked out from any one of these places but the point is that we cannot table it here until we have a sufficient number of copies to make one available to all members of the Legislature. I rather expected it was going to be done this afternoon, but I do not see the Minister here. Maybe he will be in before the sessions are over.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition has a question from yesterday apparently of the Minister of Health. I do not think it has been asked.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, it is a matter of some concern. I felt that the Minister of Health had put me off somewhat the last time I mentioned this, but in the matter of the continuing strike of teachers at the Hamilton district school of nursing, is the Minister making any effort to assist in the solution of the strike through the Ontario Hospital Services Commission? I think budgetary matters are concerned here.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, this is primarily a matter between the hospital and The Department of Labour, but we have advised The Department of Labour that we are ready to help in whatever way we possibly can, both through the department and through the hospital services commission.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask the Minister if he is prepared to assist, by the provision of funds, to at least meet part of the salary demands, which cannot be met under the present budgeting circumstances controlled by OHSC?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, since I have absolutely no personal knowledge with the issue in dispute, I would not be presumptuous enough to anticipate what might be necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he has knowledge of the substantial number of students who are in danger of losing a full year of their education as nurses if this is not resolved immediately?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have full knowledge of what is at stake.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister.

Will the Prime Minister prevail upon the Ontario Research Foundation to undertake a study on the feasibility of a steel complex for the processing and manufacturing of steel in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that such a request has ever been made either to the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), under whose jurisdiction the research council comes, or to the research council itself. I do not know what would be involved. I would be quite happy to take it up with the Minister, and he could consult with the research council to find out whether they feel there is research they could do that might be valuable in this regard. I will speak to him about it, but no request has been made of them to date.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Will the Minister explain the reason for his decision not to make public the result of the inquiry into alleged dumping of acid by Stelco into Hamilton Bay?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the staff of Ontario Water Resources Commission maintains a continuing surveillance over provincial waters and frequently reports on matters similar to the one raised by the hon. member. These reports are part of the administrative procedures within my responsibility, and I do not think it appropriate that the Legislature should spend time each day on matters of administrative routine within a Minister's responsibility.

I am, of course, always willing to answer specific questions.

Mr. Deans: May I, Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, enquire of the Minister if he does not feel that the polluting of the water of Hamilton Bay is a public matter, not a private matter for his department?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Polluting the water is a public matter, but reports to the Ministers are private matters.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, is the Canadian Manufacturers Association correct in its confidential March 3, 1969,

bulletin, in which it states that the Ontario director of employment standards has requested an individual application from each firm in Ontario that wishes to allow its employees to celebrate Dominion Day on Monday, June 30, this year, instead of the official holiday, which is on Tuesday, July 1?

Will the Minister agree with me that, considering the huge number of companies in Ontario, a tremendous amount of unnecessary paper work will ensue if this requirement is enforced?

And will the Minister avoid this unnecessary work by giving blanket permission?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to questions from the hon. member, I would say that the bulletin is correct. It reflects accurately the position of the director of The Employment Standards Act, which is in accord with section 2 of the regulations under that Act.

In reference to the second part, the answer is "no." I cannot agree with the member on this point. This will not impose an undue burden on the employers, and my department will be equipped and ready to handle the matter.

The third part: Again the answer is "no." This work is not unnecessary. The possibility of workers suffering from exploitation would be greater if blanket permission were given.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Inasmuch as this was brought to me by a workers' organization, perhaps the Minister would explain how this could cause exploitation if Dominion Day was celebrated on the Monday instead of the Tuesday?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It depends, Mr. Speaker, on the arrangements that are worked out. Normally, if the employee works on July 1 he would receive time and one-half for the work he performed at those rates under the changes in The Employment Standards Act. Under the provision of the regulations some alternative arrangement can be worked out depending upon the individual circumstances for an industry and their employees.

Mr. Shulman: Could the Minister not impose a blanket rule that would save all this work?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, there are too many individual situations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister planning to establish a township or town at Shebandowan where the Inco mine is located?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been before the Cabinet committee on town sites and no decisions have been made as yet.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is he aware that at the present time the miners in the area are buying the cottages and building houses in the area, and there is going to be another Ear Falls situation pretty soon if some action is not taken?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I thank the member for that bit of information. We are aware of some activity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): A question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in two parts:

1. In view of the continuance of the tax shelter programme, would the Minister consider amending paragraph 6 of regulation 219/68 of The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968, to afford to tenants reciprocal rights of set-off now enjoyed by landlords?

2. Would the Minister not agree that such reciprocal rights may well lead to an extreme reduction in litigation resulting from such statutes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, our experience has indicated that the great majority of inquiries by tenants to our information officers in the past have related to eligibility and amount of entitlement. Under the present system officers of my department are in a position to advise tenants of their entitlements and rights.

If the proposal of the hon. member were carried out, many tenants might well take precipitous action and find themselves facing litigation or even eviction over an error in the right or amount of the offset which we really are not in a position to advise them about.

In regard to the second part of the question, the member may well be right. The amount of the present kind of litigation might decrease. However, there would no doubt be an increase in litigation alleging non-payment of rent.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am wondering if the Minister would consider this, in view of his response to my first question. Is the landlord not in the same position—as far as possible litigation at the present time under the regulations—as the tenant might well be if you afforded him this reciprocity?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the landlord really only has the one right of setoff, that of unpaid rent.

Mr. Bullbrook: I do not think that is really a direct answer, because he is exactly in the same position contractually as the tenant is. That is the entire purpose of the relationship.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a series of related questions for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

1. Is the Minister aware that the corporation of the city of Toronto has applied to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval to issue debentures in order to raise money to begin purchasing properties in the Trefann Court urban renewal area?

2. Is the Minister aware that the city gave evidence at the OMB hearing that it intended to purchase as many properties as it could and that purchases would not be limited to vacant properties and sub-standard properties?

3. Is the Minister aware that on November 6, 1968, the council of the city of Toronto officially withdrew the redevelopment plan approved by council on February 9, 1966, and at the present time has no plan for the area?

4. Is the Minister aware that the Trefann Court Residents Association, representing some 75 per cent of the 77 owner-occupiers, opposed the city's action, maintaining that a redevelopment plan should be developed before any purchases take place, and that they feel this is the only way in which both owners and tenants will be protected?

5. How does the government's policy of citizen participation fit in with this action on the part of the city?

6. Will the Minister exercise the discretion conferred on him by section 20(4) of The Planning Act and withdraw his approval given in January, 1969, under section 20(3) of that Act on the grounds that since the enactment of the city's bylaw number 22827, designating the area of a redevelopment area, on April 14, 1966, the city has made no progress. And will the Minister not grant any further approval until a new bylaw has been enacted by the city council and until a redevelopment plan has been worked out with full citizen participation?

7. If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think the first thing that should be said in reply to the member's statement is that it should be borne in mind by all members of the House that in urban renewal projects it is the municipality—in this case, Toronto—which is the principal party in the undertaking, rather than the province or for that matter the federal government.

In reply to the first question, yes, I am aware of the applications to the Ontario Municipal Board. In fact, one of our staff was subpoenaed to appear before the board by the solicitor acting for the Trefann Court residents association. As a matter of fact, I understand that there was a subpoena being waved around for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but he was successful in avoiding it. So it was never served.

In reply to the second question, I was not aware of the particular evidence the city gave. I do not think, in my capacity, that there is any requirement for me to be made aware of it, particularly in view of the initial remarks which I made as to the principal responsibility being with the city. The municipality has the authority to acquire land within the designated area. This authority was secured under section 20(3) of The Planning Act on November 3, 1966.

In reply to the third part of the question, the answer is yes. We were advised by the municipality of this on November 13, 1968. We were also advised that the municipality was preparing a new plan in full consultation with the residents of the area.

My replies to the other parts of the question are:

4. Generally speaking, I am aware of the concerns of this group of people on this point, and also of the different opinions of other people having substantial interests in the

area. I have met a number of these groups. My staff have met with them also on other occasions.

5. As far as I know the city is involving the citizens of the area in the preparations of the plans for urban renewal. In terms of provincial policy, I will not recommend financial participation by the province unless I am satisfied that there has been adequate citizen involvement.

6. Based on developments to this point in the area, I am not prepared to withdraw the designation made in November, 1966, and confirmed in January, 1969, in my letter to the municipalities.

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

Mr. Young: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

How does the Minister reconcile the statement in Budget paper B, page 64, that the provincial take over of the assessment function will represent a saving to municipalities of approximately \$15 million, allowing a corresponding reduction of provincial grants, with the Toronto *Daily Star* report of his speech in Oakville on Tuesday stating that costs of assessment will be shared by regional government and Queen's Park?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on receiving the hon. member's question I went over the speech referred to, and I am unable to find any reference to a sharing of costs by the province and regional governments and I do not recall making any such statement. If I gave this impression to a reporter it was not intended. I think the words on page 64 stand and that is certainly my impression.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I will send a copy of the report.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Niagara Falls has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. What consultation took place with the International Joint Commission concerning the stoppage of water flow over the American Falls at Niagara?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, during the past several months detailed consultation has taken place involving the Hydro Electric

Power Commission of Ontario, the power authority of the state of New York, the government of the province of Ontario and the state of New York, and the governments of the United States of America and Canada.

Hon. members may be interested to know that the basis of the agreement reached is that the American Falls be de-watered by building a coffer dam, and that the additional flow of water by way of the Horseshoe Falls will be made available for hydroelectric generation. This additional power will be shared equally by the two power authorities and a sum of money contributed by each towards the cost of the work on the American Falls, the amount to be contributed to be in relation to the value of the power produced.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to question 20 appearing on the order paper. I answered this question in the House. The answer is to be found on page 1433 of *Hansard*, and I would therefore ask that this be removed from the order paper, and the order be discharged.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would just like to make some comments about the question of pollution and the changes we anticipate making here in the administration. There is no doubt that in all industrial countries today one of the major problems facing them is the problem of pollution, and pollution abatement—environmental management as it is called in some circles.

While very substantial progress has been and is being made in these fields, the government proposes to make certain organizational changes to strengthen the machinery available to administer expanded or expanding programmes. Accordingly, I wish to familiarize hon. members of changes which are being planned and which will be implemented in the near future.

The present programme related to water and air pollution are administered, for the most part, by The Department of Health and the Ontario Water Resources Commission, although other departments and agencies are involved in these activities in varying degrees. Responsibility for the air pollution abatement programme and for supervision of the disposal of refuse is vested in The Department of Health. The Ontario Water Resources Commission is the principal government agency involved in water supply, sewage treatment and the abatement of water pollution.

Bringing certain of these functions together under one Ministry would result in greater co-ordination and efficiency in the total environmental management programme. Accordingly, it is the intention that legislation will be introduced in this session to accomplish this. The appropriate staff of The Department of Health and of the Ontario Water Resources Commission will be brought directly under the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, thus greatly expanding the functions of that department in the field of environmental management and pollution abatement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: You are making it worse.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just wait for it, wait for it.

It is the government's long-run intention to make the Minister of Energy and Resources Management responsible for all pollution abatement programmes, including air pollution, and, at an opportune time, perhaps, soil pollution. The Minister of Health will, of course retain paramount responsibility for human health and the two departments will collaborate closely.

It is intended that the staff of the Air Pollution Control Service will work in close collaboration with the energy branch of The Department of Energy and Resources Management and that this closer relationship will improve the performance of both the branches. It is also intended that The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act and the staff involved in the programme under the Minister of Mines will also be transferred to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and subsequently incorporated in the air pollution control branch.

The Ontario Water Resources Commission in the past has carried out dual functions. On the one hand, it has operated as a quasi-judicial agency, holding public hearings and dealing with such policy consideration as rates. On the other hand, it has dealt with the supervision of a highly technical operating staff specializing in all aspects of water supply and pollution control.

One of the problems that inevitably arises in any such agency with dual roles is the difficulty of acting in an impartial manner when ruling on disagreements or differing points of view as between technical matters and policy considerations. The government proposes to separate and clearly define these two functions. The Ontario Water Resources Commission will continue to be responsible

for the holding of public hearings, resolving disputes, and considering rate structures and wherever the public interest is involved in matters of water management and pollution abatement.

This will include such matters as municipal sewage treatment, municipal water supply, regional water or sewage schemes, and industrial pollution. It is intended that the commission will, where necessary, examine witnesses, including appropriate provincial officials and that the public will be encouraged to participate in such hearings to the greatest possible extent.

The operating staff of the commission will be transferred to the civil service and report to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management through the Deputy Minister. In doing so, the staff of the commission, as presently defined, will be working in close collaboration with the staff of the conservation authorities branch and I anticipate that a much closer relationship in water management on a river valley basis will result.

When making this announcement, I would be remiss if I were not to say a word in tribute to the accomplishments of the Ontario Water Resources Commission during the 13 years since it was formed. Its original conception and subsequent development and functions must be regarded as one of the most forward-looking and productive operations ever undertaken by this province. The government's task in establishing the new departmental administration and thus updating the work and relationships of the commission would have been impossible but for the solid basis which has been laid by the commission and its staff.

The government, of course, is of the view that all its functions should be reviewed and scrutinized periodically and that organizational changes should be undertaken where these are desirable to ensure that we are carrying out our responsibilities to the people of Ontario, in the light of changing requirements, as efficiently and expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, two matters for clarification if the Premier will permit. If the Ontario Water Resources Commission and its staff is going to become a branch of the Minister's department, will it lose its commission status if they are all employed as public servants?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I think perhaps the member misunderstood me. We are separating the two functions. The commission and

all its quasi-judicial and policy-making functions will continue as it has done in the past. But that portion of the staff of the Water Resources Commission—the technical aspect of it; the people who are doing the surveys and planning the plants and operating in many cases, because more and more are they coming into the operation of these plants across the province—will be brought into the department, but the commission will continue to function as a commission.

Mr. Nixon: Two other matters:

How does the Premier explain moving the jurisdiction of the Sulphur Fumes Arbitration Board from the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) to the Minister of Health last week and then moving it from the Minister of Health to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management this week?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is very, very simple, Mr. Speaker. It was moved from the Minister of Mines to the Minister of Health because the Minister of Health is in charge of all air pollution. Having got the whole field together under the Minister of Health we are now making another move from there to some place else.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 15th order; resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-1961

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, yesterday before the adjournment of the House I was going to take a few moments to discuss the situation in regard to the taxing of production machinery.

I am sure that the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) did not intend to mislead the public in indicating that this was, in effect, a tax from corporations and mining companies. In actual fact this is not going to be that. This tax is going to be taken directly out of the pockets of the consumers of this province.

In the press release that was handed out on the day of the Budget, there were indications that from corporation and mining companies an amount of \$105.7 million was to be raised, while from the consumers an amount of \$75.3 million was to be raised.

If we take a look at the actual effect on

this province—and the economy of this province—of the imposition of this five per cent retail sales tax on production machinery, I am sure the Minister would agree that those figures are not accurate. This \$38.2 million should actually have appeared under the heading of “from consumers” as opposed to “from corporation and mining companies”, because there is no doubt that if not all, at least by far the major portion of the \$38.2 million, will be passed on from the producer to the consumer.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): The same as the corporation tax.

Mr. Deans: Exactly. It is the same, and we must stop this. The unfortunate part, of course, is that it becomes a pyramiding tax.

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): Are you against corporation taxes?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I would draw to the attention of the members that the proper way to conduct a debate is for the members to address another member through Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that they do that and that the hon. member who now has the floor will proceed with his speech.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What is obviously going to happen is that when this tax is levied on the production machinery manufacturer, he will pass it on to the manufacturer of the finished product. But in passing it on, he will add to it—as is always the case—a percentage for profit, a percentage for administration costs, and so on. Instead of passing on the five per cent he is more likely to pass on five and a half or even six per cent to the next lower level, or the next level up, whichever way you look at it. Then this person, having had to pay that, will add that to the price of the finished product, and the consumer will then have to pay not only more for the finished product but an increasing burden of sales tax on whatever it is he is going to buy.

So what you have done, in effect, is you have gone to the consumer for more money in a very subtle, underhanded way. If you had to raise the money, any honest tax move would have been to go to the people who are going to have to pay and to levy it on them. But, no. This government, in an effort to make it appear for public consumption that they were trying to bring about an equitable tax structure, decided that they would go on the outside and, on the surface, let the

consumers of this province, the people who live in the province, feel that they were getting some tax from the corporation level. This is just not the case.

What I would suggest is that if you have to raise this money, read the speech of the hon. member of York South and take something out of the book that he put forward—the many tax areas that we have not yet begun to exploit—and let us move into those, rather than putting an ever-increasing burden on the consumer of this province and rather than hiding behind the gloss, the front, that you put on the budget of last week of attempting to make it appear that you are trying desperately to save the consumer money, when in actual fact you are charging him more—more than you would have done had you levied it directly upon him.

We will oppose this tax; we will oppose any effort to put on the consumers of this province any additional hidden taxes of this kind.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, if I may make a few comments on this tax. I would like to start out by saying that I will not talk at any length, because this has been fairly well hammered out by all members on both sides of the House.

However, I would like to point out that, even though we may derive \$38 million from the levy of this tax, there may be an adverse result. It could result in unemployment in certain areas of the province, especially in my area, which has been able to benefit so much by the auto trade pact. A lot of the industry had contemplated expansions and now, with this additional burden—especially if the industry is the type that is fairly marginal—they may have second thoughts on the plant expansion and, as a result, may forego that.

It likewise puts the industries at an unfair competitive advantage with their counterparts across the border. Why should a manufacturer have the product made in the province of Ontario when he can have it made over in the States at a more reasonable figure—and that figure could be the difference between the cost of the production machinery, especially when the runs may not be as great as they would be over in the U.S.

The cost for the production machinery is only going to be passed on, as the hon. member has just mentioned, to the consumer. So you can see this five per cent tax on production machinery will have a multiplier effect. It will have a real multiplier effect;

the five per cent may have the effect of increasing unemployment in an area.

The industries in my own community are so concerned over this that they have already started to send communications to the various members. However, the fact is that the government has moved so fast that they have not had time to really get together and organize in a fashion that they could have really expressed their opposition to this tax.

Yesterday the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) made mention of Auto Specialties Manufacturing Company in the city of Windsor, which registered strong objection. He made mention of M.G.M. Brakes Limited in Windsor, which also made strong objection. He mentioned the Automotive Parts Manufacturers Association who likewise have objected. And today the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) received a letter from a manufacturer in his riding, S.K.D. Manufacturing Company, which registers very strong objection. One of the paragraphs in the letter reads:

We have been thinking of expanding, but this additional tax on the equipment which we will have to purchase, because it is not available in Canada, will be a serious deterrent to our final approval of any new expansion project.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wished to raise \$38 million more, I think he could have found better ways of doing it than putting this tax on production machinery.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words about this Bill 79. I do not want to re-echo what has been said many times, but I must say this bill is another blow to the tourist industries of the province of Ontario. I must say that last year, Mr. Speaker, the gas tax was placed on the people of the province of Ontario; also, admission fees to parks have increased, and the fishing licence was placed on the fishermen of the province. Now this year, the same government taxes motel rooms, hotel rooms and also increases the tax on meals ten per cent up to \$2.50.

I would say this is another blow to the tourist industries of this province, and I have been contacted quite a number of times because it is a great concern to them. Also I am quite concerned about this tax on manufacturing machinery, which has been brought to the Minister's attention a number of times since this debate has started.

In this province, the government has designated over 200 municipalities as slow

growth areas; in my own riding, there are some villages that are designated as slow growth areas. We are making a great effort to encourage industries to come into these places, create work and build these municipalities up. With this tax on manufacturing machinery, they may change their mind and they may reconsider locating in these slow growth areas.

Of course, this five per cent sales tax on manufacturing machinery adds to the spiral of inflation and it goes down and nits the little man, because this machine that is taxed is added on to the finished product.

As my colleague from Windsor-Walkerville has said, this car parts deal means a tremendous thing to the province of Ontario, if we listen to the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), who outlined to us last year the amount of money derived through that car parts deal. I for one would not want anything to happen. If anything happened to that deal I would say the province of Ontario, and maybe Canada, would be in a very difficult position.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will have to vote against this bill. I think there are other areas where the Minister could have added a tax, if taxes were needed, to get the \$38 million.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, just to help break the monotony—

An hon. member: You are not capable of that, I can assure you.

Mr. Peacock: No, I was according the Speaker that privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief remarks about three aspects of this bill. The first is that I think the bill should have brought under its head the taxation of tobacco in the province, rather than the Minister bringing in an amendment to The Tobacco Tax Act and continuing that Act in existence. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because under The Retail Sales Tax Act, we can see the impact of the rate of tax upon the wide class of goods that are purchased by consumers, but it is not nearly so visible, not nearly so easily calculated in the case of The Tobacco Tax Act.

I think the Minister has, under The Retail Sales Tax Act, through the use of the differential tax rate, the means of bringing that commodity under the umbrella of this Act, so that

it will be treated in the same class as any other taxable good. If he feels that it ought to carry a higher rate of tax, it should be stated clearly in terms of the effective rate of tax, which he could do by use of the differential tax rate.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the bill represents the cardinal effort of this government to move into an area where the federal government has either vacated some tax room—in this instance the extension of sales tax on to producer goods, the federal government has withdrawn from that area—or where the province can rely on the federal tax itself to accommodate the increases that Ontario wants at the expense of Ottawa and cannot get by voluntary agreement.

It is using within this Act the tax on producer goods and on motel accommodation, both of which can be offset by deductions from the federal corporate income tax, payable by the provincial retail sales tax payers, to arrogate to itself revenues that it could not get by agreement from Ottawa.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat many of the arguments that have been used by other members to oppose the extension of the retail sales tax to production machinery producer goods, other than to say that the province's target for productivity advance in the coming years is going to be adversely affected by this tax. A target that is already too low if this province is to make the contribution it must make to the achievement of an overall national productivity goal.

It is a goal that must be achieved if our exports are going to continue to advance as they have over the last few years, particularly those exports that are now moving to the top of the list of goods sold abroad by Canada.

Exports in the manufacturing area, automobiles, trucks and parts, moved into the first position, I believe, in the latest period for which the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has reported on Canada's export performance. They are leading the traditional exports of wheat, flour newsprint and timber.

While a great deal of attention has been focused on this particularly buoyant export field, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other manufacturing areas in our provincial economy which, while they do not enjoy the same large export market or the same high level of efficiency and productivity as the motor vehicle manufacturing industry, stand on the threshold of a movement into wider export markets. And their opportunities to make that move will be inhibited by the imposition of this tax.

There are other industries, Mr. Speaker, which, under the long-term protection of our tariff, have failed to keep up with similar industries in the United States and abroad. And any motivation they may have had to modernize and equip themselves to serve the Canadian market or the Ontario market will also be inhibited by the extension of this tax on to producer goods.

I want to ask the Minister since he has entered on to the taxation of elements of the production process, why he did not extend the retail sales tax to the purchase of all of the other elements in the production process—electricity, natural gas, materials themselves that enter into the production of goods; a tax on the other costs, on payroll costs and, perhaps, on the overhead costs.

He may bring himself to do that but why has he picked out, at this time, that one element of the production process for this kind of discriminatory tax treatment? Why has he picked out solely the producer goods category and excluded or continued the exemption on all of the other elements of the production process?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is simply no rationale for it at all. Had he wanted to raise large amounts of revenue by a tax on the production process, he might well have levied it on the materials themselves. Surely these represent a consumer transaction though not at the retail level.

They are a consumption transaction and might well have been more logically picked out to be taxed rather than the producer goods that are now to be taxed. I want to ask the Minister to state why the producer goods category was selected for the extension of the sales tax and not all of the other elements of the production process.

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

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, one has to repeat what has already been said to try to make his point in connection with this bill, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, simply because it affects the riding that I come from and we are not too pleased about the sales tax on motel and hotel rooms.

I recall, not too many years ago, that the city of Hamilton came to the committee on private bills with a similar bill for the city of Toronto. The private bills committee did not approve of that bill because they did not think a sales tax ought to be imposed on the people of Toronto or the conventioners who

come here. It did not make good sense or good business at that time; it did not appear to be the right thing to do.

This new Minister finds himself wrestling—he has a tiger by the tail, I would say. You could almost reverse that and have that, too. This is a serious problem. It affects a lot of small business people in my area, especially the small tourist camp operators, the small motels that operate only for 100 days of the year. Through this bill you have made them taxpayers for the province of Ontario; tax collectors I should say.

This hardly seems to be the right type of an imposition on small business people who have limited staff—to make them bookkeepers for the province of Ontario. I believe that this is a wrong step. It is not going to encourage the tourists to come to Canada, and we need the tourist dollar, we need the American dollars in this province.

Because of the many tourist establishments in the city of Niagara Falls, and many other areas along the border and in the province too, that this bill is going to offend many of our taxpayers. I cannot see how we can possibly support them on this one issue alone. If we were to debate and discuss the many amendments in this bill, Mr. Speaker, we would be here for three days.

But I say to you, in no uncertain terms, that the people of Niagara Falls will be contacting this Minister and telling this government that the time has come when they should take into consideration the people affected in this particular type of business before they pass legislation such as this.

This bill is an imposition on people who can hardly bear the load, and I do not think it makes for good public relations. It also does not make for good business.

There is a meeting this evening, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to this very Act, in the city of Niagara Falls, and I will be there. They are not at all happy with this government and I am sure this was impressed upon the Minister. He has many establishments in his city that look to the tourists who come into London. I think he has done a great injustice to the travelling public of the province of Ontario; he is going to discourage many of them from coming to this particular area for that purpose.

Someone made a statement in connection with this bill saying that it was collusion between the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario. Both provinces want to impose a similar tax so that no matter where people go, the governments will get it. But

I can only say that when the election rolls around they are going to get it right in the neck. The public is not going to stand for it.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I wish to register my opposition to this Bill 79, especially as it affects the taxing of production machinery.

If this were merely a squabble between the provincial and the federal tax collectors, I and most other taxpayers just could not care less, but this is more than an academic matter. It may affect everybody in the automotive parts industry, and their families as well.

Recently, exports of automotive parts have increased in a very encouraging fashion because Canadian production capabilities have enabled us to compete successfully with the American parts manufacturers. A tax on production machinery either will inhibit purchases of new and superior machinery or will increase the selling price of the product.

Because our American competitors are not being subjected to such taxes, they will obviously be able to quote better prices for their products, causing Ontario to accept a smaller share of the market. Even a small cut-back on sales would reduce production and employment, increase welfare payments, reduce income tax receipts and reduce purchases of consumer goods and would offset a part, perhaps even a large part of the province's financial gain through this tax.

If the Minister of Revenue's hope for \$38 million income from a tax on production machinery is realized, there would probably be a corresponding loss of about \$20 million in federal and provincial corporation taxes, of which Ontario's share would be about \$6 million and the federal government's share about \$14 million. This is based on the supposition that no decrease in sales of production machinery would result and that the sales and export of automobile parts would not be reduced.

If, however, Mr. Speaker, there should be a significant loss of exports, then the net advantage to the province might be quite small indeed. For that reason among others I must oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this bill before the Minister?

The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I rise to reinforce, to the best of my ability, the statements which have been made by

many other members on the Opposition benches in opposition to this bill which the Minister of Revenue has brought in.

But it is much more fundamental than that because it is the first illustration that we have had, in specific terms, of the end of concern of this government for the whole structure of the federal system of government in Canada. I charge this government with a deliberate scuttling of the long-drawn-out, difficult, awkward, tedious discussions which have led, in the international field, to the decisions of the Kennedy Round on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Let me just put this clearly on the record for the Minister. What we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the removal of the exemption which appears in paragraph 38 of section 5 of The Retail Sales Tax Act and, in substantially the same language, has existed from the time this tax was originally imposed in 1960 or 1961. The exact wording of that exemption at the present time is:

Machinery and apparatus and parts thereof as defined by the Treasurer that in his opinion are to be used by the purchaser thereof directly in the process of manufacture or production of tangible personal property for sale or use.

When the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) introduced this proposed tax change in the province, what did he say? We have only to look at page 27 of the Treasurer's statement on the introduction of the Budget and we find a statement which can be only categorized as fatuous, meaningless and administratively wrong. I quote from page 27 the following from the Treasurer's report.

The second aspect of retail sales taxation concerns the existing schedule of exemptions. Again, we have studied this area thoroughly. We have reviewed the practices in other jurisdictions—

And I assume he means by "other jurisdictions" the federal jurisdiction, the jurisdiction of the federal government of Canada—

—and examined the fairness of various options in terms of the overall equitable tax structure which we hope to develop.

I state in parenthesis that the Treasurer refused to disclose what the so-called comprehensive range of options which were presented to him in any of the areas related to tax changes, let alone in relation to this particular tax change. And the Treasurer goes on:

As a result I now propose to remove the existing exemptions for machinery and

equipment used in the production of goods and the provision of taxable services. The existing exemption on machinery for use in farm production will be continued.

I am quite aware that the taxation of production machinery is a major move by this government, but I hope to explain why, after much consideration, we have decided to do so.

We all waited with great expectation for the Treasurer to give the reason, and what what was his reason?

We feel that the withdrawal of this exemption will remove a substantial grey area of doubt and administrative inconvenience both for the government and the private sector. We also consider this extension of the tax base a fair and equitable one.

And he gave no reasons for that expression of opinion on his part.

As you will realize this additional tax on corporations will become an allowable expense under corporation income tax, which is automatically shared by the federal and provincial governments to the extent of some 40 per cent by the federal government and 12 per cent by the Ontario government.

As my colleague the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has said, if it were only that kind of a dispute we would not be terribly interested in the problem—

—which is automatically shared by the federal and provincial governments to the extent of some 40 per cent by the federal government and 12 per cent by the Ontario government. The effective date for the removal of the exemption will be April 1, 1969. The tax will apply to all deliveries on or after that date. The expected yield in the next fiscal year is estimated at about \$38 million.

The only reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer gave in substance, was this statement about removing a substantial grey area of doubt and administrative inconvenience both for the government and the private sector. Well, the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is well aware of the purpose of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. He is well aware of the great expectations which the Kennedy Round opened, for the freeing of international trade. He was also well aware, or should have been aware, of the extremely difficult problems which were involved in

negotiating tariff decreases in the international markets, by the countries which are concerned about international trade.

The removal of those barriers after those lengthy negotiations was finally achieved. And what happens? In comes the Treasurer of Ontario to take up the whole of the benefits which the government of Canada had tediously worked out in order to improve the efficiency of the industrial complex of Canada and particularly of this province. In order to allow this province to have the advantages of reduced costs for machinery which is becoming more and more complex, which is subject to a high degree of obsolescence, and which is an essential part of the rationalization of the Canadian economy, so that the Canadian economy can stand on its own feet and compete successfully in the internal market of Canada and in the foreign markets.

This is but one example of this government's absolute insistence that the province of Ontario will continue to be nothing but a branch plant economy. There is no question whatsoever that this government is not concerned about improving the industrial efficiency of the province of Ontario. It has immediately levied an additional five per cent tax when it should have been moving in every way possible to facilitate not only the import of modern equipment into Canada for the purpose of improving its productive capacity, but also to stimulate the development in Canada of the machinery production industry, to enable it to become (a) more efficient, (b) up-to-date in terms of the technological developments and the rapid technological change which is taking place, and (c) to be rapidly and effectively able to deal with the rapid obsolescence of machinery in a rapidly changing society.

Let me just quote, not a particular view on the topic, just an explanatory statement of what the government of Canada had attempted to do in this field. This was a statement that was made some time ago, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the monthly review of the Bank of Nova Scotia, which is about as sophisticated a regular statement on the affairs affecting the economy of this country as is published regularly in Canada.

It is dated April 1968, and the substance of the remarks should certainly have been available to the task force which was working out the budgetary changes that were going to take place, and it should certainly have been in the mind of the Minister of

Revenue, who was one of the persons with whom the task force directly consulted in working out, and I quote again, "the so-called comprehensive range of options which were open to this government."

And I am going to quote, Mr. Speaker, at some length, because it is absolutely essential that this be documented and brought home to this government. I substantiate, with this document and with my other comments, the charge that I have made against this government, regardless of whatever flow there may have been of concern about the confederation in this country up to and for a very short period following the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference and which has now ebbed to the point where this little autarchic empire which this government believes it is building in the province of Ontario, is going to result in the kind of high cost, inefficient, industrial plant which could only be attributed to the modern version of a feudal state.

Mr. Speaker, the review to which I have referred is explanatory of the government of Canada's activities in this field. It had this to say—and I do not intend to quote the whole of it, but the pertinent parts relating to this particular topic:

The first of the Canadian tariff cuts agreed to as part of the Kennedy Round, came into effect at January 1 this year pending parliamentary approval.

That was referring to January 1, 1968. And I might just interpose that parliamentary approval had to be subsequently obtained through the new government which came into office in Ottawa in June of last year.

Such approval will now have to be sought in the next Parliament, but the initial cuts have been confirmed by order-in-council. The most important aspect of the new tariff changes was the introduction of an entirely new programme for machinery used by manufacturing and service industries, including first a general lowering of rates, and secondly, provision for the full remission of duties when the machinery is not available from production in Canada. In introducing this particular programme, the Canadian government was seeking to achieve a significant reduction in capital equipment costs, and thereby to encourage more efficient and competitive industrial development in this country.

As a further aid to this objective it was also possible for the Canadian government to use the overall reduction in machinery

tariffs, in substantial payment for tariff concessions being made by other countries.

It goes on:

The Kennedy Round agreement and its introduction should provide substantial potential benefits for Canadian industry. These benefits, in turn, should complement very closely a number of other measures which the federal government has undertaken in recent years to foster a stronger industrial base.

Mr. Speaker, I will skip a portion of the review, but one of the quotations is:

The Canadian authorities gave major emphasis in these negotiations to tariff cuts which would lower costs, particularly for machinery and equipment.

It refers to the obvious fact that any change in tariff structure requires an adjustment of industry to the change in that tariff, but it goes on to say:

An essential part of this process of adjustment and of meeting the challenge of changing technology is the increasing use of more complex and costly equipment. The new machinery programme to which we have now turned should assist such technological change and also facilitate a general lowering of industrial costs.

Most countries have recognized in their tariff arrangements the importance to industry of obtaining the best equipment at a reasonable cost. In addition because of the highly specialized character of machinery development, and the fact that much of it tends to flow out of new technological progress, most countries must depend to a considerable degree on imports.

It then goes on, Mr. Speaker, to make some further comments and states:

Under the new programme which came into effect on January 1, 1968, duties on a broad range of machinery not available from production in Canada will be completely remitted.

Protection is still provided for domestic machinery producers but at somewhat lower rates. At the same time the application of tariffs has been made more flexible. The programme involves regrouping a number of tariff items under one heading covering the major share of machinery used by Canadian manufacturing and service industries.

Agricultural machinery, which accounts for around 28 per cent of total machinery

imports is not included—because it moves freely in any event—nor are certain other types of machinery for particular end uses, accounting for a further 27 per cent.

I emphasize, Mr. Speaker:

The remaining 45 per cent of imports, however, covers a very broad range, including general purpose machinery; construction equipment, such as power cranes; materials handling equipment; metal working machinery, such as machine tools, drills, and so on; control equipment, and various types of special industrial machinery, as for example, pulp and paper machinery and such service industry equipment as laundry, dry cleaning and vending machines.

Tariffs under the new heading are now 2.5 per cent British preferential and 15 per cent most favoured nations, with provision for remission of duty when this is in the public interest and the machinery imported is not available from production in Canada. This compares with previous rates on most machinery now coming under the new programme of ten per cent British preferential, and 22.5 per cent most favoured nations, for machinery of a class or kind made in Canada, and a free British preferential and 7.5 per cent most favoured nations for that ruled not made in Canada.

Then, Mr. Speaker, it goes on to refer to the administrative changes the federal government instituted in order to provide for the working out of the details of this substantial tariff change, and points out that the federal government established a machinery and equipment advisory board to make certain that the industrial corporations in the province and in Canada would be able to be informed and to have the full advantage of the changes in the rates which were affected as a result of these negotiations. It goes on to say:

The more flexible and pragmatic approach under the new programme is expected to bring definite benefits to both users and producers of machinery.

Along with the change in administrative approach, the other key aspect of the new programme is that it involves an overall reduction in tariffs on imported machinery. To indicate what this means, the new tariff item covers annual imports which ran close to \$700 million in 1966 out of total machinery imports of over \$1.5 billion. By far the largest came from the most favoured nations countries. It is expected that over

half of the machinery included in the new item will qualify for remission and thus come in free of duty.

In recent years, between 60 and 65 per cent of the machinery now coming under the programme was designated as a class or kind not made in Canada. For much of the most favoured nations imports, the duty has dropped from 22.5 per cent to 15 per cent, thus—

And I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker—

—the average rate of duty for all imports is expected to be around six per cent to seven per cent, compared with previous average incidence of about 12.5 per cent.

I emphasize again:

Altogether it is estimated that for purchasers of imported machinery, this will mean a reduction in machinery costs of at least \$45 million per annum. The new machinery programme, of course, has important implications for the Canadian producers of such capital equipment. On the one hand, there will be a number of benefits, not least the fact that duties will apply as soon as production capability is available in this country. On the other hand, the degree of tariff protection, though remaining substantial, has been considerably reduced and—

I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker—

—will force a downward adjustment in prices of Canadian machinery in cases where full advantage has been taken of the previously higher rates.

Meanwhile, the tariffs which other countries apply on their imports of machinery will gradually be coming down, and this should open up at least some new export opportunities. The international market for machinery, however, is highly competitive, and the Canadian industry thus faces a major challenge in adjusting to the new conditions.

Not surprisingly, the greatest strength generally is found in those parts of the industry—that is the machinery producing industry—producing for resource and primary industries, notably pulp and paper, mining and electric power.

On the other hand, Canada relies on imports for almost its entire supply of textile machinery and for a major share of the machinery used in chemical processing. Its machine tool industry also is very small. Coming in between are certain types of general purpose machinery, materials,

handling equipment and packaging facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think we here are entitled to know in the Minister's reply on the second reading of this bill, which includes this exemption, what the range of options were that were presented in this field, and of which he must be quite privy. We are entitled to know—and I notice, of course, as is the custom, that none of the other Ministers affected by these matters ever participates in the debate—what the Minister of Trade and Development believes is the effect of the movement by this government into what they obviously consider to be a little private vacuum into which they can move with great expedition.

I would like to know whether or not there was any consideration or consultation—the much-vaunted desire by this government for cooperative consultation with the federal government—or how much consultation took place with the federal government on the question of the introduction of the five per cent tax, which was going to vitiate for practical purposes the 6.5 per cent reduction in tariff that was achieved through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in the Kennedy Round.

I want to know where this fits in this strange world in which this government can speak in platitudes about its concern for Confederation. But, as the government of the province that has the major part of the industrial machinery and the industrial complex of Canada at the present time, it persists in making certain that this government will become nothing but an adjunct of a policy of continentalism, which will so intermesh this economy with the American economy that we will be inextricably bound and unable to extract ourselves from it.

I want to know from the Minister how he can possibly justify imposing this additional burden, as the member for Windsor West said in his remarks, upon the industrial manufacturing and service industries of this province, which play a major part, a significant part—and in the eyes of this government, the sole part—in increasing the productivity of the province of Ontario and providing for that **much-wanted increase in the gross provincial product**, of which this government takes pride.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister to tell us why this government, in terms of the productive capacity of this province, always settles for second best. Why does the government persist in the view that the capacity of this province is to provide for a growth rate of 4.5 per cent, when the government well knows

that the Confederation requires an annual rate of growth of 4.5 per cent. Yet, this heartland of the ability of this country to increase its productivity, to increase its ability to provide for the services of the society, which we all need and expect, insists that this province can only achieve 4.5 per cent rate. And it makes a point of imposing this kind of tax, which will depress this economy and will prohibit it from both flourishing within its present context—adapting itself to the necessary changes in technology which are inherent in the modern equipment and machinery which is required—and which will make certain that the province of Ontario remains the preserve of the parent companies to which the Minister of Trade and Development—obviously with the agreement of all his colleagues and obviously with the agreement of the Treasurer and the Minister of Revenue—believes is the only fate that we can have here for the economic base of the province of Ontario.

I repeat, I charge that the members of this government stand stripped of all the platitudes, of all the soothsaying, of all the mythology which they have tried to create in this province that they are concerned about the federation. They are not concerned about the federation. They are concerned about their own petty little empire. They are concerned about perpetuating the second rate in this province. I say to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, that if he has any sense, if he has any judgment, if he has any wisdom, he will reverse the decision to impose this tax. And I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that if he does not, this amongst other things will be one of the basic and fundamental ingredients as to why this government and its tenure in office will come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, there will be some who say “How can one possibly say this about the Tory government? After all, this change was only introduced as the Treasurer said, “to eliminate”—if I can now find the page—“a substantial grey area of doubt and administrative inconvenience both for the government and the private sector.” Well, if that was the option open to the Minister then I think he had better give serious consideration to changing the advice which he receives, to face up to the implications and to obligations which this government has, not only to the people of the province of Ontario but in its much vaunted concern about the continuance of the federation.

I simply end up, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it on other occasions—I have used it before and I will repeat it again—Harold Innes, in

a brilliant essay about the economic history of Ontario, ended up with these words:

The strength of Ontario measures the strength and the weakness of the federation. An empire has its obligations as well as its opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I demand, we here demand, and I am quite certain the members of the Liberal caucus demand—and I am also quite certain that the measure of the number of people who have spoken on this side of the House on this item, must reflect a very substantial concern which lies in the hearts and in the minds of the backbenchers of the Tory party—that the government withdraw this tax.

Otherwise, it stands condemned, as I say, to scuttling the long-drawn-out tedious, difficult negotiations for the reduction in tariffs which would have been undertaken whether there were a Liberal government at Ottawa, whether it were a Conservative government at Ottawa, or whether it were a New Democratic Party government at Ottawa, for the purpose of making certain that we could have, in this province, a modern, efficient, effective, industrial enterprise that would permit us to begin to achieve so many of the things which this Tory government for many years has denied to us and denied to the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this bill? The hon. Minister.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very great interest to some of the comments and criticisms and evaluations of the measures contained in this particular taxing bill, and with your permission I am going to go through them chronologically and attempt to meet the points of criticism that have been offered.

I was interested, as one might expect, to hear the Liberal members speak about the regressivity of taxes on snowmobiles and cigarettes and other items which we consider to be discretionary purchases, and as a matter of fact, a form of luxury purchase. I did explain in the debate on the tobacco tax bill that this is a misuse of the word regressivity and the misuse that we witnessed in the debate yesterday was compounded when the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) got up and talked about the regressivity of taxing snowmobiles, and so on.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He was quoting the Smith report. Does the Minister not accept anything they say?

Hon. Mr. White: Now, sales taxes as such are regressive—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My comments had nothing to do with snowmobiles at all. My comments dealt only with the fact that certain taxes were being imposed in certain areas; it so happens that gasoline for snowmobiles is one, and I have no quarrel with the imposition of that. I was not referring to snowmobiles.

Hon. Mr. White: I made a note of it at the time, Mr. Speaker, and I think *Hansard* will show that I am right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Now, dealing with the regressive or progressive nature of sales taxes: They certainly are regressive if they are applied evenly and without credit rebate on all goods, particularly essential goods. The sales tax becomes reasonably progressive if there is a wide area of exemption for food and children's clothing and so on. It can be made more perfectly progressive by using credits instead of exemptions. That is a point that the select committee dealt with, and one that will undoubtedly be considered very carefully in the future. As a matter of fact, we go part way towards that by attempting to broaden the base of the sales tax. The Treasurer has also forecast that an effort will be made to make sales taxes even more progressive by gearing them to a personal income tax, whether that should be collected by the federal government or by the province.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Production machinery is regressive enough.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I will be dealing with that—just a minute now, do not say that too quickly—I will be dealing with that in a minute.

The next speaker dealt with the room tax, so-called—the five per cent sales tax on transient accommodation—and my notes indicate that he referred to the idea of having reached the point of diminishing returns. I think this is incorrect.

In November, I think it was, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce came before Cabinet

and they urged us not to impose this particular tax. They cited some stories—shall I say some illustrative reports—that were intended to prove that such a tax would bear very heavily on their industry. That same month, strangely enough, there was a meeting of directors of retail sales tax from all over Canada, and I asked the representative from Quebec if there had been any decrease in tourist business in that province since the imposition of the retail sales tax on hotel rooms. He said there had not been, that there had been a regular progressive increase in the industry which was not interrupted by the imposition of the tax. He did point out that the high figure in 1967 was sometimes compared unjustly with the more normal year of 1968. If that extraordinary year of Expo were removed, then there has not been any setback to the industry as a result of this tax.

At any rate, I did say to the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and to the newly elected president of the hotel association, "If you can marshal statistical evidence to the contrary, we would be very glad to have it, because no such evidence has been forthcoming to date."

I was rather hoping, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that there would be a more rigorous presentation from some members opposite, particularly those who specialize to a degree in economics. But no such rigorous presentation was forthcoming.

Mr. Nixon: I have not heard anything of significant rebuttal from the Minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Now we find a variety of criticism coming from the opposite side dealing with the removal of the exemption of the sales tax on certain classes of production machinery, which, by the way, constitute only four-elevenths of all production machinery acquired. In other words, in order to get the exemption in the past, the item had to enter directly and immediately into the production of goods. And so, if you put a conveyor track around your plant, that has always been taxable—and, in the past, seven-elevenths of all such equipment was taxable.

Mr. Nixon: The Smith committee said they should be exempt too.

Hon. Mr. White: This tax simply eliminates the other four-elevenths. I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, that some effort might be made by the hon. member for Scarborough East to quantify the effect of this, as I myself have done.

Mr. Peacock: The Minister has the staff.

Hon. Mr. White: We took total sales of manufactured goods produced in this province as a proportion of capital, and we found that for every \$110,000 worth of annual investment in machinery and equipment, annual sales amounted to \$1 million. If one deducts the seven-elevenths already taxable, this leaves the value of newly taxable machinery and equipment in 1969-70 at \$40,000. This is for every \$1 million in sales. The sales tax—the five per cent on \$40,000—amounts to \$2,000 for every \$1 million of annual sales, you understand. The amount of the sales tax depreciated on a five-year straight line basis would be \$400 in the first year, the reduction in corporate income tax due to the depreciated sales tax component of the price of production machinery, is $.52 \times \$400$ or \$208, leaving a net additional cost of \$192. This \$192 to \$1 million in sales works out to one-fiftieth of one per cent.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Who did that for the Minister? Who compiled it?

Hon. Mr. White: I prepared the illustration, and an economist in the Treasury department put in the figures for the province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe the Minister would like to share some of that information with the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. White: Share what? It took only about five minutes. What is the member talking about? I am sharing it with the members now. It is the kind of a thing I should have thought you might have attempted.

Mr. Nixon: It is not very good, anyway.

Hon. Mr. White: In other words, Mr. Speaker, if all of the increase in the cost of this tax were put over onto the consumer, it would be less than one-fiftieth of one per cent. But, of course, all will not be passed on.

Mr. Deans: More than that will be passed on.

Hon. Mr. White: Some significant proportion, in certain industries at any rate, will rest with the owners of capital. That is the reason my hon. friends, the members from Windsor and Essex county are getting a flurry of letters from boards of directors and managers, because some portion of the total cost will rest with the owners of capital. So the one-fiftieth or one per cent is very much

higher, I suspect, than the actual case will be. If this rests evenly with the owners of capital and with the consumers, then the proportion will be about 1/100th of one per cent.

The hon. members opposite have taken what I would consider to be a very extreme stand, having in mind that the amount of additional tax being realized is very small, starting with \$38 million from the withdrawal of the exemptions on the four-elevenths of production equipment and machinery, which was previously not taxable, and \$13 million from the extension of the sales tax to hotel rooms. That total of \$51 million, must be decreased by about one million dollars, which is the decrease in our own provincial corporation income tax returns. You will see that there is a lag in the decrease in the corporation tax because, while the sales tax comes down in the year of acquisition, the decrease in the corporation tax is spread through the subsequent fiscal years as depreciation is claimed.

The member for Riverdale, who was not interested enough to remain for this debate—

Mr. Peacock: He will be right back.

Hon. Mr. White: —asked what the options were. Well, every possible alternative was considered. To get the same \$50 million would have necessitated a two percentage point increase in personal income tax. I would be glad to know if the members of the NDP would have urged that course of action. Or, alternatively, it would necessitate a two-point increase in the corporation tax, and I am wondering if the members of the Liberal caucus would urge that course of action, having in mind that our gross receipts are substantially more than the net cost to the industry.

The automotive industry is being particularly aggressive in this matter, I would judge, because of the submissions that have been received by my hon. friends opposite, and we ourselves. We think that this tax will not impede the very great progress that those aggressive and able business men have made, as evidenced by the percentage increase in automobile exports, which were up 50 per cent during 1968 versus 1967. Incidentally, the exportation of vehicles only was 33 per cent, and so it will be seen that the exports of parts was considerably more than the 50 per cent, and perhaps 70 or 80 per cent. It is a computation I have not made. So we think that this will not be a serious inhibition to their continued progress.

Mr. Speaker, this production tax has been in effect for years in the other manufacturing provinces of Canada. I am surprised that was not mentioned too. For instance, it has been in effect in British Columbia since 1958, where production machinery of all sorts is taxable, and where consumables are also taxable.

In Saskatchewan, it was first effective about 1934, although it may have been turned over on a tax-rental basis for some years during wartime. In that province, where the tax has been in existence for, one might say, decades, all production machinery is taxable. Consumables are taxable, and in the province of Quebec, where the tax has been in effect for years, production machinery is partially taxable. The eight per cent applies to everything acquired. The proportion of products shipped out of the province of Quebec is used to reclaim a portion of the tax paid. I tried without success to get the figures, and I think they are not available.

My own educated opinion is that no more than three-eighths of their product will be exported. Therefore, the net tax chargeable to Quebec acquisitions will be five per cent, or perhaps a little more; certainly I think not less than the net tax here in Ontario. They also apply the tax to catalysts, and to consumables.

These four provinces—British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Ontario—account for 90 per cent of the production of manufactured goods in these provinces.

Mr. Lawlor: Have you read John Due on Quebec? In his "Provincial Sales Tax" he just riddles it as slowing down economy growth.

An hon. member: Is the member quoting Nova Scotia again?

Hon. Mr. White: Now, just a minute.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): What else did the bank letter say?

Hon. Mr. White: I have the figures here, Mr. Speaker, showing the proportion of manufactured goods in each of these provinces. Ontario accounts for 51.9 per cent of all the manufactured goods in Canada; Quebec accounts for 28.4; British Columbia 8.3, and Saskatchewan about one per cent. This totals approximately 90 per cent. In other words, the withdrawal of this particular exemption on four-elevenths of the production equipment and machinery in this province will put us in the same position as the other manufacturing provinces of Canada. In my opinion

this will have no adverse effect so far as our domestic competitive position is concerned. I will deal with the international aspect a little later.

At any rate we have had some number of critics say that all of this tax would bear on the consumer because it would all be passed on. I have pointed out to you that if this were, in fact the case, the increase would be less than one-fiftieth of one per cent.

We have had other members say, however, that suppliers and manufacturers of one kind or another will find it impossible to have this passed along to their customers, and therefore their growth will be inhibited. I think the member for Lakeshore was suggesting that a minute ago.

Mr. Peacock: Do you think General Motors is going to accept this price increase?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, you cannot have it both ways, can you? You cannot have it both ways in aggregate. In point of fact, the proportion of this particular increase which will be passed on will depend on the characteristics of the industry. I should think that the automobile companies themselves will pass on virtually all of the cost which comes to them as a result of this increase because that is an "oligopolistic" market, over which they have very considerable control over their prices. On the other hand it may be—

Mr. Lewis: How much will it mean on the price of a car?

Hon. Mr. White: On the other hand the automotive parts suppliers are selling into a "monopsonistic" market, and they will have to absorb a proportion, I suppose, of the tax.

Mr. Lewis: You are saying that you have just increased car prices; that is what you are saying?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I am not saying that at all. The hon. members, including your seat-mate, have pointed out that some number of companies in the industry will not be able to pass the tax on.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, GM will not accept the tax that is passed on with supplies.

Hon. Mr. White: Whatever proportion is not passed on because of the "monopsonistic" characteristics of the automobile industry itself, obviously will not be passed on to the consumer, but will be left with the owners of capital in the supplier enterprises.

Mr. Lewis: But where it can be passed on, it will be.

Hon. Mr. White: Where it can be, it will be. I am not going to argue economics with you, if you want a lesson turn to your seat-mate.

Mr. Lewis: You just said we—

Hon. Mr. White: I said if all the costs were paid out it would be less than one-fiftieth of one per cent, but obviously this is not going to happen.

References were made to the pyramiding of this tax, the idea being that if you increase a particular element of cost by, let us say, \$1, at some future stage the price to the consumer will be something more than that \$1. In point of fact, if there is an increase in labour costs, corporations I think very often take the opportunity of moving their prices forward to accommodate that labour increase, or the increase in costs of raw materials, or the increase perhaps in taxes in the increased return to their own shareholders.

But, certainly, in a market where competitive forces are at work, the increase in cost of \$1 here will not necessarily result in the increase of the sale price in the amount of \$1. Now, I do not mind going into that in greater detail, I mean there is a great deal more that can be said but I suspect that will do, at least for the moment.

I have given very great consideration to this aspect and I have come to the conclusion that the final price will increase by no more than the increase in this particular cost. I go beyond that and say that the increase in this particular cost is in no way different than the increase in any other cost, whether that be a labour rate increase, or an increase in corporation tax. So to have some member of the NDP arguing in favour of other additional corporation income tax, and against this particular tax makes no sense at all in my opinion.

Mr. Lewis: It is argued in the context of the redistribution of income.

Hon. Mr. White: In the past, as a matter of fact, there have been certain inherent inequities, because large numbers of enterprises in this province have always had to pay the tax on the production equipment and machinery which they have acquired. As I mentioned earlier, we have been collecting the tax on seven-elevenths of all the production machinery and equipment acquired. So wholesalers, and others, have paid this tax on everything they have bought for their plants. In spreading this on to the other

four-elevenths, it not only greatly simplifies the administration, it not only greatly reduces the administrative costs for ourselves and for the taxpayer, but I think it makes more equitable the tax which has applied in the past to a wide variety of production equipment, and machinery.

The hon. member for Lakeshore gave a lengthy speech which I enjoyed listening to and which was helpful in some regards. I have dealt with several of these items, and I would now like to deal with several additional matters which he mentioned. He dealt at some length with the anomalies in the exemptions which had been provided in The Hospital Tax Act. He also pointed out that these exemptions were coming into The Retail Sales Tax Act.

But as I spelled out in my opening remarks in this debate yesterday, this is for a transitional period and these exemptions are going to be eliminated during the next 12 months and not later than March 31, 1970.

We did not want to, and in fact, we could not, withdraw the exemptions immediately. To give one example, the Stratford Shakespearean Theatre has had its tickets printed, its brochures printed, ticket agents throughout North America provided with prices, and such like, for many weeks. For us now to say, this sales tax applies to all sales after April 1 would have been tremendously disruptive and not at all fair.

By the same token it was thought unwise to set a date in the fall, for instance, because winter fairs and fall fairs are making their plans now. A wide variety of benevolent organizations have made plans for more ambitious undertakings and we did not want to interfere with that. For that reason we are dealing with each of these exemptions separately in the next 12 months with the objective of eliminating all such eruptions by the end of March next year.

That will meet the recommendation of the Smith committee and the select committee. And, of course, those meritorious organizations which require and deserve public support can be given grants and these grants can be subjected to the scrutiny of legislators and the scrutiny of the public at large.

The member for Lakeshore questioned if the Minister had the power to exempt these particular groups of taxpayers, and I would like to read a legal opinion that I have acquired. I draw your attention to the following provisions of The Retail Sales Tax Act, section 39, subsection 1:

For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Act, according to their true intent and of supplying any deficiency therein, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make such regulations as are considered necessary and advisable.

Subsection 2:

Without limiting the generality of subsection 1, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations—

This is paragraph f.

—providing for relaxing the strictness of this Act relative to the incidence or collection of tax hereunder in special circumstances where, without relaxation, inconvenience or hardship might result, including cases involving the purchase of tangible personal property at bazaars and rummage sales.

I would also draw your attention to section 9 of The Department of Revenue Act, which provides for the remission of tax under special circumstances.

My hon. friend quoted, or rather misquoted or misinterpreted Mr. Justice McRuer. Mr. Justice McRuer did not say that the Minister should not have these discretionary powers. But he did say that the Minister should be fully responsible for the exercise of discretionary powers in the matter of tax forgiveness or tax exemption, and that he should not be able to thrust this responsibility onwards to a judge, or somebody else, standing at some distance from the Legislature.

As a matter of fact, I was surprised and very interested in the enthusiastic support that this proposition got from legislators with whom I discussed the matter, and I came to the conclusion that even the Opposition wanted to see the Minister with the power and the responsibility so that they could call upon that Minister to stand up and defend his actions.

Mr. Lawlor: I wanted a review, too. I wanted consultations—

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the member for Lakeshore dealt with production machinery and I have described the situation in other provinces. I have attempted to discuss the possible effect on prices if all or if part of this increased cost were passed down to consumers. Here is an idea that I will mention for my hon. friends' philosophical consideration.

Is it possible that the more highly developed industries—those that are advancing

very rapidly from a technological point of view, and which use a disproportionately large share of capital—call upon the public purse directly or indirectly, immediately or eventually for public expenditures? For instance, it is undeniable when the Ford Motor Company located its plant at Talbotville, the public purse was called upon to provide the water, to provide the highway connections, to provide the schools for the children of the employees and to provide the hospitals, sewers and everything else. So that is one illustration of what I mean.

Very often one finds a correlation between capital intensity and the potential for pollution. I am thinking of a chemical industry—

Mr. Peacock: The lack of planning your land use.

Hon. Mr. White: I remember years ago, when rather an extensive addition was planned by the Imperial Oil Company in Sarnia involving tens of millions of dollars, if I remember correctly—the number of additional employees was less than a dozen.

Of course, the public has assumed the responsibility of retraining the people who would otherwise perhaps have engaged in the operation of that addition and so, the idea occurs to me that there may be a philosophical rationale in looking to some fractional, and I must say it is very small premium from the capital intensive industries, *vis-à-vis* the labour intensive industries. I have no answer to that.

Mr. Lawlor: A misuse of your taxing power. There are other more proper ways.

Hon. Mr. White: I have no answer to that. The member for—

Mr. Lawlor: What answers have you got to the range of authorities from Poole to Carter? Does it not bother you at all?

Hon. Mr. White: No. It is a matter that I have thought of very thoroughly. As a matter of fact, I think perhaps those very distinguished economists may not have been in full possession of the most current facts.

Mr. Peacock: They are not as much in need of money as you are.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Lakeshore made reference to the need for applying all taxes uniformly to different industries. I have tried to point out how, by eliminating the exemption on the four-elevenths, we are now getting a degree of uniformity in a way that was not the case before—

Mr. Lawlor: You call that seven-elevenths legitimate?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, it is legitimate. I will send you the working papers on that. The administrative economies were dealt with by him and we visualize a very substantial increase in efficiency within our department; of course, on the part of the taxpayer, too.

Mr. Peacock: At the expense of productivity in industry?

Hon. Mr. White: As a matter of fact, *ceteris paribus*, it will be possible to reduce our staff in that branch by about a third. This is not my intention because of the select committee's recommendation that the audit staff be increased to provide more frequent audits. I, myself, would like very much if it were possible to increase the frequency of audit, which now ranges from about three years to about nine years to a period not longer than two years.

At the present time we charge back for 36 months and I would like to see that period of time reduced to 24 months. This may not be possible. It is a matter that we are investigating very carefully, both the tax administrators and the sales tax branch. We have a very wide experience in the administration of tax enforcement of these regulations and legislation. Professor John Allan of McMaster, who was the economic consultant to the select committee on taxation, is studying the optimum frequency of audit and the optimum number of auditors.

I would hope that the very great increase in the efficiency which will flow from this change will make it possible for us to increase the efficiency of audit for all taxpayers.

I have dealt briefly with the claim that sales taxes are regressive, but I point out to the hon. member that we have a differential rate in three categories—zero tax on a certain range of goods and services, a five per cent tax and a ten per cent tax. This range is intended to make the sales tax much more progressive than it otherwise would be. That is why I am so astonished to hear the Liberal comment that the tax on expensive meals, for instance, is regressive because, of course, it is exactly the opposite. It is very progressive.

The differential rate, the exemption, the inclusion now of additional services, more particularly the hotel service, the fact that consumption is very directly related to income—all of these features make the sales tax more progressive than it otherwise would be.

We have applied the retail sales tax to the

production equipment which was previously exempt because it is productive, efficient and competitive. Those are the reasons—it is productive, efficient and competitive.

Mr. Lewis: And lucrative.

Hon. Mr. White: The point was made by one or two speakers that this tax may force business out of Canada. I do not think this is going to happen. The amount of money is relatively small, and the fact that it has been in effect in the other major manufacturing provinces, and apparently well accepted, leads me to think that this will not give us a great deal of difficulty internationally.

We have a letter here from some of the other jurisdictions, pointing out that there is no evidence that the imposition of the tax interfered with their exports to other countries. I have one here from British Columbia which seems to have been mislaid. I will not be bothered reading it but I ask you to accept that assurance.

If it should happen that this or municipal taxes or some other such impost did make Canadian industry non-competitive, I should think that that would be best remedied at the federal level. At the present time, of course, the federal government has a three per cent surcharge on corporation income and if it were found that increased costs of whatever kind across this country of ours were leading to some international uncompetitiveness, I suppose that that is the level of government at which redress should be sought.

The member for Windsor West suggested that tobacco should be under The Retail Sales Tax Act rather than under the separate tax. Before he was a member here, as a matter of fact, it did come under the retail sales tax. It was only a few years ago that that change was made and it was made for the administrative efficiencies which it has brought to the government and to the vendors of cigarettes, and was very popular with the industry. As a result, on January 1, 1966, this tax came out of the retail sales tax and into the tobacco tax.

It had been pointed out that some small vendors sold only cigarettes which were subject to the retail sales tax, because, of course, chocolate bars and such like are less than 21 cents, so by removing them from the retail sales tax these businesses could not have any taxable sales. It also was a very great help to enforcement. Having the wholesale and a few large retail chains collect, there is

less opportunity to evade the taxes. As a consequence, Mr. Smith in his report, on page 281, volume 3, said:

Collection at the wholesale level has greatly improved administration, removing many vendors from the list of retail sales tax collectors since the only taxable commodity they handled was tobacco.

That I think will answer the suggestion that the hon. member put forward. I think I have dealt with nearly every point that has been raised, Mr. Chairman, except the comments—which, I observe, were seriously intended but which I think are completely inappropriate and which I refuse to answer.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister permit a question? If in fact that is the case, that the reduction in tariff duty on the basis of the GATT agreement would amount to \$45 million per year, and the Minister has increased it by \$38 million—most of the \$45 million, or a good part of it, being in Ontario—then how has he improved the situation? How has he supported the international agreement so carefully negotiated?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Did the CCF in Saskatchewan think of that when they imposed it?

Hon. Mr. White: The purpose of tariffs 100 years ago was to raise revenue. The purpose of tariffs in more recent decades has been to decrease international trade, to keep out the products—the primary or secondary manufactured products, or raw materials, in fact—from other countries, to give a special inducement to domestic producers.

This introduces diseconomies because of the advantages which flow from comparative advantage and absolute advantage in world trade. For governments unilaterally to destroy comparative or absolute advantage is to decrease the standard of living within their own importing country and in the exporting country. Now here again we are getting into a very complicated economic area. There is no more relation between an imposition of a domestic tax here in Ontario and the GATT treaty than there is between an increase in the municipal tax at Exeter and the tariff on ping-pong balls in Biafra.

Now the hon. member for Riverdale broached this subject and went on to imply or to state that we were destroying Confederation. I reply to him by paraphrasing the remarks of the leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) as contained in his speech of March

11, 1969, which was the day before yesterday, on page 2073, where he stated that:

The soundest foundation on which to build unity in this country is an equitable financial basis.

I have tried to point out to you how these changes are more equitable and how they conform more closely to the taxing provisions in the other provinces of Canada.

The soundest foundation on which to build unity in this country is an equitable financial basis that will meet the needs of the people across this country and give them some equality of services. Fiscal separatism is what we—

Meaning the NDP—

—heard yesterday.

Meaning from the Liberal leader.

Mr. Speaker, he went to say that that is a propaganda slogan that is sterile and bankrupt and I would apply these words of the leader of the NDP to the extraordinary presentation from the member for Riverdale.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification from the Minister's statement. As I understand it, he said that \$38 million will amount to one-fiftieth—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member does not have a ministerial statement upon which to ask a point of clarification. This is a debate and the rules of this debate as adopted in this House are that the members all have the opportunity to speak and then the Minister presenting the bill has the opportunity of rebuttal. I would rule the member out of order.

An hon. member: He accepts questions.

Mr. Makarchuk: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave us some figures, and on checking them back they are not accurate.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled the hon. member, and his question, and his point of order, out of order.

Mr. Lewis: Well if the few Ministers that accept questions—

Mr. Speaker: The motion is by Mr. White for the second reading of Bill 79. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

In my opinion I hear a dissenting voice, and in that event, as many as are in favour of the motion will please say "aye". As

many as are opposed will please say "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion for second reading moved by hon. Mr. White, which was agreed to on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Ben
Apps	Braithwaite
Auld	Breithaupt
Bales	Bullbrook
Bernier	Burr
Boyer	Davison
Brunelle	Deans
Connell	De Monte
Davis	Edighoffer
Demers	Farquhar
Downer	Ferrier
Dunlop	Gaunt
Dymond	Jackson
Evans	Knight
Gilbertson	Lawlor
Gomme	Lewis
Grossman	Makarchuk
Guindon	Martel
Haskett	Newman
Henderson	(Windsor-Walkerville)
Hodgson	Nixon
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Paterson
Hodgson	Peacock
(York North)	Reid
Johnston	(Rainy River)
(Parry Sound)	Renwick
Johnston	(Riverdale)
(St. Catharines)	Renwick (Mrs.)
Johnston	(Scarborough Centre)
(Carleton)	Ruston
Kennedy	Smith
Kerr	(Nipissing)
Lawrence	Spence
(Carleton East)	Stokes
Lawrence	Young—30.
(St. George)	
Meen	
Morningstar	
Morrow	
McKeough	
McNeil	
Potter	
Price	
Pritchard (Mrs.)	
Reilly	
Reuter	
Robarts	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Simonett	

AYES

Smith
 (Simcoe East)
 Snow
 Stewart
 Villeneuve
 Welch
 White
 Whitney
 Winkler
 Wishart
 Yaremko—54.

NAYS

In connection with vote 402, I should point out to the committee that if they will refer to page 40 of the estimates book, there are programme activities described there. The first three sections—that is, general administration, care of adult offenders, the treatment and training of adult offenders—have to do with reformatories and provincial jails. But the aftercare of adult offenders has to deal with aftercare parole, and so on. Perhaps we could restrict our discussion along those lines. If this would be agreeable to the committee and if that is what the hon. Minister wishes, we will proceed then with vote 402.

The hon. member for Humber.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the “ayes” are 54, the “nays” 30.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITALS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves second reading of Bill 80, An Act to repeal The Hospitals Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 19th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
(Continued)

On vote 402:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a correction. The other evening during the discussion of my estimates I gave some information to the House. In reading the transcript there is a correction I wish to make. It is not of very great import but I would just as soon have it correct on the record.

I stated that MACTO visited 22 jurisdictions in the course of arriving at its recommendations. Actually I should have said MACTO studied and/or visited 22 jurisdictions in arriving at its recommendations regarding the incentive allowance.

Mr. Chairman: When we completed our deliberations the other evening we had passed vote 401 and there had been considerable discussion which had been ranging on to vote 402.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, on this aftercare of adult offenders, I note from looking at that particular item that the Salvation Army, the John Howard Society, and the Elizabeth Fry Society, Toronto and Ottawa, are specifically mentioned. But there is no mention of the St. Leonard's House or the Inn of Windsor, one being for male and the other for female offenders; these are halfway houses. These are very essential institutions in the rehabilitation, if I may put it that way, of former clients of the Minister of Correctional Services. Since it is now called Correctional Services, I hate to use the word inmates; what are we going to call them now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just call them releasees.

Mr. Ben: Releasees. Now what do you call the people you have in your custody at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Inmates or students, depending upon their age.

Mr. Ben: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I point out that much has been written on the importance of halfway houses such as the St. Leonard's House or the Inn of Windsor, which is a proposed halfway house.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): It is affiliated with St. Leonard's.

Mr. Ben: It is affiliated with St. Leonard's, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville informs me. I am surprised that there is not a grant under this item for either the St. Leonard's House or the Inn of Windsor. Looking through the estimates, Mr. Chairman, I may have missed it, but we did look for them with care; we cannot find any grants to these institutions. Would the Minister please comment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The grants to the halfway houses, including St. Leonard's House, are handled by The Department of Social and Family Services. You will find them under the grants of that department.

Mr. Ben: I am gratified to hear that, Mr. Chairman, and as long as they get the money I am not going to start splitting hairs as to who should give it to them. But inasmuch as I should think the services they render are to a great degree rehabilitational or correctional, may I ask out of curiosity why these particular grants were put under The Department of Social and Family Services rather than your department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it comes under the category of a hostel and The Department of Social and Family Services has money set aside for hostels. It is a matter of administration and I suppose it could be handled by our department. I cannot recall at the moment but there is a possibility that some of the halfway houses do not necessarily confine themselves to releasees from correctional institutions. That may be one of the reasons.

Mr. Ben: If I may please pursue this. Has the Minister any idea what amount has been granted for this purpose by that department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the year 1965-66 the figure for St. Leonard's House was \$7,312.91; in 1966-67, \$11,575.26; and in 1967-68, \$39,378.90; a very substantial increase.

Mr. Ben: I thank the Minister for the figures but I wish he had not used the word, substantial, because in relation to the work it is doing I would say it is far from substantial.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Aside from whether or not I think it is substantial, I said a substantial increase. I am sure the hon. member will agree that an increase from \$11,000 to \$39,000 is a substantial increase.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, that substantial increase also leads you to believe that there must have been a substantial amount of work done by the association. What disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister does not recognize the work that St. Leonard's House does. Social and Family Services recognize it because the grant comes under The Charitable Institutions Act, but the recognition does not come from your department and they are dealing primarily with people who have served apprenticeship in your depart-

ment and are now out in the world. I think it behooves you, Mr. Minister, to see that the grant comes from your department rather than Social and Family Services. Recognize the work they do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that is a rather interesting proposition. In the first place, it is all out of the same pocket; it all comes from the government. In the second place, I have no objections and I know the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) would have no objections. In fact, we have talked about the possibility in the past. We did not think it was important so long as they get the funds, but it is rather interesting to note that some people in the Opposition will say there is a stigma attached to an association with The Department of Correctional Services, and now the suggestion is that we should take something out of Social and Family Services and bring it into Correctional Services.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Do not look at us when you say that; we know whereof we speak.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to straighten the records before I get into what I want to say on the correctional institution in Burwash and the problems confronting the people in that community.

I want to go back to *Hansard* of March 7, in which the Minister made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question it is the policy of the department that political meetings are not held on institutional property.

Because of this, Mr. Kirby, principal of the school in Burwash village, wrote to Mr. Marsden, a member of the staff at Burwash in reply to a request for the use of the school for a meeting.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out to the hon. member that as the Chairman pointed out to the committee at the beginning of our deliberations, we would deal with the programme activities. And the hon. member for Humber did start out on aftercare and parole under the fourth programme. The hon. member is dealing with reformatories.

Mr. Martel: I am going to deal with parole as well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Could we deal with the parole branch under this particular activity and then go back to the other?

Mr. Martel: I would still like to straighten the records out, Mr. Chairman, before I get involved in this.

Mr. Chairman: Has the hon. member done that? Has the hon. member completed that portion with reference to—

Mr. Martel: Not at all, Mr. Chairman, I have not completed it because all I have done is quote the Minister so far. I am afraid the House was being misled at this point because the Minister was well aware that I was not going into Burwash to a political meeting, Mr. Chairman. The Minister was well aware that I wrote him a letter on January 22 in which I invited him to attend a meeting in Burwash with me to discuss the problems confronting the people in the town of Burwash, and in that letter I suggested to the Minister, and I quote:

Your careful consideration and help in this situation would be very greatly appreciated and I hope you will be able to find time to accept my invitation to visit Burwash with me.

He is quite aware, as well, that this was no political meeting. And if we are going to get involved in political meetings, then I suggest the Minister should not allow Conservative candidates to use the facilities of the school to make political speeches to the civil service association during a political campaign, and then to turn around and deny a member of this Legislature on the pretext that it is a political meeting when he knew full well it was not.

To use this as an excuse for denying me the right to see the people who invited me to come in to discuss their problems is a real sham on his department. I am wondering what they have to hide in Burwash, and I would like this matter straightened out before we go any further.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is confusing matters here. His letter on January 22 did not talk at all about meeting at any particular place. During the course of some comments which he made he talked about some the members of the staff being unhappy about certain conditions, and on page 2 of the letter, which I presume he has before him, in the second paragraph, he states:

I must once again urge that someone be allowed to maintain some sort of confectionary, so as to give the residents easy access to such things as cigarettes, refreshments, etc.

I would be more than delighted to visit the area with you so that we could in a very constructive manner attempt to eliminate the dismay that has set in.

There is no reference in the first place—

Mr. Martel: Go down to the final paragraph.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The final paragraph reads:

Your careful consideration and help in this situation will be very greatly appreciated and I hope you will be able to find time to accept my invitation to visit Burwash with me.

It was very kind of the hon. member, of course, to ask me to visit one of my own institutions with him. I can assure him I will be very glad to call him when I get to Burwash if he wants me to call him for any particular reason to visit Burwash when I am there. He will appreciate the fact that we now have, I think, some 82 institutions under the jurisdiction of my department. It is most difficult to visit them all when I would like to—but, to get to the particular point: He merely asked me to visit Burwash with him to discuss some of these matters, and at that time there was no question about whether this was to be a special meeting or what the nature of the meeting would be, or anything of that nature.

Mr. Martel: Right, Mr. Chairman, I also took the liberty, when I returned to the House, to discuss a possible visit with the Minister, some time later. The point I am making is that the Minister was fully aware that the people in Burwash wanted to discuss their problems through the correspondence I had had given. Where the idea of a political meeting came from is a hoax, and the Minister is aware of this. There was never any suggestion of a political meeting by anyone. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if I might go so far, the people who contacted me are dyed-in-the-wool parties; they were not going to invite me to a New Democratic meeting, I am sure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I am sure they were not going to invite me to one of their political meetings. The only member that they have ever

seen fit, to date, to invite in there was the Conservative candidate in the last election.

An hon. member: Did he come out?

Mr. Martel: If this is the case the school facilities can be used for a political meeting for a Conservative candidate. How in the world do you deny a member of this Legislature to visit with the people in there? Under the pretext that it is a political meeting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member is really just inviting me to put on to the record again—at the waste of some extra time, I think—what I mentioned in the House the other day when his leader asked this question. I explained this in quite some detail and, I thought, to the satisfaction of his leader. I explained the precise position we were in with regard to having political meetings on government property, particularly when that government property is connected with a penal institution. It had nothing to do at all with the matters which the hon. member discussed with me in his letter. This was another matter that came up, about a particular meeting, which some of the members of the staff wanted to hold, and apparently they did ask the principal whether they could have this meeting.

Mr. Martel: Legal permission?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will save time, Mr. Chairman, if I read exactly what went on during the discussion between his leader and myself.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, are we talking about a political meeting, or a meeting to discuss problems?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what I am trying to find out. That is precisely what I am trying to find out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member asking me whether I, in fact, refused to come up and have a meeting with him and members of the staff on government property; or is he asking me whether, in fact, the superintendent refused to let someone have a meeting, because in his view it was a political one?

Mr. Martel: Right. Now where did he get that idea?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is exactly what we were discussing the other day, and I repeat it again here.

My answer to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) was, "It is the policy of the department that political meetings are not held on institutional property." Because of this—

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Who said it was a political meeting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The master question, if the hon. members will please give me the opportunity to answer it so we will get a clear understanding—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Kirby, the principal of the school, which is on government property, on institutional property—

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): What is sacred about that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —asked about someone wanting to have a meeting at the school.

Mr. Martel: This is somebody who is a member of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The principal wrote—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Please. Because of this policy that we do not allow political meetings, Mr. Kirby, principal of the school in Burwash village, wrote to Mr. Marsden, a member of the staff at Burwash, in reply to a request for the use of the school for a meeting. He advised him that, as it appeared in his view, Mr. Kirby's view, that the meeting was to be of a political nature, he, Mr. Marsden, should get permission from the superintendent. Mr. Kirby's reply, Mr. Chairman, was fairly well in keeping with what has been our policy—I am quoting my comments on that date—and here is the point, and I would like the hon. member for Sudbury East to keep it in mind. Incidentally, I gave this answer on Friday, March 7, and I should add that no further application at this moment has been made to the superintendent as a result of that letter which, on the face of it, would lead one to believe that the intention was in fact to use it for a political purpose.

Mr. Lewis: Boy, oh, boy, that is a non-sacred area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, just a moment, it is not a non-sacred area.

Mr. Lewis: It was the Minister who intimated that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never intimidated any meeting. I know nothing about the intention of someone having a meeting there for that purpose, and I add that for the benefit of the hon. member, and other hon. members, who may not have been here on that occasion.

However, I recognize that a general policy in respect of the use of institutional property is difficult to apply to Burwash because of the fact that a large number of staff live on the property. Therefore it is obvious that some change in rules must be made for the use of meeting facilities for staff at this particular institution. For this reason I am considering the problem with a view to revising instructions so as to clarify the use of the village facilities for meetings, either to discuss village problems, or problems of staff conditions, if the members of the staff feel they require such discussion.

I would think if they wanted to invite their local MPP to be present, there should be no objection providing the meeting is not of a political nature. In fact, as an MPP myself, I feel that not only is it the right of an MPP, but it is his duty to meet his constituents if they invite him to do so.

I would, however, appeal to hon. members, not to take this as an invitation to utilize institutional property for political purposes, keeping in mind that Burwash is a penal institution, and it is very easy for actions which would be normal in any other setting, to precipitate very serious repercussions in a penal setting. I do not see what objection the hon. member can take to that.

Mr. Martel: Certainly, I have plenty of objections, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to know where someone got the idea it was a political meeting?

This was not Mr. Kirby's decision as I am told. I am advised that Mr. Kirby had given consent for the use of the school, and that he was instructed to change his ruling on the granting of the school to the citizens of Burwash for me to go in and visit with them.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, where in the world would he dream this up—if it were Mr. Kirby, and I have my doubts, because I have had the occasion, over the last four or five days, to speak to a good number of people. I have my doubts it was Mr. Kirby's decision, because these people maintain it was the superintendents decision, and not Kirby's.

But more important, on what grounds, if it were Mr. Kirby, would he make this assumption that it was a political meeting.

How can they second guess the odd hundred people who wanted me to come in, and I know the number. By what divine knowledge would one man know that I was coming in for political reasons? This is the point, Mr. Chairman, that grates me to no end—that someone on his own decides I am coming in for political reasons.

I know that you do not have a political meeting there, because I have had one with residents of Burwash, and that meeting was held in a school in Wahnapeetae, so I know the rule quite well about a political meeting in Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought that was pretty clearly explained here. I have seen a copy of the letter when this question was raised by the hon. member's leader. I have seen a copy of the letter that Mr. Kirby wrote to Mr. Marsden, telling Mr. Marsden that, in his view, it was going to be a political meeting. How Mr. Kirby arrived at that, I do not know; I was not there.

I did not discuss this with Mr. Kirby, but the fact remains that if it was not going to be of a political nature, why did not Mr. Marsden then carry out the suggestion of Mr. Kirby, the principal, to go to the superintendent and say, "This is not a political meeting, therefore, may we have permission?" Perhaps the superintendent would have approved of it. The fact is that after they got this letter from Mr. Kirby, the principal, they did not ask for permission. That is why I said in my answer, "on the face of it it would appear that Mr. Kirby's decision that it was going to be of a political nature appeared to be a correct one," because nobody questioned it, nobody went to the superintendent and asked for permission.

Mr. Martel: That was questioned in the House here but we will ask again. The only reason we have not asked, or the people of Burwash have not asked, is that they are waiting until we get this cleared up down here, because the invitation still stands. We want it cleared by the Minister that we are entitled to have a meeting in there with them. The request will be made very promptly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member asking me what the policy is again? I am sorry, I could not hear the hon. member.

Mr. Martel: No. I am just saying that the Minister made reference to the fact that Mr. Marsden has not made another request to

hold this meeting. I am saying that Mr. Marsden has not made the request until I could get back to the Legislature to find out what the answer would be to the question, which the leader of the New Democratic Party raised last Friday. But there will be a request made, I would say within the next 24 hours, then, for the use of the school so I may meet with the residents of that part of my constituency.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought, Mr. Chairman, I made that crystal clear in my statement. I said meetings not of a political nature—of course permission should be granted. If, in fact, the superintendent does not grant permission after you have satisfied him of the nature of it, then it is a matter for head office and it is a matter for me to clarify. But apparently the superintendent has not refused it, because apparently it has not yet gone to his level.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I am told by the people who contacted me that it was the superintendent who vetoed the meeting and not Mr. Kirby at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member not believe me when I say I read a copy of the letter which Mr. Kirby sent to Mr. Marsden asking him to go and talk to the superintendent? I have seen the letter. What the hon. member has heard from some other people, I am not in a position to pass judgment on, I can only deal with those matters which are before me.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Would the Minister table the letter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes, I would be very glad to do that. If the hon. member wants the letter tabled, I would be very pleased to do it.

Mr. Lewis: Has the Minister got the letter—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I had a copy made, apparently—

Mr. Lewis: One would want to know on what basis—I think the member for Sudbury East puts it very well—on what basis Mr. Kirby arrived at that conclusion, because the moment you put the onus on the employee to go to the superintendent with the undercurrent implicit that there is a political motive. You then make everyone in the institution concerned about holding any meeting at all, and that is exactly what happened with the member for Sudbury East.

It happened, Mr. Chairman, because in the Minister's institutional framework generally there is much unease about the expression of civil servant discontent, because there is so much of a closed nature in those institutions. If you want to free it you would have a very nice flow of discussion because what the member for Sudbury East was about was a perfectly legitimate political duty and it need never have been construed by Kirby or anybody else as a political motive, except on the previous performance of Tory political candidates, but never on any other basis. There is a sort of contagion of conspiracy in these institutions, that is why this kind of thing happens.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that is just utter nonsense. I know what the hon. member for Scarborough West is referring to—about all kinds of freedom for discussion and so on. He has no idea what things are like in attempting to run a correctional service, he just has no conception.

As far as holding meetings at Burwash is concerned—I am speaking from memory, I could be corrected and I will be, I am sure, if I am wrong—there have been other meetings of a like nature in Burwash where they have discussed often their working conditions. This is precisely what the branch is there for. They meet in Burwash, they meet in the hall in Burwash—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): With a member?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, just a moment. In the first place, the hon. member for Scarborough West was not talking about seeing a member. He was suggesting, he was implying—

Mr. Lewis: I was talking about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member will just give me an opportunity. He was, in fact, saying that the members of the staff did not have freedom of speech to discuss their working conditions.

Mr. Lewis: No, I did not say that at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have told the member for Sudbury East what the policy of the department is. I have explained to him that there is a grey area here which is difficult to resolve and I am sure if he wants to be fair he will appreciate that. Now, how some particular member of the staff construed that this might have political overtones, at this moment escapes me.

But he will also appreciate the fact that having, as I said, some 80-odd institutions, some local autonomy, some local responsibility must be given to the staff at the institutions. We cannot possibly deal with everything at head office. So somebody at some stage decided that there were possibly some political overtones.

Because of this he says, "You better go and ask the superintendent's permission for this meeting." Presumably, Mr. Kirby did not feel—and I only presume this—presumably he did not feel he wanted to take this responsibility because of some of the things perhaps he heard. After all, the hon. member for Sudbury East said people were talking to him about it. So he wanted to make sure he was in a clear position, and he told Mr. Marsden, "go and get the permission of the superintendent." Now after that nothing happened.

The hon. member's suggestion that Mr. Marsden or anybody else would get into any difficulty because they went to the superintendent to ask for a meeting, is entirely wrong, it does not do justice to the way our institutions are operated. The branch has had meeting after meeting over the years at the institutions to discuss working conditions.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury East was on his feet.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, the interesting part in all this is that the Marsdens had mailed letters out as they had received permission from Mr. Kirby to use the school. But, once the letters were received, the superintendent in Burwash said, "no." This is the implication. It was only after the letters were mailed out, advising the people in Burwash that I would be coming in on March 7, that the use of the school was denied. It was not a decision by Mr. Kirby.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say it was a decision by Mr. Kirby—the hon. member says this is implied.

Mr. Martel: The Minister is saying that the people should have gone to Mr. Silcock to get permission. They had permission from the principal, and it was only after the notices were delivered that the permission was withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, perhaps, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Martel: From Mr. Silcock.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, perhaps because of what was in the notices, Mr. Kirby came to the conclusion it might have political overtones and because of this he asked Mr. Marsden to go and ask the superintendent for his permission. What was wrong with that? He had some concern about this. Now, the hon. member has implied, he did not charge, he implied that the superintendent had in fact already denied them the use of the hall. Is that what he is saying?

Mr. Martel: After the principal had granted it, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if this is what the hon. member is saying, this is something I will have to investigate. My information is that no official request was made of the superintendent for the use of the hall after the letter from Mr. Kirby.

Now, upon what someone else has told the hon. member, he must appreciate, I cannot take any action. If he is prepared to make this charge, I will ask the superintendent anyway, whether this fact is true, which I doubt very much.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to this. There is almost a phobia that has been created in the atmosphere of correctional services around politicians, particularly politicians of Opposition parties, entering the institutions, reviewing the conditions in those institutions, and engaging in examination of those institutions. The whole reaction, which to me is almost paranoid, about Opposition members doing what is a very reasonable political function, has filtered right down through the entire institutional framework. The Minister likes nothing more than to rally the troops at some point in the debate—it will happen again—in defence of his civil servants against the assaults of Opposition members. That is the way the department is treated. But let Opposition members try to find out what is happening within those institutions, let them come unannounced, let them make certain charges, let them attempt to find certain facts; things have to be cleared ahead of time, all the difficulties in The Department of Correctional Services are thrown up to us—such as how tough it is to run the department and how abusive it is for the civil servants, and how, therefore, the Minister has to exercise restraint. I am really suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would have a far freer time in the management of his institutions if he gave a

wholesale invitation to every member of the Opposition to behave as he saw fit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To what?

Mr. Lewis: To behave as he saw fit in the entry or non-entry of his institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, is that not precisely what I have done?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is any other jurisdiction in Canada which issued the invitation which I did, three or four or five years ago, to all members of the Legislature—

Mr. Lewis: Right, and subsequent qualifications—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment—to visit any of our institutions without notice of any kind. And certainly the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), and the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), have taken advantage of that on numerous occasions. So how you can possibly say that we restrict their movements, that we restrict their freedoms?

Mr. Lewis: There are certain qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course there have to be qualifications. You cannot go into the confidential files. Of course there have to be qualifications, and the hon. member, either deliberately or unwittingly, is attempting to equate the situation in Burwash with other institutions. Either he does not know the particular situation in Burwash—Burwash is a village composed entirely of staff of the institution. It is all within institutional grounds. If we had to build an institution like that today this would not be necessary, but whenever it was built—perhaps 30 years ago, 40 years ago—these people were so far removed from any built-up area that you had to provide them with homes there—very well subsidized homes, I should tell the hon. member for Sudbury East. They are being treated very well.

That is very different from any other institution that we have. Here is a place where there is a large penal institution, and some of our tougher customers are there, too. And within the grounds of this institution are all of these villagers who are members of the staff. Now this is not quite the same as any other penal institution that we have. You just cannot have the same rules apply.

For instance, we would not be giving some of the benefits to other institutions that we give to the villagers of Burwash merely because of the fact that they are not as close to a built up area as others are. We will go into that later—I am sure the hon. member for Sudbury East is going to raise some of these questions—but to try to equate this with all of our other institutions and to suggest that this department is restricting the movement of the members of this Legislature is utter nonsense. They get more freedom of movement than probably any other jurisdiction in North America, let alone Canada.

Mr. J. Renwick: In the world.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe the world. I have asked this question. I have told the hon. members that I have been the circuit and have asked these questions, and I do not know of any other jurisdiction where the head of the department has given this invitation to the members—and that invitation still applies, it still goes on. The members are still going in and getting all the freedom they can expect within such an institution.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we have heard the Minister speak about political meetings, and then we hear him then draw to political overtones. I would like to ask the Minister very clearly, Mr. Chairman, and for our clarification, if the staff workers in this particular institution wanted to speak to the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), about staff problems, about problems of unpleasantness either with this government or working for the government—does the Minister define that as a political meeting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That, I think, was the only real, legitimate question that has been asked to this moment, on this whole problem, because it is very germane, and it is a very difficult question to answer. I will tell the hon. member quite frankly that we have discussed this. I have put myself in the position of a local MPP, and asked about this because it is a different situation in other institutions. Suppose they want to discuss working conditions. I really do not know whether this would be considered as having sympathetic overtones or not; I do not know. This is a matter which I was thinking about when I said we will have to review the policy in respect of Burwash village.

Quite frankly, I would think that because there is a structure and a setup, there is machinery for the staff to air their grievances. There is a branch there of the Civil Service Association of Ontario. The machinery is set up that any complaints or any grievances brought to that branch can be brought to the headquarters of the CSAO which will then take them up with the civil service commission. This is the machinery that is set up for this purpose, the same as it is in private organizations where there is organized labour represented in that organization.

Now, it is a question; I have not answered it yes or no because quite frankly, at this moment, I do not know. I would just hope, as I mentioned earlier, that the hon. members will consider—take the hon. member for Sudbury East because he is involved in that particular area—the implications of any kind of meeting that he may be attending and that it may spill over into the morale of the staff within a penal institution and even possibly involve inmates.

An hon. member: So that is your position?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the point.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this a little further. I would like to define, with the Minister first of all, that there is a village within this institution, a village of people—of how many inhabitants? The member for Sudbury East says 750—and this is a village where these people must be able to speak freely with their member of Parliament or we are suppressing a very important function of democracy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About 700, that is correct. I have agreed to that.

Mrs. M. Renwick: They must be able to bring their sitting member of the legislative assembly, Mr. Chairman, to this village where they are residents, even if it does fall within one of the provincial institutions.

The Minister has said, Mr. Chairman, that grievances can be aired through a structure. But every citizen in this province has to have some way of being able to communicate with their sitting member of Parliament beyond any structure that is woven around their place of work. To me, Mr. Chairman, these people were being denied the freedom of speaking with their member of Parliament collectively, and this of course is a very serious infraction.

I think that the Minister also has to take into consideration that for the first time these constituents have had a member of the Opposition as their provincial member of Parliament, and for the first time they had a public voice that is going to, in all likelihood, be made publicly critical of the government whereas the tendency for any sitting government member would be to deal with this sort of matter privately. I would like to say that I am concerned greatly if these people do not have a voice publicly through their sitting member of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not too sure that the hon. member is correct in saying that Burwash always has been represented by a member of the government.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, I stand corrected on that, but certainly not for some time, Mr. Chairman. I only went by the word of the member for Sudbury East, when he said that they had not had an NDP member represent them before.

But, shall we just say then, Mr. Chairman, it has been some time since an Opposition member has represented those constituents, and this is a deliberate attempt on the part of the superintendent, or whoever made that final decision, to muzzle those constituents.

Mr. Lewis: For many years before the renaissance, they had no one there.

Mrs. M. Renwick: The superintendent did not say so.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I think what the Minister has said about freedom of members of the Legislature has some validity. Some of us have been into his institutions from time to time, and perhaps Burwash is one where I visited without the Minister's knowledge—not inside part of your institution, but inside another part; however, you never got that word. Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that I know the general situation in that area, and what the Minister said a while ago I think has some validity in respect to the grey areas. Whenever a member of the Legislature comes into a situation like that, how do you keep politics out of it? That is the question in the Minister's mind, you see.

Mrs. M. Renwick: You cannot.

Mr. Young: You likely cannot.

Mrs. M. Renwick: You cannot. And why should you? It is a political decision.

Mr. Young: And a politician is a politician. And if a politician goes into a situation like that he is going to be conscious of the votes that are there, whether he is a New Democrat or a Conservative or anything else.

Mrs. M. Renwick: And the problem is there.

Mr. Young: And the problem is there. If he solves it it is going to help him a bit, perhaps, politically. If he does not solve it, it will be perhaps just the opposite way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Somehow or other I get very few solutions from this.

Mr. Young: But the fact is that politics are going to enter into that kind of a situation regardless, some sort of politics.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Freedom of speech is a solution.

Mr. Young: Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get back at the nub of this problem. And let us look at it. The nub of the problem is that the people in Burwash village arranged for a meeting. That is number one. They had the school arranged for. That is important to remember. Then, having arranged for it they invited their local member of provincial Parliament in to meet with them. That is number two. Two steps. The hall was secured then the invitation to the member was given. This is as I understand it. Now, once somebody realized that this was not a member of the Conservative Party, that somebody woke up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the hon. member's view.

Mr. Young: Well, somebody may have become conscious that a New Democrat won this election and not a Conservative. And so it was a New Democrat coming in—a member of the Opposition, let us put it that way. And then suddenly the wheels began to turn, and at that point—after the hall was secured, the school secured, after the invitations had gone out, then the knowledge came that this particular person, this Opposition member representing these people was to come—at that point politics began to enter into it. There would have been no politics if it had been the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers). No politics at all, it just would not have happened. He would have come and there have been no fuss.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would doubt that.

Mr. Young: Well, all right. The fact as I see it—this is my point of view and I am representing my point of view and the point of view, I think, of a good many of us in this House—is that if the member for Nickel Belt had been invited, there would have been no cancellation of the meeting.

Mrs. M. Renwick: And there would have been no public—

Mr. Young: The fact is that once this knowledge came then the wheels started to turn, and then the cancellation came. It became a political meeting, because the member of the Opposition was there instead of a member of the government. That is the difference between a political meeting and a non-political meeting. And I think we have to recognize that fact. And it may well be that the member for Sudbury East would have made some political kudos out of this if he had been able to solve the problem.

Naturally, the people would have been grateful. But how do you disassociate that kind of thing from a meeting where people invite the member to solve a problem for them? I think this is the situation. Not after the letter was written to which the Minister refers, but before. In other words, this letter came after the hall had been secured and after the invitation—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I still repeat to the hon. member that as far as I am concerned, and from the knowledge that I have available, permission to use the hall was not denied.

Mr. Young: All right. Then, Mr. Chairman, I think the member for Sudbury East is now in the clear and that the meeting can go forward. This is what I understand.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If it is not in the nature of the kind of political meeting—

Mr. Lewis: What is wrong with a political meeting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell you what is wrong with it to begin with. I have to concern myself with this thing. The only thing different about this, the only reason I am giving it any consideration at all, is because of the nature of the particular area. Because otherwise there is no problem, you are not allowed to have partisan political meetings on government property.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What is a partisan political meeting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the policy of the government.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Well then, how did the Conservative candidate in the last provincial election get in?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know, I will have to find out—it may be that at that time somebody decided that if it is an election campaign—

Mr. Makarchuk: Was it political?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Was he at the hall?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Was he in at the hall, or was he at the village? Well, do you want me to hear the hon. member for Sudbury East? Who has the floor, Mr. Chairman?

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 13, 1969
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 13, 1969

Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Grossman, continued	2241
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2279

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1969

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (Continued)

On vote 402:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not know whether the discussion on the use of the facilities at Burwash has been completed or not and if it has not, I would not want to intrude in that. Because I was expecting it to continue, and for you to go over the details just once more beginning with the letter. But I did want to bring to the attention of the Minister—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Do you get the point?

Mr. Nixon: You were successful and there was complete capitulation, is that it? Anyway, Mr. Chairman, there is one matter in the after-care of the adult offender, if that is one area, that we can discuss under vote 402 at this time—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if I might say to the hon. member—

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: —to the hon. leader of the Opposition. Before we started this afternoon we had agreed, I think, amongst the committee, that vote 402 was divided into two sections more or less. It was suggested that we would keep the after-care of adult offenders, which includes paroles, under one discussion and then continue the general discussion under reformatories, provincial jails, etc. So if we could leave that portion until later, sir.

Mr. Nixon: I certainly agree with that.

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 402 generally. The hon. member for Wentworth is on his feet.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to shock the Minister, and what I have to say really is not derogatory in any way. As the Minister knows, I have an interest in two jails in the area from where I come. One is the Hamilton Barton Street jail and the other is Milton.

An hon. member: What do you mean an interest?

Mr. Deans: Well, an interest in that I have visited both on at least a couple of occasions and had a look through them and—

An hon. member: No conflict of interest?

Mr. Deans: No, no conflict of interest. I would like to ask first of all whether or not you have a programme that will somehow get rid of both of those monstrosities. Particularly, for the moment, the one at Milton; but equally obnoxious is the one on Barton Street in Hamilton. Before I go on to say more, I wonder if the Minister could tell me whether he might be going to get rid of it within ten years—either one or both?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Hamilton and—what is the other one?

Mr. Deans: The one at Milton.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, insofar as Hamilton is concerned, I think the hon. member appreciates the fact that this is one of the five which have been named as having the highest priority. In the meantime there have been a considerable number of renovations which have been taking place—I do not know whether they are completed or not yet—in the Hamilton jail. Has the hon. member been there since the renovations took place?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I could not really tell him just about when Hamilton is going to be rebuilt. All I can tell him is that the first that is going to be done is the Ottawa jail. Where Hamilton comes after that—it will have to take its place in respect of what is recommended after the Carleton jail gets under

way and having regard for what the task force reports should be the next one. At this moment, they have not done so.

Mr. Deans: I wonder if I might ask the Minister, considering the conditions at Milton for a moment, the last time I was there—it was a number of months ago as you are aware—the conditions were intolerable and you did do some work on it. I recognize this, but I am curious to know whether or not that jail now serves a useful function or whether it would not be possible to perhaps use the Hamilton Barton Street jail and eliminate that jail altogether. The one at Milton is a dungeon quite frankly.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Not as bad as Hamilton.

Mr. Deans: Oh it certainly is, in my opinion. It is a matter of where you come from.

Mr. Kerr: We have a good staff at Milton now.

Mr. Deans: Nonsense. No, the member for Halton West indicates that the most humane personnel are at Milton rather than at Barton—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You mean the humane society.

Mr. Deans: I would have to differ from you, because the reason I rose really was to pay some tribute to the governor at Barton Street jail. It is my opinion that, considering the facilities there, the staff and the governor of Barton Street jail are to be commended. There is probably no better staff in the province of Ontario than the staff in the Hamilton Barton Street jail. The facilities are atrocious and the opportunity for education and the opportunity really for them to do any work in the way of rehabilitation is almost non-existent.

But taking those things into consideration I believe that Governor O'Neil has done an excellent job with that archaic dungeon that he works in. He has undertaken a complete refurbishing of it, if that is what you can call what you do to a jail—painting and cleaning it up and generally making it as reasonably liveable as one could expect—and I say—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our department.

Mr. Deans: I say, well your department under his prodding, I think you would agree. But anyway I want to pay public tribute to him. I think that here is a gentleman who

very rarely gets the accolades of the public. He deserves them. He has done a tremendous job in that area and I want to make sure that he is recognized properly. But the best recognition you could give him would be to tear the place down and build him some place half decent to work with.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat that Halton and Peel, including Hamilton, are among the five which I named on October 29 last. Halton and Peel, Hamilton, London, the Niagara region and Metropolitan Toronto. These are the ones that will be regional detention centres.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): When?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: First we will do the Carleton County one and the Quinte one. There are priorities—I would like to build them all next week. In the meantime there are already, as the hon. member for Wentworth has pointed out, considerable amounts of renovations in many of these jails. I agree with him in the work that the governor is doing, and I might say this applies to most, if not all, of the governors of all the jails who have been—as I said here in this Legislature—doing a good job under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. Deans: Just one final word on this. I was wondering just what was being done in the way of providing better rehabilitation services and educational facilities in those two jails that I mentioned. Now in Milton there is nothing—I think you would agree with—there is absolutely nothing in the way of rehabilitation or educational service. In Barton it is almost as bad.

What could be done in that area? Could we not bring some better form of educational programme into the jail, with properly trained personnel to provide a better rehabilitation atmosphere and try to get those people back into society, into some useful function?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the first thing we have to remember is that local jails are at the moment just holding places. In the first place we have people awaiting trial, who in many instances are found innocent. There is no programme for these people.

Insofar as the other is concerned they are all short termers and anyone with a sentence of more than 30 days usually moves out of the local jail into one of the reformatories so that they can take advantage of the programmes in effect in the reformatories.

Mr. Shulman: You have people sitting in those jails for months awaiting trial and awaiting appeal. Some of them for close to a year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Certainly the hon. member will appreciate that a person awaiting trial cannot be incorporated into the correctional system. If he is awaiting trial he is still, in the eyes of the law, an innocent man.

Mr. Shulman: Many of them have already been convicted and are awaiting appeal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If they are convicted and awaiting appeal they are in exactly the same position by law. I think the Attorney General will bear me out—he is nodding his head, he agrees. I can tell the hon. member that a person who has applied for an appeal is still in the same position as a person who is innocent—even though he has been convicted, he is treated in exactly the same way.

When we have the new regional detention centres there will be more activities which they can take advantage of if they want to, but it will be strictly voluntary of course, because they will be treated as innocent people until they have been sentenced. In the meantime, I repeat—anyone who has a term of longer than 30 days is taken out of the local jail as quickly as possible and taken into a reformatory, which is one of the reasons we were glad to integrate the whole county jail system into the correctional system generally.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Halton West was on his feet previously.

Mr. Kerr: I just want to clarify a point. Possibly the hon. member for Wentworth misunderstood me. I just said that the staff at Milton is now more humane. I was not necessarily making any comparisons with any other jail or institution. I am just saying that recently the staff has improved and there has been, in spite of the situation there, some renovation and a great deal of improvement in the staff.

I do not mind the hon. member for Wentworth coming into Halton once in a while and inspecting our jail—by invitation or otherwise—because I think the record will show in *Hansard* that I have raised the point of the Milton jail on a number of occasions since 1963.

Mr. Deans: Have you been in the jail?

Mr. Kerr: Yes, I have been there lots of times to see clients. As the hon. Minister said,

Mr. Chairman—and he has promised me on a number of occasions—Halton and Peel are high on the priority list. I do not know how Quinte snuck in there since last year, we were after Ottawa last year, but we will wait as long as it is completed this year.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Well, Mr. Chairman, we will not get back to Burwash. Before getting into the main comments, I would like to ask the Minister two questions—possibly he could answer these—with respect to matters I raised last year. One was, have any facilities been set aside now for the young single men who are working in Burwash to do their social drinking—which they did not have last year and which I was promised would be looked into? Secondly, has his department decided that pertinent information should go on the record so that the guards or the custodial officers could see it?

The reason I raise this again is that, Mr. Ford—who was transferred to Sudbury in this little schmozzle recently at Burwash—suffered from epilepsy and this apparently was not on his card and he got to the jail house in Sudbury and went three weeks without pills and as a result suffered two seizures on March 1, 1969. If the pertinent information, as I requested last year, was put on the cards—so the custodial officers would know the type of prisoner they were watching—this sort of thing would not happen.

Before I get into the main portion, I was wondering if the Minister could answer those two questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me say in respect to the first matter which the hon. member raised last year, the regulations for the department have been in the process of being rewritten now, I think, for about three years. The hon. member may think that this is a long time for regulations but they are very detailed, very complex, and you have to take into consideration the various problems in the various institutions to make sure that the general regulation applied to all the institutions will not have other implications of a disadvantageous nature.

The regulations have now been completed. We just this week received from the federal government approval for some matters which required federal government approval before we incorporated them into the regulations—they should be going to Cabinet perhaps next week or the week after that. I have to be

careful how I say this because until my colleagues in the Cabinet approve of it and it becomes government policy, I cannot put myself into a position to say that I have recommended certain things. All I can say to the hon. member is that the matter he has raised has been taken into consideration.

Mr. Martel: Well I hope for the sake of those men who work there that this will be given top consideration.

Now, I want to get to the treatment of the residents of Burwash themselves. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the residents living in Burwash are not what you would call the most contented people in the world. In fact, they are very, very dissatisfied with the treatment they are receiving from this department. Their complaints deal with a wide range of problems. Unfortunately, because I could not get to the meeting last week, I do not have them all, but I have seven or eight.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): The member should ask them to write him.

Mr. Martel: One of the main areas is the condition of the road the residents must use from the time they leave Highway 69 till they get in to where the houses are. I have been over this road on three or four occasions and to say it is deplorable would be putting it mildly. In winter, according to one of the letters I have received, here is how they describe it:

Snow blocks the road in winter. In spring and early summer the unpaved road breaks up and is almost impassable, later on in the summer the roads are choked with dust when it is dry or full of potholes when it is wet.

It is unfortunate that government equipment could not be sent in there more frequently to keep these roads in top condition, because the residents are being forced to use that four or five miles of road to do every bit of shopping and so on for their everyday living.

Another area which is of vital concern to them, and the Minister and I have exchanged considerable correspondence over this, is the matter of the general store which was closed. Now I realize that the Minister is going to say that it is policy to close this store. However, the sales which the Minister will use to show that it was not worth while keeping open hardly describe the picture at all.

The residents in Burwash are paid every two weeks, as I understand it, and there is no place for them to have their cheques cashed, and consequently they have to travel to Sudbury to have them cashed. As every-

one knows, the banks do not open until ten, and the one store that was in existence closed at 11.30 in the morning.

Now, if you went into Sudbury to cash your cheque, and then returned the 25 miles in order to do your shopping, you would get back in Burwash in time to see the store closed—so the sales were going to be reduced. Certainly this is the reason why. I do not know of any other place of 750 residents where you could not get a cheque cashed, and it seems to me that that sort of service should be forthcoming for the residents there, regardless of whether they have cars or not.

You can go to any small community and get a cheque cashed and if this was the case then a small store could do a pretty thriving business. It is unfortunate when you have residents who have had to take the train 25 miles to buy six loaves of bread. The Minister might argue that there are all kinds of cars there, but the men use their cars to get to work and consequently the housewives are left without a method of conveyance back and forth to Estaire or to Sudbury. Even to Estaire it is a 15 mile round trip.

This certainly adds to the problems of the housewives in Burwash, and this is just another of the facilities that have been taken away from the residents in Burwash without them having any opportunity to discuss it. I am told that many of the people who went there in the beginning had certain privileges which have since been taken away from them. One of the privileges was a barber's shop, and apparently this has been removed as well without negotiation. They had a shoe repair store, and this too has been taken away.

I am wondering how the Minister can justify, or attempt to justify, that his employees in Burwash can be happy when all the facilities that were there, which enticed people there, have been taken away one by one without any discussion. And to say that they can discuss it possibly with the civil service is, as far as the residents are concerned, a lost cause, because it is hard to discuss with your employer, who at the same time is your representative.

I think it is high time that the Minister—if he intends to have employees that are happily employed and expects them to do the type of job that is necessary for them to do, and working under adverse conditions—realizes the need to put back some of these facilities. And I do not think the gimmick that they have cars—as I said, it is just too far, and too many of the guards have to take their cars to work

with them, leaving the housewives without cars. Consequently most of them have had to go into the purchase of deep freezes, which adds to the cost of living that these people already have in that locality.

The other area of concern to the residents there is the ever-decreasing recreational opportunities in Burwash. As I understand it, the facilities get increasingly worse, the roof is leaking and it has reached a point of complete deterioration. Now, in all justification, Mr. Minister, I cannot understand how you expect these people to be happy in conditions like this.

This is why I invited you to come to Burwash with me and to discuss these matters, because you would have to see it first hand. You have to remember that when you are in Burwash the drive to Sudbury might be 25 miles one-way but we have roughly seven months of winter in that part of the country—tremendous snow storms starting in October and running to on in April—and it is not like jumping in your car here in Toronto and going 20 miles.

I think it is time that the Minister looked into some of these matters. Just to show you the type of treatment these people are receiving—and I know that people are going to jump on this and say it is right to do so—they have their own post office there and they used to be able to put a postcard or a birthday card in the post office without the postage and it was delivered into someone's box, but even this has been withdrawn from them. Now this is pretty small potatoes.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): That is federal.

Mr. Martel: Oh, cute. There came the pollutant.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well if I could not do any better than you are doing right now, I would resign.

Mr. Martel: If I could not do any better than you do as a Cabinet Minister, I would resign.

Mr. Deans: Now there is an idea, why do you not? Why do you not resign?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You have never been there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: When they get so desperate that they put pollutants in your hand, they are scraping the bottom of the barrel. The last point of this treatment of the residents,

Mr. Chairman, is the medical attention that the people here are receiving.

As I understand it, they even have difficulty getting a pill in an emergency now, and although the Minister has denied this as well, the residents must know that even in an emergency there has been difficulty getting medical treatment, and this is another complaint of the residents in the Burwash area.

I am going to leave that portion, and I will come back to the parole portion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402, the hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): I was just going to remark that this comes up under "county jails." Previously the county jail in Kent county was in Chatham, and I see the grand jury report says that about the only thing that the prisoners complained of was the lack of books for the library. I wonder sometimes, opening all the mail for members of the Legislature, whether we should not send all the surplus books to the jails. There might be some good reading material for these people; it is an idea. Otherwise the grand jury report was very well received, and so I just thought I would pass that along.

One thing that is bothering some of the municipalities is the charge now for holding prisoners. I notice here in the *Windsor Star*, one man pointed out it could be costly on weekends. Assume that a prisoner is arrested on Saturday night, appears before a provincial judge on Monday morning, and requests the postponement of his trial so he can secure legal aid. Is the \$12-a-day charge going to be made on the municipality where he was arrested until the man comes to trial? This is something that some of the municipalities, in setting out their budgets, are a little confused about as they have not had this before. The county jails took care of this. So they are a little worried about that, the unknown.

Twelve dollars a day does seem a little high. In Kent county, for instance, the jail is 119 years old, but we have a nice new home for the aged where you can stay for \$8 a day, so the costs just do not seem to jibe.

An hon. member: Maybe they have better meals there.

Mr. Ruston: Well, maybe they do have better meals. I do not think it is a better bed.

An hon. member: That is a good question.

Mr. Ruston: On jails in Windsor, I was wondering, through you, Mr. Chairman, about the registry office next to the jail there. There have been rumours for some time that probably there will be a new registry office built in the city of Windsor, and I wonder if this building could not be used for an annex to the jail, as probably a women's division, and probably for some administration. I would just throw that out, and you can maybe think about it in the future, because I think it has some merit, being so close to the other jail.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness I would reply to the member for Sudbury, who asked some very pointed questions.

First, he said the staff are all very satisfied. I do not agree with that, of course. I would not doubt that there are some who are dissatisfied; I would doubt that with pretty close to 4,000 employees we cannot find perhaps in many institutions some who are dissatisfied. I think this is natural. I can understand, too, that having had certain privileges over many years and having lost these privileges, there would be some dissatisfaction with this. I can understand that. But there is a very good reason for this, a very good reason.

As far as the road grading is concerned, I have heard this quite often and I am advised that the road is constantly being graded. We have our own equipment there and there is a constant grading of the roads. The previous member for that riding constantly pressured me for new roads and better roads and I was under the same pressure at that time. It was just a matter of the cost of it and where to put your priorities, and quite frankly, I must say again at this time, that there is no intention of building a new road.

The cost is tremendous. We made a survey of the Burwash roads on at least two occasions in order to arrive at an estimate. I think it was about two years ago that a survey indicated a cost of approximately \$350,000 to pave six miles of road. Under the date of June 23, 1967, my Deputy Minister wrote to The Department of Public Works requesting a survey be made in order to update those estimated costs. The recent survey was made and we were advised that the cost, at that time, would be approximately \$165,000 to pave just 2.5 miles of road from the entrance to the junction of the institution's village roads at the post office.

I say quite bluntly that if I can get \$350,-

000 additional from the Treasury, or even \$165,000 more, there are other priorities I would rather use it for in my department than in paving these roads in Burwash, even though we would like to have better roads there.

Mr. Martel: Could they not be kept better, though?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised they are being constantly graded. I remember the previous hon. member always complained about the conditions of the roads. I will be going to Burwash, I hope—I keep promising myself, every two or three months that I am going to get to Burwash, and then we have more institutions that need some attention. I have already been to Burwash, I think, three times—as a matter of fact the last time I looked at the roads, while I was not too happy with their condition, I still could not justify spending a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. Martel: I am not saying that, I mean everyday upkeep.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will take a lot of money. The hon. member mentioned the closing of the personnel store which is obviously a great source of irritation, from what he tells me.

I think the position should be made very clear—that this personnel store was set up very many years ago when roads in this area were very bad, when few of the staff had cars. I do not know how many years ago that would be, probably 30 or 40 years ago, maybe 50; when, in fact the staff village at Burwash was quite isolated—this no longer pertains. A decision to close this store dates back to September, 1967, when a directive was issued to all institutions in our department advising that no further sales of government property in any form would be made to institution employees or any public servants.

I would like to advise the hon. members that this goes beyond just the very fact of providing a service *per se*. There are other implications which can arise from the trafficking, and I do not mean anything illegal. I mean the engaging in the sale of merchandise between the institutional staff and the institution. There have been many instances across the United States when this has caused a great deal of trouble. As a matter of fact, the hon. member might be surprised if I tell him, and this is not just necessarily in Burwash, about the number of letters we used to get from inmates who had some very strange

stories to tell as to what their view was of a member of the staff bringing some provisions out of the departmental store.

There was no use trying to explain to that inmate that this was paid for by the member of the staff. To him it had connotations which went far beyond any semblance of truth. There are other implications. If I recall, three or four years ago the hon. member for Yorkview, or perhaps it was the hon. member for Riverdale, raised the question of the sale of leather goods which were made by inmates at one of our institutions to members of the staff. As a matter of fact, it was, I think, that occasion which caused me to go into the whole subject and regretfully, as a result of that, it was decided to eliminate this whole business.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): That was a completely different situation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know it was different, but other implications arose from this. It was a good thing to have inmates making things which they could sell and which they were encouraged to make by members of the staff and which the staff purchased from them. But there was always the implication that they were not paying a fair price for it.

The same thing applied in some institutions in respect of staff purchasing provisions from government stores, and it was decided in the interests of a better, a cleaner operation, that all of this cease. I think it was a good decision. I think it is best to keep this whole thing separated, so nobody misunderstands and no irregularities can creep in. As the head of the department, I am pleased that this is in effect and working well now.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Cleanest possible operation—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. MacDonald: The cleanest possible operation is to do nothing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is not a matter of just doing nothing, because there is a very good alternative for the staff at Burwash. The Burwash personnel store was closed on November 30, 1968. It was allowed to continue its operation until the new industrial block was completed, at which time the store's building which housed both the institutional stores and personnel store was to be demolished. This building, a wooden frame construction, was also in a very deteriorated condition; it presented an extreme fire hazard

and with the closing of the personnel store at that time instructions to raze the building were issued.

It is important to realize—and the hon. member said I would mention this and I am going to mention it because I think it is germane to the whole discussion—it is important to realize the monthly sales at the former personnel store averaged out at approximately \$20 per month per employee, which—

Mr. Martel: They cannot cash a cheque.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—which makes it obvious that the staff had, for some time, been in the practice of shopping for the main purchases outside of Burwash. Now the hon. member has entered a new element into it tonight and I just mentioned that to my deputy who is sitting here. I said, here is a new element; he never mentioned cheques at any other time.

Mr. Martel: I have been speaking to these people. It is all coming to light.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know what the hon. member expects. I do not know really whether this is such a great hardship, that they cannot cash a cheque. In the first place if they are going to go into town to do their purchasing it seems to me they will be able to cash a cheque there.

Mr. Martel: They had to go to town to cash a cheque.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If they are going into town to do their purchasing they would cash their cheques there, would they not?

Mr. Chairman, the fact is we have to have as much as possible, a standard for the whole system. The hon. member should also know that there were some complaints from other institutions about staff complaining about special privileges given to the Burwash staff.

Mr. Lewis: You just lectured me this afternoon about the special position of Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right, and that is why we are retaining those things which we think are necessary to keep at Burwash because of their special position. I have just pointed out that they are obviously doing their shopping outside of Burwash, anyway.

Mr. Martel: They have to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If their average purchasing was \$20 per month per member of the staff, they must have obviously been doing most of their purchasing outside.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me finish the other questions asked. I should point out, too—for the benefit of the hon. member for Scarborough West—one of the great advantages they do have, of course, is the fact that they are getting very heavily-subsidized living accommodations. The hon. member knows that. I think it is worthwhile pointing this out because we do not like to take privileges away from staff which they have had for years.

On the other hand, I think if we had wanted to we could have properly raised their rent in accordance with the conditions to date. Living accommodation is rented to employees at a gross rental established by the civil service commission, less a percentage discount determined by such factors as:

1. Whether or not the employee is requested to live on the property.
2. The degree of private use and access.
3. The degree of privacy.
4. The type and size of the dwelling, and so on.

The average rental paid by employees for family units, that is, houses and apartments, is \$38.58 per month, and for single quarters \$13.79 per month. I think this is perfectly good evidence that in those matters in which we feel they require some special consideration because they are living in a special situation in a village composed completely of staff, we do give them special consideration, and that is pretty darn good special consideration.

Mr. Martel: Where else could they live.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They could live in Sudbury, but since they are required to live there we are giving them this special accommodation and for the rents that I have mentioned, which is a pretty good advantage.

In respect, Mr. Chairman, of the medical situation, the practice of having the institution doctor look after the staff at Burwash and their families again dates back to the days when the village was very isolated. There were no other doctors in the vicinity and there were no medical service plans. With the advent of better roads, medical insurance claims, and so on, the need for this service was less apparent, and the institution staff medical plan was discontinued in 1967 for two reasons:

1. Because, of the commencement of the provincial employees group medical insurance plan which provides adequate medical insurance coverage to all staff and dependents.

2. Because we were one doctor short and the only doctor on staff felt that the volume of work was too much and it was all he could do to take care of the needs of the inmate population.

In fact, the doctor considered resigning, and he advised us of this, if it was necessary for him to continue to service the staff. He has remained with us and has, of course, agreed that he would be able to treat any emergency that should arise. I am sure if there is something very necessary by way of an emergency in respect of pills or medication of any kind which the doctor can provide and is necessary in an emergency, he will do it. This is what he has agreed to do, and if the hon. member can give me any evidence otherwise I would be very glad to look into it.

With respect to some of the questions the hon. member for Essex-Kent has asked. He asked about the jail at Chatham and the books. I do not know whether he recalls that the other night I sent him a list of the numbers of books which have now been provided by the department to all the jails—I think they numbered well over 4,000 and this is increasing almost weekly. I am sure he will find that all of the jails, if they are not already well supplied, will be amply supplied in a matter of weeks. Is it an ongoing thing which we just started when we took over the jails.

Now, insofar as the lockup prisoners are concerned, I think I had better read to the hon. member what the position is in this respect, as I understand there was some confusion in the minds of some of the members of the local municipalities in respect of this matter and we attempted to clear it up in a letter to them.

For the benefit of the hon. member I should advise that upon transfer of responsibility for certain aspects of the local administration of justice to the province, section 374 and other related sections of The Municipal Act were repealed.

Section 374 of The Municipal Act referred to charges for lockup facilities levied against the local municipalities by the county.

Section 14 of The Department of Correctional Services Act in effect, replaces that section, the difference being simply

that charges for lockup services previously paid to the county by local municipalities will now be paid to the province.

I think that is eminently fair; since we took over the jails we should be getting the same revenue from those municipalities which do not have lockups and which were formerly paying the county.

For those hon. members who do not clearly understand what a lockup prisoner is—and there is a great deal of confusion about this—I have found this on the part of many and I hope the hon. members will not think I am talking down to them—there is a great confusion between the terms “penitentiary”, “reformatory”, “jail”, training centre”, “training schools” and “lockups”.

A “lockup” prisoner is a prisoner lodged in a jail by the police pending his appearance before a justice of the peace or magistrate. Upon being duly remanded or sentenced, a person ceases to be a lockup prisoner, and the responsibility for his maintenance becomes that of the province. He is now going into the jail after having been looked after in the lockup and when brought into the jail, he becomes a responsibility of ours.

Since an appearance before a justice of the peace or magistrate is mandatory within 24 hours of arrest, the cost involved never exceeds a one day charge per prisoner.

Mr. Ruston: What is the standard?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that it still all occurs within 24 hours. The justice of the peace is provided and he is transferred within the 24 hours or immediately after the 24-hour period, so the same thing applies. If the hon. member can find any evidence otherwise I would be glad to look into that.

The *per diem* charge to municipalities will be equivalent to the department's average per capita cost of maintaining correctional institutions as calculated in our financial statements for the fiscal year ending March 31 of the calendar year for which the charges are levied. If the hon. member is interested I would be glad to read to him a letter which was sent out to all of the clerks and clerk-treasurers of the municipalities. Would he like me to read it and put it on the record or would he like me to send it over to him to examine?

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I already have a copy of that. It is probably the same one dated November 28, 1968?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Mr. Ruston: Yes I have a copy of that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That explained the system to the local municipalities. As far as the Windsor jail being combined with the registry office is concerned, I think they are using this in some other fashion—I think they said the registry for the women's section. I would have to look at it again. The last time I was in Windsor I had a hard time getting into the jail. I did get in but I do not remember what it was like. All I can say is that when the task force looks at it I will ask them to keep this idea in mind—perhaps it is feasible but we will have to await the report of that task force.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402; the hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the Minister said that there were a few people that might be unhappy. The petition which I sent to him contains 250 names which included 95 families. Now this is a pretty good cross section of the total population of 750 that are rather unhappy.

Now the situation with the store—and the point that the Minister cannot seem to understand—if the residents had no way of cashing a cheque in Burwash then this meant they had to go to Sudbury. So, they cashed the cheque in Sudbury, but how could they get back to Burwash to shop, when the store in Burwash closed at 11.30 in the morning. They could not get a cheque cashed at the bank until 10.00 and they would have to be back in Burwash for 11.30 to do their shopping.

I mean you are killing it all along the way. The other interesting point, Mr. Chairman, is that many of these guards are working overtime and the Minister has to agree.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about their days off duty?

Mr. Martel: I am coming to this. The majority of them have difficulty getting a day off, I am told, because the jail is understaffed and there is a great deal of overtime being paid. Even when the husbands are there they have to use their cars to get to places like Camp Bison, or just to get to the prison in Burwash itself. It means the men must use cars, and if a women runs out of a box of soap, what is she going to do. There is no public transit, how is she even going to get a box of soap to finish her washing? Does she travel 25 miles to get a box of soap?

There is just no store for her to make these purchases.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is still a canteen which is run by the staff, I understand, and these small items I think are kept at the canteen. They can look after themselves in this respect. Again I tell the hon. member we cannot make any more exceptions than we have already provided for, because of the difficulties involved in running a department of this size. Incidentally, he has not mentioned the fact they do not have to go to Sudbury, there are stores in Estaire—what is that, five miles away?

Mr. Martel: Eight miles.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I have heard three, I have heard five and now I have heard eight. I guess I will have to travel it myself.

Mr. Martel: The interesting part again though, Mr. Chairman, is that if the husband has the car at work, how is the housewife going to get to Estaire? Is she going to walk. We are fairly hardy in the north, you know, but this is stretching it to extremes.

The Minister has not mentioned the other things, he talks about privileges but this is a privilege these people went there with, that you have taken away from them, the same as the barber that you have taken away from them. It is an extreme condition, it is unique to the whole reform institution of which he is Minister. And therefore, because of its uniqueness, they should maintain the privileges which they were hired on to go there. These are the privileges that they went there under and now you are taking them away one at a time without even negotiating them—just telling them, arbitrarily, this is gone. Now, if this is the way to keep those people who are 25 miles away from the nearest city happy, it is sure a strange way of doing it.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask of the Minister when he plans on settling the problem of the employees at the Essex county jail.

When the jails were taken over on January 1, 1967, Mr. Chairman, the employees were working under a different type of a contract from what they have now. They have lost a lot of their fringe benefits and some of the wage increases that they were going to get from the municipality, and they have been negotiating with the department now I understand for well over 12 months without any satisfaction.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have some of the facts that are involved in this particular situation. I do really think it is a proper matter for discussion in respect of my particular estimates. This is a matter which is taken up at the civil service commission level; it has to do with salaries, wages, fringe benefits and this sort of thing, and this is handled as a matter of general government policy, and I cannot really deal with it. It is being dealt with at the civil service commission level.

Mr. Lewis: This a brief footnote to my colleague, the member for Sudbury East; when was the Burwash Industrial Farm—is that what it is called?—when was it built?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was opened, I am advised, about 1913.

Mr. Lewis: There were some largely inaudible, incomprehensible and irrelevant interjections from one of the Minister's colleagues, I could not hear very well—1913? And why was it built in that area of the province?

Mr. Martel: The Minister would like to know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have some information which might be helpful. I would think from what I have in front of me here, that probably the theory at the time was that you opened them where the inmates could do a lot of forestry work, and this was a good place for it. And this is the reason it was built there, I guess.

Mr. Lewis: There was considerable hardwood available in that section of the province, I take it, then, in 1913.

I asked the question, Mr. Chairman, to make, I hope, the simple point that the essential problem with the speciality of Burwash and all the difficulties that flow from that, is its location in the province.

Mr. Chairman, if one talks about an enlightened correctional system, then the Minister does not encourage it. If he did, the Minister would not come in, estimate after estimate, year after year and allow the perpetuation of an isolated community whose amenities become evermore abstract from the people who live in that village and whose conditions internally for the residents are equally untenable, not only by the nature of the building they inhabit but by their own geographic isolation and the removal from other civilized centres in the vicinity.

What one is saying, Mr. Chairman, is that God only knows this Minister has, within his capacity in this department, the privilege of relocating his correctional centres.

There are reasonably modern methods in corrections, the Minister will grant me. It is not necessary in the year 1969 to perpetuate the absurdity of Burwash as a correctional service. I see no reason why one cannot relocate within the general geographic vicinity, still allowing people to maintain their jobs and livelihood in a more enlightened, more humane and more relevant kind of centre.

It attests to the paucity of thinking on the part of government that the only kind of centre that can be envisaged is this particular conglomerate which works against the residents and works against the people who serve them. And that is essentially at the root of all the Minister's problems.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would let the hon. member's comments go without comment except that it may suggest that we are not aware of this, and that there is something we can do about it right away and yet are not doing about it. Of course, this is the problem with Burwash and I think I said the other day, the first day of my estimates, that if we were going to build it today we would not build it there. Perhaps what we have to do is accelerate what we are doing now, reducing its size.

As a matter of fact, there were three camps at Burwash at one time, now there are two. We are building forestry camps out of Burwash. The trouble is that there has been a great deal of taxpayers' money invested in many of these institutions. At Millbrook—there is a great deal of money invested in Camp Bison. I remember when I was there this was a relatively new building. I do not know what this cost it must have cost many millions of dollars. And you just do not throw the taxpayers' money down the drain that way.

Again it is a matter of priorities. We need a lot of new jails. We need a lot of new regional detention centres. We need some new training schools. We need all sorts of things. And having regard for these priorities, we carry out a programme which is designed in the overall to accomplish what we want to do.

We have reduced the population at Guelph 300, we have reduced the population of Burwash 200, and all I can say is I agree with the member in respect of the problem, the location of Burwash. But we cannot start tomorrow and rebuild everything, because it

would cost hundreds, literally hundreds of millions of dollars. We are doing it at a pace which I think the hon. member cannot say is too slow, having regard for the financial ability of the people to pay for it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not too slow having regard for the correctional concept which this department advocates. Within that context, it is entirely acceptable and one could predict its slow evolution. But that is where we part company.

The investment of the tens of millions of dollars in these non-functioning institutional monoliths, destructive of the people in them and of those who work there as well, is an inheritance not only from this government but of previous governments. But, Mr. Chairman, the terms the Minister uses, "the jails," "the training schools," "the camps," the terms themselves, reveal a corrections mentality that suggests that that is the environment where rehabilitation of the offender takes place.

It seems to me that in very short order it would be possible to effect around the province of Ontario a number of community settings of very small cottage units—I do not like the word cottage—even smaller than that—which are in some ways now available, and in other areas could be very quickly constructed to revolutionize the correctional system. In very short order, certainly in very short order—in a matter of 18 months; a year to 18 months.

The simple proposition is that when a government such as this government mis-manages finances in the way it does; seeks so many distorted priorities, implements so much absurdity through its budget and through some of the tax bills which we were viewing this afternoon, of course one has to think in terms of total reconstruction.

The money would be available to you. This is not the estimate to discuss it in, obviously, but even within the limited funds you now have, it is possible to transform radically your whole correctional field, except for the absolutely irretrievable tie which the department has for what was ancient and self-defeating.

Until you are ready to revolutionize your entire corrections environment, then you will always feel stifled about the proposition of never having enough money, or feeling that a change will take decades, or feeling that it will cost tens of millions of dollars. It need not cost tens of millions of dollars at all. We have enough experience in this Legislature to

know that certain government departments which have put out millions of dollars for buildings supposedly to treat people, can achieve the same thing in other ways at one-tenth of the cost, providing one has a different conceptual framework.

Now it may be that the Minister is having trouble with his own Treasury Board, I am willing to concede that there is probably resistance from the Minister of Energy and Resources, whose capacity to view this field would be non-existent. But there are others in the Treasury benches who might support the Minister if he put this toughly enough and vigorously enough and told them that ultimately one saves money if there is not this absurd reliance on the present structure.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt was trying to get the floor before.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, through you, I notice from looking on page 100 of the report that of the offences for which people were committed to the city, county and district jails, 27,427 were committed for offences under The Liquor Control Act, and 4,201 were committed under The Highway Traffic Act. My question is, did these people committed spend one day in the county jails for which the cities were required to pay?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Many of these municipalities have their own lockups, as the hon. members knows. The City of Toronto, for example, Hamilton, I believe. Many of them have their own lockups, so if they spend one day they spend it in the local lockup. I do not know whether I have understood the question completely. Is he asking me whether, in fact, some of them have to spend that day in the county jail instead of the local lockup?

Mr. De Monte: I imagine the majority of them would, would they not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not necessarily, not the majority. Some of them do because the local municipality, not having a lockup, will rent the space, as it were, from the county jail, and there is a section set aside for this purpose. Of course, when the regional detention centre programme is set up and goes into effect, this will all be improved because of the structural nature of the centre.

Mr. De Monte: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have the number of people that were locked up for these offences in the jails under his jurisdiction, or lockups under his jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will find this on page 103 of the annual report, in which it shows the number committed during the year for indictable offences, and all of the other information he is requiring.

Mr. De Monte: You are referring to the non-indictable offences, I take it—being locked up for non-indictable offences? No? But the point is this, Mr. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know that if you read the report—here you are, the number of non-indictable offences in the second column on the same page.

Mr. De Monte: Yes, I see that. But the point is this, Mr. Chairman, of the people locked up—and we do not know how many were really locked up for these offences in the institutions under the Minister's control—only 4,977 were sent to jail for any length of time. I am wondering if, and perhaps this is not the time to discuss this, but I am wondering if a better bail system were instituted at the police stations where police sergeants could give bail, we could not cut down the costs of these lockups for these offences such as drunk offences, and driving offences, for which the person is being locked up for an offence that is not basically criminal, more or less a moral offence. I was wondering whether he has discussed this with the persons concerned so that we could cut down the cost for the lockups.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this has been discussed and I would be quite happy—the more improvement there is in the bail system, of course. It is better for more reasons than just cutting down of expense of keeping them in an institution. I think the hon. member will agree, as a lawyer, that the bail system has been liberalized considerably in the last year or so, and I look forward to a further liberalization, while it is not within my jurisdiction.

And I am sure the hon. member appreciates this. There is a more intensive look being given at the whole bail system, and more bail is being granted where it appears it should be granted and could be granted without any risks involved.

Mr. De Monte: I am glad for the Minister's remarks, Mr. Chairman, but time and time again you go down to the lockups in the city hall and the magistrates courts, and you see men who have been locked up for a day or a week because they have been drunk. I know this is not the Minister's department but the point is this, the cost involved in

locking these people up must be quite high in his department, and could be probably cut down if we changed the philosophy of the bail magistrates and the police so that these people could be let out on their own bail, not any bail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member discuss this under the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General?

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the hon. member for Scarborough Centre unless she wishes to yield the floor to one of the other three or four hon. members who were up.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to the comments of the member for Sudbury East when he mentioned that the men were having difficulty getting a day off in the institution. I would like to ask the Minister, is the institution some number of positions vacant at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My deputy advises that we are practically up to strength at this present time.

Mr. Young: What is practically?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, having been concerned about a provincial institution this last week that government are running with a vacancy of eight posts that were quite important posts, I would like to ask how many positions are vacant and in what capacity these people would be operating?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am waiting for my deputy to get this information.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have a second question if the member from Brantford will allow me. I would like to go back to this afternoon, to when the Minister was discussing the halfway houses, the St. Leonard's House and so on, and ask if you have a figure on the number of persons who passed through those halfway houses this past year for rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman: I think that this properly comes under the after-care of adults and offenders, parole, etc., and we had agreed to discuss this under one grouping if the hon. member will save it until then.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that will be a question for my estimates anyway. The Department of Social and Family Services, which provides the grants, will probably be getting this information from the halfway houses, because they

pay—it is paid on a *per diem*, so they can figure that out very easily.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, then I would like to say with all respect to the Minister, are you really saying that rehabilitation is not your concern, it is the concern of the Minister of Social and Family Services?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, that is not what I am really saying. We have a rehabilitation staff and we do a great deal of rehabilitation and after-care work. We do a great deal of it, but there are private halfway houses which co-operate with us and we co-operate with them and they do the work which they feel they are able to do, and that does not mean that we are not interested. We are a great deal interested in them. If we were not, they would not be getting grants from the government.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Minister that part of my work in the last session and certainly more in this session will be asking for the government to work more closely with private agencies because the private agencies are very often working under severe hardship. They are working under skimpy funds in many cases, or short staffed and losing their good staff. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that as Minister of Correctional Services, the number of people who are being successfully rehabilitated through any form whatsoever in the province are his concern, even if the money is in fact coming from another department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I just cannot let that go by either. I was answering the hon. member the question as to numbers. I do not have those numbers. I think I mentioned the other day—if I did I will repeat it and if I did not, I will now say it—that we are much interested and we are now carrying on research with halfway houses and their effectiveness and the different kinds of halfway houses so that we can, in fact, establish just what the hon. member is referring to—just what is the most effective way in which we could carry on our after-care service and rehabilitation service generally.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask then, is that part of that service, part of that research? Will it be considered how many of these people are second offenders and how many were successfully rehabilitated? Will it actually find out how much good has come from these halfway houses?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would hope so.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, on page 98 of the report the Minister indicates that 615 prisoners were released from jails on the payment of fines. Obviously this is a pretty sad commentary on our so-called equality before the law, because it seems to me these people were in jail because they did not have the money. Could the Minister indicate what the average length of stay was in jail for these people and how many people are in jail right now because they could not pay their fines? Also, would the Minister consider the possibility of providing some type of employment for these people so when they are in jail, they could possibly work their fines off, either in factories or through some arrangements made by his department, so that they do not have to remain in the jails for a period of time simply because they do not have the money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is The Attorney General's Department.

Mr. Chairman: I would think that is so.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, at least the Minister could give me the figures, then. How many people are in jail right now who are there because they could not pay their fines, and what is the average length of stay in jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how I would have those figures. If a man does not pay a fine in the court, he is committed to the institution and all we have is a warrant of committal. I am advised that the warrant of committal does state that it is in lieu of the fine.

Mr. Makarchuk: The Minister does indicate in his report the number of people who are discharged on payment of fines last year, which was 615 people. What I want to know is whether somewhere, in his pile of figures, he may have an idea as to how many people are in jail right now because they could not pay their fines.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not have that, but I think the hon. member has raised a good point. I will give that same serious consideration by way of trying to compile those figures so we could have them in our report, in future.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has the figures that the member for Scarborough Centre asked for a moment ago?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are five vacancies at Burwash.

Mr. Young: The establishment is—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is 308.

Mr. Young: And only five vacancies at the moment. Well, Mr. Chairman, that looks like a fairly good record then—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It does not look like they are unhappy there.

Mr. Lewis: They have no superintendent—

Mr. Young: It may be that the figures the Minister gave us for housing and the rent they are paying may have some bearing on this, and I think that is an inducement which is justified here, and a good inducement. I am wondering though, Mr. Chairman, through you, whether or not these people have not a real grievance, in the sense that when they came there and now they are locked in by low rents and so on. Perhaps they have some real interest in their jobs—I presume they have—but when they came there they had these services, the ability to buy certain commodities right there on the premises. Now that has been done away with.

I wonder if there is not some real justification for allowing a private individual to start a store on a basis on which any other merchant would start one. There may not be enough customers there, I do not know, but you can see all kinds of small corner stores in cities, small stores out in the country areas where populations are smaller than this. Would it not be possible for a private person to move into a situation like that, pay his normal rent and have a chance to provide services? This may have been explored by the Minister, but this was the question which I think the hon. member was trying to get at.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Sudbury East, I think, did raise the question of this possibility. There were some implications in this with which we had to concern ourselves. I cannot recall what all of them were. I think one of them was what repercussions there would be to bringing in someone to operate a store on government property to compete with, say, the store in Estaire, where there is a store run by a taxpayer who is paying taxes and who would be in competition with a store on government property.

Mr. Young: You would charge him rent!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is the other implication too. As I mentioned earlier, I am happy that we are not involved with any of these kinds of transactions within a penal system, even though we are talking about the staff, because there are other implications I would rather not discuss. Someone may take this as a personal affront and I do not want to give any particular person, any particular member of the staff, the impression that I feel they would abuse it. It is just better, we feel, in a correctional institution, to avoid all of this kind of commerce.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402?

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I do not want the vote to pass, and I am sure it will not, without my indicating to the Minister that I do not agree, I do not accept at all, his proposition that the matter of the adjustments asked by the employees of the Essex county jail in Windsor are not properly before this committee. They may not be properly before the committee insofar as the staff relations branch of the Treasury Board, as the collective bargaining agent on behalf of the government, in its relationship with that particular group of employees, and the efforts of the two sides—the government as employer and the employees in their association—to work out differences which still exist between them as a result of the transfer of the county jail employees to the provincial payroll on January 1, 1968. But I do want to say to the Minister that, recognizing that the responsibility for the collective bargaining aspect of this problem rests with the staff relations branch of the Treasury, the Minister himself cannot slough off the implications for morale and staff commitment to their jobs insofar as they are affected by the lingering on of these outstanding issues.

I want to raise these matters when we come back to the Treasury Department estimates, Mr. Chairman, but on this other aspect, I wish to remind the Minister that while the particular collective bargaining relationship may be one coming under the aegis of The Treasury Department, the failure of that relationship to satisfy the needs of the employees for equity, security and commitment to their employment is one which is his direct responsibility. Insofar as those objectives are not satisfied, it is the Minister's responsibility to go to the Treasury Board to see if there are ways in which they can be worked out monetarily.

I am speaking somewhat in the abstract when I put that to the Minister. I have gone

into the calculations used by the Treasury Board to establish the compensation which the board felt would be appropriately paid to certain groups of employees in the former county and municipal jail staff, following the transfer. In the case of the transfer of the Essex county jail employees to the provincial payroll, while an overall resolution of the problem may have been achieved, there are nonetheless individual employees in that jail, as I am sure there are in many other jails around the province, who as individual employees did not receive particular recognition for the coverages, the fringe benefits, which they themselves lost. Insofar as that loss has not been made up—it has not been satisfied monetarily or in any other way—wherever that deficit still remains, then surely the Minister has to take it into account in assessing the morale of his staff, and their capacity for carrying out the work which he assigns to them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, of course it would concern me. I did not say it did not concern me; I said the particular question the hon. member asked was properly a question which has to be answered by the Minister answering for the civil service commission.

We make our representations to the civil service commission. We let them know that some of our employees feel that in the calculation of the changeover, they were not properly dealt with. You have to be a statistician, you have to be an economist, you have to be an expert in this sort of thing to calculate the benefits that they derive from the changeover, and balance that off against any losses they may have had in benefits as against their previous contract.

We are not in a position to do this. There are people in the department of the civil service commission who are experts at calculating these things. We just have to take their word for it—if they have seen how we calculated everything here, and we say that they have been treated exactly evenly, or they are ahead \$150, or they are behind \$110 or something of that nature.

As a matter of fact, the hon. member says he imagines there are quite a few across the province. I rather imagine that most of the jail employees had tremendous increases as a result of being taken over by the province, because they are about up to the level of the highest. So I do not think that holds true. Of course, that is not my concern or responsibility. All I am telling the hon. member is that I am not in a position to do anything other than what we have done, and

that is, bring it to the attention of those who have the responsibility for calculating all of these benefits, and leave it to their experience and ability to come up with the right answer.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister one or two brief questions about some of the specific jails and reformatories under his control.

We will start with the Perth provincial jail which I had the opportunity to visit fairly recently. One of the first complaints which I have noticed is that visitors can see the prisoners but not *vice versa*. The set-up has been made in such a strange way that the light goes in only one direction, so the prisoners cannot see who is visiting them.

I complained about another jail last year where there was a similar situation, and I want to know what, if anything, you are doing about this particular problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, all I can answer to the hon. member is that all of these matters are being considered by the task force covering all of the jails, and I also must advise the hon. member that there are certain jails which are going to be closed. I do not know whether or not Perth is one of them at the moment; this will be recommended by the task force.

So where he is saying that there is no action being taken? It may very well be that that particular jail is going to be one of those which is going to be closed up. On the other hand, if it is not, then the task force is looking at all these. There might already have been a considerable amount of renovating taking place, as is presently the situation at many of the jails.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, yes. One year ago we raised this very point. It is not going to take a great deal of expense. All it needs is a saw to cut out those peculiar bars that you put in there so that the prisoners can see their visitors. Why can you not do that now; this is not a matter of money, it is a matter of a simple change? You could do that tomorrow if you issued the instruction—you could do it yourself; in fact it might be good exercise for you!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ask whether the hon. member is referring to Perth county or Perth town.

Mr. Shulman: The jail is provincial. I am sorry, I missed one, I guess; when I was

going through; I am describing the Perth provincial jail. It is the one near Stratford.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Stratford?

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402?

Mr. Shulman: Oh, it is too late. I have got several hours' work here concerning jails. Are we getting anything more on this problem? Are you going to look into this specific problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Every jail is being looked at—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member is going to give me a list of jails, he might as well save himself the trouble; we are looking at every jail.

Mr. Shulman: But you said that last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right, and we have been inspecting a lot of jails. There are 35 county and two city jails.

Mr. Lewis: Tell us what they look like.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told here that the estimated costs of the projects have been approved at this jail. They are going to point the exterior jail walls, \$600; install visiting facilities, \$2,000.

Mr. Shulman: When is this going to be done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Install floor covering, \$900; install protective corridor screens, \$800; and the total estimated cost of planned projects in that particular jail is \$4,300.

Mr. Shulman: When are you going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I imagine shortly, because they are working in all the jails.

Mr. Shulman: Before next year's estimates? All right, there was one he did not mention in that in reference to Perth provincial jail near Stratford—the doctor's office, which is a disgrace. It consists of a bare chair and table, nothing else; no possible facilities for doing a proper examination.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are a lot of jails like that.

Mr. Shulman: I know there are a lot of jails like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And we are fixing them up.

Mr. Shulman: All right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And in respect of the task force, I am also advised that the inspection of all of these jails to see what needs to be done is influenced by our medical director visiting every jail in the province to report on matters of this nature.

Mr. Shulman: Here is another matter which has to do with policy and refers to the doctor up in Perth. For some reason there is a very funny set-up where he gets paid \$15 for the first prisoner he examines and then \$3 for each subsequent one. Because of this rather intriguing piecework basis, Mr. Chairman, the doctor is not anxious to come out to the jail until there are a number of prisoners piled up for him, because it is hardly worthwhile to come out and see two prisoners when he gets paid only at the rate of \$9 a prisoner.

Apparently it takes very little time for those examinations and he likes to work on a massive basis. Now, this is obviously wrong. If an examination is worth \$15 for one prisoner, it is not worth \$3 for the next. Why is this peculiar arrangement set up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that all the arrangements and the arrangements made with the doctors at the county jails were worked out by our medical director with the particular doctors, and presumably this is the way they want to work it. I cannot give any advice as to whether the doctor is prepared and perhaps prefers to work this way; I do not know. But the medical director went out and negotiated this with the local doctor. I have just been handed a note that this was negotiated with that particular doctor at the doctor's request. That is probably the only way we could get a doctor in there.

Mr. Shulman: The problem in this circumstance is that the doctor is not coming out every time a prisoner is admitted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All we can do is get the medical services which are available in the particular area. We have a great number of problems at local jails because there are not all the doctors available that we would like. There are doctors who do not want to come in and give the service that we require, and we are glad to get any doctor to come in

under a situation like this. We are just as happy he comes this way rather than not come at all.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not a question of money at all.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I have not finished.

Mr. Chairman: I caught the eye of the member for Port Arthur. We can come back to you.

Mr. R. H. Knight: (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: How can I lose the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if the Chairman wants the House to enter a state of disarray then he is inviting it. The member has the floor and he has not given up the floor. He is engaged in an exchange with the Minister; he has the right to finish that exchange.

Mr. Ruston: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I take strong exception to that. In this area I have noticed for the last two hours the Chairman has been facing that way and there is very little opportunity for anyone sitting here to get the eye of the Chairman. I think it is time the Chairman did turn around and give someone else the opportunity.

Mr. Shulman: I will be perfectly happy to yield the floor to the member for Port Arthur if you will allow me to finish Perth jail and I would be only too glad to yield to him.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Knight: I will yield to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: The other matter I wanted to ask about is in reference to the Perth jail, Mr. Chairman; in relation to the toilet and water facilities. This is not one of the things the Minister mentioned in his list of things that are going to be done at that jail. There are no toilets in cells, there are no water facilities in cells. In fact, I am embarrassed to tell you that the cells are a replica of the dungeon

maintained in Joliet, which I told you about to show how people were kept in that area in prehistoric days. Why can you not do something in that jail? Since obviously you are not going to tear it down, why cannot you do something, if necessary with prisoner employees—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not obvious that we are not going to tear it down.

Mr. Shulman: If you are going to tear it down so you are going to tear it down. If you are not, it is not proper to keep human beings in the way you are keeping them there, in dungeons with no water facilities. So I am going to ask you now—are you going to do anything about that particular problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We just took the jails over last July, 37 of them, and we are moving as fast as we can.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, but what is disturbing is you have just read the list of things your task force says are going to be done in that jail, and you have not mentioned one of the essential things—and this is one of the essential things—which is treating these people like human beings.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what the task force reported needs to be done immediately.

Mr. Shulman: And this needs to be done immediately. Send your task force back to take another look.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I imagine a lot of things have to be done.

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

Mr. Knight: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The matter I am concerned with at this moment, and which I would like to broach the Minister on, is the matter of notoriety—which I think becomes the major obstacle to the rehabilitation of any prisoner—and I wonder if it would be acceptable to discuss this under this particular vote?

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure what the member means by notoriety.

Mr. Knight: Notoriety, the bad reputation that the prisoner gains through press and news reports and so forth that lasts with him all the days of his imprisonment and comes back to haunt him when he is back in the free world. I think his biggest difficulty in getting a job is being able to face friends and being able to be a real man again. It is notoriety,

and I am interested in knowing what programmes or what advancement this department is having in this phase of rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman: I feel that the member would be more in order under the next vote which specifically deals with rehabilitation.

Mr. Knight: Of juveniles.

Mr. Chairman: No, no. We have split this vote in two.

Mr. Knight: Oh, I see. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: This brings us back to the member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Well, let us go to the Middlesex County jail. Mr. Chairman, the Middlesex County jail needs a stove. They have a very serious problem in that they do not have a stove and because they do not have this stove they are being forced to prepare their food under very strange circumstances. Apparently they have made numerous requests for a stove. Could the Middlesex County jail get a stove?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I think it is a complete waste of time of this House for the hon. member to bring in individual cases in each jail. As I said there are 37 jails we took over; we have people covering all of the jails, examining and deciding what needs to be done in each jail, and this is not just window dressing, there is action taking place.

There must be 12 or 15 jails at the moment having work done in them. I have been in a half dozen of them myself, and there is no use going into every little item because every little item in each one of these jails is not going to be fixed; it would be impossible to do all of this, and it would be foolish to do it in some instances because some of them are going to be replaced in the foreseeable future, so I think it is wasteful of the time of the House to go into things like whether this particular jail is going to get a stove, and that sort of thing.

Incidentally, I have just been told we have already bought one and it is in there.

Mr. Shulman: It is four months since I have been there. I am delighted that things are happening.

An hon. member: Would the stove have been there if you had not gone, though?

Mr. Shulman: Well, perhaps that has some effect. I hope so, Mr. Chairman. The other

thing that I found rather odd—there is a huge sign which you will run into at the Middlesex County jail which says “visiting—male inmates, 2 to 4 p.m., female inmates, 4 to 4.30 p.m.”

Would the Minister explain to me, why the restricted time for females to have their visitors?

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402?

Mr. Shulman: Wait, please, I have asked a question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This may have something to do with the physical structure of that jail—when the male inmates are being visited and when the female inmates are being visited—it may have something to do with the particular structure of the jail. I could not tell the hon. member that. If he wants this information we will make a note of that and I will let him have the information.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, to carry on with Middlesex County jail, I find disturbing again—I hope the Minister has a list of things they are doing in Middlesex—but once again there are no toilets available and once again we have these terrible dungeons which we have talked about so many times. Is it in the Minister’s plan to do something about the water system in the Middlesex County jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can just answer as I have before, Mr. Chairman, that we are doing everything we can with the money available to fix up the old jails until the time they are going to be replaced.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, through you, why radios are forbidden in the Middlesex County jail?

Mr. Lewis: They would not want any modern technological devices in there.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister going to answer that question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It may again have something to do with a particular aspect of that particular jail.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I am sure even the Minister realizes the foolishness of that answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member would realize the foolishness of asking me most of these questions on really unimportant matters on 82 institutions, most of which we have just taken over a few months ago. Having regard

for the answer I have given him earlier, it is going to be impossible to answer these kind of questions in detail.

If he is asking me whether it is the policy of the department that no institutions have any radios the answer is no.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, first of all I must reply to this. This may be an unimportant matter to the chief guard but it is very, very important to the prisoners who are in these jails and have nothing to do. Many of them, as he knows, are on remand or on appeal, or have not been convicted, and a radio or a television set is a very, very pleasant way of passing the time of day. For him to say it is unimportant and to slough it off like that is completely unreasonable.

However, we know where he stands. Let us go on to something more essential. Perhaps in talking of defending the indefensible, which is what he is doing constantly, I am coming to Peel County jail. I had not really intended to visit that jail because a good job was done by the grand jury who visited the jail, examined it, and made their report on October 7, 1968. This report, which I have here, begins, “It is hard to express the utter distaste this monstrous anachronism arouses” and it goes on describing this horrible, horrible place.

Finally, I will not take the time of the House to read the whole report, it is similar to many others—there is one thing which it says here which I found very disturbing, not just the fact that this occurred but the fact that the Minister’s department would attempt to defend this. One prisoner suspected of suffering from hepatitis was confined for the good of the other prisoners in the detention cell. Actually this is a dungeon. There was no light. It was in the lowest level of the building and it was explained ordinarily vegetables were stored in this cell. Obviously there are no isolation facilities other than this cell.

What do we find in the paper a few days later? I have here the *Oakville Record* for November 6, 1968, and the heading is “Investigation Into Peel Jail Proves Grand Jury Report False”, and I quote:

A report that a prisoner suffering from hepatitis was placed in what was described as a dungeon without light in a Peel County jail has been described as false by the Provincial Department of Correctional Services following its investigation of the case.

The case was originally reported last month by a grand jury in its report sub-

mitted to Mr. Justice Stewart at the sessions of the Supreme Court.

Inspector Harry Hughes of The Department of Correctional Services said that certain charges in the grand jury report were found to be untrue. He said the cell where the hepatitis victim was placed was larger than normal. It had a window which allowed in fresh air and light. He said the cell had a high ceiling.

Hughes said the investigation revealed that the officer in charge did all he could in the situation. He pointed out the prisoner told him of his illness at 2.30 a.m.

The officer accepted the prisoner's statement and felt he had to segregate him from the other convicts. He then put him in the best cell that was available. During the day a doctor came to see the prisoner and he was transferred to a hospital.

Well, the member for Lakeshore and I were rather curious as to how a grand jury could see a jail cell that looked like a dungeon and the department get up and say it is a great huge cell with lots of light. We went and we looked at that cell and the grand jury had told the truth and the department again had defended the indefensible by glossing over the truth—I could use a stronger word.

This room, if one can use that word, is nothing more or less than a dungeon. It is in the basement. It is true there is a window, a little window similar to the window that Jean Val Jean had in that great movie they made about a prison in Paris, high up, the size of an envelope, a little light filters through. This room is nothing more or less than a dungeon. We expect better from this department. We do not expect you to get up and lie and defend things like this. We expect the truth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now the member is using the word "lie".

Mr. Lewis: That is an appropriate word for the circumstance.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister should accept the truth and do something about it, not try and gloss it over for the sake of the public.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do something about what?

Mr. Shulman: We are talking about the cell in the cellar of the Peel county jail. And let me tell you some more about the Peel county jail; I am sure you will not

want to hear it, but this is what we saw, this is not in the grand jury report.

In these cells, in these dungeons that they have, they have bare metal beds, no mattresses; no plumbing. The kitchen is too small and is downstairs. The staff want to shift it upstairs where the food is stored but they cannot do that because the stove is too small. The result is the prisoners get their food cold.

Another thing which occurs there and which I find difficult to undersand is that no tobacco is given to sentenced prisoners unless they have cash themselves to purchase it and they are limited to a pack daily. Would the Minister please explain, in addition to these other things, why this particular aggravation is further visited on the prisoners at that particular jail?

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 402 agreed to?

Mr. Shulman: Whoa, I have asked a question, Mr. Chairman, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have a hard time keeping up, these charges are flying so fast.

Mr. Shulman: They are not charges.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While I am trying to get an answer to one question, the hon. member is throwing another. What particular—

Mr. Shulman: I am asking about the Peel county jail, and to make it easy for the Minister, Mr. Chairman, I will give him the questions one at a time.

What is being done about the dungeon in the cellar?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, earlier I mentioned that on a number of occasions in this House I have announced that this particular jail was one of those high on the priority list for replacement. I visited this jail four or five weeks ago. There are many changes which should take place in the meantime.

As a matter of fact, we had some ideas of our own on the subject and some changes are going to be made. For example, the hon. member raises the question of mattresses and beds. One of our institutions is now in the process of manufacturing new beds and mattresses for all of the jails. I have been told that the new beds have already been delivered to the Brantford jail. All these things take time.

Mr. Shulman: Well, does it take time to buy mattresses? Why can you not buy mattresses for those metal cots. Do they have to lie on metal cots until the department can manufacture mattresses? Does the Minister not have the money to buy mattresses?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because we want to buy mattresses that fit the beds we are making now for all of the jails, so we will not have to replace mattresses shortly too.

Mr. Lewis: Do not ever let the people fit the bed, be sure that the beds fit the people.

Mr. Shulman: Am I to understand you are unable to buy mattresses of the proper size at the present time, is that what the Minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we bought the mattresses that are going to fit the new beds we are manufacturing, they might not necessarily fit the beds which are in the jails at the present time. Now is that fairly clear?

Mr. Shulman: Well, inasmuch as you have manufactured some mattresses, could you please take the trouble to take the mattresses out of the jails where you have sent the new mattresses and the new beds and send them down to Peel county so these men do not have to lie on the concrete or on the steel frames. Is this too much to ask?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All these things are being attended to, Mr. Chairman, in all of the jails.

Mr. Shulman: We will see next year. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask through you to the Minister, why do we have peculiar tobacco regulations in this particular jail? When I say "peculiar" I mean different from the other jails. No tobacco is issued to any prisoner after sentence unless he has the money to purchase it; and they are limited to one pack a day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That regulation, of course, is in existence in all jails; you have to buy your own tobacco.

Mr. Shulman: I believe the Minister stated the other day that tobacco is issued to every prisoner—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the reformatories.

Mr. Shulman: And this does not apply to jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. We just took over the jails.

Mr. Shulman: Well, how long does it take to make a change like that? Do you need a task force to advise you on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member suggest that after we take over the jails and when we are considering a major change, we change something temporarily and then make another change later?

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to understand this Minister, but let us come back to Burwash—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has already been provided for in the estimates, we are now talking about. So all inmates will be looked after in that fashion.

Mr. Shulman: When will that go into effect, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In about three months.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member was not listening to my speech yesterday.

Mr. Shulman: I paid very good attention to it, I found it most enjoyable.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to come back to Burwash and add just a few words to what my colleague, the member for Sudbury East had to say about that institution.

I have a copy here of a certain Toronto newspaper dated February 24, 1969, and it lists the number of the complaints of the guards up at Burwash and there are one or two of them I find rather intriguing and I would like to ask the Minister about them.

One of the guards, by the name of William Courier, objected that employees at penal institutions living in single quarters are dismissed if they take liquor into their residences.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Sudbury East asked that question earlier and got an answer.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I am sorry I missed that. Would the Minister mind answering it again?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member just wait for a couple of days and read it in *Hansard*? It was a rather lengthy answer. The hon. member for Sudbury East, I think, was quite happy with the answer.

Mr. Lewis: He was positively delirious.

Mr. Shulman: All right, let that go.

I am sorry I missed the comment of the member for Sudbury East. Did he also go into the matter of the guards' complaints—specifically the complaint of Mr. C. A. Edwards—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: I was away for 45 minutes, the hon. member has been away for 45 days.

The complaint of guard C. A. Edwards that he ran into trouble with the security sergeant when he went into a Sudbury bar and had a drink, because the lady who was sitting at the table with him later turned out to be the wife of an inmate at Burwash. If that has been covered already, I will not belabour it, but if it has not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it has not.

Mr. Shulman: Well then, will the Minister please explain to me this interesting regulation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member not think that it is the responsibility of the staff of a correctional institution to do his best to see that a member of the staff does not associate, particularly in a matter of this nature, with the wife of an inmate; does he not appreciate what this could cause? Surely he would think this would be the responsibility of the sergeant or anyone else in the institution to ask questions about this?

Mr. Shulman: Well, I am sorry, perhaps the incident appeared more serious to you than to me. As I understand the circumstances—as it is reported here in the *Telegram*, the guard went in without knowing of any connection whatsoever, had this drink, and subsequently was called in and questioned rather closely about it, because someone recognized this woman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All they did was warn the man.

Mr. Lewis: What a reversal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not a reversal at all. They found this had happened and he was warned that this was not the proper thing for him to do; and it is not a proper thing for him to do. Now, what would you expect the officer at the institution to do?

Mr. Shulman: I do not wish to belabour it. I do wish to belabour something at Burwash though, and that is a matter which you have been saying is *sub judice*, and it is no longer *sub judice*, thank goodness.

A few weeks ago a rather shocking incident occurred at Burwash and perhaps now it is no longer *sub judice*, you will be willing to talk about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not willing to talk about this matter.

Mr. Shulman: It was thrown out today.

Mr. Lewis: The charges were dismissed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Two men were acquitted but there are still other cases pending. If the member wants to take the responsibility that is his business.

Mr. Shulman: I am not talking about two men, I am talking about Steven Ford and I am going to talk about—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am just trying to tell the hon. member, I am advised by my staff that even if he refers to the two who were acquitted, it relates to the case that is before the courts, and I think perhaps the hon. member for Riverdale will bear me out that it should not be discussed. If the hon. member wants to discuss it, he may discuss it, but I certainly, in my position, do not intend to discuss it at all.

Mr. Shulman: But this case has been dismissed; it is dismissed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. If there is any case that is before the courts that has not been decided and completely taken care of, even though one or two persons involved may have been acquitted, it is the opinion of the Chair that the whole matter is before the courts and is *sub judice* and should not be discussed in this House.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I explain, that a certain individual was charged with a certain crime. His case was heard before the courts and was dismissed. Are you suggesting that, because someone else was charged with a similar crime, that we cannot discuss this case.

Mr. De Monte: If it is on the same fact.

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting to the hon. member that, in discussing the matters of these two particular individuals, that there may be points discussed that could relate to the other individuals involved in this particular case.

Mr. Shulman: I have no intention of talking about what is before the court.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have all been charged with the same offence. These two gentlemen may still be called as witnesses, for all you know.

Mr. Shulman: Will you let me commence. If I say anything that is *sub judice* please interrupt me. I am not going to discuss the case at all. What I am going to discuss is what happened to this man in that jail as a result of an accusation that has been made against him, in that reformatory, and the punishment that was meted out to him. Nothing else. The fact that he was put into the hole, and that he was convicted without a trial.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is "the hole"?

Mr. Shulman: "The hole" is the punishment cell, for your information.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do you not say that?

Mr. Shulman: He was put into the hole.

An hon. member: Why dignify it?

Mr. Shulman: It cannot be dignified. This man was punished without trial, subsequently has been found innocent, and he has been, to my mind, badly maltreated. I want to know what steps the Minister is going to take to see that amends are made. I would like to read the letter from Mr. Ford which outlines it so very well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am only going to answer to this extent. This case has been mentioned a number of times in such a manner as to give the impression that we, in fact, laid charges, which we did not do. One inmate wished to lay charges against some other inmates.

To do this, obviously the institutional staff had to bring in the police so the man could lay his charges, and I am told that none of them was punished, they were segregated. The hon. member wants to call the segregation, "a hole", giving the impression to the public that old stereotype idea about throwing them into some dirty, filthy old hole, with rats scurrying all over them. They were segregated and there was no punishment handed out to them.

Mr. Shulman: Now, may I read the letter, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: What is the date of the letter, prior to today?

Mr. Shulman: The letter just arrived today.

Mr. Chairman: I was wondering if it contained evidence or anything that had to do with the case, which case is not completed?

Mr. Shulman: No, it has nothing to do with the case.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member assures the committee that it has nothing to do with the case then he may proceed.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Dear Dr. Shulman:

I am writing you concerning the treatment I received at Burwash Reformatory in connection with the charges which I wrote to you about last month. Because of these charges of indecent assault, it has hurt my name by slander.

I have went to court for them and the charges were dismissed against me. And now I am pushing for a law suit against the institution.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, would that not be considered *sub judice*.

Mr. Shulman: Well, he has not started the law suit. If he starts the law suit then it will be *sub judice*.

I cannot express in words how this whole thing has hurt me and a lot of other people, like my mother, and father, and my wife to be.

My parents are going to write and ask if something cannot be done in the way of a parole in amends. I would like to thank you and Mr. Martel for helping us in this case. I would be very grateful if you would write the Attorney General and see if something could be done in connection with what was done to me.

I also have a letter that came today, from his mother, and this is Mrs. George Ford, in Peterborough. It is a fairly lengthy letter which explains briefly how her son was originally charged with stealing two pairs of pants. How he admitted this as such, was committed to jail, and subsequently had this incident occur in the reformatory which I will not discuss because of the other cases that are coming up, but there is one line here which worried me:

After this accusation was made, and my son denied this completely, and he has always admitted the truth whether he has been in trouble or not, he was put into the hole. Whatever place in the prison that is, I do not know, that is what he and his

friend told me. He was there for twenty-some days. Then he was taken to Sudbury, Ontario, to stand trial and the case was dismissed and he was found not guilty.

Can something not be done in the way of amends for what he has gone through in this last month. Will the department be willing, because of him obviously having been mistreated in this way, to make some amends in the form of shortening his sentence or giving him a parole, because the original crime of stealing two pairs of pants was surely not that serious.

I am raising this point on behalf of this particular man, and I will discuss the whole aspect of the other matter in the Attorney Generals' estimates after the other cases have been settled. But, I am raising this point on behalf of this particular man and on behalf of the other man who was acquitted yesterday. Are you prepared to make some amends, regardless of whether you laid the charges, or whether the police laid the charges, or whoever laid the charges?

Certainly the prison system leaves something to be desired when this type of thing can occur. This man has obviously had an injustice done to him. Are you willing to do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this happens in the courts quite often. A man is charged with an offence, he is held in a jail pending trial, he is kept in maximum security if he is charged with a serious offence, and sometimes he is in a jail for months.

Mr. Shulman: This was a punishment cell.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment. What do you mean, a punishment cell? It is a maximum security cell, that is all it is. The hon. member for Sudbury East, I think, visited the inmate. Did he find any cruel or unwholesome conditions except the fact that the man was segregated.

Mr. Martel: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right, there is your answer. He was just segregated. This giving the impression all the time that we put men into some hole, and throw bread and water into them every three or four days—

Mr. Shulman: Was he in the punishment cells?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Listen, listen. Now, the man was not charged by us. We are required, when a man is charged, particularly

for his own protection, to keep him in segregation until he is tried, and this is what we did in this case. There is nothing we can do about it, any more than society does for a man if he is charged with an offence and he spends six months in a jail waiting trial. Perhaps in some cases much longer than that and there have been cases, and then he is acquitted. Well, of course, there has been an injustice in a case like that, but there is an injustice and you cannot do anything about it.

Mr. Shulman: But you can in this case.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You mean by parole?

Mr. Shulman: By shortening his sentence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, we cannot shorten his sentence. When he is ready for parole, the parole board will take everything into consideration they feel needs to be taken into consideration, for the man's rehabilitation.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I will make it easy for the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Presumably, if a man appeared before the parole board, he would bring this in as a factor as to why he thought he was entitled to parole. If the parole board thought, in their good judgment, that this was a good reason to give him parole, then it would be entirely up to the parole board.

Mr. Shulman: It is not entirely up to the parole board at this moment. I am asking the Minister, and I am making it very, very easy. Considering the circumstances, will he make a recommendation, that is all I am asking him for, to the parole board that because of these circumstances the man be paroled? Yes or no, it is very simple.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is: I will not interfere and it might have been much happier for everyone concerned if the hon. member had not used the man's name.

Mr. Shulman: You have him taken to jail in Sudbury; you have his name splattered all over the press in six papers and you tell me not to use his name. What hypocrisy!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not—

Mr. Shulman: What hypocrisy. You don't understand one thing but you certainly understand the other.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not have anything to do with it at all. If you want to

help the rehabilitation of any inmate, of any prisoner, do not blazon his name all over the newspapers and all over—

Mr. Shulman: It has already been all over the newspapers. I see you are not supported by your own party but you are supported by writers to the right, who do not understand it either.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because the hon. member for Port Arthur was raising this question earlier and that is precisely the answer I was going to give him. Anybody who really has rehabilitation of prisoners at heart will not give them undue publicity; will not put them on television; will not put them on radio; will not blazon their names all over the front pages—

Mr. Shulman: But you lay charges against them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We laid no charges. I have told the hon. member that 40 times. We laid no charges against the man.

Mr. Shulman: All right, let us bring it down to its simplest form, Mr. Chairman. This man has been falsely charged regardless of who charged him. I asked the Minister very simply, will he make amends by making a recommendation to the parole board, and he says, "no". Not only does he say "no", he says, "You are hurting the man because you mentioned his name." What false hypocrisy and where does he get his support? Let us go on to another jail.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what is the Minister advocating? That the man just disappears back into the obscurity of the correctional system and that no one knows what happened to him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say that you should let the man disappear into society so that everyone will not know that he served a term.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: By allowing your system to be violated by the law, you have invited—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Lewis:—you have invited them to—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member has even identified the location of the mother.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. Minister and the hon. member for Scarborough West please take their seat. The hon. member for Port Arthur has risen on a point of order.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to settle the dispute over the name business. I just wonder whether the hon. member for High Park—

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Mr. Knight:—in using the man's name—

Mr. Chairman: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr. Knight: Well, the point of order is to settle this dispute.

Mr. Chairman: This is not a point of order. The hon. member is out of order. The hon. member for Sudbury East has risen; was the hon. member for Scarborough West finished?

Mr. Lewis: No, I was not quite finished.

Mr. Chairman: All right, proceed.

Mr. Lewis: I wanted to make the very simple point, Mr. Chairman, that in the opinion of this party it is because of the nature of the correctional institutions which the Minister runs that these incidents occur. They might as well have been perpetrated by the department itself because of the nature of the services it provides.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Shocking!

Mr. Lewis: Never mind shocking. That the Minister would not permit a situation—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree with the hon. member that if we did not have correctional institutions these things could not happen in correctional institutions.

Mr. Lewis: That is a nice tauntology.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is exactly what the hon. member said.

Mr. Lewis: It may secure the Minister's conscience, Mr. Chairman, but it does not affect mine when you—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have a great conscience.

Mr. Lewis: It is a very simple proposition, Mr. Chairman, a very simple proposition. The Minister should be going to bat in a pretty fierce way for the men who were thus charged and for the elimination of the incident that was involved. It should be his department's role, it seems to me, to make sure that the conditions do not exist which engender such events, rather than to facilitate the bringing in of the law—the laying of charges, the besmirching of reputation, all the injustice that followed from it. It was the department that facilitated the blazoning of the man's name, not a member in this House.

As a matter of fact, there is no better place, Mr. Chairman, to raise a name than in this House because no one listens to what you say.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can just imagine the self-righeous NDP members getting up here, if we had not called the police in and this man had written a letter saying, "Dear Doctor Shulman, I want to lay a charge against the five men and they will not let me do it. What in the hell is happening to these institutions?"

The hon. member for Scarborough West would get up in a high dudgeon, with the usual self-righteousness, and say, "What kind of Minister of the Crown is that, that he allows this thing to go on; a man wants to lay a charge and he is not able to do it. You are hiding things down there. If a man wants to lay a charge let him do it." And the hon. member for High Park would be the first one to get up and say it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Down, boy, down.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister is not doing badly; make a good member of the Opposition. He is doing well. I like your practicing for the art for which you will soon be employed. Mr. Chairman, there is a qualitative distinction in our mind of the kind of "Dear Doctor Shulman" letters that are written. We are capable of making that distinction and what we are saying to you in this instance and—

Mr. Winkler: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Lewis: I am not going to be diverted by the rhetoric in this instance because I have been guilty of that myself on many occasions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Precisely.

Mr. Lewis: Precisely.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are too good at it—

Mr. Lewis: I am just going to reassert the proposition, Mr. Chairman. That is, the Minister should be pretty uncomfortable about some of the things that occur in his institutional environment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, I am.

Mr. Lewis: Is the Minister's department moving in for the defence at the trial? Has the Minister's department been called? Has it offered to act in defence at the trial? Has it offered to come before the court and say that this is not the way one treats this particular act; this is not a therapeutic response to what occurred in my institutional environment?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knight: I am not a member of the legal profession, but if this debate is not prejudicial to whatever case is still going on in relation to the matter, I do not know what it is.

Mr. Chairman: I find nothing prejudicial to any particular case in what the member has said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is prejudicial to me.

Mr. Lewis: It may be prejudicial to the Minister, in which case, it is warranted. Obviously we are not going to get very far; the Minister has a fixed position on this.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Then forget it.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I am coming to the point where I am—

An hon member: If you cannot change it, then keep quiet.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, order. Could we have fewer interjections than we have been having and let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, maybe they are valid, the positions that have been put by certain members of the Liberal party. While I disagree with them, I can understand precisely from what they stem, they would make a very legitimate area for debate. But the position that this government is taking on this kind of issue—we in this party entirely repudiate it.

It may be very pleasant in these comfortable pews on a Thursday night to dismiss what takes place in an institutional environment as being boring or offensive or irrelevant

to government. But it is not boring, offensive or irrelevant to this party in the Legislature and the Minister should be in there fighting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have all the conscience.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister should be in there fighting for all of his violated inmates instead of making adolescent comments about conscience.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Never mind, it is not a question of conscience. If it were a question of conscience one assumes it would have been decided some time ago.

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

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, when that voice in the wilderness quits over there, I will start.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury East has the floor.

Mr. Martel: It is rather interesting to hear the Liberal comments, Mr. Chairman, in that of the six young men I have had occasion to interview—three of them used their only phone calls to get to me to go, in the last week and a half, to the jailhouse in Sudbury. The time I spent with these three men left me somewhat dismayed at some of the things that apparently transpired.

Two of these men have already been released after spending a good deal of time in lockup on charges which people admitted they were really not involved in. I want to thank the Minister by the way, for advising me that one was released; I appreciated that a great deal. But there are some circumstances, Mr. Chairman, around this whole mess that have left me considerably disturbed after speaking to three of the men, and a fourth who phoned me on Tuesday, just before I left home, hoping that I could come in and see him as well.

The thing that disturbs me, Mr. Minister, is the fact that it took four days from the time the alleged incident occurred until these men were put in segregation, so to speak. Why there was a four-day delay I do not know and neither do the men in question. But they were greatly disturbed. I am also disturbed by the fact that there were 14 men in that corridor when this alleged incident

occurred, Mr. Chairman, and none of the 14 apparently saw anything happen. The fact that the man who is laying the charges is apparently a homosexual, leaves me somewhat disturbed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I appeal to the hon. member to avoid going into these details; they really are *sub judice*, and they should not be discussed.

Mr. Martel: I agree with the Minister. The only problem, Mr. Chairman, is that after months of torment for two of these young men, they have been released, and there are still four awaiting charges.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I suggest to the hon. member, he is not going to affect the situation now anyway. After this case is disposed of, if the hon. member wishes to raise these questions with me, and if he is dissatisfied with some of the actions that occurred, I will be very glad to deal with them as it will be my responsibility, either on the floor of this House, or outside.

But I think at this particular moment that it would be better if we did not discuss it. As a matter of fact, I can argue that the infrequency of this sort of thing is an evidence that the system is working fairly well. I would suggest that, well, I am just asking the hon. member in all fairness, in the interests of justice that he not discuss it at this stage.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, well if the hon. member was referring to the situation as had been discussed here a few minutes previously, certainly he should not refer to it in total.

Mr. Martel: All right, fine. Well, at least then I have the knowledge that I can discuss this with the Minister after, because as I say there are some things in the case which I will not refer to which have disturbed me greatly and I have written the Minister a letter in the last day with respect to the interview I had with three of the men.

I would like to ask the Minister on the issue of paroles, as I understand it—are we able to discuss paroles at this time, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: No, I believe if the hon. member will recall, I am not sure if he was in his seat, but we have decided that we will deal with vote 402, under the general heading of provincial jails, reformatories, and complete that portion, and then go on to after-care of adults and paroles, which is part of vote 402. So if we can restrain ourselves

from discussing parole at this time until we have finished the rest of it.

Mr. Martel: Fine. There are a couple of issues I would like to raise with regard to Burwash then. I have had considerable complaint about such treatment as the following: a man being taken to Sudbury for a medical operation on his hand, and two and a half hours from the time he left the institution he was operated on and was back in the institution.

If this is the case, this man was in no condition to be transported, a few minutes after an operation, 25 miles back to the institution. I would certainly like to see this sort of thing eliminated, so that there was proper treatment and time for, let us say, convalescing and operation room—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This will all be in the—

Mr. Martel: Well, there are apparently two doctors there now, am I right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If he was taken to the hospital it is the doctors at the hospital and the doctors at the institution who between them would be responsible for this. If the hon. member has a specific case in mind, if he would like to bring it to my attention I will get a report from the doctors.

Mr. Martel: Yes, it is in regard to a man who had a hand operation. I would just as soon not give his name.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if the member will give me his name.

Mr. Martel: Right. With regard to the other question, it is something I do not like to do because I have always tried to defend the men in the institution there because I know many of the guards and know them personally. However, there is a case of an apparent attempted stabbing incident, where seven men were confined and within a matter of time they were released. I would like to know how seven men could be held responsible for an apparent stabbing and then, because of a lack of evidence, be released later on. It seems to me that this is a pretty sham way of treating seven prisoners, that they be thrown in jail and kept in confinement for a time and then released for lack of evidence on a supposed stabbing incident.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is another situation, Mr. Chairman, with which I am not familiar, nor are my officials around the table here familiar with the particular inci-

dent. If you draw it to my attention I will be glad to answer the hon. member's question.

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

Mr. Shulman: I think I should say a word about the Waterloo county jail. I do not think we have reached that one yet. I have here the *Globe* of September 17, 1968, and the heading is rather lurid: "Accused tells court he took murder rap to escape county jail. Kitchener. Henry Joseph"—by the way, do you mind me mentioning prisoners' names when quoting from newspapers, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If you want to do it, go ahead.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Kitchener. Henry Joseph Dietrich, 45, testified yesterday that he pleaded guilty to non-capital murder two years ago because he could not stand the Waterloo county jail any longer. Dietrich pleaded guilty at his trial after an inquest had ruled in 1945 that a shooting death was accidental.

Dietrich was cross examined yesterday by a Crown Attorney H. D. "Do you mean to say that you would rather be sentenced to life by pleading guilty to non-capital murder than spend another week or two in the county jail?" Mr. Dockman asked. "That is the way it appeared to me at that time," answered Dietrich. "I was there nine and a half weeks and was under extreme pressure. There are better jails."

And it goes on to explain in some detail the rather unpleasant situation in the Waterloo county jail. I want to ask the Minister, in the light of the fact that prisoners in that jail would rather plead guilty to a murder accusation than spend another week or two in the Waterloo county jail, what changes are being made in the Waterloo county jail in your long list?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to answer the question based on such a ridiculous statement made by some inmate who said he would rather get a life sentence than spend two weeks in some jail. All I can tell the hon. member is what I have told him before. All of the jails are being looked at and repaired.

Mr. Shulman: Well the Minister was good enough a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, to

read me a list of the things that are being done to the Middlesex county jail. Would he mind telling me what is on the books for the Waterloo county jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, except that this can go on for a long, long time.

Mr. Shulman: Is it a long, long list?

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): It is costing the province a lot of money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Projects approved but not completed: repair jail eavestroughing \$289. Equipment purchases and installations since December 31, 1967: kitchen equipment, chest freezer, deep fryer, toaster, etc., maintenance equipment including tools, paint, etc. Approved and ordered but not yet received: library supplies, office equipment, corridor and cell equipment, beds and mattresses, laundry equipment. Total estimated cost of planned purchases \$3,313. Total expenditures to date \$1,102. There is about \$6,000 work being done there.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you Mr. Minister. Now I would like to come to one of the show institutions—I think it is a show institution—the Alex G. Brown Clinic. Are you fairly proud of that one?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Well, let us come to the Alex G. Brown Clinic, which I had not visited until reasonably recently, actually in the last few months. I think to explain the situation, although it is a long letter, perhaps I should read it into the record so the Minister will understand how I happened to go down there. This is a letter I received from a prisoner on October 8, 1968. The prisoner's name is E. A., and it is addressed to the Hon. Dr. M. Shulman:

Dear Dr. Shulman: I am a patient at the D.A. Clinic of the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic at the Mimico Reformatory. Two and a half months ago I was transferred from Millbrook Reformatory for the last three months of my definite time. My sentence is six months definite and three months indefinite. Also while at Millbrook I was granted parole in principle. My tentative release date of parole in principle if further acted upon is October 27, 1968.

My first two months at the clinic were quite beneficial; active in hobby work, chairman of the patients' committee, participant in patient organized toastmaster's club,

active in sports. In short, sir, I feel I responded to treatment insofar as opportunities afforded. The above mentioned facts are—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It does not sound much like a punitive system to me.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps the hon. Minister would let me finish, Mr. Chairman. Wait until the other shoe drops, if I can quote your words.

The above mentioned facts are applicable to most of the other patients in this clinic and this letter is a reflection then not only of my own feelings but also the prevalent feelings of all the patients.

I make this last statement as chairman of the patients' committee and for the purpose of acquainting you with facts that we feel are unjustified. For a number of years there has been an alcoholic clinic and a separate, but adjacent, drug addict clinic in Mimico Reformatory. All addicts are originally sent to Millbrook. They are screened there for the purpose of possible treatment at the clinic. They have always been told by the screening clinician what is expected of them at the clinic with one exception. It is this exception that I write you about.

None of the present addict population of the clinic were informed that they would be transferred to the alcoholic clinic.

These are the drug addicts.

This transfer is to take place this Saturday, October 12, 1968. May I say at this point that real hostility exists between the alcoholic population and the supervisors and the drug addicts and their supervisors. They do not want us over there and our feelings are the same.

These feelings would normally be resolved between adults at maturity. The difficulty, however, arises out of the unique three-way situation that exists in clinics here, that is, patient, custodial staff and treatment staff. All of us patients feel that after having made certain rather painful gains that all could be negated by a move to a hostile environment.

The superintendent spoke to us as regards the move today and while he did imply that we are being sacrificed for the sake of convenience he was adamant in his decision in favour of the drug addicts integrating with the alcoholics regardless of the consequences.

In closing, sir, may I say that I am interested in treatment for myself and for the other patients here and if I were able to talk this over with a psychologist this letter might not be necessary. But unfortunately, and much like others here, I have had nothing but an initial interview with the social worker since my arrival here some two and a half months ago, and although I have made repeated requests to either see the social worker again or see a psychiatrist or psychologist there is no one available.

Please reply at your earliest convenience. I would appreciate your looking into this matter now because of the urgency of the matter. Respectfully,

And this is signed by nine patients from the drug addict clinic.

Well, I went out to Alex G. Brown and went through the clinic and I found some rather surprising things. The first thing that disturbed me was seven addicts had been moved before their treatment process had been completed—this was last October—and the staff agreed that this might very well interfere with the treatment that they were receiving but because of construction programmes which were under way this was necessary.

My first question to the Minister is—why in the world are you spending thousands of dollars to renovate the drug addict building when you have plans to tear it down next year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In answer to the first question, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that because of the changes made there was some dissatisfaction on the part of some of the patients at first, but after the programme was in effect for about three months, they were completely satisfied with the new system.

I have here a letter from Mr. Glinfort, the superintendent, dated August 14, 1968, to the Deputy Minister:

Dear Sir: Due to the very urgent need in the clinic for office space as well as space for individual and group counselling, it is respectfully requested that authorization be given to move the patient population from the DA clinic to the Alex G. Brown clinic, which would allow conversion of the total DA clinic building counselling and administrative offices. The advantages of such a move are manifold.

1. Conversion of dormitories, etc., could be made by our own staff at a nominal cost probably not exceeding \$200 to \$300,

in addition to the cost of installing telephones. This would immediately make available three large and two smaller offices with more space to spare which could be partitioned off later.

2. The alternative, such as renting other space nearby or acquiring portable temporary office buildings as in Guelph staff college, would seem to be far more expensive. This move would immediately free the four supervisors now on duty in the DA building, which would help to relieve the immediate great pressure on supervisory staff.

3. Integration as far as housing is concerned for the DA patient population has for some time been advocated by the treatment staff. There is little doubt that the therapeutic arguments for integration are many and valid.

The move would allow far more economical use of space and personnel. For example, it would make possible the concentration of various filing systems which are now located in two different buildings and thus make information available easier and quicker.

Elimination of the trial beds now located in the DA clinic would not reduce the total bed capacity of the clinic as four additional beds can be added to each dormitory in the AGB in an emergency, and in an emergency one of the day rooms in the number two annex can be converted into a temporary dormitory.

Normal capacity after eliminating the beds in the DA clinic would be 104-72 in number two annex and 32 in the AGB with a possibility in an emergency to increase this figure to 120. The average daily population is between 65 and 75. The highest number housed on any one day in the clinics since April 1, 1966, was 112 on November 28, 1967. The day before the count it was 96 and the day after down to 105.

In the fiscal year, on April 1, 1966, to March 1, 1967, the highest count on any one day was 89, which was on November 1, 1966, and this year the count has not exceeded 90. It is my considered opinion, and that of the clinic staff, that the advantages of the suggested move far exceed any possible disadvantages.

At the present time we are finding it practically impossible to provide staff with the most necessary place in which to carry out the treatment programme. When

the vacation season is over in mid-September this problem will become critical. I therefore respectfully request authorization to carry out the suggested move as soon as this can be done with the least possible upset for the patient population.

Yours sincerely,

E. K. Glinfort, Superintendent.

I am advised there is some dissatisfaction in the earlier stages but now it is working very smoothly.

Mr. Shulman: That is a very good answer and satisfies my problems there. However, there is a more serious problem in relation to the Alex G. Brown clinic. I have here the schedule which is set up for treatment of the drug addicts and for some reason—I guess someone set this up some time ago—but the schedule is set up for a 30-day programme so that addicts who are all sent there for 90 days, repeat the programme three times.

Now, is there any explanation for that, and if there is not why in the world do you not change your programme around so that it is set up over a 90-day period instead of a 30-day period?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, can the hon. member tell me whether his documentation shows that the 30-day treatment is duplicated three times?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, that is what it says.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But does it show that the same treatment takes place every 30 days?

Mr. Shulman: Well it shows the same things—Tuesday, 9 a.m., arts and crafts—it is exactly the same as the set-up on the 90-day schedule.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For a 30-day schedule?

Mr. Shulman: Yes. But the prisoners are sent for 90 days.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told they could have, for example, group therapy every Thursday morning and there is nothing wrong with that schedule as it exists.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, but there is something wrong with seeing the same movie three times; the movie that is shown to rehabilitate them and—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They would not be seeing the same movie three times. I would suggest—this is a rather technical matter—that the hon. member send that along with his comments and we would be very glad to

send him out a letter and give him what the views are of the subject.

Mr. Shulman: Well I do not wish to press the Minister, but will he look into this matter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: And get the situation cleaned up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will send me what he has and his comments on it, if he wishes to make any, we will give him the answer to it.

Mr. Shulman: Well you have heard my comments on it already. There is one other thing here; arts and craft play a very large part in this schedule. In fact, it is something which they do every day except Thursdays, unfortunately they are limited to five dollars worth of material for 30 days for an alcoholic and five dollars worth of material for 90 days for the drug addicts.

I think perhaps the reason this whole problem arose is that the alcoholic is only there for 30 days and the drug addict is there for 90 days. Is this why this difficulty arises to the drug addicts? Well anyway you can look at that. But in any case they should be allowed more than five dollars worth of material, because if they use that up the first week the rest of the time they sit there for the next 85 days or 80 days with no material available. Does the Minister wish to make any comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I had better look into that detail. All I can tell you is that the administrator of the adult male institutions is Dr. Harry Hutchison, who is in front of me now and who is an expert in the forensic sciences and in this particular work also, and if there is a programme going there, under his direction—particularly under Mr. Glinfort—it must be a pretty good one and we have had nothing but compliments about it.

Mr. Shulman: I do not wish to criticize this individual. I am just saying that even the best individuals sometimes make mistakes or are not aware of certain things that can occur in institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Doctor Hutchison said that we are looking into giving more and more arts and crafts. That is, through the payment of prisoners which we have been talking about these last few days. There will be incentive allowances and more arts and crafts involved.

Mr. Shulman: You are not going to restrict them to five dollars, in future, is that it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Five dollars a week.

Mr. Shulman: Five dollars a week from now on. I see. If they have money available is there any reason why they cannot buy more material?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I do not imagine that this is what is happening. I am—

Mr. Shulman: Well that is the situation now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot imagine why they do not have sufficient material. I will look into that; they should have sufficient materials.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402?

The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, two questions on policy. I wonder if the Minister would describe the function of the punishment cell at Burwash? The purpose they serve, Mr. Chairman—I am trying to get at the purpose these cells serve, as far as the Minister is concerned.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. Minister replied earlier, they were not punishing cells.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think what the Minister objected to was the member for High Park calling them, "the hole" and asked him why he did not call them punishment cells. I stand to be corrected if that is—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think I said punishment cells. But, do not think, Mr. Chairman, there is anything too much wrong with calling them punishment cells anyway. Sometimes they are used as a means for disciplinary measures. Sometimes they are used for the protection of the inmate himself. Sometimes the inmate will ask to be put into segregation; sometimes he just feels he needs to get away from the others. There are various reasons for segregation. You have to use them in all institutions. I am sure they need them in hospitals as well. I do not know really what the hon. member is driving at. But this is what they are used for.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if they are any different from the other cells, as far as being less desirable to be in, by the inmate? I am trying to get at the fact that when the Minister answered in

the Ford case that the people concerned were segregated, were they in fact segregated into punishment cells? Is that, in fact, the way of the institutions, assuming they are guilty before they ever get to trial? Is there no other way of segregating your prisoners except into these punishment cells?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have detention cells and we have segregation cells. Depending upon the circumstances, either one or the other is used. Some are called—this is the punishment cell—solitary confinement; the amenities of which depend on the particular cells I suppose. If the hon. member is talking about these particular men we were talking about earlier, I am told they were not put in what is known as "solitary confinement" or punishment cells. They were put in open cells. They did not have the solid door. You have to segregate an inmate sometimes if he becomes violent and, of course, those kind of cells would be so designed so that the inmate could not do any damage to himself or the cell, if he becomes very violent.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the Minister that this is what I wanted to know because I think the Minister would agree that the morale of an institution is a very important part of the institution and that if—when difficulties arise such as the homosexual charge and the stabbing charge that the member for Sudbury East brought out, prisoners are removed and in fact put into what are considered or are inferior cells as a form of guilt, before they are even taken to jail and tried, it is very undermining to the morale.

I wanted the Minister's assurance that this is not what happened to those five men or is not what happened with the people in the stabbing case or is not what happens to prisoners when they are under a shroud of suspicion of any sort; immediately plucked out and segregated, as much as to say you are guilty until we get you into a court for you to prove your innocence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is not the kind of cell these people are put into. They would be put into the kind of open cell I was talking about, the kind of cell which some inmate may ask from time to time that he would like to be placed in, for fear that he is going to do something to himself. There is no stigma attached to it insofar as the inmate population or inmate sub-culture is concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under vote 402?

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Well, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, is it not true that these punishment cells in some of your jails—and I have been in several of them, as a visitor I can assure you—but is it not true that they have no windows? Is it also not true that the door is a solid door with a small opening in it, in many of them? Is it not true that there is absolutely no mattress on the bed; it is a bare spring and in some cases, there are no blankets?

Is it also not true that there are no toilets or wash basins in them, that in order to wash they have to use a basin that is given to them daily and for their other necessities they have what we used to call a thunder mug, which they have to dump and scrub out each day?

I am a little surprised when the Minister says these are not punishment cells, that they are segregation cells because they are very definitely punishment cells. I am a little more surprised after all we have gone through with Bills 73 and 74 and how the Minister relented on his bill in that case, and yet, in our prisons we are actually putting people through the same procedures that they put animals through in Riverdale Zoo, we segregate them into little cells—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member talking about jails or reformatories?

Mr. Jackson: What is the difference?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, there is a difference. The hon. member, I think, was talking about jails.

Mr. Jackson: Are the reformatories worse?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would suggest that the hon. member visit some of the reformatories and then compare them with jails and then perhaps his criticism would be more of an educated nature.

Mr. Shulman: Your punishment cells in Guelph are as bad as anywhere in the world.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, no, they are not.

Mr. Jackson: One of my experiences took place at Monteith and if you go into Monteith you will find that they have six segregation cells which they use for punishment and very happily, they use them very seldom. But nevertheless, these cells are just as I have described. They have a doctor that goes in—or the doctor supposedly goes in—and examines those men on a regular basis to make sure that they do not suffer mental defects or mental problems because of the segregation.

Yet, for 20 days you put a man that has not been convicted of any crime into a cell that is basically for punishment and you punish him before he is even convicted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you talking about Monteith?

Mr. Jackson: Yes, I am.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, in Monteith we are not happy with the segregation cells, what you call the punishment cells and we do not keep anybody in there for 20 days. If the hon. member can give me some documentation or some evidence of that I will be pleased to look into it. I would doubt it very much. We are not happy with them. Some changes are going to have to be made at Monteith in these particular cells.

Mr. Jackson: Is the hon. Minister saying that the cells that these other prisoners were held in for 20 days, are different from Monteith?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Jackson: That they have windows?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes.

Mr. Jackson: They have doors?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes, quite different; they are open to begin with.

Mr. Jackson: They have mattresses on the beds?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have mattresses, yes.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, before I sit down, when the Minister is going to do something about Monteith? When you are going to tear out those cells and put in decent confinement places for these men?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are working on it—this matter is being attended to at the present time.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, is the only difference between the punishment cells and the segregation cells in Burwash the fact that the one door is solid and the other is open? And do they all have washing and washroom facilities?

Mr. Shulman: We are going up there next week so give us a good answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that all of the cells have toilet facilities in them. The difference between the so-called punishment

cells and the segregation cells is that the punishment cells have a door between the cells and the corridor, and the segregation cells do not. Does that answer the hon. member's question?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yes, I can appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the second door when people have been put in punishment, but what I was trying to get at was, is the only difference in the cell restricted to the door that is on the cell—that one is a solid door and one an open type of door? Or if the segregation cell has an opening, what size would that be?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the best thing would be for the hon. member to visit them.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I will in time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as I am concerned, I visit so many of these places they begin to meld in my mind. I cannot remember what I saw in one place as against another. The hon. member for High Park writes notes on these things, and he comes in here and he has all the details. I do not keep them all in mind.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Are you suggesting that the hon. member for High Park is more efficient?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think if I were going to attack the member for High Park, I would make these notes so that I could attack him, but I cannot carry all the details of all the different institutions in my mind. I would suggest that I would invite the hon. member for Scarborough Centre to visit Burwash and all the other institutions and get a fair idea of what the system is like. Some are better than others because some are more modern, and, of course, our design and our aim is to improve all those which need improvement, and eliminate all those which should be completely eliminated.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would just like to assure the Minister, and for the record, that I hope in my career that I will visit the jails and institutions in Ontario both for men and women.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, what bothers me about this course of the debate, this discussion this evening in the estimates, is that there have been a number of items raised in relation to the amenities that persons in custody are entitled to. There have been a number of question raised as to the

quality and character of equipment that is available to them; there have been a number of questions raised about many other aspects of the Minister's department. I recognize, and I think we all recognize, that it will take him some time to deal with the jail situation. What I cannot understand is why the Minister has not published, by way of regulation under the principal statutes which he operates, the regulations which provide for public knowledge of the basic ingredients of the care and treatment and training of individuals.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Was the hon. member not here when I explained that?

Mr. J. Renwick: I am sorry, no I was not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I explained earlier that the regulations have taken a considerable amount of time to formulate. I think we have been working on them for about three years. There is a tremendous amount of work involved. I said earlier that we had to formulate regulations so that they would apply in a general way to all the institutions, and make sure that they did not have any particular implications for any particular institutions which were not applicable. And when they were all finished, as they have been, we had to get federal approval for some of the regulations which were just forthcoming—I think I said this earlier this week.

This will now go to Cabinet, and the regulations will be published very shortly. It is the end of a very mammoth job and no one can really appreciate the problems involved in writing these regulations. They went back and forth between our department and officers of the Crown; and so on, and so on, and it was a tremendous job. It has just been completed and, as I say, we will have these regulations shortly, and of course they will be published.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, do they deal with the area of dress, and regulation, and personal deportment of the prisoners? Are these matters dealt with in the regulations? Is there still going to be a substantial residuary function which the members of his staff in the institutions are going to pre-empt to themselves, or is it going to be so clearly stated that the inmates in the institutions are going to have a clear idea of what they are entitled to, and what the limitations are upon the guards within the institutions, and the public will know—in the same way, for example, as the regulations published for The Department of Education are available to the public—about the governing sets of

detailed rules and regulations that will govern those institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member, of course, is asking for a value judgment. What he may feel is not satisfactory, we may feel is, I think all we can do in a case like that is wait until the regulations are published. I think he will be happy with them, and if he is not, why, of course, he will be quite at liberty, and it will be his right, to complain and ask that they be changed. I should add that in addition to the regulations, we are designing a pamphlet for every institution, to be given to an inmate, so that he will know what is expected of him and he will know what particular duties he is expected to perform and also know what rights he may have, such as visiting, and letters, and so on, which I think is helpful to the whole system.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to a different topic under this vote. This has to do with Millbrook, and being transferred from Millbrook to the Alex G. Brown clinic for treatment of drug addicts. To come back to that, I had better wait until the Minister can hear because I think it may be of some interest to him. Are you ready?

Perhaps it would be easier than explaining the situation, to read the letter which sets it out quite well. This is dated September 25, 1968, it is from Millbrook, and it is addressed to:

Dear Dr. Shulman:

The choice of directing my particular problem to you is in view of your professional medical background and the perceivable zeal which you undertake in championing those in adverse situations.

My struggle for coherency may suffer somewhat due to various enigmatic situations confronting me. I am serving a five-month sentence and am allocated to a cell wing that is ostensibly for drug addicts, totalling 15 in all. Ten of these inmates, including myself, all have convictions for possession of hard drugs, and the remaining five have convictions for possession of marijuana.

To date all ten of the hard drug users and three of the marijuana users have appeared before a representative of the A. G. Brown drug clinic for admittance to the treatment, and all the drug users were denied admittance and the three marijuana smokers were accepted. The remaining two of the marijuana group have yet to appear before the representative.

Before I go on, this seems very odd, because of course—as I understand it—but perhaps the Minister has a different understanding—marijuana smokers are not necessarily addicts at all. In fact, marijuana, I happen to know, is a non-addictable drug, so why in the world would you give preference to marijuana smokers instead of drug addicts in taking people into the Alex G. Brown clinic? Perhaps you would like to answer that question before we proceed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My officers tell me that we do not treat marijuana smokers at the clinic unless they are involved in some other addictions.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps I should read the rest of this letter then.

At present, there are approximately seven at the drug clinic, and I understand that only one is a genuine drug addict.

Frankly, sir, I was given to understand that Queen's Park was given a grant from Ottawa to assist in the maintenance of the drug clinic, solely for the treatment of rehabilitation of drug addicts. I would like to quote from another noteworthy incident:

Dr. Hutchison of Queen's Park, in reply to a letter from one of the rejects here, concerning the prevailing preferences of selecting exclusively the marijuana crowd, stated that he had no knowledge of any marijuana user being at the clinic and stressed that they had no facilities or treatment for this group.

This is truly a paradoxical statement. It appears that there is a lack of communication between the two branches of your department.

The majority of us here have been to the clinic previously. However, there are many others that were there three, four, or even five times, and I understand that statistically the results were more favourable with each subsequent admittance.

He goes on, but the rest of it is not relevant so that is why I read this part about Dr. Hutchison. Is it possible that Dr. Hutchison is not aware of what is occurring in the Alex G. Brown clinic?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, Dr. Hutchison is in charge of Millbrook and the clinic so he would know what is going on in both of these institutions in respect of this matter—such as the matter of drug addicts and marijuana smokers and so on. Is the hon.

member, suggesting that the marijuana smokers say that there have been other marijuana smokers treated in a manner which he was not?

Mr. Shulman: No, no, no. This man is not a marijuana smoker; this man is a drug addict. What he was complaining of is that of the large number of people in these wings—some 15—these drug addicts had been rejected for admission to Alex G. Brown and the marijuana smokers had been admitted which, if correct, seems a little odd. I do not know at this point if it is correct, although I will investigate it further.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there may have been other factors involved which was why they may not know anything about it. In fact, there were if they went to the clinic.

Those who remained may have been people who, I presume, the staff felt were not properly motivated and were not considered suitable for treatment at the drug clinics. If a man is not well motivated, and you know there is no use attempting to treat a man who does not want to be treated, there is no point in sending him to the clinic.

Mr. Shulman: I would not argue that with the Minister, but I am asking—and perhaps he has already answered it—is the Minister suggesting that marijuana smokers as such are not being treated at the Alex G. Brown clinic? In other words, unless they are also addicts on top? I will not go out there tomorrow and find the Minister was not correct?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Dr. Hutchison says that is the case.

Mr. Shulman: That is the case as far as you are concerned. Thank you. All right, we will go out and take a look.

I would like to go on to another matter, and this is a very serious matter.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You mean the others have not been serious?

Mr. Shulman: This is also a very serious matter because this is not a matter of waiting for the Treasurer to give you money, it is a matter of policy. I received a number of letters on this particular matter and perhaps it would be easier, Mr. Chairman, if I just read one of the letters as an example.

Mr. Chairman: This is still on vote 402—general?

Mr. Shulman: Still on vote 402, general, and this has to do with the treatment of prisoners in the jails and reformatories. I have a large number of letters on this very matter and I have had considerable correspondence with the Minister on this matter and I will also read some of his answers, because they lay the situation out very well.

This letter is dated January 11, 1969. It is also from Millbrook and reads as follows:

Dear Sir:

I am writing you this letter with the hope that you will be able to assist me in receiving a transfer closer to my home which is London, Ontario. My mother is not in the best of health and I would like very much to be closer to home where my relatives could keep me informed personally of any change in her condition and where I could occasionally receive visits from her.

I have approached the administration on this matter and was informed that a transfer was not possible for at least three months because of a charge I had of possession of an offensive weapon.

I can assure you this charge sounds far worse than any intent I was suspected of having. My record proved that I was never disciplined for this type of charge before. Also I find it very hard to make any effort of rehabilitating myself in a place that is filled with people with no intention of doing so. Believe me it is hard to get on the right road at Millbrook.

I would appreciate very much any effort you may have in this matter.

I wrote to the Minister asking if something could not be done to get Mr. T. moved to an institution closer to his home and the Minister replied as follows on February 7:

Dear Dr. Shulman: Re: L.R.T.

This is to acknowledge your letter of January 27 re the above named who is presently at the Millbrook Reformatory.

In your letter you advise that this man would like to be transferred to an institution in the London area because of the illness of his mother. Our departmental policy does not permit the transfer of inmates solely for the purpose of visiting. Only in those cases where it is determined it is essential to the health of a close relative, and this must be supported by a statement from the attending physician, is consideration given to a request for transfer.

You will realize that there are many within our system whose elderly parents

are not in the best of health who could make similar requests. To grant permission would negate our whole programme of classification.

Sincerely yours,
Allan Grossman

Mr. Chairman, this is one of a number of similar requests, and subsequent requests were answered as follows from the Minister:

Dear Dr. Shulman:

May I refer you to my letter of such and such a date with reference to our policy regarding transfer for the purpose of visiting.

So I have abandoned writing letters to the Minister on this subject, and this is where the Minister is making a very, very serious error. If he is not just paying lip service, and if he seriously is interested in the rehabilitation—and many of us on this side of the House have grave doubts on that matter—but if he is seriously interested in the rehabilitation, surely he will agree with all the foremost international authorities. I have them all here in a very large volume called “The Law of Criminal Correction”, and I would be happy to quote them to him if he so wishes. He says, “Spare me,” so I will spare him.

But all of these authorities are agreed that the visiting of relatives and friends to inmates is one of the most, in fact, the most important factor in rehabilitation. For the Minister to take the attitude that he will not transfer prisoners to a prison or reformatory where it will be more convenient for them to receive their families’ visits, where it will be possible for them to receive their families’ visits, is completely ignoring the whole problem of rehabilitation.

I am asking the Minister here in the House, will he please reconsider this policy and change it because it is a bad one. It hurts the families, it hurts the prisoners, and it drives them toward crime.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place the hon. member has oversimplified the case. He is, in effect, treating this particular case as if it were an ordinary case—there is a sick mother, and it would be nice to let this man visit with his sick mother. As I attempted to outline in my letter, every inmate in an institution would like to do this, to pick the place he would like to go to, particularly if he is in Millbrook.

Millbrook is a maximum security institution and in this particular case this man has a behavioural problem. He was there be-

cause he had a behavioural problem in the other institutions. Naturally he would like to find a way to get out of there, and if he can use a sick mother, whom he may not have seen—for all the hon. member knows—for months or years he will do so. Merely because a man makes a request of this nature it does not mean that *ipso facto* we are going to grant that request.

We look into the files of this man, take a look at what his past has been like; take a look at what his probable motivation is, whether there is any point in granting his request on the basis of this. This man was reviewed, and surely the hon. member can see that you cannot grant all these requests merely because they are asked.

Again I would point out, without going into too much detail, he was at Millbrook because he was a behavioural problem.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I could accept this very well, except that it is very easy to get out of Millbrook—you just have to become a behavioural problem. Last year we had dozens of cases where people in Millbrook broke the rules, became behavioural problems, and the Minister then proceeded to transfer them all over the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the hon. member will also notice that they do not want to get out of Millbrook, because even Millbrook is preferable to a jail where there are no activities, and the jail is in fact a greater punishment for them. So this is not as simple as the hon. member attempts to point out. If a man wanted to get to his mother he would not consider breaking out to get to another jail, because he obviously would not necessarily get to a jail near his mother.

I am just asking the hon. member not to oversimplify the case. We know what the files of these prisoners tell us; they tell us a story. We can see why there is a particular reason in some instances to grant a request and why to refuse a request. In this case, there was ample reason in the opinion of the staff for refusing it, and I can see by reading just what I have in front of me that there was a good reason for it.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has very carefully muddied the waters. The point I made was not that he could get out by portraying behavioural problems but that Millbrook was not the be-all and end-all for behavioural problems; you send them to jails all over the province. There is no reason—if the problem is security—why this man could not have been sent to a jail near his home

where he could see his elderly mother. What bothers me is not that you refuse this individual but the policy which you state in the letter: "Our departmental policy does not permit the transfer of inmates solely for the purpose of visiting."

Just to underline this—and let us get away from Millbrook—let me read you another one, and this one is from Burwash:

Dear Dr. Shulman:

I am writing you about the possibility of being transferred to Mimico Reformatory, if it is possible. I could then be able to be closer to my wife, who at the present time has been trying to visit me every two weeks but being on welfare she has trouble making ends meet and after paying the rent it is very, very difficult for her to raise the money to come up here to visit me.

I am trying to do my best to straighten myself out and anything in the way of your attention to this problem would help me because it is a constant worry for my wife and family. As I am here and not seeing them I am constantly worried and unable to think of anything else.

Now, I wrote the Minister about this and he wrote me back a two-line letter, again saying the policy is not to allow transfers for purpose of visiting. And here is, I think, a reasonably clear cut case—and there are others, I can read them if you wish—and I think the Minister perhaps is oversimplifying the problem. Visiting should be a major factor, more important I think than security, more important than any of the things he has mentioned—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If a man wants to visit his mother and he is that kind of a person, he should not be winding up in Millbrook as a behavioural problem. He is the kind of person who would not co-operate with anyone. He cannot be trusted anywhere except under maximum security, complete maximum security.

In any case, as was mentioned earlier, under the new system of compassionate leave, when we get the new legislation into effect, if a man can be trusted to make visits to his home he will make visits to his home. Now, it is apparent that a man who is a group 1 behavioural problem in Millbrook Reformatory would not be so trusted anyway. And being near his home—

Mr. Shulman: I am speaking of another case in Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know, but all you have to do is grant a few of these on the basis of this kind of request and we would have hundreds of them right across the system.

Mr. Shulman: And why not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if the hon. member cannot see the answer to that—we would have a whole system of travelling back and forth across the province. The hon. member was concerning himself with the programmes in the institutions—how are we going to carry on programmes in the institutions when we are having a bus system travelling right across the province because this inmate wants to visit his mother, another wants to visit his sister, another wants to visit his brother? Most of these people are not the kind of people who want to visit brothers and sisters and mothers.

Mr. Shulman: No one is talking about sisters and brothers, we are talking about wives and mothers. And really this is what boils down the difference between the Minister and I; he is worried about transporting the prisoners around the province, I am interested in the rehabilitation. You can try the rehabilitation programme just as well at Mimico Reformatory as you can in Burwash Reformatory.

To suggest that we are not going to transfer the prisoners down because this might suggest others would ask for the privilege—what is the Minister interested in? Is he interested in detention and security or is he interested in rehabilitation? He wants to have it both ways. He gets up and he wants to give the lip service to the rehabilitation but when it comes down to the nitty-gritty, to the brass tacks, he backs away and says, "My God, are we going to start transporting dozens or hundreds of prisoners around the province?"

And he says "back and forth"—nobody is talking about back and forth. The prisoners should be sent in the first place to the area closest to where their families are so their families can visit them if—and I do not believe the Minister is—if he is interested in rehabilitation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How are we going to carry out a programme? Suppose a man is in a particular programme in a particular reformatory and the place nearest to where he wants to visit does not have any kind of a programme of that nature at all?

Mr. Shulman: Let me answer that one for the Minister. First of all, I have seen the

Minister's programmes and they really are so inadequate that very few prisoners profit from them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Shulman: Sure, it is a matter of opinion; it is the opinion held by everyone who goes in that less than ten per cent of the people in the reformatories are taking programmes that are of any value to them. Secondly, how much value do you think a programme will be to a man who is bitter and unhappy in not seeing his wife? Here is a man whose wife is on welfare and cannot afford to travel to visit him and you say, "We are not going to move that man because it might give an idea to other people." Do you think he is going to get anything out of a programme under those circumstances in Burwash when his wife is down here?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We move some of them; we move people whom we think should be moved, having regard for all of the circumstances. That is all I can tell the hon. member. Some will not be moved under any circumstances.

Mr. Shulman: I will agree that some prisoners cannot be moved, but the policy is what I am worried about. The policy is set out here in a letter and the policy is a bad policy. It does not lead to rehabilitation, it leads to crime.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402?

Mr. Shulman: On vote 402 I have another little matter to bring up, or two.

This matter again is a matter of policy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would permit, perhaps this would be a good time before we have a "Dear Morty" letter again, when I might move that we rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, it is the intention to go to the order paper tomorrow and do legislation, and also work in the committee of the whole House. Then at 12.00, of course, it will be the private members' hour.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:15 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 14, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Friday, March 14, 1969

Tabling reports, Mr. Davis	2283
Teachers' colleges, statement by Mr. Davis	2284
Student housing corporation, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Nixon	2285
Grace graduate nurses, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald	2286
Fyfe report, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Good	2286
Ferry services, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Farquhar	2287
Warden Woods housing project, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Lewis	2289
Operating Engineers Act, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Gisborn	2289
ETV, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Martel	2290
OMSIP and EGIP, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald	2290
Conflict of interest of public employees, statement by Mr. Robarts	2290
Town of Burlington, bill respecting, Mr. Morrow, second reading	2291
Bobier convalescent home, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, second reading	2291
Maimonides schools for Jewish studies, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, second reading	2291
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, Mr. J. Renwick, second reading	2291
Town of Mississauga, bill respecting, Mr. Kennedy, second reading	2291
Milk Act, 1965, bill to amend, reported	2292
Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act, bill to amend, reported	2293
Mining Act, bill to amend, reported	2293
County Judges Act, bill to amend, reported	2293
Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, reported	2294
Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act, bill to amend, reported	2295
Consolidation and revision of the statutes, bill to provide for, in committee	2295
On notice of motion No. 14, Mr. Apps, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Brown, Mr. Lewis	2299
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	2309

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1969

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning in the west gallery we have students from Wilcox public school, in Toronto. Later today in the east gallery there will be students from Oakdale junior high school, in Downsview, and from Walter Perry public school, in Scarborough.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the reports of the Ontario College of Art and The Department of University Affairs. I have also placed on the desks of the members a report which I am sure is of some interest to all members of the Legislature. It is the report of the committee on religious education in the public schools of the province of Ontario, 1969.

As the members will recall, this committee had as its chairman the Hon. J. Keiller Mackay, one of our most distinguished jurists, a former Justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario, a former Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario and, until recently, chairman of the province of Ontario Council of Arts. To his long record of distinguished public service, Mr. Mackay has added another dimension through his work as chairman of this committee.

He has had associated with him a number of other outstanding citizens from the legal and academic communities whose interests extend or have extended across the whole spectrum of our society. It is a great tribute to the public-spirited attitude of these citizens that they were willing to undertake at considerable sacrifice in time, both personal and in terms of family and financially, the task of helping us to resolve some of our problems in the areas with which the report deals.

These members are Dr. Mary Q. Innis, who acted as vice-chairman, Mr. M. Paul Forestell of Welland, Mr. Marsh Jeanneret, His Honour Judge Harry Waisberg, and Mr. John W. Whiteside. Mr. B. W. Monday was secretary of the committee and for the second time

has rendered valuable service in the work of an important committee.

During the period of its deliberations the committee lost two of its original members through the retirement of Mr. W. S. Martin in 1966 by reason of ill health, and Dr. F. C. A. Jeanneret who was vice-chairman of the committee until his death in 1967. These were great losses which made the task of the remaining members and their replacements all the more difficult. I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the dedication and devotion of all those who were associated with the committee in its attempt to find reasonable solutions to what was admittedly a difficult assignment.

During the course of its deliberations the committee gave every opportunity and encouragement to all those individuals, groups and organizations, who had opinions to express, to present them to the committee in public hearings. Several hearing were held in different parts of the province. The result was that 141 briefs were received and considered.

Consultations were held with a number of authorities who had experience or who were knowledgeable about the matters with which the committee dealt. Visits were made to the different types of schools in our province and, of course, to other jurisdictions. I think it can be truly said, Mr. Speaker, that every relevant viewpoint has been sought and every possible solution considered.

I have had an opportunity to read the report and have been impressed by its content, research, and by the forthright nature of its recommendations. The intention is to make the report available to the groups and organizations which presented briefs and which are broadly representative of the society, to the educational authorities, and to the general public, and to encourage full consideration and discussion of the recommendations. The department will undertake immediately a consideration of the proposals and will wish to have the advice and assistance of the groups to which I have referred.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the committee has made a real contribution towards the ultimate improvement of programmes in the

whole area covered by its terms of reference. I am gratified by the thorough study and imaginative suggestions which are evident in the recommendations and which characterize the report as a whole.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a rather brief statement to make.

I undertook with the members of the House to keep them informed as to the progress of the discussions between the department and the universities with respect to our teachers' colleges. I am pleased to indicate to the House today—and there will be a statement made by Dr. Dunton, I gather, at roughly the same time—that guidelines have been established between the universities and the department for the integration into the universities of our teachers' colleges.

There are certain general conditions, that I will mention very briefly, that are set out in these guidelines. They include conditions relating to buildings and facilities, to capital and operating grants, the admission of students, the structure of the teacher education facility and of its advisory committee, staffing questions, certification and curriculum.

It is proposed that the land, buildings and facilities of an existing teachers' college adjacent to a university will be transferred to the university. Planning and construction of new buildings required to provide teacher education in a university will be done by the university, in the same manner as with other university facilities.

The intention is that operating costs shall eventually be paid on a formula basis as is done at present with other operating grants to universities. However, the formula system will not be introduced until the universities have had some experience with the operation of its teacher education facility. In the meantime, the funds, both capital and operating, required for teacher education will be paid 100 per cent by the government of Ontario, through The Department of University Affairs.

Each university will have an advisory committee to advise the senate or other appropriate university bodies on the teacher education operation. The advisory committee will comprise persons named, in part by the Minister and by the university, and by any other bodies that may be provided for in each agreement. The individual agreements will also specify the matters with which the advisory

committee will deal; staffing policy and curriculum are likely to be included.

The university will be free to admit to the teacher education programme any student who satisfies the normal academic admission requirement set by the university.

There is no need for a uniform organizational structure for the teacher education facility throughout the province, this is set out in the guidelines. Whether there will be a college or a faculty of education, or some other structure, will be a matter for decision by the university concerned, in consultation with The Department of Education.

All entirely new appointments to the teacher education facility in a university will be made in accordance with the procedures of the university concerned. However, the initial appointment of the head of the facility will be made in consultation with The Department of Education, and all existing members of the teaching staff of a teachers' college who wish to join the faculty of the university, following integration, will be continued in employment by the university for a minimum period of four years. Provision is made to protect the salary and pension rights of teachers' college staffs after integration. If at the end of four years a former member of the staff of a teachers' college does not continue on the university faculty, The Department of Education will use its good offices to attempt to secure alternative employment for him.

Members of the teaching staff at a teachers' college integrated into a university may be encouraged to take study leave to enhance their academic qualifications, and The Department of Education will make an agreed contribution to provide financial assistance for staff members to whom study leave is granted.

The guidelines further record the Minister's right to grant Ontario teaching certificates to graduates of a teacher education programme, and to prescribe the conditions requisite for certification. However, the universities will establish their own programmes of teacher education at both the elementary and secondary level, subject to the ordinary procedures for new programme approvals.

I should also add, Mr. Speaker, now that the general guidelines have been established and agreed to between the department and the universities, that will be moving ahead with discussions with individual universities over a period of the next months and probably over the next two or three years. I should make it clear that, because of the necessity to maintain a flow of teachers, the

economic conditions involved and certain practical considerations, we cannot anticipate that all teachers' colleges will be transferred within the next two or three weeks. It will be done on a staged basis over a period of months and perhaps over two or three years.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Could the Minister advise how much consultation there will be with the various teacher affiliates on this new structure? In devising courses and so on, how it will run and how much say will the teachers' association have?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the question from the hon. member. It is the intention that, as the individual universities integrate the teachers' college into their institutions there will be representatives from the teaching profession on the advisory committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development, from the other day.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy with me.

Mr. Speaker: I will be glad to send it down to you.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, if you would not mind.

Mr. Speaker, notice of this question was given the Minister, I believe yesterday, and it is as follows: Why does the Ontario Student Housing Corporation call for tenders on the so-called, "design-build" programme basis, which according to architects may not be in the best interests of quality and efficiency?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, The Ontario Student Housing Corporation undertakes the development of student housing using the developer proposal method as it has been found that this technique has produced well designed high quality residences at prices substantially below the cost of residences prior to 1966.

In 1966 the average cost per student bed in the province of Ontario was well in excess of \$7,000; the average cost today under the builder proposal technique as used by the Ontario Student Housing Corporation is \$5,000, including facilities such as dining rooms, kitchens and lounges, even though costs throughout the construction industry have accelerated substantially in the last three years. The corporation has not reduced the standards requested by the universities, either in sizes of the residences or in the quality

of the structural, mechanical or electrical systems. The corporation has maintained a lower level of costs for these residences consequently allowing a greater number of residences to be constructed so that a greater number of students would be able to afford to attend universities and live in these residences.

The builder proposal technique allows participation not only of the contractor, but also of architects and consulting engineers throughout the design stage, and in fact all proposals issued by the corporation have resulted in a considerable number of proposals being submitted by outstanding professional teams of contractors, architects and consulting engineers.

The corporation has received support and favourable comment from architects participating in builder proposals as to the results that we have achieved since 1966.

The corporation utilizes the services of consulting architects and engineers throughout the development and construction phases to ensure performance of the contractor to our specifications.

The supervision of all projects is undertaken by the corporation through its technical staff and by the continuing use of consulting architects and engineers. The corporation also requires that the consulting architects and engineers of the contractor produce certificates that the residences have been built in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, prior to the corporation accepting the structures from the contractor and turning them over to the university.

The builder proposal method is not a new technique and is being used today throughout Europe, the United States of America and Canada, not only by governments but also by institutions, industry and commerce.

However, as in any system, there may be ways of improving it, and the corporation has met with professional groups in the past such as the Ontario Association of Architects, and will continue to meet with these groups to review their comments and find new and better ways of developing residences at the most economical prices.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if the Minister will permit.

What about the conflict of interest that develops when the architect is actually working for the construction company rather than in this case, Ontario Student Housing Corporation, which is the owner or the builder of the facility?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, that is a conflict of interest; but also I would say that the sophistication of building techniques today mean that many construction companies have their own professional architects and consulting engineers. We have been asked what the fees have been insofar as paying these people that are within a construction group. We submitted figures to the professional architects. They have checked them out and they find that there is no cut in the fees that are being received by the contractors; but what the professions would like to do is make sure that everything that is being built today goes to them first and they act as the management on the job while the building is going up. There is a conflict of interest I think between the professions, not necessarily with the housing corporation.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Minister in fact employ two levels of architects, those who are actually designing for the builders and another group that works for him as the responsible Minister of the government, so that there are architects at two levels checking on each other? Is that the way it works out?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We could use either method. We want to make use of all the professional services that are available. If it is an architectural firm without any contractor attached to it, they feel that all the work should go through it, and it should in turn find the contractor. We say that the building techniques today are changing and we also have developed a sophistication ourselves with our own staff of the housing corporation similar to Central Mortgage and Housing. I think it is unfair for them to say, as one said the other day, that we have got to wait for a housing corporation building to fall down before we get some changes made. I pointed out to them that the only building I know of that fell down in the last ten years was built at Eglinton Avenue along the lines they are talking about. So far, no Ontario Housing Corporation building has ever collapsed and I do not think ever will.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question. Would the Minister say that he accounts for the reduction in costs per unit from \$7,000 to \$5,000 because of the fact that the building is not channelled through the normal architectural facility?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, not necessarily. We checked out some costs from private architects and found they are much higher. But they too have learned that they have to sharpen their pencils and now they are right

down to the crunch. They are coming in and looking for business and we are talking with them almost on a monthly basis. In fact, I talked with professional architects here this week and my people are quite prepared to give them an opportunity to work for the housing corporation if they can show they can save us some money and get on with the job.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health, in three parts.

1. Is the Minister aware that the Ontario College of Nurses has advised Grace graduate nurses that in order to qualify for the writing of nurse registration examinations, a Grace graduate nurse: (a) must have been employed in nursing for five years immediately prior to taking the exam; (b) must be currently employed in Ontario; (c) if she does not pass the examination the first time, she will not be allowed to re-write the examination?

2. Does the Minister agree with these rules set out by the Ontario College of Nurses?

3. If not, what steps will the Minister take to ensure that arbitrary rules, such as the ones outlined above, are withdrawn, and that Grace graduate nurses may write their examinations under conditions similar to those spelled out in sections 8 and 9 of the regulations under The Nurses Act?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker: 1. Yes, I have had several letters advising me of the situation.

2. No, I heartily disagree with the rules as set out.

3. I have apprised the college of my views on this regulation and have urged them to give immediate and urgent reconsideration to this decision.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North has a question from the other day of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

1. Due to the many problems which have resulted from the delay of Dr. Fyfe's report on the Waterloo county area government system, would the Minister advise the House as to whether or not he has now asked for completion by a specific date?

2. Is the Minister aware that this delay has affected the internal operations of Kitchener, Waterloo and surrounding municipalities?

3. Does he believe the results of the Waterloo South—the word Wellington should be in there, it was omitted somewhere—land use study will have further complicating effects on the report?

4. Will this delay affect the government's original decision to have regional government in effect by 1971 in the area?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is no, I have not asked Dr. Fyfe to have his report completed by a specific date. I do not think that is practical. He obviously, I believe, would like to have the report done as quickly as he can.

I have asked him on two or three occasions to complete his work as quickly as possible and I will continue to do that, but I do not think, in the interests of the people involved and in the scope of the work involved, it is a good idea to hold a shotgun to his head and say he must have it done by such-and-such a time if he cannot have it done. There really is no control over how fast someone writes something.

I would hope, and I will continue to urge, that it be done as quickly as it can be. He is aware of that and I think is making every effort to write it and get it done.

In reply to the second part of the question, I am sure that there has been some effect on municipal operations in Kitchener-Waterloo and the surrounding municipalities. It is difficult to assess the measure of such effect and the specific causes involved. Certainly the municipalities, so far as I am aware, have not been advised by me or by any branch of government to defer or forget about any essential work on the basis of the report not being completed.

On the third part, the land use study to which the member refers involves The Department of Highways, The Department of Treasury and Economics, and the community planning branch of my department. The study involves the municipalities and the planning boards in the area. There is specific work being undertaken by the Waterloo county area planning board in preparing the basis for an official plan for the whole area.

All these studies are going to have a great influence on the form and distribution of development in the areas under study. Certainly, in our study of Dr. Fyfe's recommendations, when they are received, I can assure the member that we as a department, and as a government, will take the results of the Waterloo South study and the other studies

very much into account in whatever determination we finally make but these studies are not delaying the production of Dr. Fyfe's report in any way.

Finally, on the last part of the question, I indicated to the House on December 2 that we should be in a position, if all goes well, to have legislation ready within 12 to 14 months after receipt of the report and that would still be our intention.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin has a question of the Premier.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier this morning, as follows:

Has the provincial government received a request from the federal government concerning the subsidizing of ferry services between Tobermory and South Baymouth, and between Meldrum Bay on Manitoulin and Blind River on the north shore, and the services for Cockburn Island?

Since intra-provincial ferries are simply highway links, is the provincial government prepared to take over the entire cost—or a portion of the cost—of this operation consistent with its responsibilities concerning the ferry service between Prince Edward County and Adolphustown? If so, will the Premier give the House assurance that action will be forthcoming for the current tourist year?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have had some correspondence between the federal government and ourselves concerning the subsidizing of the two ferries running to Manitoulin Island and the matter is presently under negotiation.

In the second question we have once again, Mr. Speaker, a statement of facts in a question which are not necessarily correct, inasmuch as the question is worded "since intra-provincial ferries are simply highway links".

I would like to point out to the hon. member that the federal government has been subsidizing these two ferries for an indefinite number of years, so it is not simply a question of this government trying to avoid any responsibility that it may have. This responsibility for subsidy to Manitoulin Island has been accepted by the federal government for a good many years and the gist of their correspondence to us, is that they want to get out of this subsidization. This may be a perfectly logical position for them to take, but it may be one that this government will not necessarily accept out of hand.

I might say that in the final part of the question—"will we give the House assurance"—well certainly, the ferries have to operate. But once again, Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that in our negotiations with Ottawa we not only have to compete with the government of Ottawa, which is trying to improve its position *vis-à-vis* Ontario, but we have to compete with the Opposition in this House, because this question obviously is designed to put the position of the federal government—

An hon. member: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and I am getting very, very tired of it. Every time we—

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): The Premier looks tired.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier's government reflects his tiredness. The statement is unworthy of the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is not the least bit unworthy of me. I am becoming very, very tired of having to fight this Opposition on every dispute we have with Ottawa.

Now here it is. Just read the question and analyze how it has been written. It could have been written by someone from the federal government, putting their argument. Now it is time we settled down in this Chamber right here and started to protect the interests of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: That is the attitude—"I am all right Jack," let somebody else pay.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is endeavouring to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Farquhar: Could I ask the Premier a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Since I will not be allowed on this occasion to enter into a debate on the matters that he has raised? I will have to do that—

Mr. Nixon: Well the Speaker did not call him to order.

Mr. Farquhar: —do that at a later date. I simply want to ask him—in view of the extreme concern on the Island and the shore, which the member for Algoma shares with me—how soon, or if, in the near future, we are going to be able to get reaction from the provincial government that will relieve the tension that is existing there right now with respect to the forthcoming tourist year?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think I could make this assurance, my little outburst has nothing to do with the facts of this particular case. It is obvious that this government—

Mr. Nixon: Completely out of order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is obvious that this government is not going to leave Manitoulin Islands cut off, without ferry service; and I make that assurance to—

Mr. Nixon: Much as the government would like to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —that assurance to the hon. member, and to the people who live on the island and the people who want to visit it.

Mr. MacDonald: How about Pelee Island?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Pelee Island is another question. Here again we have a ferry service, and I might say that I am conducting a survey—if I am going to answer this question—I am conducting a survey of what ferry services are subsidized by the federal government in the other provinces of Canada. I think this is information we should have when we are being asked to take over from the federal government a subsidization that the federal government has assumed for many, many years.

We are quite prepared to negotiate with the federal government. I have been in touch with Mr. Hellyer personally and there is no animosity between us on the question, but I just do not like to always have to fight this group as well as the federal government.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The Prime Minister need not apologize for his outburst.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. member for Sarnia has the floor.

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker!

Are you going to permit the hon. Prime Minister and other Cabinet Ministers, in replying to us, to impute motives to the Opposition when they ask such questions? Because as I understand the rules of this House, if I might continue—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Bullbrook: As I understand—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: As I understand the rules of this House, imputation of motives, unless those motives have been previously avowed, are completely out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I would point out to the hon. member that questions as submitted and approved by me obviously are intended to impute motives to the government, otherwise the questions would not have point, and I have allowed them. Therefore, I think it is quite proper that an answer in similar vein should be given. I would propose to continue to allow that type of question to be asked and the answer of similar vein to be given.

If the hon. members do not wish that then the question period loses all its impact, in my opinion.

Mr. Lewis: What about these lackeys of foreign powers taking up the time of the House?

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Speaker, may I speak further to the point of order?

I simply want to say that the last answer I got from the Premier was the answer I was looking for. I am perfectly satisfied. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a question from the other day of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Designed in my own office, by my own hand, Mr. Speaker.

To the Minister of Social and Family Services: Is there any truth to the contention by recipients of mothers' allowance presently resident in the Warden Woods low rental housing project that the reduction in their February rent by virtue of the basic shelter exemption will now be reclaimed in one or more installments by the family benefits branch of the Minister's department over the next few months?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the fact that the person who asked the question was the author of the question makes it a very easy one to answer, which is as follows:

Recipients of family benefits resident in the Warden Woods housing projects will be permitted to retain the basic shelter exemption grant payments to the extent that the amounts actually paid for shelter by the recipient during the year exceeded the amounts approved in their allowances for shelter. Where there is no excessive amount paid by the recipient the amounts will be recovered by one or more installments over the next few months.

This is similar to the previous question and answer I gave on December 10, 1968.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Is the Minister aware that his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), subsequent to his answer on January 2, 1969, wrote to all the people about whom he speaks saying that he was pleased to confer this benefit upon them, and subsequently the Minister's department is reclaiming it from them? How does the Minister reconcile departmental policy?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Wherever the recipients of those letters paid rent in excess of that budgeted, as I said, they will be permitted to keep it. No person will be paid twice.

Mr. MacDonald: Scrooge was a generous soul compared to the Minister!

Mr. Lewis: Another supplementary: Why is the basic shelter exemption given by one department, being used to fund another government department? Was that the meaning of the legislation?

An hon. member: That is right!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Our regulations apply to everybody in the province of Ontario, regardless who the landlord is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East has a question from the other day of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Labour: When will Bill 35, The Operating Engineers Act assented to April 14, 1965, be proclaimed?

How many charges have been laid for violation of The Operating Engineers Act, 1953, chapter 282, from April 1965 to date?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, the regulations are currently being completed and I expect that the Act will be proclaimed within the next few weeks.

As to the second part, there have been nine prosecutions, and convictions were registered in eight cases.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East has a question of the Minister of Education.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: Will the Minister investigate the ETV programming as it is being shown at the present time on some TV stations to ensure a two or three minute break between programmes so that classes can move in or out of a television room, or a TV set can be moved to another classroom during such a break rather than interfere and lose part of the programme itself, as is presently the case?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter is, of course, being considered by the branch. We face a very practical problem of time being quite expensive and trying to get as much actual programme material into the amount of time available to us. The actual break is one minute and 50 seconds at the present time. We feel that when the transmission facilities become available to us as a provincial jurisdiction, together with an increase in the number of television receivers or recorders within the system, this problem will then disappear.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health has an answer to a question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) asked a question concerning OMSIP and EGIP a few days ago and I undertook to get him further information.

Employees group insurance plan entitlement to medical services insurance is dependent upon participation in the basic life insurance programme. OMSIP has no such requirement. OMSIP provides all necessary medical services, certain specified dental and surgical procedures, and refraction by either a physician or optometrist.

EGIP does not provide all necessary medical services. Exceptions are found in obstetrical care, caesarian sections, well-baby care, periodic health examinations. It makes no provision for dental or optometric care. EGIP, however, does pay 100 per cent of

the OMA fee schedule; OMSIP pays 90 per cent of the 1967 schedule.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, you may recall that in 1967 a committee of senior officials was appointed to enquire into matters dealing with conflict of interest of public employees.

This inquiry arose originally as a result of an Alderman Collins in my own city of London who got into some difficulty as far as the city council there was concerned as a result of a potential conflict of interest. Then the hon. member for Riverdale, in another debate, raised the question of conflict of interest of members of boards of governors of universities; so this eventually got into a rather broad study.

The terms of reference for the committee were as follows:

1. The consideration of the best interests of the public in having any employee of a municipality or a local board serve as a member of a municipal council or of any local board, and to determine appropriate safeguards in respect of conflict of interest.

2. The means by which the knowledge and abilities of an employee of a municipality or local board may in the public interest be made available in elective or appointive office.

3. The extent to which other persons presently disqualified by statute should be permitted to participate in public office, and to determine appropriate safeguards respecting conflict of interest.

4. The consideration of the application of these matters to governing bodies of the universities.

5. Such other matters as may be pertinent to the inquiry.

Today I would like to table the report of this committee. I will make this available to all the members of the House.

I might point out that this is a very difficult area, indeed. It has been studied by select committees of this House, it has now been studied by this committee. There have been changes in the legislation over the years and it is very difficult to arrive at black and white solutions to these problems that are fair to everyone involved. On page 53 of the report, within two or three pages there is a summary of its recommendations set out in tabulated order.

What I would really like to do with this report is refer it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), to the Attorney

General and Minister of Justice (Mr. Wishart), and any other Minister whose portfolio might be involved. And I hope that during the course of this session we will be able to produce a piece of legislation which, I would have to say from the beginning probably will not touch all the bases or be perfect within its four corners for all the various opinions that are held by people in this regard, on the other hand that is no reason why we cannot press on with some approach to the problem, so that when the legislation comes here we will debate it. It can then be sent on to a committee of this House where members of the public who might be interested can make representation.

I hope in this way we will be able to produce a piece of legislation which will embody the recommendations of this report plus some consideration by the public.

As I say, the whole matter was studied by the select committee dealing with The Municipal Act some years ago and there were many public representations made at that time and the Ministers involved with this report will have the benefit of the report of that committee. But I think the time has come when we had better stop seeking 100 per cent perfection and produce a piece of legislation, even though it may not satisfy everybody concerned.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of clarification, I thought in the remarks just at the end of the Premier's statement that he was suggesting that a select committee might re-examine this matter once again. It appears that the recommendations from the committee tabled today are somewhat similar to those of the select committee on The Municipal Act and I would not think we would have to go through the procedure much more often.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The whole burden of my remarks is that even though we will not get perfection, we can take the results of these two committees and produce a piece of legislation and see how it works out.

Mr. Speaker. Orders of the day.

TOWN OF BURLINGTON

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West), in the absence of Mr. Kerr, moves second reading of Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BOBIER CONVALESCENT HOME

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South), in the absence of Mr. Spence, moves second reading of Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Bobier convalescent home.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MAIMONIDES SCHOOLS FOR JEWISH STUDIES

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), in the absence of Mr. Singer, moves second reading of Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Maimonides Schools for Jewish Studies.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale), in the absence of Mr. Pitman, moves second reading of Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF MISSISSAUGA

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South) moves second reading of Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the town of Mississauga.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, I wonder if I can ask the Premier if it has been decided that Parliament will not proceed with Pr13?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Oh no! We are just holding it up to have a look at it.

Mr. Nixon: The vote went against the government in the bills committee, and I—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This has happened before.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): We wanted to take it up with Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: I see, yes—take it up with the backroom boys in London.

Clerk of the House: The fifth order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. Reuter in the chair.

THE MILK ACT, 1965

The House in committee on Bill 17, An Act to amend The Milk Act, 1965.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Would the Minister explain the necessity for section 2 of the bill?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): First of all section 2 and section 1 go together to a certain degree. The amendment gives the board the authority to make regulations in section 1. The regulations that were made and filed because of The Regulations Act are now deemed to have been made under The Milk Act as amended by section 1 of this bill, and declares that the regulations were deemed to have been filed as on the date on which they were actually filed under The Regulations Act.

If the hon. member will recall the discussion and debate on the second reading of this bill, he will recognize that it was a technicality flowing from a judgment that had been handed down—I should say an expression of opinion of one of the justices of the court. He said that what the board had done was quite in order but they should have done it by order rather than by regulation. The Regulations Act provides that when a board makes a regulation it has to be filed under The Regulations Act. We are simply validating this, but section 2 in no way interferes with the right of anyone to challenge the making of such a regulation.

Mr. J. Rewick: My problem, Mr. Chairman, is simply that it appears, as far as I can tell, to only have a retrospective effect, and is not retroactive in the sense of affecting persons rights prior to the enactment of this bill. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not a lawyer and this is a technicality, but I have been assured that there is no reason whatever in section 2 of this bill to interfere with the right of anyone to challenge the authority of the milk board—or to make regulations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Might this be a suitable time for the Minister, who is not a lawyer, to explain to me and some others who are not lawyers what the difference between a regulation and an order actually is?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Under The Regulations

Act, all regulations have to be filed; that is, published in the *Gazette*, and published in the House paper of the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, *The Milk Producer*. When this legislation or the Act was passed in 1965 and the milk board was finally appointed, so that everyone would know what they were doing by way of decisions they were making, it was decided that rather than file them as orders, as is the case in some jurisdictions, particularly the United States, that they be filed as regulations.

Under The Regulations Act there is no choice but to file those decisions publicly. This was the decision that they reached, and they have stuck by that decision ever since. I think this is a very sensible arrangement because it gives all producers the opportunity to know what the regulations really are.

Mr. Nixon: That sounds very helpful.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think so.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairmen, when section 2 of this bill went into the agriculture committee I was under the impression that the wording was "shall be deemed to have been made under The Milk Act, 1965, as amended by this Act", and then the wording was "and shall have the same force and effect as if filed on that date". That was the wording which I was under the impression was being put in that day; but I see this is not so. Now I may be wrong, but I thought I was very careful in writing down what they proposed that day. Was this changed in the meantime?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Here again, I am not a lawyer, Mr. Chairman. The words that I used that day—and I wrote that amendment out myself—when they came to legislative counsel they decided that the changing of some of those words would not affect the principle of what we were doing but it would be legal terminology; and that was why there were one or two words changed. It has no bearing on the principle on which we voted that day.

Mr. Ruston: Well, it may not, and I have no legal background either, as you might know. But I know in the discussion that day, the solicitors who were present representing some of those involved and interested in it seemed to have some disagreement between their opinion and the opinion of solicitors for The Department of Agriculture and Food.

That is why I am just wondering if there may be some difference in it. It just seems a little strange that would come up now—that the change would be made—because I was under the impression that that is the way it would be that day.

Section 2 agreed to.

Mr. Nixon: Before the bill is reported, I think it would be well to point out as an aftermath to our previous debate on second reading that sending this bill to committee and amending it to some extent did not in fact result in the dissolution of milk marketing in the province as was predicted by the Premier. He said it would fall on its face.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I am delighted that it worked out so well. Sometimes I am happy to be wrong.

Bill 17 reported.

THE PREPAID HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICES ACT

House in committee on Bill 22, An Act to amend The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, before the bill is reported, I wonder if the Minister can indicate to what extent the use of this bill is expected in the next few years, dealing with insurance covering drugs?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I cannot estimate that, but there is one plan—and I believe we call it the Windsor plan—which will go into operation at once.

Bill 22 reported.

THE MINING ACT

House in committee on Bill 24, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 6:

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, on section 6 I would like to move an amendment, please. I move that the present section 6 be deleted and that the following be substituted therefor:

6. This Act comes into force on the first day of April, 1969.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment is pretty obvious. We want to make it clear in the Act the effective date for it. We have now cleared the way administratively with the new form and the new facilities so that these departures from past procedures in The Mining Act will be available to the public and therefore we feel if we set out the date right in the amendment this will facilitate the services to the public.

Motion agreed to.

Section 6, as amended, agreed to.

Section 7 agreed to.

Bill 24 reported.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

House in committee on Bill 50, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

On section 1:

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): In respect to section 1, I move that subsection 2 of section 1 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Subsection 2 of section 2 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

2. Two junior judges may be appointed for the county court for the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and of each of the counties of Essex and Wentworth.

The amendment, Mr. Chairman, substitutes the proper name of the new municipality.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on section 1, and I hesitate to mention this particular subject, but does the initiative for the expansion of the judiciary come from here or from the Minister's counterpart in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well the initiative insofar as the number of judges is concerned comes from us, the province, as the administrators of justice. Federal Parliament has the power of appointment of Supreme Court judges, district and county court judges, but as to the administration and the judges we need and all the other facilities that we need to supply—courthouses, staff, sheriffs, all the officers—all the administration is a part of the provincial jurisdiction.

So when we find that we need more judges, either in the Supreme Court or in the county or district courts, we make requests to Ottawa to appoint additional judges as required. That is why these bills must go through, so we can

make a request as a government request to Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: Is there parallel legislation in Ottawa or is it just a provision of the constitution?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think that the Minister of Justice at Ottawa must then obtain legislation to appoint the judges. I believe this is the way he proceeds.

Mr. Nixon: But legislation would be similar?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, there is The Judges Act—which covers, I think, all judges—supreme court, superior court, our county and district courts, and I think it also deals with the exchequer court and the Supreme Court of Canada—and that is the federal Act which sets up the number of judges who shall be appointed in certain areas in certain provinces. My understanding is that the Minister of Justice, when he receives our legislation, must then amend his Act.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That is what happens when lawyers do these things.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might direct a question, through you, to the hon. Attorney General. It has just come to my mind. I understand the need for the amendment that the Attorney General has just proposed, but what will they call that court? And second: For example, as we go on we are going to appoint 14 junior judges for the county of York, and they have jurisdiction in connection with Metropolitan Toronto; now, will the court in question be called the court of Ottawa-Carleton? There is a technical difficulty that comes to my mind, perhaps I am missing the point entirely—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think it is a rather technical point. We call it a region, a regional government, a combination of counties; so I do not think we would be far wrong if we said it was still a county court. The Act creating the region states it is deemed to be a county.

Mr. Bullbrook: Just for the sake of mental gymnastics and not attempting to waste time unduly, but the jurisdiction, as far as the county of York is concerned, relates to Metropolitan Toronto. Will the court in question here continue to be the county court of the county of Carleton, having jurisdiction over those affairs within the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton? I am just wondering

really as to the technical propriety of the amendment we are really considering now, because we are appointing judges—“Two junior judges may be appointed for the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton”—and yet they will not be judges of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, they will be judges of the county court of the county of Carleton, I would think.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Those are mental gymnastics, I think, all right. I think the judges will be able to serve the area.

Mr. Bullbrook: I hope so.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill 50 reported.

THE PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 60, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

On section 1:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I suppose it is section 1. I am under paragraph 17; 16 takes up the bulk of it and then 17 the rest.

I am still somewhat concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the appointment of a registrar of partnerships. With the introduction of the computers, this central registry for partnerships, limited and otherwise, is tentatively, and for the time being at least, set up in the city of Toronto at the city registry office. The proliferation of posts is what is bothering me.

Can the registrar of the city of Toronto not carry out this function? It should not be a very onerous one. It is all going to be computerized and be run through with a few girls rather quickly I suspect; and to set up a whole new registry seems to be pushing it pretty hard, particularly as the facilities already exist and are being set up down at the new city hall building. Does the Minister really feel that he has to go this far?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think it is patent in the bill that there is provision there for the appointment of a registrar of partnerships if the volume of the work—the detail attached to it when we bring in partnership registration across the province—should be so large that such an office were needed. We would have the provision there to do it. But then subsection 2 of 17 indicates, I think, our intention that until such an

official registrar of partnerships is appointed, we will continue to carry on allowing and expecting the registrar of deeds—actually, we call him the registrar now—to do that work as he does now for Toronto.

Speaking of computers, we are moving to that and anticipating that in connection with our personal property security and other features which require registration. We will not reach that perhaps for a year or two years. But this is just a safeguard to make sure that if the volume should become so great, we might need somebody to be specialized in that field.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, may I just say in reply, and comment on this, that this is most reassuring. I had taken it that you were going forward, but the fact that you will watch the volume and not appoint unless it is absolutely necessary is fine.

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill 60 reported.

THE COMMISSIONERS FOR TAKING AFFIDAVITS ACT

House in committee on Bill 61, An Act to amend The Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.

On section 1:

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I move that subsection 1 of Section 1 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Subsection 4 of section 2 of The Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

The head of every municipal council, the reeve of every town, every deputy reeve and every comptroller and alderman of a municipality is *ex-officio* commissioner for taking affidavits in the county, district or regional municipality in which a municipality is situate.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment provides for the case where a municipality is in a regional municipality and not a county or district.

Motion agreed to.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to

ask the Attorney General if in fact there are affidavits that have been taken by the people referred to in section 4, which now would be regularized by this section?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That would be the purpose and intent of that section.

Mr. Nixon: They have been under the impression that they have these powers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The section ends with the words:

Shall be deemed to have always been *ex-officio* commissioners.

That would validate any actions they have taken as commissioners for the taking of oaths.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Nixon: Does the Attorney General have any thoughts at all about instructing those who are in fact made commissioners for taking affidavits under this bill and the provisions therefor so they know what the responsibilities are in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must confess, no, I have not thought about any special instruction. Persons who receive their commission understand at the time they get it what the requirements are. Perhaps some special instruction as to how solemn an oath is and how they should be properly taken might be useful. I will give that some thought and see what we might do.

Mr. Nixon: I might just add that as I understand it, under the provisions of the Act we are amending, all of us as members of this House have this responsibility. I might just suggest to the Attorney General that there may be those present, myself included, who are not perhaps completely aware of the ramifications of this responsibility and how in fact it is used.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am glad to have the thought and will see what may be done.

Section 6 agreed to.

Bill 61 reported.

CONSOLIDATION AND REVISION OF THE STATUTES

House in committee on Bill 62, An Act to provide for the Consolidation and Revision of the Statutes.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on second reading, I raised the point about the wording of section 3. I know it is traditional and sanctified by time but that does not in the least make it not wrong. If you can read the wording here, I suggest that in future revisions that it be perused and possibly altered. It gives Warner Cox Alcombrack and Arthur Norman Stone extremely wide powers indeed, I suggest to the Attorney General.

I will not read the first part of the section. "The commissioners may alter the numbering and arrangements of any enactment . . ." Well that is fine. "And may make such alterations in language and punctuation as a requisite to obtain a uniform mode of expression . . ." Well again, that is fine. "And may make such amendments as are necessary to bring out more clearly what is deemed to be the intention of the Legislature or to reconcile seemingly inconsistent enactments . . ."

Now I find that most objectionable that we should delegate off to public servants, however learned in the law and what not, the power to make such amendments. I suggest that is a very questionable thing to do. If there are reconciliations to make—if the enactments are not, on the face of them, by golden rule or any other rule of interpretation reconcilable on their face—it is certainly not the job of any delegated body or entity from this Legislature to set up the reconciliations.

If sections clash then it is our job to amend them, to bring them into line. And while you may point out this has happened for well over a century, since these revisions have been coming down, I would ask you to give that your circumspection; I am not moving an amendment on it simply because it is hoary. I do not think that as lawyers it is our duty to shift off the responsibility that we bear in this regard by simply saying we trust these men, we know of their intrinsic trustworthiness.

The point is that there are some people who may come after them who may be slipshod, or may actually have a cause to serve which would permit them to use this wording. After all, we lawyers turn immediately to the statutes, we take them as verity, at their face value. We do not check back as to whether alterations have been made against the very wording of the original Act.

No one man or group of men of this kind has the time or wisdom to do that. It must be brought before a body of contentious legislators who will bring it out in the litmus

paper of debate, and again I would ask the Attorney General to consider that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak very briefly to it, and point out that there are some statutes which will be omitted because they were passed as a transitional thing, and they have been replaced by legislation as the ten years went along. There are clerical errors, of course; I know the hon. member is not concerned about that. But there is a need to take out in the revision certain statutes which have become obsolete by virtue of later legislation.

I think the most reassuring statement I can give is that when this work is done, when this work is ready for approval by the Legislature, it will be brought forward. And I should make the hon. members aware that a confirming statute will be necessary in 1971 to make this work official. In considering any changes or omissions that will be brought to the attention of the members, they will be able to say, "This should not have been omitted; it should have been kept in", if that were their opinion. But I think the persons in charge of the revision will be able to inform myself, or the Attorney General of the day, so that he may satisfy the House that the revision is proper.

Section 3 agreed to.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, just one question on 6: I noticed that the wording, "unrepealed" and "unconsolidated" comes up. Would the Attorney General care to comment as to what that phraseology might mean? It comes up later in the bill but it is also under the schedules.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am looking for the words "unrepealed" and "unconsolidated". Are those the words the hon. member used?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, those are the words. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, it is more in section 8, I guess, although when I was going over the statutes I noticed in 6(b) the words "repealed". "superseded" and "consolidated". Then it comes down and says and "not consolidated" in the last line. That is spelled out a little bit more in section 8 where they say "any reference in an unrepealed and unconsolidated Act".

Mr. Chairman: Section 6(b) does not use the term "unconsolidated". In section (b) it says, "are not consolidated".

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there are certain Acts that are not of public interest, such as university bills; that sort of thing which is not consolidated. They are appended to the revised statutes, as the hon. member knows. I know he is most familiar with that setup of our revised statutes. Those Acts are of no public interest particularly when unrepealed and unconsolidated and appended to the revision.

Mr. Lawlor: A further question to the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman. The Attorney General says, "of no public interest", again. Does the Attorney General, with a neatly perusing staff, I trust, look at that and make sure that it is not of public interest? It very often strikes me that there are Acts lying in some limbo, to be dragged out at the behest, usually of the Crown, when some poor devil is in a state of affliction, and his lawyer, did not know they existed. I would trust again that we would get assurance that Acts which have a public import in that sense of the term do get consolidated.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the committee I would like to revert to section 5. I had confused appendix "A" with schedule "A" and I did want to ask the Attorney General a couple of questions on section 5. You got by it before I recognized the mistake I had made.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member suggesting the chairman was going too quickly?

Mr. J. Renwick: No, Mr. Chairman, section 5 refers to appendix "A" which is what I wanted to comment about. Section 6 refers to schedule "A", and I made the mistake of assuming that my remarks were pertinent under section 6.

Mr. Chairman: Would the committee consent to reverting to section 5 under the circumstances?

You have the consent of the committee. The hon. member may direct questions.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question to the Attorney General refers to this appendix "A" of the revised statutes which provides for:

Certain imperial Acts and parts of Acts relating to property and civil rights that were consolidated in the Revised Statutes of Ontario 1897, volume 3, pursuant to chapter 13 of the Statutes of Ontario (1902), that are not repealed by the Revised Statutes of Ontario (1960)—

And I assume that would be 1970 in the new revision—

—and are in force in Ontario subject thereto.

That quotation, Mr. Chairman, is simply the heading of appendix "A".

Those statutes which my colleague, the member for Lakeshore, referred to on second reading of the bill, are five Acts. One is the Act commonly known as The Habeas Corpus Act. The second one deals with monopolies. The third one deals with champerty and the fourth and fifth deal with real property, commonly known as *quia emptores* and The Statute of Uses.

In looking at the origin of this particular appendix, and it is a little bit lost in antiquity in this province, I notice that in 1902, chapter 1 of the statutes provides for the revision of the statute law. That Act repealed a large number of old imperial statutes to the extent that they were in force in the province of Ontario, and those statutes are listed in the schedule to that chapter 1 of the statutes of 1902.

Then in the same year, by chapter 13, there is an Act respecting the imperial statutes relating to property and civil rights incorporated into the statute law of Ontario. And in reading the preamble to that particular statute, Mr. Chairman, it refers again to the antiquity of these statutes that were repealed in this session, and then goes on to state:

Whereas it is expedient to include in such consolidation certain statutes of the present session passed in substitution or amendment of certain of the said imperial statutes.

Somewhere within the framework of those two statutes and out of the discarding and repealing of many old statutes, these five statutes were selected for perpetuation in the consolidated statutes of the province of Ontario. My question to the Attorney General is whether or not the commissioners could in this particular instance look particularly at appendix "A" to see first of all whether it is now adequate to give effect to matters which are included, or formerly were included, in the statute law, whether it is now necessary that those statutes be repeated, and whether or not it would be possible to translate them into relatively more relevant language—particularly the two or three difficult statutes—and fourthly, whether or not there is room for the inclusion of other statutes as part of the imperial statutes in force in the province of Ontario.

I think the import of my remarks is simply, could these now not become statutes enacted by this Legislature and avoid this incorporation by reference of these imperial statutes into the law of the province of Ontario? For example, The Habeas Corpus Act or the Magna Carta. It would seem to me that the historic nature of that language would permit it to be enacted directly by this province as a statute.

The application and extent of the next Act—the one concerning monopolies and dispensations with penal laws—is one which almost defies either interpretation or application in the existing situation in the province of Ontario. Maybe it could be recast into language which would be clear and unmistakable as to its import and application.

Presumably the Act respecting champerty could be directly included as a statute in the consolidation, and presumably the statute of *quia emptores* and the statute of uses could also be included directly within the consolidation, rather than carrying them forward only by an appendix, which is not an area in the consolidation that one usually refers to in looking up questions of applicable or pertinent statute law.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestions put forward are very meritorious. I might say we had considered this to some extent and the advice we took was from the law reform commission. Our advice from them was that we might leave these until they complete their study—they are doing a particular study in the field of property law, of all property. They suggested we might leave these till that report had been received.

However, I think perhaps it is certainly clear that some of these Acts in appendix "A" do not relate to property alone and as this work will certainly be proceeding through next year, I am quite prepared to consider the possibility of either amending these sections, if you would let them pass. I am sure we could make that amendment in time as we perhaps change our approach, we could make those amendments in time to enable that work to be done in a different manner.

We did take advice on this. The law reform commission felt that we might leave them for this revision, but I think there is perhaps merit if we can get to a change which would bring them directly into our laws that would be better than leaving them in these appendices.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just two other points that I would like to comment on in the same appendix.

I am glad to hear that the Attorney General would give consideration to the suggestions and bring in whatever necessary amending legislation would be required to change this Act a year from now if it made sense to do so.

I am rather curious that in the incorporation in the statutes in appendix "A" there is no mention, for example, of the Bill of Rights, which was passed—if my historical recollection is correct—in 1689—

Mr. Lawlor: 1688!

Mr. J. Renwick: My colleague, the member for Lakeshore, advises me that it was in 1688 that it was passed—and there may be similar statutes related to this whole question of rights of citizens. I do not know what the status, for example, of the petition of right, which—again deferring to my colleague, the member for Lakeshore—I believe was 1628. And I do not understand why references to those statutes—which in my studying were part and parcel of Magna Carta—should not be included, because they would have become part of the laws of Upper Canada in 1792.

But in any event, in the consideration which is given by the commission to this particular appendix "A", they may well consider that there were other statutes affecting the rights and liberties of the people which should be included in the consolidation.

My last point is that I simply ask the House to note the importance of this appendix in relationship to the position in the province of the relationship of landlord and tenant. For example, this right of distress we find as long ago as the reign of Henry III in part of the statutes of this province the provision that it is agreed that none "from henceforth shall take any revenge or distress of his own authority". And of course that is the point which we have been making and which the law reform commission is finally dealing with—this whole question of people taking the law in their own hands.

I make that point both because of the modernity of the statute but also because people do not realize that part of the statute law of the province of Ontario preserves certain of these ancient rights and liberties. I would like to see the appendix "A" not only revised in modern understandable language, and brought into the consolidation as such, but the statutes dealing with the rights and liberties of people up to the time of the in-

corporation of the province of Upper Canada reviewed, and all of them, if necessary, included or re-enacted as part of the laws of this province.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the hon. House leader would allow the Chairman to put section 6 which I feel has been carried?

Section 6 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Then section 5 has not yet been put.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendments and certain bills with amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in this private members' hour we shall deal with resolution No. 14 standing in the name of Mr. Apps and shown on page 9 of the order paper.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Private member's notice of motion No. 14 by Mr. Apps:

RESOLUTION: That a department of youth should be created to deal with the social the problems of our youth.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the following resolution:

That a department of youth should be created to deal with the social needs and the problems of our youth.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the hon. member to first put his motion before the House by moving his resolution.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 14, standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce this motion with the understanding that the social needs in that definition include physical needs as well. I move the resolution that this department should have its own Cabinet Minister, and

I do so with some regret because I had hoped that a resolution of this nature at this time would not be necessary. The key resolution of the Ontario Legislature's select committee on youth was as follows:

The select committee recommends that a separate provincial department of youth with its own Cabinet Minister should be formed at the earliest convenience of the Legislature.

The reasons for this recommendation, which was passed unanimously by all members of the committee, are well documented in the report and I do not intend to dwell at any great length going over them again at this time. I will say now, however, that I have no reason to change my mind from what I believed when the recommendation was made, first of all in the interim report of the Legislature in June, 1966, and again in the final report in 1967.

In my own view this recommendation was the key to the successful implementation of a large number of the recommendations outlined in the report, and in this connection I would like to quote a small section of the report found on page 18 of the Youth Report:

The select committee, in its interim report to the Legislature in June, 1966, unanimously recommended the formation of a provincial department of youth with its own Cabinet Minister, and since that time the committee has not changed its mind, and reiterates its recommendations, which are based on two and a half years of study and deliberation.

During this time the committee was made aware of the need for a separate government department devoted to youth requirements, and this will be necessary to establish the many proposals outlined in the report and to ensure a wider participation by youth in the life of the community. The preponderance of evidence from the submission backs up this recommendation and is shown in later pages.

As I have already indicated, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason for changing my mind from what the report indicated at that time. To my knowledge there are only three arguments against the recommendation, none of which I feel is valid.

First of all, people have suggested that you should not create a department for a certain section of people such as youth, that it segregates them, that this could lead to segregating them from the rest of the populace and lead

to a breakdown in communication and give certain special status to those under 25. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody needs to say at this time that there is now a certain lack of communication between the young people of this province and those of us in the older generation. I feel that a department of youth would not lead to extending this lack of communication but would do a great deal to improve it. Youth should receive a great deal more attention than they are getting at the present time. Many of the programmes would certainly carry over to a later age and there would be a co-ordination of those programmes.

The second objection is that there are too many departments already in the government and it would not be wise to add another. It seems to me that since the recommendation came down a couple of years ago, there have been two additional departments created in this government—Financial and Commercial Affairs, and The Department of Revenue. The question in my mind is, are they more important than having a focal point, a department for youth in this province? As far as I am concerned, although these two departments may certainly be needed, I still feel that a department of youth is needed just as much, maybe more.

Third: Other departments already in existence can carry out the recommendations made. I realize that many of these departments are working very hard to do a job for the young people of this province. I do not think they are getting enough support and I do not think their efforts are adequate. I feel that there must be one Minister whose sole responsibility is to examine the problems of youth, originate and carry out the needed programmes, press diligently in other areas which are not directly his responsibility and show the way in co-ordinating their activities. I will have a lot more to say about this shortly.

One of the most obvious needs is to bring together in one department these various activities concerning youth and recreation which are now spread over many. First of all, the athletic commissioner is under The Department of Labour. Nobody really knows why this office is under The Department of Labour other than the fact that this was a pretty handy spot to put it at one time. There is no question of the fact that the commissioner does a good job within the scope with which he is limited. I feel he could do a much better job and I feel his activities could be expanded, but they have not been.

The community centre grants are under The Department of Agriculture and Food. I think at one time there was very good reason for this, because many of these grants were made to county fairs, and so on, to help them implement the facilities that they needed. However, a great many of these grants now are going to community centres and so forth. I had the pleasant opportunity, a few days ago, of presenting to the city of Kingston a grant of \$40,000 to help build two arenas, and it comes from The Department of Agriculture and Food. We are very happy to receive the money, but I feel they should be co-ordinated in a department that will look after the needs of the youth in the community.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Do not tell me the cheque went through the hon. member?

Mr. Apps: If the leader of the Opposition would like to know, the cheque was given to me and I presented it to the mayor. There was no publicity whatsoever.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Shame!

Mr. Apps: All right, look at it and see.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The member does not have to worry about being recorded—

Mr. Apps: I see that. Needless to say, the cheque was very well received because it did help in the building of these facilities. My only regret was the fact that it was not a larger sum.

The youth and recreation branch is now in The Department of Education and the Ontario Council for the Arts is now in The Department of Education. I think many of our training schools, which deal with very young people, are now in The Department of Correctional Services—which, by the way, I think, has improved a great deal; I think everybody in this House will share that opinion with me. But I feel that these things could be incorporated within a new department of youth.

I was rather encouraged the other day when the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wells) made a speech on what has been done in connection with the implementation of the recommendations by the select committee on youth. I would like to read just a little bit about what was said at that time, found on page 4:

In addition, the government recognized

that our services in regard to youth are so important that there would be an advantage in having a body that would meet at regular intervals to discuss youth matters specifically and co-ordinate the total approach of the government.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Apps: No, I am not. To continue:

Accordingly the Prime Minister has established an inter-departmental committee on youth, made up of representatives of a number of departments whose programmes directly affect the young people of this province. With the exception of myself, as chairman of the committee and a member of the Prime Minister's staff, who acts as secretary, all the members of the committee are drawn from the operating branches of the department. This means that the members have intimate knowledge of, and day-to-day experiences with, the programmes and with the problems of our young people. The advantage of this choice of membership had been readily apparent at our meetings.

The thought comes to me, and I may be a little bit irreverent in this, about who makes the final decisions as to the policies and principles that are going to be followed in connection with the young people? Are the department officials going to make them, or are the responsible Ministers going to make them?

As far as I am concerned, although this may be something which would prove very good, yet I feel that we are at too much the lower level. I feel that this committee should be made up of the Ministers involved who are in a position to press forward, making certain that the ideas that are formed in this committee are put into active legislation.

Second, on page 5 it was indicated that the formation of a youth and recreation branch would be implemented within The Department of Education. This is a step forward. I hope this is the beginning of, ultimately, a Department of Youth. I was encouraged, to some extent, by that, but my encouragement was somewhat dampened when I looked at the estimates for the year 1969-70 and saw how they compared with the estimates of the former years, to determine to what extent at least they were providing more to implement many of the recommendations that certainly would be forthcoming from the interdepartmental committee.

Although it is somewhat difficult to accumulate the estimates because they are in different

areas, I find the following information: In 1968 and 1969 the total expenditure for the youth branch, Ontario fitness programme, community programme, leadership camps, programme of recreation and non-profit camps, was \$2,756,000, and in 1969-70 the same amount of expenditure proposed is \$2,707,000.

As I say, my encouragement was sort of dampened by the figures that were shown from the 1969-70 estimates. I think that this points out even more clearly that unless there is some responsible Cabinet Minister in a position to promote the programmes designed for the youth of this province, we are not going to get too far in many of those programmes, good as they may be.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Who would the hon. member nominate?

Mr. Apps: Well, I am glad the hon. member brought that up. I would like to dispel any thoughts on behalf of the Opposition over there that I am interested in being a Minister of youth in this Legislature because I am not. I will tell you why; I am too old and there are many young people on the government benches who would do a very capable job, if just given the opportunity.

An hon. member: Where?

Mr. Apps: So let us not hear any more about that.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): The hon. member has not got anybody on his party's benches.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that concerns me a great deal is the physical fitness of the young people of this province. I would like to go back and quote again from page 23 referring to what the select committee said at that time:

The physical fitness of our youth requires energetic promotion and a planned policy that can be implemented throughout the province for school-age and after-school-age youth. This is not being done adequately by any one existing department of government. Sound physical education programmes in elementary and secondary schools are found in relatively few places in Ontario and most elementary schools lack gymnasiums and qualified health education teachers are in short supply.

Army statistics have revealed the extent of physical and mental disabilities among Canadian youths, and the Canadian public has been shocked to learn that nearly half the young men examined for induction

into the army during the war 1939-45, had been found to be physically or mentally unfit. Another fact, not so well known but equally significant, is that at small cost and within a short time, close to 50 per cent of those rejected could be rendered capable of at least limited service. There is little evidence to indicate that the Canadian youth is in better physical condition today.

Mr. Speaker, we have several physical fitness programmes within the province of Ontario. We have the Duke of Edinburgh awards, we had the 5BX plan by the RCAF, we had the Centennial physical fitness plans and many other unco-ordinated plans. It would appear to me that the time has come when someone, somewhere, preferably a department of youth with its own Minister, would sit down and decide what we wanted and work out a co-ordinated programme to obtain the results that are desired. I think we need a better physical fitness programme throughout the province and I feel the department of youth would certainly go a long way to help design such a programme and carry it through.

In Australia, every Wednesday afternoon, I understand, is set aside for physical fitness activities where everybody in the schools goes out and participates in some form of sporting activity in a physical fitness programme. I think that the results they have shown in many of the international athletic competitions indicate that this is certainly a help to them in the field of recreation, which is becoming more and more important because we are advised there will be more time for recreation as the years go by—because a shorter working week, automation and so on will mean that there will be many more hours of recreation available for the people of this province. Again, may I quote just a short passage from the select committee on youth, found on page 96, which says:

What is recreation anyway? It has been defined as refreshing the body or mind, diversion, amusement, any pleasurable exercise or occupation. Recreation, then, is that part of our activity that is connected with free time, more commonly called leisure time. The eight-hour work day has particularly focused attention on recreation as a necessary part of daily life in a well-ordinated society.

Further on:

There are implications for youth here that as adults they will have more leisure

time than any previous generation. This means it is more urgent than ever before the young people acquire, in their youth, skills of healthy recreation in order to be able to use their skills in a satisfying and effective manner during the balance of their lives.

I think The Department of Education is doing its best in this regard. Then I go again and look at the estimates for this year as compared with last year and under programmes of recreation in 1968-69, we find \$1,290,000 which we are improving in 1969-70 to the extent of \$30,000 for a total of \$1,320,000. I do not think that is enough. The reason for it is that no one in government is really responsible for the recreational needs of our people. There are many departments in government that have something to do with it, but it is such a small part in the percentage of their main functions, that as a result these programmes, I feel, really get shuffled off to the side. Sure, you have so much money, go and spend it. But there is no one to my knowledge really who is actively trying to co-ordinate a form of recreation in the province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind interjections from the opposing parties here. I sat here very diligently over the last few weeks and I have listened as carefully as I could to many of their talks. I would appreciate it if they would listen to me, because I am thinking seriously. I am thinking seriously because I believed in this two years ago, I believe in it now, and if I have any criticism of the government, it is criticism in a constructive way. I am trying to point out to them and, for that matter, to the Opposition, that I feel that more should be done in these fields for the young people of this province.

Now, we ran across facilities. People need facilities, young people need facilities. In many cases we do not know the facilities we have, we do not know whether they are being used to the full extent. We do not know what we are aiming for, really.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! In order that the hon. member may complete his remarks in reasonable time, I would advise him there are two minutes left of the time allotted to him.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I understood I had 20 minutes and the other speaker on our side—

Mr. Speaker: Your 20 minutes will be up in two minutes.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to point out to you that the Conservative Party had 30 minutes allocated in this debate and—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member had 20 minutes to speak in the introduction of this and then the other speakers have the floor.

Mr. Apps: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall try to go on as fast as I can.

I would like to say further on sports activities in the province of Ontario, that certain grants are being made and the athletic commissioner is doing a good job. I do think his activities should be expanded more than they are. But there is no way in which young people can really communicate directly with a responsible man unless it is the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). I feel that a Minister would be of great help in this regard.

I would like to speak on other problems of youth—for instance, the drinking problem, and how easy it is to get. What we should do about it? What is the experience in other areas? Whether we should lower the drinking age to 18 or not. What research is being done on the effects of this in other areas.

I would like to speak about health, about the problem of smoking, and smoking in public schools. Everybody really knows now through the doctors this is harmful. Are we doing anything about it? Is there anyone here who keeps saying to himself: "This is one of my jobs, I have to do it"? I do not think so.

There is the problem of glue-sniffing. I have a letter here from a minister in Kingston who is very concerned with the results of glue-sniffing and other kinds of activity among the very young people in this province. He does not know where to go. Is there anyone he can go to about this? Is there anyone here who would do something about it?

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): "Dear Dr. Shulman".

Mr. Apps: Other speakers will talk about welfare and delinquency. Do the police have a youth training bureau for training police particularly to deal with the young people of our province? On the problem of employment, the Prime Minister has come up with a programme to try and help the employment of young people, of students. Would it not

be better to say to a department of youth and the Minister, "This is your job. You work on this all this year. Co-ordinate the activities of the departments here, find out how many jobs are available, and continually go out to private industry and say to them, 'We need to have so many jobs for young people during the summer'." I think this is an important aspect that the Minister of youth could do.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have no more time because I have a lot here that I would have liked to have said. However, I would like to conclude by saying—

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. member that the committee is sitting as a House, Mr. Speaker is in the chair, the hon. member is now over his time allotment. Will he please bring his remarks to a conclusion?

Mr. Apps: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will.

I have tried to outline a few of the arguments; I have many others. I think a start has been made with the youth and recreation branch, and I commend the government for it. But I do not think this goes far enough; I think more work should be done and it should ultimately end up with a Department of Youth. There are pressing problems among the young people in our province. We need somebody they can go to who is responsible. Every young person is important. We need their youth, their enthusiasm, and most of all we need their best efforts.

I maintain a department of youth would make a great contribution to the youth of this province. It will indicate to the young people that we are prepared to designate a Minister of the Crown whose responsibility it will be to adequately promote the welfare of the young people of this province, to institute new programmes and provide active and vigorous leadership, and I think most important of all, we would be in a position to do something about it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps), has outlined for us three basic reasons why he feels that there should be a department of youth within the government. I hope in the course of my remarks to deal with these three reasons from the opposite point of view.

First of all, before I do, I want to say to the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands that I would feel much more comfortable with

him as Minister of youth than some of his colleagues along the front row. I think—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): And even the young ones in the second row, too.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, even the young ones.

As a member of the youth committee, I was one of those people who signed the report in respect to the recommendation to establish a youth department and portfolio within the government. Indeed, the recommendation was signed by all of those members on the committee from all parties. However, perhaps at this point I could hang my hat on the rationale of my friend, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), when he said that perhaps it was in a moment of weakness, perhaps it has changed things in that we have now had time to reflect—

Mr. Lewis: Is the member repudiating his position?

Mr. Gaunt: And finally he said that essentially we play a different role in this House than we do on a select committee. However, Mr. Speaker, the main reason for changing my stand on this recommendation is that I have now had a chance, and my party has had a chance, to assess and view in retrospect the government's attitude towards this recommendation.

Mr. Lewis: The federal Liberals do not want it.

Mr. Gaunt: The government attitude and response to youth has become more apparent to me, Mr. Speaker. The government very quickly shuffled off this recommendation into the dark recesses of the Cabinet minds. It generated very little public discussion when the report was released, indeed it did not evoke a response from the Prime Minister, as I recall it, or any of the leading Cabinet Ministers on the front bench. So I take it that the role and the function of youth within society does not hold a very high priority with this government.

The government, as far as I am concerned, never intended the recommendation to become a reality and has not changed its mind. I think this is reinforced by the fact that the Minister without Portfolio from Scarborough North recently made a rather lengthy statement on what was being done in the youth branch within The Department of Education and he enunciated, in effect, the establishment, more or less, of youth councils within that particular

branch. I think what he was trying to say to the youth committee and to the member for Kingston and the Islands was that this government does not believe we should have a youth department, a youth portfolio. The member for Kingston and the Islands used that in a different way. However, I am firmly persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that that was the thrust and the essence of what the hon. Minister without Portfolio had to say.

Mr. Speaker, the voting age in this province could have been reduced 25 years ago, had the government of that day, a Conservative government may I add, allowed a resolution to come to vote at that time. I suppose the import of it was very much similar to what the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) put forward in his bill on February 21. However, the government did not allow it to come to a vote and consequently nothing happened. It is against this background—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Same as Ottawa.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I have some words to say about that, too, but at the moment I am dealing with this particular resolution and I am sitting in this particular forum, and so I am going to address myself to this province, Mr. Speaker. It is against this background that this resolution, in my opinion, becomes purely mechanical. It is very limited, and it is very restrictive in its approach. It is a form of tokenism; it is not even a gesture, Mr. Speaker, it is a jest.

Mr. Apps: The member does me an injustice by speaking like that.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to that, I do not mean to say that in any personal way. I am addressing myself to the government. I know full well that the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is very sincere in proposing this resolution. I do not take that away from him and I would not impugn his motives for a moment. I am addressing myself to the government and to the government policy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We can feel the lash already.

Mr. Gaunt: I want to suggest that a department of youth perhaps would not be the best move, for three reasons, and if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enunciate them for you at this time.

The resolution, in my opinion, reflects an adult consensus that something should be done about youth. Consequently, part of the

problem seems to be in applying an adult analysis to a youth culture. That is the first point.

The second point: The resolution implies a patronizing and paternalistic approach which is bound to evoke a response of frustration and even disdain from young people. One of the failures of the youth committee, in my opinion, was the fact that it failed to establish a dialogue with young people. It failed to establish a communication with young people, and essentially the report consisted of adults talking to youth.

Surely the adult role is to provide support and not domination. Young people have shown that they have high ideals and worthwhile aspirations. The gut issue, Mr. Speaker, is, that either we give young people a creative role in society or we do not. We expect a great deal from our young people, but I have always maintained that the major stress among young people stems from lack of place or role in society.

The third point I want to come to, Mr. Speaker, is that all the government departments are set up on the basis of function, not age. The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands dealt with this. As far as I am concerned I think there is some validity in saying that if one sets up a department of youth then, similarly, departments of middle age, and old age and even infancy have some validity. The point is that all of the present government departments are now constituted on the basis of function.

Frankly, I would shudder to think of some of the Ministers in the front row becoming the Minister of youth, for instance. The thought of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), or even my friend, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), becoming the Minister of youth would drive shivers up my spine. With respect, gentlemen, you just do not project the image.

What the government needs to do is tear down the walls that have shut young people out. If all the departments concerned with youth—and there are a number of them in the government with certain functions in respect to young people—would try to establish more meaningful support insofar as young people are concerned, I think a great deal could be accomplished.

And then I come to the gist of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this government should lower the voting age to 18 forthwith—at this session, if it is serious about sucking

young people into the mainstream of society where they can become full participants. The most powerful message that this government could address to young people in this day and age is to say, "We want you to vote at 18," but I suggest that they are not going to do this. There has been very little response.

I was interested to note just a few weeks ago that the Prime Minister made a statement to the effect that the government was considering lowering the voting age. I think on one other occasion he also made some type of statement suggesting that they were going to wait for the select committee on election law before they did anything about this particular matter, or considered it in a very serious way. And so, I suggest to you that now is the time. We could do it in this session, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, the government's attitude can be summed up very briefly, and it has not changed in the last 25 years.

Mr. Speaker: I would direct the hon. member's attention to the clock. His time is up. Would he please draw his remarks to a conclusion.

Mr. Gaunt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will draw my remarks to a close very quickly. Mr. Speaker, I think the reasons are compelling. I think that young people should have a place, a role in our society. We have many pressing problems. We were directed, more or less compelled, into the position of recommending a department of youth because of the sins of omission and commission of this government in respect to directional services, correctional services, education, driver education and so on. The real solution lies in giving young people a vote at 18, and I suggest that this government do it immediately. It would be a big step in achieving, Mr. Speaker, Canada's second century unlimited.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands on presenting this resolution and acknowledge the kind of deep disappointment and despair that lies behind the necessity, some three years after the commission on youth for it to have to come as a private member's motion.

Without doubt, this particular member has worked very hard, very long and very constructively on behalf of youth. He did it under the assignment of his government, as a function for his particular party. He did it well. I can remember being before that

commission myself and the respect and attention which we received as well as the sincerity with which he was undertaking his work. I can feel with him the kind of despair that leads him, three years later, to acknowledge that it is not going to happen. It was never intended to happen, it is not going to happen in the future.

At the same time, I cannot support the resolution. In saying that, and after a great deal of searching to see whether or not there was some way to support the resolution, I come to the conclusion that I cannot as much as I am in sympathy with the work and the intent behind it. I think we first have to look at the dreadful situation that is presently the case as far as youth is concerned in the government of Ontario.

One of the great problems, of course, is that the service to youth is a fragmented service, divided between a great many departments, and there are reasons—and I will just very hastily outline them—why this is particularly unfortunate. The fragmentations have the result of fragmenting the child himself, because many of the children who have their special needs brought before community services have more than one need. There are many children with multiple needs, and these multiple needs fall into various jurisdictions of government, and the child, by the fact of his need, becomes fragmented.

Secondly, this fragmentation carries down into the services that are a reflection of the legislation that is set up within the various departments, so that we have services fragmented as well; and we add to the fragmentation of the individual, the fragmentation in the services of the professional groups.

Getting away from the human element and the waste of the limited resources that we have to meet these problems, we find that the duplication that results through the various departments dealing separately with aspects of children's problems, produces a high administrative cost. There is a great deal of duplication in the administration of services to children.

There is no reason why the five administrative structures that we now have could not be one administrative structure. In fact, it would be a great deal more economical, efficient and effective if that were true. There is a great duplication in the use of professional and consultative services and the costs reflect this duplication. There could be not only saving in the costs reflected in the use of professional and consultative services, but

there would certainly be a more efficient use of these services which are in short supply at the present time.

Let us take for a moment the departments that are now dealing with youth directly—I was rather chagrined to hear that The Department of Agriculture and Food also has its hand in there. I am going to talk about the main departments that deal with youth, and to look at the inappropriateness of the departments in carrying out these functions.

The Department of Social and Family Services obviously should not be dealing with youth. It has failed over the many years of its operation, even with the changing of its name, the changing of Ministers and the changing of the staff within the organization. It has failed, first of all, to grasp the real problem in that particular area. The social problems, the neglect, the nature of the modern problems of youth have been missed by this department. There is no indication, either, in what the department is doing today or what it is proposing for tomorrow, that it somehow is going to catch up. Youth is not being well served in The Department of Social and Family Services and it would be well to see that the services this department offers were administered by some other department.

We all know how inappropriate The Department of Correctional Services is in terms of serving the modern needs of youth. I would say, without doubt, that there should be no child under 16 within this particular department's jurisdiction, and that we should immediately see that all children under the age of 16 be served by some department other than this one.

The Attorney General's Department is not providing even basic minimally adequate service to children. The juvenile courts are archaic. We should do away with juvenile courts. We have no need for them. They have lost their function, and are no longer relevant. This is not the way to deal with the inability of a child to adjust or with the deviant behaviour of our children. This department would well do away with its services to youth.

And when I say that they can well give up their services to youth, it is because they are functioning inadequately. It would not only be good for the youths themselves, it would be good for these particular departments, and it would be good for the government.

The Department of Health should give up its services to all those children who do not

have an organic or a medical problem. It is inappropriate that The Department of Health, under a medical model, attempt to solve the problems of youth which are related to problems of learning, problems of communication, problems of adjustment. This is not the proper department to do that.

So we say, looking at these four major departments that deal with youth, that we are left with only one other department. Here, I would suggest, is where the services for youth should be focused and organized, and that is The Department of Education. When I say that, I am quite aware that the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has a great deal on his hands. He has a very large department. He is well extended over a broad field. But let us face the fact that he has the only department that has established, within it, contact with children at an early age throughout the entire province. He has the only social structure that can reach out and touch every family and every child in the province at an early age, and whether we like it or not, or whether it is too big or not, we must face the fact that this is one department that could gather to it all these services that the other departments I have talked about are failing to do.

So I would suggest that The Department of Education assume the responsibility for youth, primarily because it has the responsibility traditionally, to provide for the children of the community, for educational training in terms of content, of specific knowledge, social adjustment, human adjustment, how to work with people, and how to work with one another. This is the charge the department has from the community, and because of this it could very well take on functions that are now inadequately carried out by these other departments.

It would require a certain amount of reorganization within The Department of Education, and I think a certain amount of reorganization within that department is long overdue. There is no doubt that it has a very fine record, and I do not criticize that record. At the same time, a very casual glance at how the services in that department are organized indicates, very easily, that there needs to be a reorganization.

The reorganization, of course, must start at the fundamental level of its responsibility, and that is the level of teacher training. It is a crime that the amount of money we are spending in the province of Ontario today on behalf of education should produce, as a consequence, the level of teaching staff that

we have. It is incredible, it is a crime, it is a shame. It should not be allowed. Besides, it is a waste of good money. The quality of what happens within our educational institutions depends on the quality of the training our teachers get, and there needs to be an immediate revamping of that training.

I think one important function of this department is the training of teachers, and they should see to it as quickly as possible. Another important function—I am now talking about how this department could be subdivided—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now talking in the time allotted to the last speaker. If the last speaker, the member for Scarborough West, is agreeable, the hon. member may continue.

Mr. Lewis: I would be more than agreeable.

Mr. Brown: I will draw my remarks to a close, thank you. I was simply going to suggest that there are a number of functional divisions within The Department of Education that could be made and that would make it possible to bring children under a certain age under the jurisdiction of The Department of Education, rather than having the services fragmented in The Department of Social and Family Services, The Department of Health, The Attorney General's Department, and Correctional Services.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the report of the select committee on youth was submitted, I guess, some three years ago. It has already been discarded by the government. One might call it, I suppose, death at an early age.

The member for Kingston and the Islands will be waiting breathlessly to see how another colleague on his committee reacted over the interim. My feelings parallel, perhaps even more vigorously, those of the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). I am pleased to stand and say in retrospect that I indicated a year ago, Mr. Speaker, that this report's special recommendations should be virtually repudiated in their entirety; that the report of the select committee was never designed to do other than obscure the requirements of youth in this province.

Those of us who were initiated in those early years were drawn in by this devious plot very well executed by the first Minister and his colleagues. And the results of that report reflect the inappropriateness of the committee ever having been established. I

have always felt some considerable embarrassment in having been associated with some of its recommendations. Indeed, sir, it is the greatest put-on, I suppose, since the leader of the Opposition contrived to pull Judy LaMarsh into the leadership race.

I must say also, Mr. Speaker, that like lambs led to the Cabinet dining table, the committee then took a number of members of the Cabinet with them and a number of members of the House as well, and the result in the interim, sadly, has been that very little has taken place in the area of services to youth. And in all those obvious compartments where something might have been effected, there has been continuing obstinacy, continuing refusal on the part of the government to indulge in action. Not that they could not have done so. There were some pretty eminent members of the Cabinet who might have been involved.

The other night the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) revealed to us that there is a Cabinet committee on policy, and on that committee, incredible though it may seem, sits the Minister without Portfolio, one of the *eminence gris* of the youth report. Indeed, the Minister of Correctional Services sits on that committee, surrealistic though that may appear, Mr. Speaker, and one would assume that given the vested interest of the Minister without Portfolio in the select committee on youth and the obvious support from his other younger, more agile, more enthusiastic colleagues, that something would have come of its recommendations.

The reality, of course, is that regardless of all the efforts put in by the member for Kingston and the Islands, it never was, and it never will be the intention of government to take those recommendations seriously—certainly not the principal recommendations. That is why they are now sufficiently irrelevant to be repudiated. Indeed, if one goes through the summary of recommendations in the select committee on youth, department by department, one finds, as I am sure with some abject humiliation the member for Kingston and the Islands has noted, that every single serious recommendation put forth by the select committee has been rejected, or abandoned, or treated indifferently by the government. Every single recommendation.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): That is not true.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister without Portfolio, dignifying the "without portfolio" por-

tion of his portfolio, made a speech in which there was an announcement of some committees around the province to conduct a sort of liaison with youth and with the Legislature—a friendly exercise in colonial condescension towards youth, but not very productive in terms of specific legislation in the various government departments.

Hon. Mr. Wells: More productive than any NDP programme.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all productive in those terms.

There were points made, Mr. Speaker. They asked for documentation. In the lavish time remaining I will give that documentation. The report made certain recommendations in the area of guidance and counselling. They have been totally discarded. It made recommendations in the area of universities granting certain undergraduate facilities leading to a degree in education; totally discarded. The community use of school facilities throughout the province has never been pursued. Auxiliary education services—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The members reveal their views by their interventions.

The auxiliary education services which were to encompass children with various problems were completely discarded. All immigrant education was to be placed under The Department of Education and was ignored by the government. All the recommendations regarding Indian education were ignored by the government. All the recommendations relating to mental health care, and the juvenile defender, and moving this preposterous anachronism called Correctional Services into another department were ignored by the government. Mr. Speaker, there is not a thing of qualitative content in this report—and certainly The Department of Youth was not a qualitative recommendation, but the others were. There is not a single thing that one can look to that was, in any sense, accomplished over the last three years.

Therefore, what the resolution of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands means, is a blanket indictment from him, as a member of the government, of the activities of all the Cabinet Ministers in the interim. That is really what it means. I suppose that is unfortunate, and I would recommend to the Prime Minister, who is in a sufficiently congenial mood to accept the recommendation almost without examination, that he accept

the restructuring proposed by my colleague from Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) and reorganize his Cabinet accordingly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The private member's hour has now expired.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will go back to the order paper. There are some second readings I would like to call; plus bills in committee which will include the private bills; then, of

course, the private members' hour, and no night session.

An hon. member: No estimates?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not think we will have time to reach them.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 17, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Monday, March 17, 1969

Mrs. Fiona Nelson, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. MacDonald	2315
Meetings re fringe municipalities around Metro, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Trotter ..	2315
Fluoridated water in dialysis baths, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Burr	2316
Milk distributors, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Deans	2316
Pinery provincial park, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Shulman	2317
Civil service, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Shulman	2317
Howe Island ferry service, question to Mr. Haskett, Mr. B. Newman	2317
Algonquin park, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Stokes	2318
Hydrochloric acid waste, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Deans	2318
Sandy Falls dam, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Ferrier	2318
Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading	2319
Consolidation and revision of the Statutes, bill to provide for, reported	2320
Consolidation and revision of the Regulations, bill to provide for, reported	2321
Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, reported	2321
Change of Name Act, bill to amend, reported	2322
Matrimonial Causes Act, bill to amend, reported	2322
Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, bill to amend, reported	2323
Jurors Act, bill to amend, reported	2323
Judicature Act, bill to amend, reported	2323
Department of Justice, bill respecting, reported	2323
Fines and Forfeitures Act, bill to amend, reported	2332
Tobacco Tax Act, 1965, bill to amend, reported	2332
Retail Sales Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	2332
Securities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, on second reading	2337
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2347

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1969

The House met today at 2.30 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: In the east gallery today we have the 5th Trafalgar Scout group from Oakville; the 1st Sandown Land Rangers from Scarborough; and members of the 1st North Pelham Scouts from Ridgeville.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister), seconded by hon. Mr. Wishart, moves that the provincial auditor be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1969, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have no particular objection to the motion, other than to point out that it is normally brought to the House a bit closer to the point when the government is going to need the money. What are they afraid will happen between now and the end of the fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it was at the request of the provincial auditor. For his own mechanical reasons he asked that this vote come a little early in order that they may set up their accounting procedures.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

The hon. member for Eglinton?

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the members this colour combination which is on their desks—it is a candy combination. You will notice that the green candy is emblematic of Ireland and its people.

Perhaps the licorice requires a little explanation. Some members may think in terms of this representing a snake; really, it is not. What is represented here today is a whip. I

understand that licorice has often been used from the standpoint of medicine. It was my wife's idea that the combination would be symbolic of friendly Irish criticism.

I do not know the purpose of the leprechaun on the desk here, Mr. Speaker, unless this is a subtle reminder from my wife that my hair should be restyled.

And in my desk today I found this—I suppose it is meant to be a blackthorn stick. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, of the origin, and my associates in the caucus office apparently were sworn to secrecy. However, if you would be good enough to use it for the remainder of this day I would be glad to present it to you now through the pageboy.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay respect to all the people of Ireland and Irish people wherever they may be, and particularly to my own Irish parents, for what they have done for me.

I have cards here from various parts of the province but I have two that I would like to bring to the attention of the members. One is signed, "Love, Lynné"—that is my daughter Lynne.

For you on St. Patrick's Day
A very special little gem
Imported from Killarney
For you alone, that precious stone
Pure, imported blarney.

The second one is from my wife, who is sitting up in Mr. Speaker's gallery right now, Mr. Speaker. It is entitled "An Irishman's Prayer":

May you be blessed with faith
May you be blessed with friends
May you be blessed with love
May you be blessed with peace.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to send these blessings to all members of the Legislature.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I would say, in rising to wish the people of Ireland and of Irish descent congratulations on one of the best days of the year, that the hon. member for Eglinton, I think, has kissed the original blarney stone and does not need any substitutes.

My mother was a Harrington. Her parents came directly from the Emerald Isle; and for

what they gave to her, and what they gave to me, I would like to thank her and all the Irish people. It is truly a day, Mr. Speaker, when there are only two kinds of people in the world, those who are Irish and those who wish they were Irish.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in this great debate. I noticed, looking through the text of the *Dail Eireann* the other day, that the quality of debate in the Irish Legislature was very low.

They were passing a bill on one occasion, making an imposition upon the future, and one of the more rhetorical Irish members got up and said he was against it. He went on at great length; and somebody said it was for the purposes of posterity that this was being done, and he said, "What on earth has posterity ever done for us?". The other members figured it out, and when some began to laugh at him he went into a lengthy explanation right in the text of their *Hansard*, in which he said he did not mean "our ancestors", he meant those "who came immediately after us".

I suppose a few words of verse might be in order today, and I can think of some lines from Chesterton that may have some appositeness in more senses than one. They run somewhat like this:

The folk that live in Liverpool
 Their hearts are in their boots
 And they go to hell like the lambs they do
 Because the hooter hoots.
 Where men may not be dancing
 But wheels may dance all day
 Where men may not be smoking
 But only chimneys may.
 But I come from Castlepatrick
 And my heart is on my sleeve
 But a lady stole it from me
 On St. Gallowglass's eve.
 The folk that come from black Belfast
 Their hearts are in their mouths,
 And they see us making murders
 In the meadows of the south.
 They think a plough's a rack, they do
 And cattle calls are creeds,
 And they think we are burning witches
 When we are only burning weeds.
 But I come from Castlepatrick
 And my heart is on my sleeve,
 But a lady stole it from me
 On St. Barnabas' eve.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition—

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I would think that it might be well to confine it to one from each party, as is normal. However, with a tie such as that I am sure no one could resist.

Mr. Root: Well, Mr. Speaker, on this St. Patrick's day I could not let the opportunity pass without bringing greetings from two municipalities which carry the name of Erin. This morning I was talking to the editor of the *Erin Advocate*. Incidentally, he is the third generation of the Hull family that has published that fine paper. He said: "With that tie on, you had better bring greetings from Erin."

Now Erin is one of the beauty spots in the province of Ontario, up in the headwaters of the Grand and the Credit Rivers where the air is fresh, the water is pure, the grass is green, the ladies are most beautiful and I bring you greetings from Erin township and Erin village.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I hate to refer to business this afternoon, but I do have a question for the Attorney General.

Is the Attorney General aware that Waterloo Crown attorney William Morrison has refused to prosecute 13 property tax rebate cases in the Galt area saying that: "The court should not be used as a collection agency"? What action does the Minister intend to take in this matter?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a similar question which he might place at this time.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General.

Is any action contemplated against Crown attorney William Morrison of Galt for his actions in refusing to prosecute 13 persons charged under the Residential Property Tax Reduction Act?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Attorney General would give the member for Eglinton a chance to raise a point of order that I think he was rising on?

Mr. Reilly: I am sorry to have to revert back, Mr. Speaker, but I just wanted to say one thing before we went into the orders of the day.

Mr. Speaker: We do not go into orders of the day until after the questions.

Mr. Reilly: There was just one thing further about Irishmen's day, and I thought I should bring it to your attention. It was generally restricted to the members who are

Irish, but now I find that our own Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is invading our field—he had some green trilliums presented to him today and I thought I should bring it to your attention.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): It is the only thing over there that grows.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): One more thing than over there.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in replying to both the questions, I sought to get in touch with the Crown attorney and I was not able to reach him. Since the questions were received a very short time ago I will take them as notice and answer tomorrow.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Health. Can the Minister inform the House if John Walker, director of forestry for the Ontario Paper Company of Thorold, is involved in the research, writing or preparation in any way of the Royal commission's report on pollution in Haldimand county; and if so, to what extent?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot answer this question because this report has already been submitted and I have no idea who was involved in the preparation or the research other than the members of the commission. The commission did not give me that information and I know of no commission which has had to give such information in the past. I therefore regret I cannot answer the question.

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

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister, which has been redirected from the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), in view of his enforced absence this week with the OEA convention.

Further to the Minister of Education's reply last Tuesday regarding the firing of Mrs. Fiona Nelson by the Toronto Board of Education, have the "uncertainties of the facts of the situation" been cleared up? And can the Prime Minister advise the House whether a board of reference will be granted?

Mr. Nixon: I would say, before the Prime Minister replies, Mr. Speaker, that I had a similar question that was not referred to the Prime Minister but I want to associate myself

with this question. I had asked the Minister if, in fact, he was prepared to give a decision on the granting of a board of reference.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out that the redirection was by the member for York South, not by Mr. Speaker or his staff.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not find it necessary to speak for my Ministers, but in view of the fact that the Minister of Education is otherwise engaged this week, I obtained some information from him. He tells me that, as he indicated to the House, he had received a letter from Mrs. Nelson. He subsequently wrote to her and also wrote to the Toronto Board of Education. He has not yet received a reply to those communications. As soon as he has done so, he will inform the House as to what course of action he plans to take. But at the moment it is in a state of exchange of information.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a second question, Mr. Speaker, in two parts, for the Minister of Health.

First, who are the members of the Ontario government's pesticide advisory committee?

Second, will the Minister comment on the reports carried in the March 11 issue of *Farm and Country* that the board has never been asked for advice or suggestions on really important questions, and that members have either resigned or threatened to resign because the board has been denied any meaningful role?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, since I have not yet read this report I have sent for the newspaper. I will therefore take this question as notice and will answer it tomorrow for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale has a question for the Prime Minister.

Mr. Trotter: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the question is as follows:

Can the Premier indicate how many meetings have been held between the government and the Metro executive committee this year to discuss fringe municipalities around Metro, in the application of regional government principles to them? Has the Premier attended any of them and will such future meetings be open to the public?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there has only been one meeting so far as the government is concerned. There have been other meetings but the government has not been involved.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) attended one meeting at the invitation of those who arranged the meeting. There are no further meetings planned. I have not attended any meetings.

I noticed that report in the paper this morning. I have not been at any meetings, and we do not have conduct of the meetings. Inasmuch as there are no meetings planned, the final question has no significance, really.

Mr. Trotter: A supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker. If such meetings are being held, would the Premier encourage that they be held in public? It is obvious that this concerns the area and these deals seem to be made before the public knows about it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it completely and absolutely clear that this government is not indulging in any deals of any kind. So let us not leave the imputation that there are any deals being made behind closed doors, or behind anyone's back. There are meetings being arranged by various groups, and the government really has no part in these meetings. As I say, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was invited to attend one such meeting.

I do not know what power we have to tell these people how they will meet or when they will meet or the circumstances under which they will meet. I can only assure the members of this House that this government is not making any deals. We have made it very clear in our submissions to this House in dealing with the matter of regional government, that complete discussion and knowledge, particularly knowledge by the people involved of what is going on is, in our opinion, an essential ingredient of the whole process. On anything that we have anything to do with, we will keep that objective in mind.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside was on his feet a moment ago.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: Is the Minister aware of a recent report to the Royal Canadian College of Physicians and Surgeons advising that the use of fluoridated water in dialysis baths of artificial kidneys is dangerous?

If so, has the Minister drawn the attention of hospitals in Ontario to that report?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered a similar question put by the

hon. leader of the Opposition, I think on March 6.

In answer to the second part of the question: I have not drawn this to the attention of the hospitals because this grew out of a paper delivered by a member of a hospital staff and scientific papers are usually available to hospitals as readily as they are to The Department of Health. Indeed, we get our information of this kind from the scientists who are out in the field, and therefore the hospitals have access to the same information.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a supplementary question?

Is the Minister aware of the fact that this warning was made in February, 1965, in the archives of internal medicine, in a study by University of Rochester scientists under a grant from the United States Public Health Service?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour.

Have representations been made by the Hamilton and area milk distributors to be excluded from the overtime section of the new Employment Standards Act? If so, with what results?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, I am not aware of any representation made by the Hamilton and area milk distributors, but there were meetings between my officials and representatives of the Ontario Milk Distributors Association. At those meetings, the Ontario association asked that their wholesale and retail drivers be excluded from the overtime pay provisions of The Employment Standards Act.

A review is being carried out as to the hours of work in the various centres across the province, and when that is complete, then a decision will be made.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Has his department contacted the various unions involved and asked for submissions from them as to their opposition or compliance with the request?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of contacting people, but to make a

survey as to what is going on in this particular area throughout various centres in the province, and it is on that information that we will reach a decision.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question from the other day of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Yes, Mr. Speaker, in three parts.

Has The Department of Lands and Forests investigated complaints about entry regulations at the Pinery Provincial Park, which were forwarded to the Minister by the hon. member for London South (Mr. White) on February 19, 1969, in the form of a letter from one of the hon. member's constituents, Mr. T. K. McNamee?

When will the Minister inform the hon. member for London South of the results of the investigation?

What action is being taken to solve these problems?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for High Park, the answer to the first question is yes; to the second part, a letter was sent to the hon. member for London South on March 11; to question number three, additional fees are levied to cover the cost of supplying winter facilities, and the winter fee structure will be reviewed prior to next winter season. I hope to have a better arrangement than the one we presently have.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a question of the Minister of Transport also.

Mr. Shulman: Yes. In view of the statement in the March, 1969, news bulletin of the Civil Service Association of Ontario denying the statement in Department of Transport circular number 69-7 that the new policy, which might involve dismissal if an employee loses his licence to drive, had been discussed with the CSAO and had their acceptance, will the Minister withdraw that circular?

Will the Minister change this policy?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, CSAO's March bulletin appears to deny that the department had discussed the content of its circular No. 69-7 with the association prior to releasing the same.

The bulletin quoted from Mr. MacNee's letter of Feb. 17 to Mr. Bowen, but de-

liberately omitted this portion of that letter—and I read,

In the first place, this notice was discussed with the CSAO through the normal procedures. The director of personnel, Mr. J. Arber, contacted Mr. Keating, who is the CSAO official who handles The Department of Transport matters. He explained what was intended by the notice, and pointed out to him that they were reluctant to proceed without the CSAO being fully aware of the intent. Mr. Keating assured Mr. Arber that it would be entirely in order to proceed. Since I would not presume to interfere with the internal operations of the CSAO, I did not see fit to question the authority of Mr. Keating to give us such an undertaking.

Since writing this letter to Mr. Bowen, the general manager of the association, our Deputy Minister has had no reply.

Accordingly, my statement given to the House a month ago, when the member for High Park first raised this question, still stands.

Mr. Shulman: Does the Minister intend to answer my second question?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In view of my reply to the first portion, Mr. Speaker, it does not apply.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question then?

Will the Minister change the original policy, since it has caused so much dismay among the CSAO and the general public?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I think that was inherent in my first reply too.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transport.

Will the Minister order an immediate investigation into the ferry service between Howe Island and St. Lawrence Park Beach, east of Kingston, to determine the adequacy of the safety features of this service in view of the catastrophe that occurred on the ferry at 9 o'clock last evening?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, this unfortunate accident on the ferry running between St. Lawrence Park Beach and Howe Island is presently being investigated by the Ontario Provincial Police. However, this

privately operated ferry service is under the authority of the federal Department of Transport, which is responsible for the safety regulations, and inspectors of the federal DOT are now making an investigation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Has the department made an inventory of the allowable cut in Algonquin Park?

Will the allowable cut by present operators ensure a continuous operation?

Is it the government's intention to terminate the timber licenses on March 1, 1979, in multiple use zone six, comprising 1,175,000 acres; as well as multiple use zones one to five, comprising 448,000 acres as stated in the provisional master plan for Algonquin Park? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Thunder Bay:

1. Allowable cuts have been calculated for all areas within Algonquin Park.

2. The purpose of allowable cuts is to ensure continuous production, although the level of production from a particular area may fluctuate from time to time.

3. The provisional master plan is presently under very active review and until this is completed, the replacement of timber licenses by volume agreements prior to March 1, 1979, is definitely not settled.

4. If they are not terminated and replaced the volume agreement by March 1, 1979, it will be because the thorough review of the provisional master plan has indicated that this is not the best solution to this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South might perhaps wish to ask his question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management from the other day, and there is a similar question I believe from the member for Wentworth.

Mr. MacDonald: My question from Friday, Mr. Speaker, was with regard to the OWRC's report on Stelco's alleged dumping of 150,000 gallons of hydrochloric acid waste into Hamilton Bay,

1. Did the report confirm that in fact, this did happen?

2. If so, what conceivable explanation was there for such an anti-social act at this stage in the public's fight against pollution?

3. If so, what punitive or corrective action does the government intend to take?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Wentworth would please place his question now too?

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a question in the same area. Is any legal action contemplated as a result of the investigation into the dumping of acid by Stelco in Hamilton Bay?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question: Stelco's report to OWRC stated that the spent pickle acid was discharged to a holding lagoon over a period of three days where the wastes were diluted by a factor of at least 2,000 to 1 before entering Hamilton Bay.

The second part of the question: The acid had to be disposed of and the only practical way to do this was to first dilute the acid and subsequently dispose of it in a large body of water so that eventual dilution would be safe.

We might say that the waters in the Hamilton Bay were tested by the staff of OWRC and no trace of the acid was detectable. Stelco has been advised that in future the circumstances surrounding such decisions should be first discussed with the commission's staff prior to taking any action in order that we can be sure that all reasonable alternatives for disposal were considered.

In answer to the third part and to the member for Wentworth, this matter is being reviewed and if sufficient evidence is available, charges will be laid.

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

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Will Ontario Hydro take steps to install a sluice gate on the Sandy Falls dam on the Mattagami River in order to better control the water level during the spring run off?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, Ontario Hydro has no plans at present for installing a sluice gate at the Sandy Falls dam on the Mattagami River. During large floods there would be no substantial benefit in reduced levels at Timmins through the installation of sluice gates at Sandy Falls, as it is, the eight and a half mile river reach between Sandy Falls and Timmins, which is the bottleneck in passing large floods rather than the dam itself.

Sandy Falls dam was constructed in 1911. In addition to the power house, the discharge facilities consist of an overflow spillway some 700 feet long. After the large flood in 1947, and particularly after the largest flood on record in 1960, Ontario Hydro made intensive studies of any measures that might be taken to reduce flood stages.

It was found that it was the river itself, rather than the dam, that determined the levels at Timmins during large floods, and that only insignificant improvement would result if sluiceways were added to the dam. Of more benefit were five main storage reservoirs upstream from Timmins, four of which are maintained and operated by Ontario Hydro, which can be operated to impound the peak of the flood. It was computed that this storage reduced the flood level at Timmins by over four feet during the 1960 flood.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

In view of the high unemployment rate in northeastern Ontario, and in view of the Prime Minister's statement that only a nucleus of key men would be hired from outside the area:

(a) will the Minister move immediately to prevent the importation of 23 workers from Mont Joli, Quebec, by the sub contractors Messrs. Bijou and Rice to work on the Ontario Hydro Lower Notch project at Cobalt?

(b) will the Minister further instruct both prime and sub-contractors to hire all workers, other than key workers, through the local Canada Manpower office as long as workers are available from that source?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, as this question had to do with labour I transferred it to the Minister of Labour on Friday last. Perhaps he has the answer. I am not sure.

Mr. Jackson: Well, Mr. Speaker, on that point I must disagree with the Minister. It is not involved with labour. It is directly involved with the letting of contracts to these persons.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may disagree with the Minister if he wishes, but the Minister has taken that action and he is entitled to do so. Was the hon. Minister of Labour listening to that particular exchange?

Order please!

Was the hon. Minister of Labour listening to the reply by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I heard it generally but—

Mr. Speaker: Has the question been transferred to your office?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The hon. Minister gave me a copy of it on Friday and I was looking into it, but I have not got any further information on it yet.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Minister take it as notice then today?

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister accept it as part of his department?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, it is a question—as to whether it really comes within our department or not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming will probably be able to get to the bottom of it when a Minister does bring in an answer.

Orders of the day.

THE APPRENTICESHIP AND TRADESMEN'S QUALIFICATIONS ACT, 1964

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill 56, An Act to amend The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act, 1964.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, to speak on the principle of this amendment is going to be a little hard because the principle of The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act has been dealt with at some length and we have to now deal with just a minor change.

I have read the changes in the amendments and it is pretty hard to determine just exactly what the Minister is trying to do. I might give my impression and if it is incorrect the Minister, of course, will say so.

I take it that the changes in the wording in section 2 itself—that is section 2 of section 10—are just to clarify or change the intent. Now we know under the old Act that section 3 has a specific intent, inasmuch as it gives some protection to those who were working at the trade before certification was brought in.

Now what I am concerned with in this section is the term "that no person other than

an apprentice or person that has a class that is exempt from this section, or a person referred to in subsection 3". Now we know exactly what that means, but nowhere in the Act, or nowhere in the regulations can I find others exempt.

I have looked at all of the regulations covering the various trades and also the general regulation, and it does not spell out what it means by "others who are exempt". Now I might take it to mean that if someone who is working in an industry, in an industrial plant, that is fabricating some materials that are then shipped out and handled and erected by the tradesmen—let us say the sheet metal trades, who are under the certification—then they would be certified.

But those handling it in the industrial plants under the same firm would be exempt. I would take it that is one exemption.

Now I wish the Minister would explain exactly what he means, because I cannot make very much sense out of the changes. The explanatory note tells us that these provisions are designed to clarify the intent of the Act as to the persons who may work in, or be employed in, a certified trade. The one specific change I notice in the addition of 2(a) is that the same onus is placed upon the employer or any person with the intent of employing a person in a certified trade as subsection 2 places upon a person seeking employment in that particular trade. My question to the Minister in regard to this amendment is: Is that the real intent of this change?

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak? The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My opinion of this whole Act was first of all that it was to protect the public; and secondly to protect the tradesmen who work in the trade. I am bothered by the thought that, although he is tightening up the Act to bring everyone under the control of it, he is forgetting that we must have adequate inspection in order to fulfill the requirements of the bill or the object of the bill.

And one of the things that is sadly lacking in most industry today is adequate inspection, especially by government inspectors. No matter how much this bill is tightened up, unless we provide adequate inspection it will not serve any useful purpose. I would like the comments of the Minister on that.

Mr. Speaker: Any other member who wishes to speak before the hon. Minister of Labour?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reference to the matters that have been raised, this bill is meant to clarify the original bill as it is presently in force. Under this, we are placing additional onus on the employer to insure that all persons working in certified trades possess the required qualifications.

At the present time, the onus is on the employee and we are laying greater stress on the employer. There have been cases involving The Apprenticeship Act where the onus was not on the employer and for that reason matters were thrown out. It is simply a strengthening of the existing legislation and it is not dealing with the other matters that were raised by the hon. member for Brantford.

But under this bill the employer will be subject to additional requirements as provided in section 2(a) of the amendment. For that reason we want to bring it in to strengthen the whole arrangement.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. Carruthers in the chair.

CONSOLIDATION AND REVISION OF STATUTES (Continued)

House in committee on Bill 62, An Act to provide for the consolidation and revision of the Statutes.

Section 7 agreed to.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I thought we had reverted back to section 5, and that section 6 had carried but that the Chairman had gone back to section 5. Just before we rose on Friday he marked that section 6 had carried, but section 5 had not.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Section 5 had carried.

Mr. Ben: It had not carried on Friday, but section 6 had. I believe one of the members on the government benches wanted to go back to section 5.

Mr. Chairman: The bill is initialled, that is all I have to go by.

Mr. Ben: All right, I was under the impression that section 5 had not been carried and

section 6 had; and we had gone back to section 5 because it had been missed by some member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression that section 5 had carried, but I am not objecting if Mr. Chairman wishes to permit discussions on 5.

Mr. Ben: I mention this, Mr. Chairman, not to discuss the matter but merely as a point of order.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Just keeping us straight.

Mr. Ben: I do not wish to discuss it, but I think it should be carried in a proper manner.

Section 5 agreed to.

Sections 8 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 62 reported.

CONSOLIDATION AND REVISION OF REGULATIONS

House in committee on Bill 63, An Act to provide for the consolidation and revision of the Regulations.

On section 1:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, under this bill, my remarks are apposite, I believe, but directly on point. I have two points I wish to make to the hon. Attorney General under the regulations. As the consolidation and revision are going through, it might just be the opportunity to include in the substance of the bill the possibility of reviewing the regulations more often; not just the five-year basis which I previously mentioned. By way of the type of committee that the former Chief Justice McRuer placed before us, a scrutiny committee of this Legislature would review these regulations from time to time.

My second point has to do with the Canadian Bill of Rights. If the hon. Attorney General will advert to it on occasion he will see a section I noticed when I was looking through it at the weekend. This section gives the Attorney General for Canada wide review powers over these regulations—I think it is section 3—and gives him a sort of scrutiny that ties in very much with the Act setting up The Attorney General's Department. It concerns this whole regulation business, which is very loose at the edges and warped at the seams at the present time.

We as members of this Legislature, with

the burden of responsibility, the type of work we have to do, simply have not time to make a thorough review of these regulations in the interim period of a decade. So in one way or another perhaps, some consideration might be given to this particular intent.

And I want to correct a misimpression left by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and certain interjections he made on second reading of this bill, that there is consolidation year by year of all the regulations that have been passed, to indicate which ones are in effect, and which ones we may advert to in capsulated form (except that one of the publishing houses does issue one for their own purposes; but the cost is quite excessive.) For the purposes of this House, we have not that at our disposal and I suggest that that might be done again through your department, sir.

Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the remarks of the hon. member are very apropos. I might have interjected when he started to speak that I have legislation in preparation implementing the recommendations of Mr. McRuer for a committee of review, and other things.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Oh good!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: So I am really in a way anticipating what I hope may be government policy but that is as far as I can go at the moment. I have the legislation drafted and I would carry out and implement the McRuer recommendations.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the Attorney General need legislation to set up a committee?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know. The legislation does have that in it, I can reveal that. So I think we will get to the things that the hon. member suggests.

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 63 reported.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 64, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 64 reported.

THE CHANGE OF NAME ACT

House in committee on Bill 65, An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 65 reported.

THE MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACT

House in committee on Bill 66, An Act to amend The Matrimonial Causes Act.

On section 1.

Mr. Lawlor: On second reading, I never did get a clear explanation, at least as clear as I would desire, as to this amendment of The Matrimonial Causes Act.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the title I could never figure out.

Mr. Lawlor: If you have ever been in a matrimonial quarrel you would know what it is all about.

We do not like to use the word "conflict", instead of the word "causes". The explanatory note, Mr. Chairman, first of all, refers to divorce, and divorce only. And, of course, The Matrimonial Causes Act itself is, in section 6, subsection 2, concerned solely with the dissolution of marriage.

Section 7, which is being amended, had previously left to the discretion of the judge the question of costs of the official guardian. The point I had brought up previously had to do with The Infants Act, and the contention, or at least the clarification I am seeking, has to do with the inter-relationship between these two statutes, and whether bringing this new section into being also imposes the same or similar responsibility upon other kinds of actions, apart from divorce: Namely custody proceedings as a whole; and second, access proceedings, where parents wish to have access to their children.

The reason I ask the question is contained in section 1, subsection 5, of The Infants Act, which refers over to and incorporates by reference, in effect what you are doing under The Matrimonial Causes Act. If that is the intent of the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, fine—and all to the good. It is not what the explanatory note has indicated; it is not what has been pointed to, particularly during the debate of this section. If I just may read subsection 5 in order to seek to bear out my point.

On an application under this section,

the court may require the official guardian to cause an investigation to be made and to report to the court upon all matters relating to the custody, maintenance and education of the child, in which case section 6 of The Matrimonial Causes Act applies *mutatis mutandis*, and the court may make an order for the payment of the official guardian's costs.

Now you can see that last clause, if this legislation is brought into being, obviously is brought under The Infants Act of necessity, because the reference is made that The Infants Act will be governed by the Act that you are dealing with now. But then The Infants Act goes on and leaves the whole matter discretionary again, and I would suggest that either of two things are in order here. Either The Infants Act is not meant to be encompassed by this present legislation, in which case you are going to have to do something about The Infants Act so to indicate. Or, if it is meant to be encompassed, then the last clause of subsection 5 of The Infants Act is clearly out of order, because it is no longer a discretionary matter upon the judge. The costs are going to be paid by the petitioner, so far as you have this set up at the present time. So I say there is an internal conflict that the department may not have been aware of. If they are aware of it, more power to them—but they have also created certain ambiguities.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must confess that I was not aware of the relationship to The Infants Act; perhaps I should have been. But having heard the hon. member, I do not believe that the requirement to pay the disbursements at the time of filing the report would apply in the same manner under The Infants Act.

When it says that the provision shall apply *mutatis mutandis*, I take it to mean with those changes which are necessary, having regard to the other section, or the section which is related. This amendment, as indeed was the language of section 7, which is being amended, speaks distinctly of a party to an action for divorce or an annulment of a marriage. The amendment also says the petitioner in an action for divorce shall pay the disbursements incurred by the official guardian, and the official guardian shall not file his report until such disbursements shall be paid.

I would think that this is not one of the *mutatis mutandis* areas at all. It is specific-

ally related to the petitioner in an action for divorce, who is the only person who would have to pay those costs. I do not think it would relate to The Infants Act situation, where the requirements of the report, the investigation that has been carried out, and so on, I think, would apply. I believe this section and this amendment are specifically related to the petitioner in an action for divorce.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, may I thank the hon. Attorney General for his reply.

If, as was indicated at the beginning of the Attorney General's remarks, some attention had not been paid to The Infants Act, I would request that perhaps you would take it up with the officers of your department, because I am sincerely convinced that there could possibly be misinterpretations and conflicts in this area.

While one refers specifically, I do not know how you can avoid the wording, in which case, if the official guardian is brought in under The Infants Act, then section 6 of The Matrimonial Causes Act will apply. And there are two different things here. On one side of the fence there is the disbursements that have to be borne by the petitioner, willy nilly. But there is the second clause in section 1 of Bill 66 before us, the question of the costs of the court. Now the petitioner may, in the last analysis, not really bear that at all. They will be picked up in the costs, and whichever party is found to be the party at fault will bear the weight of these extra costs. This seems to work out very well in the way that things work out in The Infants Act, and if such is the case, then a simple amendment to The Infants Act may be in order in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have noted it, Mr. Chairman, and I shall follow it through and look into it.

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 66 reported.

THE DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 67, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 67 reported.

THE JURORS ACT

House in committee on Bill 68, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 68 reported.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

House in committee on Bill 69, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 69 reported.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

House in committee on Bill 70, An Act respecting The Department of Justice.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of things about section 5 which raise questions.

First of all, at 952 the former Chief Justice McRuer set out a precedent modelled on the Newfoundland Act with numerous clauses, some of which have been adopted verbatim, some which have been altered slightly. If you run through "the functions", and while I do not suspect necessarily nefarious purposes in these subtle little alterations all the way through—I would certainly like to know, in several instances here, what they are all about. Why the change in wording, is there a question of the weight falling hither or yon in this particular regard? Because this is a very delicate statute.

I think the Attorney General will agree with me that if this Act is to have any bearing, thrust, weight or direction at all, and really mean anything, those nice relationships which he enjoys with his colleagues in the Treasury Bench or will not enjoy after this Act is passed, depend upon the right wording, where his responsibility lies and to whom he is really beholden. I mean, the clear designation of this bill is that you are raised again, above all your other colleagues, and no one, simply no one—not the Prime Minister of this province, not the Treasury bench, not the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, no one can tell you in the exercise of the political discretion that you employ in your office as Attorney General, what to do.

It has been pointed out that, historically, the Labour government of Great Britain fell because they precisely attempted, in the Ross-Campbell case, to bring such pressure upon the Attorney General of the day. Lord Simon and other authoritative law lords, subsequent to him, have pointed out that these subtle pressures exerted upon an Attorney General, are the very things that will undermine his own office and could very well, in a single instance, undermine a whole government in the operations of their powers.

So I question sub-clause (a) touching the office of the Minister, as the law officer of the Executive Council. But that is not what the model Act states—"He shall be official legal advisor of the Lieutenant-Governor and the legal member of the executive council."

You see the nice shift in wording here. I think you are the official legal advisor of the Lieutenant-Governor and you may also be the law officer of the Executive Council, but does that place you under their thumb? Are you to be influenced by them? Is it not your task just to be in the opposite direction, your telling them what the direction and purport of the law is? This seems, in other words, to bring you too much in cahoots with your colleagues, to make you too much the victim or if not the victim, at least the emissary of their will, rather than the reverse which is what McRuer has called for. It is your will and your determination and judgment that shall be eminent and shall be operative in the circumstances of reaching decisions. They must listen to you; otherwise the whole position here has very little direction, has very little meaning.

Now, running through the rest of this section, again under this heading of your dual capacity and the trickiness of the dual load that you are under. I was going to advert to your old speech which I had mentioned on an earlier occasion where you, rather jocular in some ways, admit the delicacy of the issues before us this afternoon.

But take (e):

The Attorney General shall advise the government upon all matters of law connected with legislative enactments and upon all matters of law referred to him, by the government.

I would like the Attorney General to tell me today who the government is. I had almost fallen into the trap of making a long dissertation in the realm of political science asking, what is a government? I want some direction on this. I looked up Ernest Barker's book "Reflections on Government" and you know,

this Legislature is not a government! It seems there is some doubt about it, that the executive council may or may not be the government.

Is the government the whole apparatus? I mean, the civil service and the rest of the apparatus that rule peoples lives? This is a term which I suggest to you is extremely vague and I do not like it. Barker says at page 46:

A Parliament exists in order to discuss and enact laws and in order to discuss and guide the general conduct of executive government but, it does not exist in order to govern and if it assumes a character of a government, it will be going beyond the generality of the status which it has and traspassing on the sphere of the particular—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would like to ask the hon. member, if he would permit, what he was speaking of in that quotation?

Mr. Lawlor: I was speaking of the role of Parliaments as being governments. He said they are not and he says, "They are not the executive government"—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, who was suggesting that they were?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was reading from "Alice in Wonderland."

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think there is no question.

Mr. Lawlor: Only one person went through the looking glass here recently, and that is the Minister of Correctional Services. You may stand corrected.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the section to which the hon. member for Lakeshore is referring is clear.

Mr. Singer: Well if it was, why a debate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is the language of McRuer. I do not think it has been changed there. Although I have not got Mr. McRuer's volume before me, he—

Mr. Lawlor: It is on 953.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He speaks of advising the government.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, his wording on page 5—953, is as follows, it is a little difficult from yours again, why this change: "he shall advise the heads of several departments of government". The hon. Minister says, "he shall advise the government."

It is not McRuer's wording and I suggest it is very dubious wording and I will go beyond that. You see, I think that the hon. Minister's advice in the last analysis, I suppose is to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. But I feel too, and this is not clear in these functions, that you are beholden to this House, the whole House, not just the party that happens to be sitting in the seats of the mighty, but the whole legislative assembly, because we are supposed to be as an entity governing in the best interests of the whole people.

McRuer's thrust is that the hon. Minister, raised to this status, is fairly non-partisan. You are trying to find in a state of serenity the true weight of an issue. Some political storm blows up and we have to discuss it. The very fact that the hon. Minister is placed in a position of relative neutrality in this regard should obviate the issues somewhat. The hon. Minister could stand up in all honesty and forthrightness, without being in the secretive position that maybe some of his colleagues would be, and state to this House, in an open way, in a way that is perhaps a degree beyond controversy, the real shape of the issue.

This is the problem in this whole bill, as to whether one can achieve what McRuer thinks is possible to achieve. The hon. Minister certainly is trying and I give him high points for it, but are we really carrying it out? Since this Legislature, under politically scientific definition, is not the government and since this Legislature is at least one of the bodies, like I suppose the first Sovereign body, to which you are beholden, and to whom you are giving these explanations in this lofty capacity, that some kind of advice or some kind of role *vis-à-vis* this body ought to be written into this statute. No provision is made for it at all, although you could construe the Newfoundland Act as giving greater weight to the kind of remarks that I am making.

It is about preserving the integrity of this Legislature when in times of crisis or in times of political quarrel where people may be in prison or there may be trials touching political matters, and it could very easily happen, you as an independent solitary voice can speak with moderation and the requisite wisdom in the matter, and we would not be able with good reason to say to you: "Oh, you are under a political ban, you are behind the left field fence in the bleachers; that you could not possibly speak the truth in the matter, or even attempt to do so because it would be to your own detriment and the

detriment of your government". This is what we are trying to preserve you from.

Now, the bill as it comes before us, does not really effect that purpose and I suggest that the wording, subtle as it may be here and there, is designed advisedly not to do so. In effect, it throws you back into a Cabinet portfolio position where you are among your peers and not in any position of advising over against them. To the extent that it can be interpreted as doing that, then the legislation becomes nugatory and we may as well forget all about it because it is not achieving the purpose it was intended to achieve.

If such is the case, then I would ask for a review. I have no specific amendments to make under this heading. I simply raise my voice in what is admittedly a very vague and nebulous bill—and perforce so. But it does not need to be as obtuse and as difficult to interpret as this particular piece of legislation appears to me to be.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest as I always do to the comments of the hon. member for Lakeshore. I do not know—the longer he speaks the more confused I get. He talks about a world really where we would not need any government. That would be the world when the Attorney General would be able to come in here and shed his political mantle completely, ignore from whence he came—

Mr. Lawlor: The member is back from down south. He is all suntanned.

Mr. Singer: All right, I kept quiet when the member was talking, and if he wants to talk I will sit down and let him talk on again.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Or if he wants to go south!

Mr. Singer: The member for Lakeshore has been ranting and raging on three or four bills. He talks and talks and talks and he finally comes to the penultimate conclusion in each one of them that he has no amendments but he is not sure he likes the way the bill is drafted. And then he ends up by voting for it.

Now, I wish he would come in here in his philosophical approach—it is a very interesting one, and it is not quite the legislative approach, Mr. Chairman. If he has intelligent comments, either criticizing or in supports of these bills, then I would like to hear them. But he ends up as he always

does in his remarks. It is very difficult for two of us to talk together.

Mr. Lawlor: I am quite prepared to speak all afternoon if it will keep the member for Downsview quiet.

Mr. Singer: Oh no, the member will not keep me quiet. I have come back with new energy and I am good for quite a while now, so the member can just sit and listen to me now.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps we could get on with section 5.

Mr. Singer: I am trying, Mr. Chairman, but these noisy fellows there do not have too much to say in debate, so they say it while they are sitting down—sound and fury signifying nothing.

The end effect is, Mr. Chairman, as I was indicating, what the hon. member for Lakeshore seems to believe we can have certain designated members of this Assembly who would suddenly stop being politicians. They will become statesmen and they will—yes, there are three of them pointing to themselves over there and they are bowing and accepting all the plaudits. I just do not believe it. And I do not believe that you are going to be able to embody these theories in a statute.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, that is what it is all about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Downsview has five minutes to think that one over.

Mr. Singer: I do not know why it is, Mr. Chairman, I seem to worry the member for Lakeshore so much. He cannot let me get four words off without some pointless interjection, but he apparently enjoys it, so let him rant on. It does not bother me at all.

Mr. Lawlor: The member is a beautiful target.

Mr. Singer: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the object embodied or attempted to be approached in this section 5 is a theory that my colleague, the member for Sudbury, and I, have been advancing through all these ten years that we have both been here. And at least it is a good thing that we begin to see some of these principles now embodied in a statute.

Whether they are meaningful or not, I have grave doubts. They are here. And I do not think the nit-picking or the pettifogging

indulged in by the hon. member for Lakeshore—changing a comma or changing a phrase—is going to change one single bit of the intent that is in this section 5.

Mr. Lawlor: What inhuman kind of self restraint does the member think I am capable of?

Mr. Singer: All we can hope, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. Attorney General and his successors—some of his predecessors have not quite been able to do it and on occasion I wonder about the hon. gentleman who occupies the office presently—will try and do the things that are set up in these various subsections of section 5.

For instance, subsection (h) says that the Minister of Justice shall conduct and regulate all litigation for and against the Crown. Now, there were two questions this afternoon posed by two hon. members, the same in content—one by my leader and one by one of the third socialist party over there—to the effect that a particular Crown attorney refused to accept certain charges laid under the statute administered by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough).

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberals are the second Conservative Party; we are the third socialist.

Mr. Singer: Now, if you read subsection (h) very closely, one would have thought that the Attorney General could have and should have been investigating this sort of thing a long time ago, and that the responsibility for the administration of this particular statute should never really have been under the control and the aegis of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Attorney General should have long since worried about the enforcement of prosecutions of those landlords who refused to pay the rent rebate.

Now, there were two questions pointed in that direction this afternoon. The Attorney General took them as notice and said he is going to investigate. But if you recall I posed a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs based on information given to me by a practising solicitor in the city of Toronto. The Minister of Municipal Affairs chose to table it.

I used it when we were in the Throne debate and we have not had any reaction from the Attorney General. And I made some very serious charges. I suggested and I charged on the basis of the information I had, that someone was telling justices of the peace in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto

not to accept information and complaints unless they had been approved of by some official of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Now, read subsection (h). I would have thought that the Attorney General, or the Minister of Justice as his name is going to be, would have been most concerned about that state of affairs, and would have chosen to rise in his place immediately he had notice of it. And there has been notice of it on the order paper in my question and in remarks that I made in this House ten days ago. But nothing!

Hopefully the problem is going to go away and the Minister of Municipal Affairs is going to be allowed to fiddle around with prosecutions under this statute passed by this Legislature and the Attorney General is going to sit idly by and do nothing.

So what I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that merely putting these words in a statute is going to be completely meaningless unless the Attorney General believes that he is given a job to supervise the conduct of litigation for and against the Crown. Now I am not sure that he believes that, or his officials believe that.

Another example—I notice the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) is now in the House. Now there has not been a department in the last two or three years that has had worse legal advice than The Department of Agriculture and Food, and he has accepted it each time.

He let one bill die on the order paper; he has had to beat a retreat on another one and amend it, so that it would have some basic principles of fairness and equity in it; he has one bill now before the House in which he shows that he apparently did not bother consulting anybody—except some lawyer in his department, maybe.

One would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Attorney General and/or Minister of Justice would concern himself with being all of the law. Now that is, in essence, what section 5 is supposed to mean. I am just not convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney General really is going to do this, even though the statute seems to imply that this is going to be his function. I am not nearly so worried with the exact phraseology as I am with the approach that is going to be taken by the individual gentlemen who occupy the office from time to time.

We would like to see, Mr. Chairman, all legal advisers of the government consolidated and under the control of one Cabinet Min-

ister, and that is what we have been talking about for these 10 years. Now this statute says that, but I do not see any change coming about because each new department seems to have its own legal advisors.

If you look in the advertising columns of the daily papers you will see from time to time individual departments and individual branches and individual segments advertising for new lawyers. Each little legal empire is being built up and there may be 15, 18, 20, 25 of them, and things have not changed a bit. McRuer comes in with three, nicely-bound volumes and a whole bunch of principles and we all pay lip service and salaam and bow down; we pass a few more statutes and very little changes.

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to see is some kind of assurance—and I do not know how you built it in with words—but some kind of assurance that this section is going to be meaningful rather than meaningless.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that is really the concern I have with section 5, that there is going to be a consolidation of legal advice and legal attention and legal direction within government, and it is going to be under the supervision of one Minister of the government; that we do not go out and hire outside lawyers. And this has been another one of my concerns, to buy and sell a piece of real estate, as is still being done. There is no reason for that and it happens in a multitude of departments.

It would seem to me that there should be someone from The Attorney General's Department, not from the legislative counsel's department, but from The Attorney General's Department, at every meeting of every committee that has to deal with the bill, because it should be the Attorney General's advisors or assistants, or employees, who are concerned about common principles.

What we see are 26 or 28 different sets of principles as we look at these statutes. Maybe this is going to be the beginning of a change. I am skeptical about it, Mr. Chairman. The words are there and there is no point in indulging in endless philosophical discussion about whether a comma should be changed. The words are here, Mr. Chairman, but it is my feeling, it is my very strong feeling, that the words do not mean anything unless there is some desire on the part of government to do something about the words.

Mr. MacDonald: We have now heard the ranting and raving, let us get back to the substance of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I could agree to some extent with what has been said—that no words, no matter how carefully they were set forth, could perhaps make all the changes that one might anticipate could be made. I think no matter how you drafted a Department of Justice or Attorney General's Act, unless you went so far as to remove him from certain functions altogether, you would still have him in a dual capacity.

Under our system he is an elected person. He is a member of the government. By government I mean the executive council with the Lieutenant-Governor, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. He has that character, come what may, and until you removed him from going to the electorate, which would be one way of removing his political character, he is going to have a political character.

As I pointed out in the debate in second reading of this bill, he not only is an Attorney General in this province, he is solicitor-general, as well as the Minister of Justice, and he is a Home Secretary—if you want to compare him with the office in the British government. One can only set forth in the best and clearest possible language, the guidelines to his duties and responsibilities, and then trust that he will carry them out. And then this House—which perhaps is not the government, in the sense that parliament is not the government—would see that he did his duties. It would make it very apparent to the public and to the members of the House if he were not doing his duty.

That, I think, is perhaps the best safeguard that one has beyond the language. But the hon. member for Downsview uses this bill a little unfairly in his criticism. He says the words are there, then he takes the occasion to recite some situations which it is designed to correct; for instance, the bringing of all law people from the various departments under the one head of the Attorney General, but he says we do not see it happening. He is pretty premature and anticipates very early before we get the bill through committee—

Mr. Singer: I would be very happy to apologize if my suspicions were badly founded.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —to say that it is not happening. I could hardly have expected it would happen before we get the bill through committee. So I thought he was anticipating

rather severely, when he starts to criticize and to say this, in effect, will not happen.

Take subsection (h) of section 5, which has been referred to, "He shall conduct and regulate all litigation"—and, I think, the important words—"for and against the Crown".

Surely that indicates that he must be impartial; he must legislate, prosecute, litigate, against the Crown, as well as for the Crown. And even before this Act, I think hon. members can recall cases of prosecution against Crown servants, Crown agents, Crown officials, judges even, where it became the Attorney General's duty to act in an impartial way, regardless of the fact that he was in that dual sense a member of government. This makes it clear that he must do that and I think the words are valuable that he must act for and against the Crown, and as I say it would be up to the House to hold him to an impartial attitude if he did not so act.

I undertook today to answer the question that was asked by two hon. members and which the hon. member for Downsview took occasion to be critical about. And I will not answer it at this moment, but I have some thought in that the cases referred to are not strictly prosecutions by or on behalf of the Crown; they are private informations sworn by private persons against individuals. True, they follow the terms of an Act passed by this Legislature but the informations are laid by individuals against other individuals and they touch upon financial responsibility in the sense of collection of a debt.

There is quite a difference between that type of thing and the prosecution for an offence where one has broken a law that is criminal or of a quasi criminal nature and there are many cases where one could show that distinction.

That is—

Mr. Singer: The BNA Act is federal and anything else is provincial.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is all I would say about the matter at the moment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Attorney General a question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, if I might just say this: I just want to touch upon that at the moment. I undertook to answer the questions tomorrow. I do not really propose to say anymore at this time but I will certainly be glad to hear the hon. member's question.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the Attorney General is seriously espousing the theory that where this Legislature has passed a statute and said that a certain group of people, in this case the landlords, must pay to another group of people, the tenants, a sum of money once a year and in the event that they do not, certain penalties shall be attended on that lack of performance in accordance with the provisions of The Summary Convictions Act, that he does not feel that he has the duty and responsibility to see that the provisions of that statute are enforced?

If he feels not, if he feels it is a private matter, then what is the point of our putting any sanctions in any of our provincial statutes? I just do not understand the Attorney General's reasoning on this at all.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I will not say any more. I will perhaps give a full and complete answer tomorrow. I do recall a similar Act—I think it was The Master and Servant Act—where wages were not paid or something of that sort, prosecution could be taken—and was often taken—by the wage earner against his employer for failure to pay. The Crown was seldom involved in those, if ever. They were prosecuted before what was formerly a magistrates court, on a private prosecution.

But to go on with this, Mr. Chairman. There are very few changes in the language, which Mr. McRuer offered in his recommendation. He was, as I said on second reading again, quoting with aberration the Newfoundland Act, which was modelled on other Acts in turn, and I do not think that leaving out the words of reference to the Lieutenant-Governor, the advising of the Lieutenant-Governor, detracts in any way from the stature of the Attorney General.

The only changes that we have seen fit to make were those that were peculiar to our own province. We added the registry and land titles offices, but did not add the control of police forces. We debated that on second reading, which some Attorneys General at least do not have, but I did, I think, assure the House that that would appear in other legislation, namely The Police Act—

Mr. Singer: It is already there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, it would be more clear at least, I think, after what I propose to bring to the House very shortly. I think we are, in effect, implementing a recommendation that Mr. McRuer has made, and I think the changes we have made were

necessary simply to meet our own circumstances. Perhaps some of them were improvements on the language there, instead of saying "he shall be charged with, he shall have the superintendence of", we say "he shall superintend, shall conduct, shall advise, shall superintend". This is simply more concise and clear language in my view, and I have nothing more to add. I would hope that this Act will result—and it is one of the objectives—in bringing under one head, the law officer of the Crown, all the lawyers who serve government in any department.

I have referred to section (h) and other sections that bear along the same line. It is true that different occupants of the office might take a different view one from another, but I think the clear definition of duty and responsibility is a guide that will be valuable to anyone who fills the office of Attorney General and Minister of Justice. As I say, if he does not, the definition is clear before every member of this House, who can rise in his place and show the duty, show the responsibility, call the Minister to book, bring it to his attention, make it a public matter to say, "This duty you should perform, and in my view it has not been properly performed." I think for that reason alone the Act would be of great value.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I listened to what the Attorney General said but I just cannot let pass the theory he has advanced about offences created by a provincial statute being perhaps, or even probably, matters between citizen and citizen.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is just in passing.

Mr. Singer: Well, it was not in passing. I think it touches very seriously on the philosophy that the present Attorney General brings to bear on these problems.

He says that the questions that were raised this afternoon, he undertook to investigate—and I am sure he will. He is a man of his word, and he will come back with an explanation. But I made the point earlier, Mr. Chairman, that it is at least four weeks ago since I gave a question to his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, which the Minister has not answered. He chose to put it on the order paper. And I dealt with it two weeks ago towards the end of the debate on the Speech from the Throne. At that time, in no uncertain language, I charged the Minister with direct interference with the course of administration of justice.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Minister of Municipal Affairs?

Mr. Singer: That is right, and I would have thought that the guardian of all the legal rights in the province of Ontario having heard that, would have taken the trouble to find out what the story was. Either it was as I said, or it could be presented in a different way. If the remarks that I presented and the charges that I made were—and I think they were—in fact authentic, then I would have thought that the Attorney General could not have waited to come back into this House and say: “I am sorry, somebody other than the Attorney General has been instructing justices of the peace about the administration of justice, and it is obvious they have no right to do it and I put a stop to it.”

That is the way I read this section 5. And I say that, to my mind, this is the way the administration of justice in this province should have been conducted even without the passage of section 5. That is why, Mr. Chairman, when I hear this long and involved explanation that perhaps it is something as between citizen and citizen, because the repository of all sanctions against criminal offences is not here, but in another place up in Ottawa, then the Attorney General raises in my mind again the very serious doubts that I have about whether or not the reassertion of these principles—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will permit. I hope he is not attributing to me a statement that justice sits up in Ottawa. I did not say that. I have never suggested that. I do not know where that expression came from, but let me make it clear it is not mine. I never suggested that justice sits on her throne in Ottawa.

Mr. Singer: Well, perhaps I did not explain it sufficiently clearly. What I meant, Mr. Chairman, was this: As I listened very carefully to the Attorney General, it seems to me he indicated that unless there was a criminal offence or something that came under aegis of the powers of the federal government in section 91 of The British North America Act, that you could probably attribute everything else, including the actions done by his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to some matter that concerns citizen and citizen, which really was not something—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is quasi criminal.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right, and when I interjected at that point and talked about the provisions of The British North America Act and the powers over criminal law, the Attorney General did not see fit to correct

me. If I have misinterpreted his remarks—and I hope I have—then I apologize. But I think it should be made abundantly clear that when either this Minister or any one of his many colleagues stands up and says, “Here is a statute, and this is the view of the government of Ontario. To ensure that its provisions are going to be carried out we have attached certain sanctions to it. We have this power because this is not a criminal statute.” We have no power to pass a criminal statute here. But we say to landlords, “Give back a rental rebate.” And if they do not they are going to be punished. What could be more obvious, Mr. Chairman?

To listen this afternoon to the Attorney General saying perhaps it is really a matter between citizen and citizen, I just find this completely abhorrent. I say that when we have a statute here—and I do not care which one—in this book or any of the other books upon the shelf, where this Legislature has said this statute must be enforced, and if people do not do what the statute provides they are going to be punished in a certain way after the facts have been proved, it is the job of this Minister, the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General of the province of Ontario, to see that that is carried out. And when he hears even a whisper that one of his officials is holding up that process—in this case the question was, was a Crown attorney holding up that process, and in the case I referred to earlier, it was my charge that one of his colleagues was holding up that process—then I would think that the first one to man the ramparts is and must be and should be the Attorney General. When a matter sits for four weeks before this Legislature, without even a murmur from the Attorney General, then I question that the words in section 5—even if the words in section 5 were “create attention to”—would be meaningful, are going to have any effect on him.

Now the Attorney General says I was unfair in saying we have not done it until now. I would suggest that those principles, as outlined there—even long before Mr. McRuer wrote them down in his book—most lawyers felt, were guidelines for anyone charged with the administration of justice in this province.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Lawlor: A few words on section 6; we have partially debated it, Mr. Chairman.

It has to do with just what role lawyers in other departments have under the McRuer recommendations and with respect to the office of the Attorney General as the chief officer of the Crown. May I say before making mention of McRuer's actual recommendation under this head—that a separate and distinct legislative branch be set up in The Attorney General's Department, which is not done under this legislation—that there is one other point which is not under this legislation that may very well fall under this particular head. I commend the Attorney General for omitting McRuer's recommendation to the effect that it be made one of the statutory provisions that the Attorney General must be a member of the bar of Ontario. That has been deliberately omitted, and it is very good that it should be so omitted.

As to the omission of, in effect, a new branch: There are five branches presently, I believe, under The Attorney General's Department. The proposal is to set up a new branch called the legislative branch of the department. The work of the legislative branch—and I will not read them in full to save time in this debate—is contained in recommendations 5, 6 and 7. Seven is quite a lengthy recommendation of the McRuer committee; that is it states that all legislation of government will come under review and be presented to the legislative branch of The Attorney General's Department.

It will not sift, particularly, for social policy; that is the problem of the individual Minister. But that it will be sifted with respect to legal policy and to the preservation of human rights. And whether or not that is the intention of this section under discussion at the moment, for all it says is that he may designate an employee in any department or agency to be an employee of The Attorney General's Department.

My question to the Attorney General is, what is the intent of the section? What are their plans with respect to bringing the other lawyers throughout the government apparatus under the Attorney General's head and under his general supervision; and how far has he gone thus far?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The section gives the power to bring the law people in other departments within the ambit, and under the direction and, I think I would use the word, control, of the Attorney General, so that there would be uniformity, continuity, exchange of views, opportunity for study, discussion, advancement, perhaps, of a group

of lawyers. And we would not have parcels of lawyers carrying on in one department without any relation to another.

The member for Downsview mentioned where there had been some views that had been given and had to be reviewed. The purpose of that section would be to bring in one law officer under whose control would come the lawyers who advise the government. Under this Act, the Attorney General would be responsible to see that that advice was given correctly and he would be responsible for it to the government and to this House.

Mr. Lawlor: But you do not set up a legislative branch as such.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not as such at the moment. In my own view, I do not think that is particularly necessary. I think that under the language of this section we can achieve the result which is desirable.

Mr. Lawlor: But with those employees; how far have you gone thus far? For instance, in The Department of Agriculture and Food, would they remain physically located within The Department of Agriculture and Food and in immediate rapport with their own Minister; and would they only come forward to you on occasion? Or would they actually be members of your department, physical located elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The physical location would be, perhaps, the most important thing to concern ourselves with, but I think they would certainly be under the direction and control of the Attorney General. He could say to a lawyer in another department, "Exchange your position, come meet with me, discuss with me, these matters; discuss with the Attorney General, or discuss with the deputy Attorney General, or the staff, these matters on which you are acting." I would think that perhaps in the actual working out of these things there would still be situations where lawyers would become expert, perhaps, in matters of highways, matters of public works, acquisition of property, that sort of thing. But they would, pursuant to this Act, be the lawyers of The Attorney General's Department.

He would see that their conduct, their approach, particularly their advice, would be under the control and direction of the Attorney General. And they would be part of a body of lawyers in the government. I would draw your attention to one other thing: That the language of section 6 is, "may designate",

and it is the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that has that power.

It would be necessary to convince, therefore, my colleagues in cabinet, as we refer to it to make these changes. But the word, "may", was deliberately used also, because there are some lawyers, or some persons in the legal branch that one might not want to designate. I do not want to expatiate on that at the moment, but there is that possibility.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on section 6. Section 6 is, I think, an intelligent section. I think it is good, I think it is long overdue. I am concerned about the permissiveness of the word "may", as against the mandatory provisions of the word, "shall". That is the argument that we have been putting forward for many, many years here. But I would like to have heard from the Attorney General this afternoon some sort of time schedule on this. I would like to know when he anticipates that we are going to have all the lawyers, or most of them, directed by the Attorney General.

I would have liked to have heard him say that when new young graduates come in out of law school that they will be hired, not by a particular department, but they will be hired by the Attorney General and assigned by him or by his officials, by his Deputy, to a particular department. They might spend a year in agriculture, another year in education and another year in the companies branch, so that hopefully we would have, as we should have, in this province, and we do not have now, the best legal advice there is available within the boundaries of the province of Ontario.

This has been the great failure that we have been complaining about for these many years. But there is no such time scheduled. And I would have liked to have heard him expand—and this is the only time really that we get this opportunity, when we go through this thing in committee of the whole House—I would have liked to have heard him expand along the line that there would be common opportunities for promotion and you may move a solicitor from grade to grade and perhaps up the line in another department.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I mentioned promotion.

Mr. Singer: Perhaps I was not listening that closely. But this is the sort of thing that I think is so important. And then I would hope that before too many years have gone by, whoever occupies the office of Attorney General will be able to stand up and say without a doubt we have the best legal advisors in the province of Ontario. No Attorney General

has ever been able to make that statement up till now, and with the greatest respect for my hon. friend, I do not think he can make that statement today. This should be the objective lying behind this Act and particularly behind section 6 of the Act.

Section 6 agreed to.

Sections 7 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 70 reported.

THE FINES AND FORFEITURES ACT

House in committee on Bill 71, An Act to amend The Fines and Forfeitures Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 71 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, every consumer shall pay Her Majesty in right of Ontario a tax computed at the rate of four-tenths of one cent on every cigarette purchased by him,

as provided in Bill 78, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965.

Resolution concurred in.

THE TOBACCO TAX ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill 78, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 78 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, every purchaser as defined in Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, shall pay to Her Majesty in right of Ontario the taxes imposed by The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961,

as amended by the provisions of Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Resolution concurred in.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-1961

House in committee on Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I move that clause 10 of section 5 be deleted.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): I would like to speak—

Mr. Chairman: May I put the motion first—

Hon. Mr. White: I would like to speak before the motion is put.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to put the motion first. The member for Riverdale moves that clause 10 of section 5 be deleted.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like a very brief word on the amendment which I have introduced.

The arguments in favour of the deletion of this section were put at length and in detail on the second reading of the bill. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that they were in substance that the impact of this tax on production machinery would mean that the economic capacity of the province of Ontario and its productive capacity would be affected and would be affected adversely.

When you synopsise all the arguments which were put by many members in Opposition, that is the net effect of it and I do not intend, nor do I believe that there is any need, to repeat in detail the arguments which were put.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the view of the official Opposition is very similar to that of the hon. member for Riverdale. We discussed this section at length, as he noted, last Wednesday and Thursday, and our conclusion is that it will adversely affect the productive ability of the Ontario economy to produce goods and services which in turn, of course, Mr. Chairman, will have an adverse effect on the number of jobs available in the Ontario economy for people looking for jobs.

We disagree with the premise of the tax and we disagree with the effect the Minister assumes it will have on the economy. We will therefore support the motion put by the hon. member of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, I would like to say a word, Mr. Chairman.

I quite understand the objections that are being posed, but I think that if the hon. gentlemen will reconsider, they will conclude, as I have, that the administrative efficiency

not only for government but, much more important, for the enterprises in this province—is one of several reasons why this change is not undesirable.

The other very important aspect is that the amount of revenue which we anticipate—something like \$38 or \$39 million—is a gross figure with substantial reductions to complete the net weight of the tax when one considers the decrease in corporation tax which will come about as a result of charging sales tax into the expenses of a company's income and expense statement.

I gave certain figures the other day to show the magnitude is small, Mr. Chairman, and I thought from the bafflement and the look of surprise on the face of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) that had the NDP had the foresight to make a comparable arithmetical evaluation, they might have taken quite a different stand. I am wondering now if the hon. member for Scarborough West had an opportunity to speak to the deputy leader, indeed if they are speaking these days. I just do not know what the pecking order is in that caucus at the moment.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is perfectly clear.

Hon. Mr. White: At any rate, let me run through those figures again—it will take only a minute.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Tell us what it will be reduced by—the Minister did not tell us on second reading.

Hon. Mr. White: It will be reduced by 52 per cent over the term of the life of the asset. It will be reduced by 52 per cent for those corporations in that marginal tax bracket. It does not mean, of course, that they have to pay that amount on all of their earnings. In fact their earnings might be rather modest to incur that 52 per cent marginal tax.

Mr. Peacock: Would the Minister permit a question, Mr. Chairman? Did he give us on second reading the amount by which the \$38 million would be reduced?

Hon. Mr. White: Let me run through this if I may and then I will answer any questions the hon. members have.

To refresh the memories of the hon. members, for every million dollars in sales, there is acquired in this province \$110,000 in annual investment in machinery and equipment. The value of the newly-taxable machinery and equipment, however, in 1969-70, will be approximately \$40,000, because, of course, a great deal of equipment and machinery has

been taxable ever since retail sales tax was imposed in this province.

And this works out to a sales tax per million dollars of sales of \$2,000. If this is depreciated over a five-year period on a flat depreciation basis, it is \$400. The reduction in corporate income tax due to this application of Retail Sales Tax is .52 times \$400, which is \$208, leaving the net increase in cost of \$192, which is something less than one-fiftieth of one per cent of sales.

I would like to run through a further series of figures for you, Mr. Chairman. I have not used them before, although they do make my case stronger. That is the same computation if one excludes construction machinery and equipment, which was included in the figures I have given to this point.

If those are excluded and one considers only manufacturing production equipment and machinery—which is to say a direct, as opposed to indirect computation—then one finds that annual sales of \$1 million are correlated with annual investment and manufacturing machinery and equipment of \$45,000, the value of newly-taxable machinery and equipment, 1969-70, is \$27,000.

The sales tax paid as result of removal of exemption is \$1,350, which is to say five per cent of \$27,000. The amount of sales tax depreciated for purposes of corporate income tax will be \$270. The reduction in corporation income tax due to the depreciated sales tax component of the price of production machinery, .52 times 270 is 140—and then one arrives at an average annual net burden to a firm of \$130, compared to the larger and more conservative figure that I used the other day.

So, because of the administrative simplicities for enterprises in this province, because it is going to produce a substantial sum of revenue for us, and we see this as an appropriate source, I would hope that the amendment posed by the NDP deputy leader would not be supported by the other hon. members of this House.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Minister forces me to make one comment. Regardless of whether or not the tax burden may be redistributed in the sense that it will be a deductible expense for corporate tax purposes or for income tax purposes, and therefore will be subject to a 52 per cent benefit to the corporation because of the way the tax is being redistributed, that does not alter one iota the fact that the reductions under the general agreement of tariff and trade in the Kennedy Round have provided

an absolute reduction of \$45 million in costs for those who import machinery for the purpose of using that machinery in production across Canada, of which a substantial part of the \$45 million would be an absolute reduction in costs in the province of Ontario.

No matter how the Minister cuts it, the fact of the matter is that this was introduced into this budget for the purpose of raising substantial additional amounts of revenue, and the Minister is going to raise that revenue at the expense of the economic efficiency of the industrial plant of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hear what my hon. friend is saying and I have discussed the effect of this particular increase in tax with an increase in corporation tax and we can in no way differentiate the economic effects, whether that is moved forward to the consumer or backward to the shareholder, or some such division in the burden of the imposition of the additional tax.

My hon. friends opposite have been less than friendly to free enterprise in this province and they have urged us time and time again to increase corporate taxes, and indeed, taxes of every kind bearing on business, so this latter day conversion is not particularly impressive to me and I am hopeful that the Liberals, who have been somewhat friendlier to the private sector of this economy, will not be distracted by these high-flown phrases signifying very little.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister seems to be losing his touch with reality if he is suggesting that we on this side are going to support him in the imposition of this tax. We have certainly made it clear to him and to the House on two occasions already that we feel it is a seriously retrogressive move on the part of the Ministry; that there have been examples at the federal level; that I was the one who brought this before the House, which indicated that while they imposed an 11 per cent tax of this type in 1963, it had to be withdrawn in successive stages, because they found it had a retrograde effect on the economy.

It seems strange that when there is this most recent example, and the recommendations of the Royal Commission itself—which said not only should this exemption be maintained, but should be broadened in the manufacturing area of our economy—that the Minister should lead the government into removing this exemption when it is obviously

going to have serious repercussions in the province, and even beyond that.

Now if the Minister is under any impression that we are going to support him in the amendment that is now before the House, I hasten to disabuse him. I think he is leading the government into making a serious error which, in the long run—and by that I mean in the next three years—is going to cost more than the new tax can possibly raise, which is estimated to be \$38 million in connection with this tax.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take exception to the remarks of the hon. Minister so far as we are concerned over here.

The hon. Minister, I think, well knows that there is considerable differentiation in the incidence and direction of this tax. So far as corporation taxes are concerned, there is not any clear statistical evidence one way or the other. They are still in some limbo of doubt as to where the weight of the tax finally falls. The feeling is, and the Smith recommendations went in that direction, a 50-50 split as between passing it forward and passing it back.

Now there has not been, so far as I know, any greater studies. The economists themselves are of two minds about the issue. That is not true about the kind of tax touching producing machinery, as in this instance. The overwhelming weight of economic opinion came out very heavily against this tax—I went to some lengths to cite authorities under this head. Kenyon Poole, who is within this jurisdiction and was the advisor to the committee, and who has written an ample work on the subject and is the foremost authority, came out very heavily against imposition of the tax.

I think there is a severe differentiation so far as we are concerned. We know and you know, of a mathematical certainty, where the weight of this tax is going to fall—except, perhaps, in a certain restrictive range of industry which cannot pass it on. The bulk of this tax will fall on the heads of the consumers without peradventure of a doubt—and the Minister knows it! To confuse the two issues does him less than intellectual credit in this particular regard.

An hon. member: It will be pyramiding!

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, the tax itself its inflationary in its tendency. It is pyramiding in its effect, and his arguments are pettifogging

in political intensity. It also makes for vertical integration in industry—which we did not get into in the second reading. But that element is involved in this tax. It is a thoroughly bad tax. I do not see how you can find it to be defensive at all. I am surprised you brought it before the House at all and I think we have no alternative but to vote strongly against it.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, may I just comment on these remarks briefly.

I may have been misunderstood, or perhaps I did not make myself clear, when I referred to the effect of any tax being borne by a business enterprise. So far as I can determine, there is no difference between a dollar of property tax paid by a corporation, a dollar of sales tax paid on the acquisition of machinery, or a dollar of corporation tax paid. Now that is the point I was trying to make earlier.

I am fully aware that there will not be a perfect correlation between the acquisition of capital goods and the profitability of an enterprise, although I think one will find a strong, positive correlation, notwithstanding the fact that it will not be perfect. That is the only point I was trying to make earlier—the burden of the taxation will depend entirely on the supply and demand curves, on the shape that those curves take in a particular industry.

If an enterprise is selling into world markets where the price, we will say, is fixed by enormous quantities of world demand, in all likelihood the burden of this tax will have to go backwards.

On the other hand, in those oligopolistic industries in Canada where the producers have a degree of control over the price structure, some—and maybe a great deal—of the burden will go forward. It is going to depend on the nature of every one of these industries. But I would point out, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members who have shown themselves so distressed about this tax, we are talking about \$38 or \$39 million in a gross provincial product of nearly \$30 billion.

Mr. J. Renwick: You are talking about a very low rate of productivity in this province.

Hon. Mr. White: So we are talking about something fractionally more than one thousandth of one per cent of the total value of goods and services in this province.

Mr. Nixon: You can relate it to anything.

Hon. Mr. White: I think we will find, Mr. Chairman, when we get into discussion with corporation managers, that they would rather be paying the \$39 million gross than to have to pay a comparable net amount of revenue through an increase in corporation tax where, in order to realize that net of \$38 million, a larger gross corporation tax would have to be paid.

Now I point out to my hon. friends that this tax is not charged against the performance of the company entirely in the year of acquisition of these capital assets. These assets are capitalized with the "tax-in" on the asset side of the asset and liability section. They are charged off over the life of the asset. I have used the figure five years but that is a conservative figure and I think seven years or eight years would have been better. But in order not to overstate my case, I have used this average life of five years. Let us—

Mr. J. Renwick: They have to pay the tax.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me elaborate then, for the sake of clarity. If a company acquires a \$100 machine which was not previously taxable and which now is taxable, they will have to pay \$105 including the tax. This will be the value of the asset established in the books of the company and in the annual reports of the company. Assuming a five-year, 20 per cent flat rate depreciation each year, \$1 of the \$5 tax will be depreciated together with \$20 of the \$100 "tax-out" figure. So, while we realize this cash revenue in our next fiscal year and while it must be paid by the private sector in the next fiscal year, at least it is not a large shock to the financial statements of the company. I think that this is a matter of some importance.

Mr. Lawlor: It is all deductible from the federal government.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has risen to speak on this clause today and introduced a new defence of his efforts to raise \$38 million in revenue by the extension of this tax to production machinery, which he did not offer, as he might have, in his introductory remarks on second reading, to the effect that the increase in prices that might be passed on would be an even smaller amount if the construction machinery component were taken out of the calculation he had used in second reading. Now does this

indicate that construction machinery is going to be covered by the extension of the sales tax to production goods?

Hon. Mr. White: It has always been taxable.

Mr. Peacock: It has always been taxable; it just happened to creep in by error into his calculation last week.

Hon. Mr. White: No, it was not an error. This is the definition from DBS, and production equipment and machinery includes that particular class of equipment.

Incidentally, I must point out that I was talking for 35 or 45 minutes the other day. I had additional data that I could have used and did not use; some of it I will make available to the members today, and indeed I have.

If one takes out the construction machinery—which actually is not necessary, theoretically at any rate because, of course, it all ends up in the cost of the consumer products—then one ends up with a smaller impost per million dollars of sales. So, I think that I was correct in presenting the conservative series of figures to the House last week.

Mr. Peacock: Fine. Mr. Chairman, my reason for asking it was I was beginning to wonder just on what the Minister had based his calculation of receipts from this extension of the sales tax, the amount of \$38 million. He used the word "net" a few moments ago in answering the member for Riverdale. Is the \$38 million, in fact, the net proceeds after the offsets against corporation tax payable by the purchasers of these producer goods that he is now going to tax under The Retail Sales Tax Act? Or is it the gross amount that the retail taxpayers will be able to charge against the corporation income tax that they are liable for in future years?

Hon. Mr. White: The gross is \$38 million and the net is \$37 million, and the reason that corporation taxes will only decrease by one million dollars is because, of course, we only account for 12 of the 52 points of corporation tax and because the expense of the new tax will be written off over the life of the asset. I have used five years, but in point of fact it will be longer than that five years on average, I feel quite sure.

Mr. Peacock: The \$38 million is extra revenue, then, for the province of Ontario?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale has moved that clause 10 of section 5 be deleted.

Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye"; those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the motion by the hon. member for Riverdale will please rise.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise.

Clerk: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 33, the "nays" are 42.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

Section 5 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment, and beg for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE SECURITIES ACT

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park) moves second reading of Bill 53, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Mr. Shulman: The purpose of this bill is to require that companies in this province notify their shareholders when they make any significant change in their business or their affairs which could materially affect the value of those shares.

This bill is obviously necessary and it is going to be supported, I am sure, by all parties in this House. It is modelled on a bill that was passed in the United States in 1934, and it is quite a mystery to me why we in the Opposition have to be proposing such a bill, since the government has had 25 years' opportunity to bring in these regulations, and still has not done so.

To illustrate the necessity of such a bill I can mention companies extending all the way from penny dreadfuls like, Bunker Hill and Windfall, up to our best corporations, Canadian Breweries, Consolidated Dennison, Clairtone, and Windsor Raceways. In every one of these companies we have seen abuse by the directors of the power that they have as a result of being directors with a complete

lack of attention to the rights of the shareholders. We have seen cases where the directors, for their own personal advantage, had deliberately withheld news until they could take personal profits, or prevent personal losses, before they gave their shareholders news which they had in their possession.

Last year we raised in this House, from the Opposition side—on a number of occasions, the question of Clairtone, which is an outstanding example of how unscrupulous management can take advantage of the shareholders.

In Clairtone hon. members may recall, last year, on July 8, the two entrepreneurs who had control of the company sold their stock at a very substantial price, a very high price. Exactly one month later, when they issued their report, they revealed that sales and earnings had dropped disastrously. The stock collapsed, and has never recovered. But, prior to releasing this news, these two men sold out all of their holdings, and they took a huge sum of money out of the market.

Outside of the shareholders who did not have the advantage of knowing this, who could have also sold, what about those poor people who happened to buy that stock, and who were literally robbed? That is the only word you can use, they were robbed by these men, because our legislation in this province is totally inadequate.

You do not have to go to Clairtone. One of the most successful companies in this province is Consolidated Dennison, and Consolidated Dennison, from the beginning to end, has been an embarrassment to the government, if the government can be embarrassed and unfortunately this is difficult.

Way back some years ago this was a penny dreadful, it was sold over the phone at 29 cents a share. To the amazement of everyone they struck a huge uranium deposit—and did the shareholders make money as a result of this? Unfortunately no, Mr. Speaker, because the people who were running the market at that time, thought—"well we do not want these shareholders making all this money, we'll just spoil them"—so they kept the news back. They went on the phones, and they bought back all this stock, or as much of it as they could get that they had sold over the phone to the public.

They bought it back at 50 cents and after they had bought it back they released the news. The stock ultimately rose to \$70, and you would think with having made all of this money, having made the millions that they

made, and these men made millions and millions that they would at least become honest with their wealth, but they have not, even yet.

I have the Toronto *Daily Star* of last August 9 here, and the heading is Lack of Detail on Profits of Dennison Mines. They have changed the name Consolidated Dennison to Dennison, and the article goes on to explain that the statement which they issued was a useless document; that is the word that is used here. One analyst called the Dennison statement "a useless document" because he said:

Unless some kind of profit breakdown is given, you are clueless. Even if they do not tell what investments were sold, they should break down profit sources, then at least we have an idea of the state of their mining operations.

So, after all these years they are still playing the same tricks. They are not letting their shareholders know what is going on.

If we pass this bill, this abuse would stop. If we had the legislation that any other western country has, any country in Europe or North America, this could not occur here. We have here the very worst, the most non-existent security legislation of any western country.

Through Windsor Raceways, we have heard a great deal from Earl Rowe our ex-Lieutenant-Governor in the paper recently. He is now involved in the racing business, and we see that he is unhappy with the people that control Windsor Raceways, because they marched into the board of directors meeting one day last year, and wanted to merge Windsor Raceways with a company that was owned by the president, which was not doing well. If the directors had agreed, they could have gone ahead and carried this out, and the shareholders would not have even known about it, until it was a *fait accompli*.

Windfall—we do not have to think back too far to Windfall. We have members in this House who were personally involved in that matter where a core was taken out of the mine, which at a casual glance was obviously of no value. And yet this news was held back from the public, and from the shareholders, for a significantly long time, while stock was sold and people were swindled.

Mr. Speaker, we need proper security legislation in this province.

I rose in the House last year, during the estimates, and I read at some length from a little book that I have here, called, "Timely Disclosures—the American Stock Exchange Experience". It showed how over the last 35

years, the United States has developed a proper system to protect the shareholders of their companies. As a result of this, the United States is probably the safest place in which to buy stock, you at least know you are going to get a fair shake. I say this here, if you buy Ontario stock, you are a sucker. This is why foreign money does not come here any more, because you do not get a fair shake, and it is because this government has not brought in proper legislation.

You do not know what the companies are going to do, whether it be the highest priced companies on the Toronto Stock Exchange, or whether it be the little "pennies", that trade over the counter. The directors run these companies for their own personal advantage, that do not care about shareholders, whether they are Canadian shareholders, or foreign shareholders.

This is why, across the United States, and in England, advisory service after advisory service says, "stay away from Canada—specifically stay away from British Columbia, but also stay away from Ontario, because you do not know what is doing. All you are doing is playing "craps", you are not investing."

Well what happened here last year, was that we in this party made a great plea to the government to wake up, to do something about this particular problem, and they moved as much as this government ever moves. I have here the *Globe and Mail* for October 1, 1968, and we see an announcement that the Toronto Stock Exchange, and the Ontario Securities Commission has set new guidelines for "timely disclosures" by firms. In effect they did everything we asked them, except that they did not make it into a law. They said, "Please, in future, would you please let your shareholders know what is going on, we would really appreciate it, it would be very nice of you and we do not want to push you too much, but these are guidelines, and we think it would be nice if you followed them". Why do they not put this into legislation?

The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), has it, in his power, within a day, to carry this out. He does not have to follow my Act; we have Acts drawn up from the SEC. I presented one of the 1934 Acts here a few months ago. The United States now has moved significantly further, we find now in the last few weeks, and I have here again, the *Globe and Mail* for last July. Now the New York Stock Exchange has gone significantly further. They have now required that any company that is listed on the New York exchange must notify their

shareholders, not after something has been done but after a proposal has been made that has gone beyond the immediate insiders.

There, in addition to this, and of course tied together, they have proper insider laws which we do not have here. Here we have pious hopes, corruption and theft. It is honest theft, legal theft, you can do it quite properly by Ontario laws; you are not going to go to jail, but it is nothing short of theft. Outside of the individuals who get robbed, the bad thing about this is that we, everyone of us in Ontario, is being robbed because money—finances—are being forced out of this province. As a result we have the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) having to go over to Germany and borrow money there, in marks which ultimately he is going to have to pay back in marks at a revalued rate. Money is not coming into Ontario anymore and the reason it is not coming in is because of our bad security legislation.

I just have a few moments left, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to digress just for a moment to comment on this private members' hour.

There was an article in last week's *Globe and Mail* that called it a "farce" and that is what it is. We are talking to hear ourselves heard; nothing is going to happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not the prerogative of the leader of this House, the Prime Minister or the leaders of any party, to make agreements which will take away our rights. It is your job to protect those rights and last week I raised a matter in this House as to votes in the private members' hour and I quoted suitable precedents. You replied to me that you hoped the motion would not be put again and that the leaders, in their wisdom, would work things out.

The leader of one of the parties is not prepared to work this out and I am now appealing to you, as the holder of our rights in this House. I am quite confident that this bill is going to receive the support of all three parties. I am quite confident if it was put to a vote it would pass unanimously in this House and, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I would just point out to the hon. member that in this debate he should be speaking to this bill and he is not now. He is speaking to a point of order which he raised some time ago, so perhaps he would come back to the subject matter of this bill.

Mr. Shulman: I am completing my remarks on this bill, sir, and in reference to the vote

on this bill I wish to point out to you that there very well may be a motion put; I hope not today, but in subsequent days after you have time to consider the matter.

I am saying that we must have the right to vote on these bills. This is one of our rights. It is written down in the rules of the House and it is your duty to preserve our rights regardless of what party you come from. As such, sir, I am going to complete my remarks by appealing to you that not this week but next week, when this matter comes up again—and I assure you it will come up again—that you follow the rules of this House. Thank you, sir.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss the bill before us now I must say at the outset that the hon. member for High Park may be in for a bit of a surprise inasmuch as I do not propose to support his bill.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is a nice buttoniere the member has there.

Mr. Meen: Yes, speaking to the buttoniere, I might just observe that although I am Anglo-Saxon Protestant of English background, I happen to have been born on March 17 and I think I am entitled on that basis to wear this buttoniere.

Coming back, to the bill, Mr. Speaker, I noted with some interest that subsection 2 of his proposed section 129(a) details (a) through (g) almost word for word the statement of the commission policy of the Ontario Securities Commission issued in September jointly with the Toronto Stock Exchange.

Mr. Shulman: Exactly word for word.

Mr. Meen: No, with respect, Mr. Speaker, it is not exactly word for word but it is essentially word for word and it certainly conveys the same intent, except that it adds to it a one month period plus ten days for the disclosure of this information. And to whom does the bill say the disclosure would be made? It says it would be made to shareholders. I ask rhetorically, what about the public, for goodness sakes? It is the public who really need to know this, the proposed purchasers.

The hon. member referred to Clairtone and the deal-off on those shares. Well that disclosure was not made to the public. The shareholders already knew it and I would suggest that this bill would not have accomplished anything in this case.

Mr. Shulman: The shareholders certainly did not know it.

Mr. Meen: Furthermore, the one month period plus ten days would have permitted these insiders—short of the insider trading regulations being applicable to them—to deal these shares off in any event without being in breach of the Act.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Will the member move an amendment?

Mr. Meen: The hon. member mentioned also in his opening remarks that this bill is patterned after the United States Statute of 1934. The people in the States found that that statute *per se* was ineffective. It really did not do what they set out to accomplish. As he said, they set up a pattern of other regulations within which their trading must be conducted. And the setting up of their timely disclosure rules really accomplished the end they sought, not so much the bill they introduced and passed in 1934, which was abortive.

What I am suggesting now is that the timely disclosure rules, as promulgated in September of 1968, by the TSE and by the Ontario Securities Commission really accomplishes everything that the hon. member would want and, indeed, what we would all want. I do not quarrel with the intent—

Mr. Shulman: It is not a law; it is a pious wish.

Mr. Meen: I do not quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the intent of either this bill or of the regulations now used and enforced by the securities commission. Indeed, they can enforce them. They can suspend dealings of the stock either temporarily or permanently. They can accomplish all kinds of—

Mr. Shulman: Does that get the shareholders' money back?

Mr. Meen: They can accomplish all kinds of control over a company by this method. If they are required to notify their shareholders as well, it seems to me that you are just adding another burden to the administrative lot of a company without accomplishing a comparable benefit. And any time you add a burden without a benefit you are being pretty foolish in the eyes of the law and of the public, for that matter too.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would impose a real and distinct danger if disclosure had to be made regardless, as this bill would so require. I can give the hon. member and

the members of this House a good example of what could have happened if this Bill 53 had been law or if in the future it were to become law. There was a major Ontario company not long ago that had a coalfield out in B.C. It was a very large coalfield but they did not have a market for that coal and their stock was consequently trading at a rather low figure.

However, the directors of that company were able to negotiate a big deal with a foreign country. That foreign country, as it happened, was prepared to pay a better price to us here in Canada for that product than they were prepared to pay in another country in which they were negotiating a similar kind of deal.

One of the stipulations which they imposed in Ontario in making the contract with this country was that for a period of six months following the date of that contract there was to be no disclosure whatever to anyone; not to the shareholders, not to the public. And if there had been any sort of leak of that information, the deal was dead, and that company would have been right back in the doldrums. It would have continued without a contract because this foreign country needed six months in order to negotiate the deal in the other country.

So the directors of this company, realizing their dilemma, went to the Ontario Securities Commission, outlined the whole business and said to them, "What do we do? You have your insider trading rules; you tell us we must make disclosure because this is a very significant contract we have negotiated. It is obviously going to influence upwardly the value of our stock on the market?"

They were told that in the circumstances, since to disclose it would be to abrogate the entire contract, that they would be allowed to not disclose it. They were permitted to keep it as a secret among themselves on the understanding and on their undertaking that there would be no insider trading of that stock.

The stock exchange watched all of these tradings and they then watched the shares in that company very carefully during that period, in order to make sure that there was no trading by these people or by anyone to whom this information might be leaked. As it turned out—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question on that point? Was the request made by a Canadian company as a result of the intervention

of a foreign company for the purpose of taking over that Canadian company?

Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no. This was a foreign company seeking to purchase only at market price a certain asset that this company had. They wanted to buy the coal. They were to get a contract to mine the coal and to ship it out to the designated shipping port of this particular country. I point out that this is, I think, a first class example of the inflexibility that a bill of this sort would impose. The securities commission would not have been able, in any way, to have given them authority to do otherwise. They would have had to disclose it according to the bill or whatever revisions that were made. And, of course, there would have been no deal; it would have been right back where it started.

As it turned out, they were able to keep this secret. The contract went ahead, and I understand that six-month period has now expired. There is a good example. The insiders made no profit. It is a good example of where tight control by the OSC and the Toronto Stock Exchange and the exercise of discretion by intelligent, experienced men can really accomplish something that would otherwise have been insurmountable.

I will not take too much longer, Mr. Speaker, because we are rather short of time, but one of the statements which is incorporated in the bulletin of September, 1968, by the OSC reads as follows:

The commission recognizes that there may be cases where disclosure might occasion harm to the company which might outweigh any possible damage to shareholders by withholding the information.

Where this arises, management should take every possible precaution to ensure that no trading whatsoever takes place by any insider or individual who are associated with the company and who may be in possession of the confidential information.

That is part of their statement; it is a very broad statement indeed.

And, apropos the release made last September, and to which the hon. member referred in his quotation from the *Globe and Mail*, I have here a quotation—and I will read, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, a part of it—from the *New York Times*, of October 2, in which they say:

The Ontario Securities Commission and the Toronto Stock Exchange declared today that investor-owned companies have an

obligation to prevent "insiders" with confidential information about a company, from buying or selling its stock before the information is made public.

In Washington, David Ferber, solicitor for the Securities and Exchange Commission, said that that agency had no such requirement on its books now. Mr. Ferber, an expert on disclosure policy, called the new Canadian rule an interesting idea that might be worth looking into.

So, Mr. Speaker, in short, I feel that this bill introduced today for second reading is rather naive in its limited scope. It strikes me as being retrogressive. It goes back to the 1934 American Act which they found did not work. It is not progressive, and consequently I cannot support it today.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the member for High Park for having brought forward this attempt at improving and correcting a situation which has been a very sad and serious weakness of the investment industry, that whereby insiders can steal from shareholders and the public, who do not have the information available to these insiders.

Unfortunately, the bill as it is drafted is, I am afraid, naive and is just going to impose another obstacle that those three per cent—who always try to find a way around any regulations—will surely find a way around. But it will just frustrate the 97 per cent who are responsible, who are looking towards their shareholders' best interest and who are trying to do a job that is constructive.

One of the points that has bothered me over the years is the fact that we have not really got to the root of the problem under which these insiders continue to steal and continue to get away with it. The penalties are a matter of a few days or a few months in prison, at the worst. In many cases there are fines which are not anything close to the money they have gained, whereas someone who has stolen money from a bank, who is no more of a criminal than these people, can often find himself behind the bars for not weeks, not months, but years for stealing a few hundred dollars.

I concur with the idea of disclosure, of actual changes in control, actual acquisition or disposal when firms have a firm deal and there is a firm deal or option on assets, an actual board approval of changes in stock split. But anyone who is familiar with the complicated negotiations which go on in any

change in a corporation's structure, recognizes that all types of situations arise which will not be in the best interests of the shareholders to disclose.

And our principle here is to try to prevent stealing by insiders from the general public, the investing public and from the shareholders of companies. That is what we are after doing and we do not want to throw the baby out with the bathwater in any bills we bring in.

So I suggest we should look at the major problems we now have where they now arise. For example, I have indicated that the proposed changes in control of companies would be difficult for anyone to know. Who, for example, knew who would end up with control of Great West Life a few weeks ago? There are all sorts of surprise offers and moves for taking over companies and it is difficult to know the outcome of these offers.

They will cause wild gyrations in the market action. And a shareholder, and actually insiders, are often badly hurt by these rumoured changes in control. The same is true of proposed acquisitions and disposals. I know one company with which I was connected had in one year over 27 negotiations at various stages for every deal that we completed. If we had ever disclosed everything that we had entered and started to work on, there would have been absolute chaos.

It takes a long time to come to an agreement in principle even, and for boards to come to a point where they will approve in principle, subject to shareholders' concurrence. But in all of these cases, the problem was to be sure that there were no insiders using information to the disadvantage of the ordinary shareholder or the investing public.

On the matter of earnings projections, some managements are honestly very pessimistic in their outlook; they are very conservative. I know one executive whom I always discount—whose earnings will be considerably over that which he indicates to the general public when he discloses, because he is just naturally a conservative individual.

And I know of another merchandise official whose estimates I always discounted to a great deal on the low side because he was always proved to be very optimistic. This is not a matter of these men having any dishonest purpose. It is a matter of their basic characteristics. So I think any legislation that attempts to actually legislate, by regulation, these disclosures of a probable nature, are most dangerous and could be far worse than the illness they are trying to cure.

At the present time, in the United States, there is a form 8K, which requires that material facts be disclosed after they have taken place. It asks that these facts be disclosed within ten days of the month end. Sometimes, it could be forty days, virtually, after a significant event had taken place. The timely disclosure cannot be regulated, because it is such a matter of judgment. You cannot put into regulations what a magistrate can base his decisions upon. It is the timely disclosure that is the point that we are really after.

The value of a form 8K, similar to the SEC's form, is that it helps build up a file on the company's record, and that information, together with information that might come to light if something of a bad nature takes place, something of untoward nature in the way of bad market action, and suspicion of insider profiteering, that dossier that has been built up by the form 8K would be of some help, and it is a form that I think that our Ontario Securities Commission should adopt.

For, after all, insiders are now required to report their change in stock holding, and why not have at the same time, the report on the changes in material fact that have taken place within the company? It would be of some assistance in building up a record, but I would very much go against any regulation requiring that probable events be recorded.

A very significant move that I suggest the Ontario Securities Commission be given, which the Securities Exchange Commission now have, which I think would really help deal with this problem of insider profiteering, would be the right to take action against insiders when information indicates they have been profiteering at the expense of the investing public.

Now in the SEC case—because of a law in the States, they take action to take out an injunction against a firm repeating something they had already done that is wrong. And the courts have the right to impose penalties based upon that conviction or that injunction. That is what happened in the Texas Gulf case. But we in Canada have a different basis of law and a way of operation of our courts, and in this case I think it is important that legislation be brought in to give the Ontario Securities Commission the right and the responsibility of taking action on behalf of shareholders.

It is not feasible in our country in the relation between crime and lawyer, to expect an

individual shareholder—even if he has 1,000 shares of a 1,000,000-share company—to take action on behalf of himself and the other shareholders to recover moneys that have been, in effect, stolen by insiders.

If a shareholder has 1,000 shares in a 1,000,000-share company and if it is \$100,000 the insider has taken, it only means \$100 to the shareholder who wants to sue. It just is not feasible. That is why, in our situation—where we do not have our lawyers, thank goodness, taking cuts with a client, or having deals with a client, for the success in any of these cases—where we have a situation that the Ontario Securities Commission be given the right and the responsibility of taking action where information is uncovered by the securities commission shows that insiders have made profits at the expense of the general public.

This is the way that I think we should be moving. Add to our disclosure form something similar to an 8K, but then add to the powers of the securities commission the responsibility of taking action on behalf of the shareholders who have suffered against the insiders. In this way we are not going to be frustrating the 97 per cent of responsible business leaders who are trying to help build our economic community on a sound and forward-looking basis, and we can frustrate and cause great concern among those three per cent who have been unscrupulous in the past. Mr. Speaker, I conclude by regretting that despite the good intentions of the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), I do not support his bill because of his naïve approach to the solution of the problem.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I take it from the remarks of the member for York Centre that he agrees with the principle of the bill introduced by my colleague from High Park, as it is set out in the first subsection of the bill, and he disagrees with some of the itemized particulars of what constitutes a material change.

Mr. Speaker, the first subsection provides that:

Where a material change or development occurs in the affairs of a corporation, the directors shall cause a notice giving the particulars of the change to be sent to each registered shareholder as soon as practicable, but not later than the tenth day of the month immediately following the month in which the change occurs.

If I understood the member for York Centre

clearly, he is not in disagreement with the principles of it, but he does disagree with the enumeration of the changes or developments that are included within the ambit of the first subsection of the bill as listed in subsection 2.

I think I would like to come back to the remarks of the member for York Centre after I have endeavoured to deal with the member for York East, who I am sorry does not appear to be in his chair—oh, I see he is in the House.

The member for York East made the statement that The Securities Exchange Act of 1934, to which my colleague the member for High Park referred, was not an effective Act so far as requiring changes to be notified to investors in companies. I would simply like to point out to the member for York East that again, unless I misunderstood the import of his remarks, he could not have been more incorrect. To take the last part of the special study of the securities markets, which was carried out in the years leading up to 1963, and was without a doubt the most thorough-going study of the exchange markets in the United States that had taken place since the '30s. That report re-emphasized and restated the fundamental, essential necessity for disclosure as the basis on which investor protection could be achieved in the United States.

I would simply quote two very brief reports. The very form to which the member

Disclosure is the cornerstone of federal securities regulations. It is the great safeguard that governs the conduct of corporate management in many of their activities. It is the best bulwark against reckless corporate publicity and irresponsible recommendation in the sale of securities.

And he goes on in the report to indicate that it seems strange in the United States that the very protections, which are available to listed securities, are not available to over-the-counter security holders.

He goes on then to say that investors in all exchange-listed securities are afforded protection both by statute and by rules of various of the exchanges. The Exchange Act requires full information about an issuer to be disclosed in a publicly filed application for registration before securities of the issuer may be issued for trading on an exchange, and requires the information to be kept current by subsequent periodic and current special reports. The very form to which the member for York Centre referred, form 8K, is the

form that is designed under the provisions of The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to be complied with by companies. For the member for York East to suggest that in some way or other in the United States they have departed from the statutory requirement of the filing of periodic reports where material changes have taken place is, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, simply incorrect.

I do not know the details of the particular case that the member for York East referred to, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here is the fundamental problem in the securities legislation of the province of Ontario. We faced up to it in some degree after a series of financial disasters, which were about to destroy the financial markets in the province of Ontario. But there is still the hangover, the remnant of the view, that somehow or other public disclosure is unwise, that people somehow or other should not have information conveyed effectively to them about the companies in which they have invested their money or are about to invest their money. And I take that to include all persons who may be a part of what is called the public so far as securities law is concerned.

This is where the member for York Centre says very much the same thing. He said that somehow or other it is done for the protection of the investor, that he is not given information, and this is the old theory of the club that, yes, we know best, and that therefore in the fullness of time we will disclose to the shareholders and to other investors and to the public what we have done, because if we disclose it to them earlier than when we think best, it will be unwise. That was the substance and the point at which the member for York Centre and the member for York East agreed, because the group that was going to buy the particular asset in Canada—the coal mine to which he referred—was able, because of the lack of statutory requirement, to pull that kind of a game on the company from which they proposed to acquire the coal mine. Then the people from whom they were going to acquire the coal mine could go to the Ontario Securities Commission and start to play the game of the private club again.

That surely is what we have been about in the Legislature over a number of years—to get away from that private deal. I doubt if there is a lawyer in the House who has dealt with the securities commission in the earlier years following the war, who was not aware that in an appropriate situation, with

responsible respected citizens of the community, you could go and have a cosy talk with the then chairman of the commission, Mr. Lennox, and he would say, "Oh, yes, in that case . . ."; and he would write you out, in his own hand, a little note saying, "Yes, you do not need to comply." We have come so far from that proposition that I am simply saying it is very discouraging to hear the member for York East and—in a rather more sophisticated way—the member for York Centre adhere still to the proposition that somewhere or other there should not be statutory requirement for full, plain and complete disclosure about investor affairs.

Now, I am quite prepared to argue the proposition as to whether something that is proposed is the kind of thing that should be disclosed or not. That is the problem for the directors; that is not the problem for you and I or anyone else to speculate about, because it is very clear that if the Act requires that there be a disclosure—a prompt disclosure, a timely disclosure—to the shareholders or the investing public or publicly made by any company about any material change or any material development in the affairs of that company, then it is up to the directors to scratch their heads as much as they want to come to the conclusion whether some event or some development requires them to comply. That is their obligation; not for you and I nor anyone else to speculate about the semantics of the particular event that may take place.

And it is strange that the member for York Centre and the member for York East used the same language. They talked about the bill of the hon. member for High Park being naïve. This is always the distinction that is made, that the public—the naïve, unwashed public from whom the money is derived that is going to be invested in these companies in some way or other—is not quite as sophisticated as the corporate managers in the society, and that the corporate managers are not only interested in making an effective profit, sometimes for themselves and sometimes for their companies, but they really had this obligation to protect the little guy in the public who is thinking that he should know about his company, to protect him against his own naïveté.

I simply get concerned about any regression in this assembly from the proposition that we have got to have full, true and plain disclosure. And if in any company, whether it is a listed company, a company which is traded in the market place, or whether it is a company which has secured money from the

investment community by way of bonds, debentures or other forms of indebtedness, then this Legislature has got to impose a statutory obligation in clear, unmistakable terms, as The Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 does—and, as it was found in this special study, is still an effective provision—so that the directors of companies, the Ontario Securities Commission, the Toronto Stock Exchange, the investment dealers association, the broker-dealers association and all persons will understand that the principle is firmly established, not just in the special circumstances that are now outlined in our Securities Act, but that in all circumstances, if there is a material exchange or a material development in the affairs of a company, that the shareholders are entitled to know about it promptly. I take it from what my colleague, the member for High Park, said when he limited his bill to the shareholders, he was really saying that in that sense the information disclosed will go directly to the whole of the public.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Speaker, this is the second time that I have been last up on the private members' hour, and I am going to request the next time that I get in a little early, because I find two things. I find (a) that I do not have much time; and (b) that mostly, everything has been said, but with a different connotation.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Sit down then!

Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not sitting down. I would like to educate a few of the members, particularly on my side, because we are not used—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carton: We are not used to these money matters. We are a working man's party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carton: And we are not like the sophisticated investors that are prominent in the New Democratic—I mean the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to point out, just by way of general remarks, that insider trading, timely disclosure, amalgamations and mergers, and conglomerate studies are all part and parcel of the same problem. The whole area is in a state of flux, and this includes the United States, it includes England, and it includes, of course, the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Shulman: But Ontario is fluxing much slower than everywhere else.

Mr. Carton: The proper disclosure, sir—and this is the crux of the matter—serves to supply investors and potential investors with information which was requisite to making a reasoned investment decision, and it helps to prevent or curtail the spread of rumours. It avoids the creation of unusual and often damaging market activity.

Without such a flow of corporate information, it is very doubtful that today's high level of public confidence in the securities markets, and broad ownership of stock would have occurred. Disclosure helps create the climate of growth and it follows, therefore, that it is in a corporation's vital self-interest to describe its operations meaningfully and accurately.

Confidence in the equity market is based on the availability of the best possible information on which to make reasoned investment decisions. And I would point out, sir, that the hon. member for York Centre carved the heart of Bill 53 which we are debating today. And notwithstanding the word of doctor Renwick, the heart has still not been put back.

You and I know, sir, that listing agreements refer to the release of specific items of information. But there are other numerous and varied corporate actions or developments not specifically dealt with, and with all due respect to the member for York Centre, I think that these are matters that should be brought to the attention of the investing public as quickly as possible. I am talking, for example, about new mineral or oil discoveries, new product developments, major technological breakthroughs, takeover bids, stock splits, merger negotiations, corporate acquisitions, and so on.

Also, Mr. Speaker, bad news should be disclosed just as promptly and as fully as good news. To withhold adverse news is most damaging to shareholder relations and the public's regard for listed securities.

As I mentioned earlier, corporate disclosure and insider trading are closely related. The doctrine that insiders cannot trade on inside information has its roots in the common law of the 19th century, although needless to say it was not too well developed.

What is insider information? Suffice to say it is an extraordinary and rare piece of information; they type of information which, if generally known, would have an immediate and a substantial impact on the price of a companies security.

The subject of timely disclosure of corporate information has presently taken on a new dimension in the United States. This is because of the Texas Gulf case and because of the Meyer Levinskies and the securities "crap" rolling.

This section 10(b) 5 that was mentioned here is strictly a fraud rule. My understanding of the Texas Gulf case, and the majority opinion, is that this case extends this fraud rule even further; to the effect that it still applies even where the company and insiders are not buying or selling securities.

Now, as I said, sir, this is a fraud rule. But the main thing is that this rule, even in the United States, does not provide a precise guide in making decisions about disclosure. In other words, the Texas Gulf case illuminates the problem, but it does not provide any guidance whatever.

When should the information be disclosed? What information should be disclosed, as the hon. member for Riverdale pointed out. This is a question of judgment which the corporation itself must exercise to see that shareholders and investors are promptly informed. It is simple to say that the policy should be based on the premise that all companies should disclose as quickly as possible news about corporate developments. Yet there are situations where "timely disclosure" becomes untimely, as for example in merger negotiations.

Timely disclosure benefits everyone—the public, the listed companies and the auction market—for two main reasons, and this is the crux of the matter. Timely disclosure works in the world of real time. Corporate developments are disclosed at the time of, or shortly after, the happening not, as proposed in Bill 53, on the 10th of the month following.

Second, timely disclosure requires prompt dissemination of information through the news media so that all investors are placed on an equal footing, not just the shareholders.

I will not take the time, sir, to go into the policy guidelines of the Toronto Stock Exchange and the Ontario Securities Commission. The hon. member for High Park has mentioned, and it was borne out by the member for York East, that the wording of Bill 53 was taken almost verbatim from the September 1968 Ontario Securities Commission policy release.

But what I would like to point out is that there has been to date a tendency to talk

about disclosure problems in abstract and legalistic terms, without getting into the area of the more difficult operational problems. They are not routine problems by any stretch of the imagination, and frequently today there are many questions that are asked and there are no ready answers from the exchanges and the commissions.

Incidentally, as I understand it in England there is no legislation on this particular matter. They have certain codes that are looked after by the banks in London, but there is no legislation. And as I understand it, if the exchanges and the commissions, which are the pulse of this whole thing, continually review their rules, if they continually look at their policies relating to disclosure, if they continually look at their listing agreements with the whole objective—and this is today's debate, the meat of it—with the whole objective of developing new principles and practices through responsible self regulatory actions rather than through government action as suggested by the introduction of Bill 53, a solution is possible.

There are questions to be identified and answered concerning proper disclosure, questions which are puzzling corporate management, lawyers, analysts and others. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, my training comes to the forefront here, because the tendency of legal counsel is to become cautious. And where you are cautious there is less likelihood of jumping into dangerous waters; and this is particularly true when matters are in a state of uncertainty. There is some confusion, there are some doubts; and in the minds of those who are experts in this field it will be many months and perhaps years before clear cut, legal guidance on corporate disclosures can be fully determined. In the meantime, corporate life must go on.

There is presently an educational process taking place in the administration of the timely disclosure policies of the OSC and Toronto Stock Exchange. They are trying to help the companies gain an understanding of and sensitivity to their disclosure obligations, while at the same time developing techniques in handling these difficult situations.

In my humble opinion sir, in closing, the marketplace is the most sensitive barometer. It will disclose any unusual activity triggered by corporate information leaks; and events having an immediate and significant effect on the marketplace should be administered by the Toronto Stock Exchange and by the Ontario Securities Commission, where

proximity to the market and sensitivity to its needs permit them to act quickly and flexibly. And if need be, Mr. Speaker, as mentioned by the member for York East, the iron fist of the velvet glove can be brought to bear quite forcibly.

Succinctly, sir, I oppose Bill 53, which means legislation, in favour of my foregoing arguments, which mean education.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will return to the order paper to deal with some legislation, and then carry on with the estimates.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Eleventh report, standing private bills committee	2351
Conservation Authorities Act, 1968, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, first reading	2351
Hospital Labour Disputes Arbitration Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading	2351
Ontario Heritage Foundation Act, 1967, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, first reading	2352
Humane societies and SPCA, statement by Mr. Stewart	2352
Training schools advisory board, statement by Mr. Grossman	2355
Sunnybrook Farms groceries, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. MacDonald	2356
Humane society, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Deans and Mr. Farquhar	2356
Milk marketing board, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Ruston	2357
Ontario Hydro, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Jackson	2357
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Peacock	2358
Senior citizen units, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Ferrier	2358
Spur national highway, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Innes	2359
Niagara escarpment scenic drive, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Deans	2359
Boards of control, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. T. Reid	2359
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported	2360
Hospital Sales Tax Act, bill to repeal, reported	2360
Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Grossman, continued	2360
Recess, 6 o'clock	2393

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon we are very pleased to have a great many visitors. In the east gallery we have the York North Progressive Conservative group; and in the west gallery, the 1st and 2nd Guide Company from Alliston and students from Ukrainian School of Queen Olga in St. Catharines.

In order that we might be aware of our visitors tonight, because we are going to have many visitors tonight, we are going to have the Queen City Chapter of Eastern Star in Toronto, the York Centre Young Liberal Association and constituents from Scarborough North riding with us at the evening session tonight.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Meen, from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's 11th report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the University of Windsor.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the borough of East York.

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill be not reported:

Bill Pr36, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Your committee recommends that the time for presenting reports by the committee be extended to Thursday, March 27, 1969.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if I might draw your attention to the fact that we have another group of visitors.

Mr. Speaker: The other group will be suitably introduced at another time.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine!

Mr. Speaker: The honour of introducing them is given to the Minister under whose aegis they are here.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT, 1968

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister just explain briefly the intent of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, they are just minor amendments, just housekeeping; we are changing three sections. I think when the bill is presented the members will see they are very minor changes.

THE HOSPITAL LABOUR DISPUTES ARBITRATION ACT, 1965

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital Disputes Arbitration Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, The Hospital Labour Disputes Arbitration Act was first passed in 1965, and we now seek approval for changes, which are essentially designed to complement or strengthen the original intention of this legislation.

First, the definition of hospital will be expanded to include nursing homes.

Second, recent developments have indicated the need to include central power, laundry or heating plants for hospitals within the definition of "hospitals," for the purpose of compulsory arbitration.

Finally, the 35-day waiting period between the end of the conciliation process and the appointment of a board of arbitration would be reduced to seven days.

THE ONTARIO HERITAGE FOUNDATION ACT, 1967

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Heritage Foundation Act, 1967.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the object of the amendments is to broaden the objects of the foundation to include property of recreational, aesthetic or scenic interest, as well as historic or architectural interest. Another change to subsection 2—it is complementary to subsection 1—permits support by the foundation of projects of organizations having other principal functions than that of the foundation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food has a statement.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, in the interests of clarification and in view of the telegrams over the signature of the Ontario Humane Society directed to members of this Legislature, I should like to document the sequence of events which led up to a meeting which is called for Wednesday, March 19.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making a point of order.

Mr. Sopha: There is at least one question from this side of the House about this, to your knowledge, and I submit that question ought to be put to indicate the interest of this party.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member who placed the question will at the appropriate time be given the opportunity to place the question. At the moment, the hon. Minister is making a statement. If by chance he answers the question at this time, then he can refer to that when the question is put.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, I want to submit to you that within the rules of the House it is perfectly proper for a member of this side of the House, before the orders of the day, to indicate that he has directed a question to this Minister. I want to say that within the rules of order, in my view it is very presumptuous of this Minister to get up at your behest—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): He is trying to jump the gun.

Mr. Sopha:—and to begin to make a statement when he is fully aware that an hon. member on this side of the House has directed a question to him on the matter that is germane to that statement.

Mr. Speaker: It would appear to me that both the hon. member who has placed the question and the hon. member who has raised the point of order should be happy enough to have their question answered, that they would not quarrel with the method used for answering.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Let me finish.

Mr. Sopha: Cut out the lectures.

Mr. Speaker: Did I hear correctly? I hope I did not. The Speaker's position here is one where he must endeavour to maintain order and an even hand. And that is what the Speaker has been trying to do. The hon. Minister is quite entitled to make a statement with respect to his department and the questioner has every right to ask his question.

It would be obvious to any of us here in the House that the hon. member who asked it was interested, and his interest will be shown. It will not be cut down, so far as I can see, by any statement which is read by the Minister. The Minister can then either answer the question, as I have mentioned, or suggest that it had been answered by his statement. The hon. Minister has the floor to continue with his statement.

Mr. Sopha: Well, let the dognapper go on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if I may begin again. In the interests of clarification and in view of telegrams over the signature of the Ontario Humane Society directed today to the members of the Legislature, I should like to document the sequence of events which led up to a meeting we have called for Wednesday, March 19, with the independent

humane societies and SPCAs that are affiliated with the Ontario Humane Society.

As the members of this Legislature will recall, on Wednesday, February 19, 1969, I introduced Bill 73, An Act to Regulate the Procurement and to Provide for the Welfare of Animals Used in Teaching and Research.

The following Thursday, February 27, a meeting was convened in the Cabinet office, 2nd floor of this building, for the purpose of discussion with members of the executive of the Ontario Humane Society relative to Bills 73 and 74. This meeting lasted two and a half hours, and was attended by Mr. Basil Capes, president of the Ontario Humane Society; Dr. Scollard, a member of the board of the Ontario Humane Society; Mr. Russell Payton, Q.C., honorary solicitor and member of the board; and Mr. Michael Spearing, the society's solicitor. Joining me as representatives of this government were the Attorney General and Minister of Justice (Mr. Wishart), and the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). We were attended by Mr. Everett Biggs, Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food; Dr. K. McDermid, associate director of our veterinary services branch; Mr. John McMurchy, of our legal branch, and Mr. R. W. Carbert, associate director of information.

Mr. Sopha: The other side was outnumbered there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We had a very useful and informative meeting, during which the Ontario Humane Society officials set forth their specific objections to these bills, and proposed suggested amendments. But at no time did the president of the Ontario Humane Society suggest the bills be withdrawn.

Following this meeting, I received at my office, letters from several of the affiliated humane societies across this province expressing a desire to meet with me and present their opinion and suggestions. For example, I quote from a letter of March 4, over the signature of D. M. Egner, president of the London Humane Society:

We should be very glad to have the opportunity of discussing these serious problems with you at any time.

And I quote again from a letter dated March 7 from Mr. A. Ignatieff, president of the Ottawa Humane Society, which is, I understand, the oldest such society in Canada, dating back to 1888:

We have prepared a brief and I am asking that you grant the society an oppor-

tunity to appear before you to present our views.

From a letter dated February 27, 1969, over the signature of Mrs. Alice Summerville, of the Toronto Humane Society:

We certainly would appreciate the opportunity to make representations to you and anything you can do to assist us will be very much appreciated.

After having received these requests it became quite clear that it would be impractical and impossible for us to meet separately with each of the affiliated societies, and so in telephone conversations with these persons it was suggested that a meeting be scheduled as soon as possible to enable these affiliates to present their views on the proposed legislation. They agreed.

We therefore, on Friday, March 14, made plans for such a meeting to be held in committee room M2-59-1, in the MacDonald Block at 2.30 p.m., tomorrow, Wednesday, March 19, 1969. Mr. Robert Carbert, our associate director of information called the president of each of the affiliated organizations, or in their absence the secretary, on Friday afternoon, informing them of the meeting and asking them to delegate two or three of their senior elected representatives to attend on behalf of their organizations. On Monday, Mr. Carbert confirmed these arrangements by wiring to each of these affiliated societies as follows:

A MEETING OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES AFFILIATED SOCIETIES SPCA, TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 2.30 P.M., MACDONALD BLOCK, QUEEN'S PARK EAST, FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING BILLS 73 AND 74. ATTENDANCE OF TWO OR THREE OF YOUR SENIOR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES DESIRED.

(signed) Wm. A. Stewart

I can assure the House that this meeting was organized in good faith for the purpose of affording these affiliated societies an opportunity to meet with us and express their opinions on the proposed legislation—Bills 73 and 74.

On Saturday night, March 15, at 10.00 p.m. I had a long distance telephone call at my home from Mr. Basil Capes, president of the Ontario Humane Society, asking why the Ontario Humane Society and its branches had not been invited to the meeting.

Mr. Sopha: That was a good question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Indeed it was. I explained to Mr. Capes that his organization had been the very first that we had consulted

with after the introduction of the legislation, and we had been given to understand that he and the members of his board of directors were representing the Ontario Humane Society in that useful and productive meeting, which had been held on February 27. However, I pointed out to him that we had called this second meeting at the request of some of the affiliated societies. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I had many requests from other societies other than those to whom I referred specifically in these comments.

When I arrived in my office on Monday morning at 8.00 a.m., I was surprised to learn that efforts had been made over the weekend to organize a boycott of this meeting. In conversations with at least two of the affiliated organizations, a telegram was read to us, which had been sent from the office of the Ontario Humane Society on Friday afternoon, at approximately the same time as our associate director of information was telephoning the affiliates informing them of the meeting. I read a transcript of that wire as it was dictated to us:

ONTARIO HUMANE SOCIETY AND ITS BRANCHES HAVE NOT BEEN INVITED, REPEAT HAVE NOT BEEN INVITED, TO ATTEND THE MEETING CALLED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19. WE FEEL THIS IS A DELIBERATE AND OBVIOUS ATTEMPT TO DIVIDE THE HUMANE MOVEMENT AND TO CREATE INTERNAL DISSENTION AND WEAKNESS. WOULD YOU BE WILLING, IF OPINION IS UNANIMOUS, TO BOYCOTT THE MEETING? ALTERNATIVELY WOULD YOU AGREE TO ONLY ATTEND THE MEETING PROVIDING REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONTARIO HUMANE SOCIETY AND ITS BRANCHES ARE PRESENT?

(signed) Basil Capes

However, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Capes had not advised me in his telephone call of Saturday evening that he had sent this telegram the day previous. On Monday, we received one wire, from the secretary of the South Waterloo Humane Society, signed by Mrs. E. Harris:

REQUEST YOUR REPLY BY RETURN IF POSSIBLE WHY DELEGATES OF ONTARIO HUMANE SOCIETY AND BRANCHES NOT INVITED TO MEETING WITH YOU ON MARCH 19.

We replied to this wire as follows:

MARCH 19 MEETING CALLED AS A RESULT OF REQUESTS FROM SEVERAL AFFILIATES WHO WISH AN AUDIENCE WITH THE MINISTER. HAVE EARLIER MET WITH THE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF THE ONTARIO HUMANE SOCIETY.

(signed) Wm. A. Stewart

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Until this morning, this has been our sole communication relative to this meeting, which will continue as scheduled.

Today in the mail I received a form letter dated March 17, on letterhead of the Ontario Humane Society, and over the signature of the general manager, Mr. T. I. Hughes. In his letter, Mr. Hughes says—and I quote:

Even now, no attempt has been made by any government department to meet with this society to discuss the details of Bill 73 and to hear any proposals we might have for solving the problem without seriously weakening and ultimately destroying the humane movement in Ontario as we now know it. Indeed, as you now know from a telegram you received a few hours ago, the Minister of Agriculture continues to disregard our views by deliberately excluding the Ontario Humane Society from a meeting with our affiliated societies to discuss Bill 73.

Mr. Hughes writes this paragraph despite the fact that no less than three Cabinet Ministers met for two and a half hours with the president and senior elected officers of the Ontario Humane Society in the cabinet room on Thursday afternoon, February 27, and I can table the notes that were made at that meeting.

However, it is not my intention to become involved in a debate with Mr. Hughes over his interpretation of our intent in calling this meeting. I merely want the members of this Legislature to know that we place a great deal of value on the opinions of those officers who are elected by the members of the more than 20 independent affiliated humane societies and SPCAs across the province. Having discussed the matter fully with the Ontario Humane Society, we now wish to hear the opinions of these other organizations who have asked to be heard which is their democratic right.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I enquire—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Wentworth, on a point of order?

Mr. Deans: No, Mr. Speaker, may I enquire, by way of clarification, whether or not the Minister intends now to invite the Ontario Humane Society to be present since that was

the question I had before the Minister at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Well if that is the question the hon. member has, then he will ask it at the appropriate time.

Mr. Deans: Well, that was not exactly the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has said that is the question he had, so that when the appropriate time comes, he may ask that question.

Mr. Deans: I cannot ask that question. I do not have that question before the House, and I want to know whether or not they are going to be invited.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has guests.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, a study team representing the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan has been touring the United States and Canada and is present in the Speaker's gallery today. They are accompanied by Mr. Klein and Mr. White of the United Automobile Workers office, which has arranged the tour. I would, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, ask the representatives of the General Council of Trade Unions to rise so that the members of the House might welcome them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Correctional Services has a statement.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the appointment of Dr. Abgan Lynch as a member of the Training Schools Advisory Board effective April 1, 1969.

She will fill the vacancy that will occur with the retirement of Dr. John Martin Bennett, MA, PhD, who has served on this board with great distinction for 27 years, including two and a half years as its chairman. Dr. Bennett served The Department of Education of Ontario as a school inspector for 42 years. He is a member of the Toronto Public Libraries Board and has served on the Training Schools Advisory Board since 1942.

I would like publicly to pay tribute to Dr. Bennett for his outstanding service to the people of this province, the training school wards and this department.

Dr. Lynch has the following degrees: BA from Manhattanville College, New York; MA from the University of Toronto; LMS from the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies,

and a PhD in philosophy from the University of Toronto. Dr. Lynch is a lecturer in medical ethics at St. Joseph's Hospital School of Nursing, St. Michael's Hospital School of Nursing and the Quo Vadis School of Nursing. She also lectures in philosophy at the University of St. Michael's College.

Dr. Lynch is a member of the National YWCA committee on membership and Christian emphasis. In the past she has served as chairman of education for the Catholic Women's League of Canada, Toronto archdiocese. She has also served on the provincial executive of the Girl Guides of Canada and as president of the Ursuline Parents Guild.

Doctor Lynch is married to Professor Lawrence E. Lynch, PhD., also of the University of St. Michael's College. They have three daughters and three sons. We are delighted, Mr. Speaker, that Doctor Lynch has accepted this appointment. With her background and varied interests, she will make a valuable contribution to the important work of this board.

The Training Schools Advisory Board, established in accordance with The Training Schools Act, reviews the progress of students in training schools and on placement in the community and makes recommendations to the Minister regarding transfer, placement and termination of wardship. The advisory board inspects the training schools annually and makes recommendations to the Minister with respect to the welfare of the students.

Mr. Speaker: Before the hon. member for York South places his questions today, I would like to advise the hon. member for Timiskaming that I have had a reply from the Minister of Labour stating that in connection with question 904, which was placed by the hon. member with the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and transferred by him to the Minister of Labour, that the Minister of Labour has looked into the question and it does not come within his departmental responsibilities.

I can only suggest to the hon. member that perhaps he might, if he wishes, consult with me or with the House leader and ascertain to whom this question should be directed, because I must confess I have no advice to give him on the matter.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to consult with you, but I would like to point out that the question will no longer be pertinent by the time that department makes up its mind. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that maybe this is what they want.

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

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Attorney General.

1. Has the Attorney General received representations from individuals and organizations in Oshawa with regard to the Sunday operations of a groceteria called Sunnybrook Farms, on Simcoe Street?

2. Is it the Attorney General's intention to lay charges under The Lord's Day Act or to take any other action in light of these representations?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I received one request for consent to prosecute in November of last year to which I consented, and the procedure is under way. I understand that the hearing will be March 21 on that particular case.

One was received recently, to which I have also consented and that procedure is under way. I do not know the date when the hearing will be but both have been consented to and prosecutions are going forward.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is the Minister going to prosecute all the grocery stores that remain open on Sunday?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has question 935 addressed to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, which perhaps he would now place.

Mr. Deans: I can see little purpose, Mr. Speaker, in asking a question he has already answered. I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member would ask his question and then he will be entitled to ask a supplementary.

Mr. Deans: Has the Ontario Humane Society been invited to attend the meeting on March 19 to discuss Bill 73? If not, why not? I know they have not; I know why not. Will you now invite them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is there another question on this same thing?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, there is another one from the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar).

Mr. Sopha: Is this not *noblesse oblige*?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I do not know, that is French.

Mr. Sopha: There is another question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Normally Mr. Speaker notices that. The two questions were together, and I apologize to the Opposition members for not noticing it.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, there is no point in reading the question—the answer has been given to the extent that the Minister intends to answer.

Mr. Sopha: With presumptuous arrogance.

Mr. Farquhar: I simply would like to know, however, why he just does not invite the people who want to come. In spite of the detailed answer I got, I would just simply like to know why not.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well Mr. Speaker, despite my hon. friend from Sudbury's suggestion that I do not know what that statement meant, he meant I am not that well educated to know the meaning of those big words. But I can say this, that I appreciate his interest in the matter.

Mr. Sopha: I am on the side of the dogs. Is the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Very much so, very much so.

Mr. Sopha: How about his pal, the Attorney General. Is he?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Very much so — unequivocally. That is where we stand. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the question that was asked me—the question that was on my desk standing in the name of the member for Algoma-Manitoulin—is not quite the same as the question that was asked by the member for Wentworth. I wonder if I might read that question with his permission, or perhaps he would like to read it himself, because it has a different meaning, Mr. Speaker, than that other question, but I thought I might deal with both of them if the hon. members so desired.

Mr. Farquhar: Fine. Is the Minister aware that the board of directors of the Ontario Humane Society has been delegated to represent the humane movement in Ontario in negotiating amendments to Bills 73 and 74, and has the government invited a representative of the board of directors to the meeting that has been called to discuss the legislation on March 19, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to both these questions I would say this: Yesterday morning when I learned that an attempt had been made to boycott the meeting which had been requested by the affiliated humane societies themselves, I had some of our staff try to contact the president of the association. His answering service, I believe, told us that he would not be available for the rest of the week.

So knowing the chairman of the board of the Ontario Humane Society, Mr. G. D. Jefferson, I called him at London and asked him if he was aware of this action that had been taken. He said he was not. He was not even aware that we were having this meeting. I told him that we were having the meeting and why it had been called and who was invited, and the reasons for the meeting being held.

I asked him if, in his opinion as chairman of the board of directors of the Ontario Humane Society, he would agree with the action that I had taken, and he said, "absolutely—you have done the right thing—and I would support you in what you have done."

Now I feel, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that the affiliated organizations having asked to come, in and meet with us personally, we should afford them this opportunity and this is what we have intended to do. But I want to again stress, as I did previously, that the first group with whom we met were the elected officials of the Ontario Humane Society.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question—a friendly one? Is this an open meeting?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, this is not an open meeting.

Mr. Sopha: It is an audience, he appears on the balcony.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Essex-Kent has a question of this Minister.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, Is the Minister aware that the Ontario Milk Marketing Board is promoting and selling group insurance through a special agent calling on producers? Is the Minister of the opinion that a marketing board should be selling insurance for a profit-making organization?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, I am not positively aware that this is the case; however if the hon.

member says it is, it must be, however, if this is a decision reached by the Ontario Milk Marketing Board then I think it is their business to so carry on that business as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. Jackson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Is it correct that Ontario Hydro management are holding parties and giving dinners for the supervisory personnel for their activities during the strike situation? If so, does the Minister think that this is a proper expenditure of public funds?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in some locations meetings are being held to explain to management staff the terms of settlement of the recent strike. Where these meetings are being held in the evening outside of normal working hours, dinner is being provided.

The answer to the second part: Of course Hydro is not spending public funds as there are no moneys voted by this legislation for the daily operation of Hydro. As far as this question is concerned—do I think that this is a proper expenditure of public funds—it is not public funds as I have said. It seems to me that this a good method of meeting with your personnel, especially if they are busy and you are trying to get a message across to them. I think this is something that is followed by business whether it be large or small I cannot see anything wrong with it unless it is overdone.

Mr. Jackson: On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, the Minister says this not public funds. Is his department not responsible for the operation of the Ontario Hydro and as such is he not responsible for the spending of public funds?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member does not know this but we have nothing to do with the day to day operation of Ontario Hydro, nor has this Legislature.

Mr. Sargent: That is the trouble, no responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is only one vote here and that is for rural lines in the northern and northwestern part of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

What is the number of family and senior citizens units under development for the Windsor area which are awaiting loan approvals by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Ottawa?

For what period of time have the applications for loan approval been in the hands of CMHC?

What efforts has the Minister been making to obtain approval of these loan applications?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question. No family and senior citizens developments for the Windsor area are currently awaiting loan approval by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The last approval was for 400 senior citizens units and this was obtained on December 10, 1968. The corporation's latest family housing development of 200 units has not yet been sent to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for loan approval in view of the fact that some design revisions were required.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, could I ask the Minister generally, in respect to the applications which are in front of CMHC, what efforts has he been making to pry them loose?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have been in touch with Ottawa almost on a daily basis and I learned yesterday that several million dollars worth of projects will be released very shortly. As soon as I get them I will be very glad to advise the House.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The energy Minister made a statement to the House that he could not answer for Hydro. Now, why are we paying the member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) \$10,000 a year, and giving him a black limousine to drive around in, if he cannot—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has no point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Well, why can he not answer Hydro questions in the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has no point of order. The questions are answered by the ministry, and—

Mr. Sargent: I am asking the Speaker why he cannot?

Mr. Speaker: I am pointing out to the hon. member that the questions are addressed to and answered by the ministry, and the hon. member for Muskoka is not a member of the ministry.

Mr. Sargent: He does not have to report?

Mr. Speaker: The Ontario Hydro reports, so far as reports are necessary, to this Legislature, through the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, who is the Minister who has been answering the questions.

Mr. Sargent: He just said he could not answer for the Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did answer the question.

Mr. Sargent: I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, respectfully, why you cannot rule that the Minister for the Hydro can speak for the Hydro in the House?

Mr. Speaker: I have pointed out to the hon. member that the Minister for Hydro, as he puts it, is the Minister who has been making the answers.

The hon. member for Cochrane South has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Has the OHC received a petition from the town of Timmins requesting the construction of the approved 40 senior citizen units to proceed on a proposal basis so that tenders can be called for the construction of these units, and the necessary land can be acquired?

Is OHC prepared to cooperate with the town of Timmins in this way, in order that the existing need for that type of housing can be met as quickly as possible?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question. The town of Timmins passed a resolution on January 15, requesting 40 senior citizen units. Since that time Ontario Housing Corporation has been investigating the availability of suitable sites. As adequate sites could not be readily optioned, the corporation has decided, after discussion with the mayor and officials of Timmins, to advertise a builders' proposal call on March 20. In this way, the need should be met as quickly as possible, and I firmly believe that this is one way we are going to get the units into production.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford has a question from yesterday of the Minister of Highways.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways:

Will the Minister comment on the report in the *Daily Sentinel Review* of Thursday, March 13, 1969, to the effect that a spur national highway will be built from Highway 401 at Kitchener, due west to a point half a mile south of Sarnia, to link up with a U.S. highway terminating at Port Huron, Michigan?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before I answer this question, I think I should read an extract from the newspaper the member is quoting from. I do not read it the same way as he does. The report from Woodstock Thursday quoted William J. Pierce, communications director for Detroit Edison Company, as saying that he has been invited to discuss the proposed highway with federal government officials in Ottawa.

Mr. Pierce told the *Record* today he had been misunderstood by reporters during an interview in Woodstock. He said he had been invited to Ottawa not to meet with government officials, but to meet with Harold Danforth, Conservative member for Kent-Essex. The proposed highway he was talking about in Woodstock was simply a proposal by his company, and Mr. Danforth has expressed interest in discussing it.

Now, the report referred to by the hon. member is not inconsistent with the service which will be provided by Highway 402 linking up with Highway 401 and thence easterly.

However, absolutely no contact to The Department of Highways has been made by anyone from Michigan.

The Department of Highways of Ontario, of course, is responsible for the planning and construction of provincial highways. The report implies that this responsibility might be that of the federal government agency. I would also draw to the attention of the hon. member that no discussions have been entered into by any agency of the federal government with The Ontario Department of Highways regarding the feasibility of the route suggested.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question from yesterday of this Minister.

Mr. Deans: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways:

Has any decision been reached with regard to the Niagara escarpment scenic drive proposal, which was made to the department last June as a result of a feasibility study?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, this proposal is being studied by a number of government departments, since they have some responsibility in this regard. A report is being provided to Cabinet, and I would imagine a decision will be forthcoming in the future from the office of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East has a question from yesterday of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that three Metro boroughs, including Scarborough, have expressed an interest in dispensing with their respective boards of control, will the Minister explain why it would be too late for such a move to take place, as he was reported to have said, according to the *Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, March 12?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer is very simple. The last date for filing petitions for private bills was January 31.

Mr. T. Reid: If the Minister would accept a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Does not The Municipal Act, section 201 (2), provide for dispensing with the board of control, and therefore would it not be the Minister's opinion that any motion passed by council with a two-thirds majority may then dispense with the board of control of that municipality, requiring no change in The Municipal Act?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, any council could go to the municipal board under that section at any time to dispense with the board of control, but there is no authority in The Municipal Act to set up an executive committee.

Mr. T. Reid: If at this time, Mr. Speaker, the Minister could clarify section 151, part 1 of Bill 11, which states that,

On and after the 1st of January, 1967, the council of each area or municipality shall be composed of (a) a mayor, (b) a board of control, if at any time the area or municipality has such a board.

Is this section not permissive rather than directive? In other words, is it not permissive, allowing the area or municipality to pass a bill to set up their council as described? And, assuming it to be permissive, would the Minister not agree then that no private Act would be needed to change this section?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, I would agree with the member's supplementary statement.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I know he is not here, but for your information, sir, I would like to draw to your attention a typographical error in my question. It is pertinent to the substance. The second last word in the first question, in the second line—"last" should be substituted for "this," making it "this year."

Mr. Speaker: I am advised that we have some further visitors under the west Speaker's gallery. They are members of the 1st Mitchell Land Rangers. I am sure we are pleased to see them here this afternoon too.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 22nd order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-1961

House in committee on Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Mr. Chairman: We had passed section 5.

Sections 6 to 31, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 79 reported.

THE HOSPITAL TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 80, An Act to repeal The Hospital Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 80 reported.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain

bills without amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 27th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (Continued)

On vote 402.

Mr. Chairman: When we adjourned the committee proceedings at the last sitting, we were dealing with vote 402 and we were still on the general discussion of provincial jails, reformatories, etc.

The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, you may recall that we were discussing the individual jails in the province and one that was mentioned was the Alex G. Brown Institute. There was some question as to whether or not marijuana addicts were being sent to the institute for training, retraining, or unaddicting.

The Minister assured me at that time this is not the case. So I thought I would visit the Alex G. Brown clinic over the weekend. I paid my little visit there, and the Minister, I am sorry to say, is not correct. At the present time, I understand there are nine inmates there of whom four or five are actual true addicts; the others are marijuana smokers who have also taken other drugs.

I find that there have been, as the Minister stated, people sent there who took marijuana only, and no other drugs. If I could have a pageboy I will send the name of one of these people across to the Minister and he can confirm it himself. I am sending the Minister the name of one young lad who was sent in error, I hope, to the clinic a few months ago.

I can well understand that errors can occur, and I ask the Minister that he take steps in future to make certain that boys—and this is really a very serious problem—who are just smoking marijuana are not sent there. I had some opportunity on Sunday to talk to the correctional officers at the Alex G. Brown clinic, and they agreed with me that putting a lad like this in, the one whose name I have just given the Minister, is very bad.

They get in with heroin addicts and learn more serious forms of addiction; they are going to learn those particular tricks. And I

would ask the Minister to ensure that in future this type of thing does not occur again. I hope he will give me such assurance.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, all I can say is, as far as my knowledge is concerned, and the knowledge of my Deputy who is in front of me, this is not the policy and does not occur. However, the hon. member has given me the name of someone. It may well be he is being treated for some other addiction. We will find this out and I will let the hon. member know.

Mr. Shulman: He is not being treated at the present time, he has been released.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will find this out.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to go on to another matter, Mr. Chairman. I spoke at some length the other day about the problems of visiting in the institutions and the incorrect attitude of the Minister, in my opinion, towards the importance of this matter. There are a number of other minor irritations which are not nearly as important overall, but which are very important to the inmates concerned.

As an example of this, I would like to bring up the matter of dentists. On December 30, I received a letter from an inmate at Monteith, a Mr. W. S., who was having serious difficulty with his teeth and his gums. He had made numerous requests to see a dentist. Perhaps the simple thing would be to just read his letter:

Dear Mr. Shulman:

I am writing you a few lines to see if you could possibly do something for me about my teeth. I have seen a doctor and a nurse here about this problem, but according to the doctor in his diagnosis my symptoms are said to be pyorrhea. I have requested to see a dentist but I have no result at all. As a matter of fact, they told me no. I am doing a long term, two years as a matter of fact. I came in here in good health and I hope to get out of here the same way.

I would appreciate it very much if you could help to get me to see a dentist, because my face is very sore and I can't eat because my teeth and my gums are always bleeding.

Thank you very much for your time. I would appreciate it very much if you would answer this letter.

I answered him and I wrote the Minister asking—I did not think it was unreasonable—that the man be allowed to see a dentist.

This was not allowed. The Minister wrote back to me on January 14 that the case had been thoroughly investigated. I quote:

The medical officer at the institution examined this man on December 6 and diagnosed his condition as a mild case of pyorrhea gingivitis. The medical officer and our director of medical services are convinced that his condition will respond if the inmate follows the necessary directions.

Yours sincerely,
Allan Grossman.

It appears to be not unreasonable, Mr. Chairman, that institutions of this type should have the services of a dentist available. When an inmate develops a problem where he cannot eat and where his gums are bleeding, surely it is not an unreasonable request to allow a dentist to see him. If there is not a dentist available full time, as I can well understand, surely there is a dentist available within the area who works for the department and who can be brought in and can see the man.

So I raise this case now. It is obviously too late for this man, but for cases in the future surely you are not running such an inhumane place that when a man is in pain and sick you cannot arrange to have the proper specialist see him, whether it is a dentist, as in this case or whether it is a specialist in some other field in other cases. I have other cases if the Minister wishes, would he care to make any comment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the hon. member read the letter?

Mr. Shulman: My letter or your letter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My letter to the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: It is dated January 14, 1969, and marked confidential:

Dear Dr. Shulman:

On December 30, you wrote to me regarding a letter you had received from a W. S., an inmate of the industrial farm, Monteith, in which Mr. S. asked for your assistance in ensuring that he obtains the services of a dentist. This case has been thoroughly investigated. A medical officer at the institution examined this man on December 6 and diagnosed his condition as a mild case of pyorrhea gingivitis. The medical officer and our director of medical services are convinced that his condition will respond if the inmate follows the necessary instructions.

Yours sincerely,
Allan Grossman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what objection does the hon. member have to this reply?

Mr. Shulman: He still has not seen a dentist. You had your GP see him again, and he had seen him before. He had not seen a dentist. He has a dental problem. That is my objection.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Dr. Hutchison, in front of me, tells me that this is a medical problem.

Mr. Shulman: If pyorrhea is a medical problem, as a medical doctor I am very surprised. I know of no doctor who treats pyorrhea.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the report I have here from the superintendent says this inmate was admitted to the industrial farm, Monteith, on transfer from the reformatory in Millbrook on November 29, 1968. He was medically examined on December 2, 1968, by Dr. C. D. R. Haskins, our medical officer, at which time he made no mention relevant to his teeth.

On December 6, he appeared on sick parade and was examined by Dr. H. B. Hall, who diagnosed his complaint as mild pyorrhea gingivitis with moderate gum retraction, as he failed to clean them adequately. At that time, Dr. Hall prescribed that our subject should undertake gentle brushing with RX Amosan after every meal. On December 9, 1968, he appeared on my interviews asking for a special letter to write to Dr. Shulman stating this suggested treatment was no good. The superintendent's report said:

I am enclosing copies of this inmate's medical report while at the Ontario Reformatory, in Millbrook.

It was signed Dr. D. B. Griggs, superintendent.

I must tell the hon. member that this is another one of those inmates who is a chronic complainer. No matter what you do for him, apparently, he is not satisfied; he likes to create problems by writing letters to people about how he is getting no attention.

All I can tell the hon. member is that, we have a medical practitioner there and the medical practitioner felt that this was the proper way to deal with it and that is the way it was dealt with.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I took the trouble to phone one of the leading dentists in this city after this incident occurred, to find out what the proper treatment was for this condition. He advised me that if someone is having bleeding from the gums and if

there is pain, as described in this letter here, the proper treatment is not at all what was prescribed. The proper treatment is packing of the gums, which is a treatment that cannot be done by a doctor.

It is a special treatment taught to dentists in school. I do not really object to the fact that the man had another treatment prescribed at first. What I do object to is that the man complained by writing to a member of this House, the member then wrote to the Minister and the Minister still refused to allow the man to see a dentist. As far as I know, his condition is still the same.

Surely in a condition like this it is not an unreasonable request, whether it comes to you from the family or the man or from a member of this House. If a member of this House asks you to let one of your unwilling guests see a dentist, you should be willing to let him see a dentist. It is as simple as that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it is not quite as simple as that. The hon. member knows perfectly well, as he is by no means unintelligent, that we have thousands of inmates who, if they felt all they have to do is ask for a doctor or dentist to come into the institution, they would do it. It would be impossible to handle. Many of them merely do it to create problems.

All I can tell him is that the doctor at Monteith made this judgment. I am not a medical man. I have to have confidence in the medical doctor who is at the institution. All the hon. member is saying is that the doctor at Monteith is incompetent. Now, I will write—

Mr. Shulman: Oh, my goodness, I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, the hon. member is suggesting that when an inmate tells me he is not satisfied with the kind of treatment he is getting from a medical doctor at one of the institutions, I should immediately override the advice of that medical doctor and say, "I do not have confidence in your opinion; someone has raised the question that this man should have an outside doctor or dentist. They do not agree with your prognosis; get somebody on the outside." Every day in the week I would be going over the head of a medical doctor at the institution, and I cannot do that.

The hon. member has, in fact, questioned the competence of this doctor to give a diagnosis in this case. So I will bring it to the attention of the doctor at Monteith and

raise the questions which the hon. member for High Park has raised. I will say he disagrees with him and perhaps let him get in touch with the hon. member for High Park. Between them the two medical men can come to some conclusion.

I do not know how else you can run an institution—a department with 82 institutions. You have to have some confidence in somebody, and I am not in a position to contradict the opinion of the medical doctor on the premises.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Do you get a mechanic to plaster a wall?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, but I take the advice of the plasterers as to whether it needs plastering.

Mr. Martel: That is right! And you would get a dentist, would you not, to look at a man's teeth?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Shulman: First of all, Mr. Chairman, before we let the Minister get that on the record, I have not questioned the competence of the doctor at Monteith. Let us get that quite clear. All I am saying is that he is not a dentist.

I am sure every other doctor cannot be correct all the time. Because a doctor may make an error in diagnosis or may make—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Once in a while.

Mr. Shulman: —or may make an error occasionally in treatment, it does not mean he is incompetent. I am not questioning the doctor at Monteith. I know nothing whatever of his competence. I do know that this prisoner needs a dentist. For some reason, which I cannot understand, the Minister is standing up on his hind heels saying we will not let him see a dentist, because if we let him see a dentist we are saying we do not have confidence in our doctor.

What nonsense. Surely we expect from the Minister who, we believe, is not unintelligent.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402?

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the member for High Park is very knowledgeable about this whole affair and I do think we owe him a lot. But I think this is an area where the uninformed people should have the chance to ask questions about their ridings insofar as penal reform and institu-

tions are concerned. I have a few short things I would like to get across to the Minister.

We have this submission of the report of the Minister of Correctional Services, 1968. This is the bible, as it were, of the goings-on of that department. And if the veracity of the information here is no better than the Minister's dialogue with me over the years, Mr. Chairman—insofar as what he is going to do about regional jails—then I do not believe we can believe a word that is in this book. Because repeatedly he has been telling me, as a representative of the Grey-Bruce area, that he is going to do something about our jail conditions in our area. And I was in the jail Saturday and Sunday in Owen Sound—

An hon. member: Careful, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: I was there as a guest.

An hon. member: A non-paying guest?

Mr. Sargent: As a guest. As a member of Parliament, I had a chance to make free entry and free exit.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not charge anybody.

An hon. member: That is important, free exit!

Mr. Sargent: And again, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring this matter before the House sometime—to shame the Minister into doing something about the jail we have there. There are 34 or 35 institutions like it across the province which are now provincial jails under his jurisdiction. They were built over 100 years ago and are giving the same punitive treatment today. In 1969 when we hope to put a man on the moon we are still treating people the same way, Mr. Chairman, as we did a hundred years ago. Every night these chaps go to bed at eight o'clock in a dark cell, 38 inches wide, eight feet long, and are kept there until six o'clock in the morning.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): What does the member want, the Royal York Hotel?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister should be jailed sometime to appreciate this.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps we should throw the cops in jail and put the convicts up at the Royal York.

Mr. Sargent: No, no, just a moment.

Mr. Martel: Sure, that just shows the integrity of that Minister.

Mr. Sargent: I think this is a shocking situation. They have a cot there with no mattress on it. All they have is a sanitary pot, in complete darkness, until six o'clock in the morning. They are locked up from eight o'clock at night. For ten hours they are locked up in the dark with nothing to read; they cannot talk, they cannot communicate.

Any normal person would tend to be mentally unstable after spending time in that institution. Repeatedly I asked the Minister what is going to be done about it, and he said we are going to take them over and build regional jails. I do not think the people who run these jails have a very nice set-up, having to deal with these conditions. I think it is a shocking situation, and a good example of how this government thinks.

I wanted to interview these prisoners yesterday, Mr. Chairman, and all the time I was there a guard stood by me and would not let me talk to the prisoner alone. So I interviewed about 12 prisoners and each time they stood by me. I asked the individual in the jail how things were going and if he had any beefs, and he winked at me—because when the guards were standing there he could not tell me the truth. So I got the governor to come up and I said, "What is going on here?" and he said "I cannot allow you to talk to the men alone without a guard being there." So how are we to find out exactly what is on the prisoner's mind?

There is one chap in there for 66 days. He has not been on trial, he cannot get bail. This is the Ontario government in 1969. So I repeatedly ask the Minister, what is going to be done about it? He guaranteed me six years ago in this very House that immediate plans were in hand to correct this.

Mr. Chairman, we have 35 such institutions across Ontario identical to that in Owen Sound. I think it is a shocking thing to have the Minister lead us on and say something is going to be done about it and nothing is being done about it. I will sit down for a moment and give the Minister a chance to answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had been here the other night I would not have had to repeat this, although I suppose I would have to anyway because I repeated it last year. We just took over the jails in July, 1968. We pointed out that it was our intention to replace all of the old jails eventually. We also pointed out that it

was impossible, it was unfair, to expect the taxpayers to have them all replaced within a very short period of time—overnight or in a year or two.

We have plans for regional detention centres, some of which are going to replace two and three and four old jails. We announced a priority programme. We announced the Quinte regional detention centre; if it has not gone to second tender yet, it is going momentarily. We did not like the cost of the first one and some changes had to be made in view of the work release programme we had in mind.

We pointed out that there were five which were going to get priority. Grey-Bruce is not one of them, because even though Grey-Bruce is, as he said, a pretty shocking place, so are most of the other 34 or 35 and some of them are in worse condition. I might tell the hon. member that priority is given to those, having regard to the condition and the number of prisoners they have to handle. These were the priorities which were set up.

I also announced that in the meantime we were going to take care of repairs, renovations and equipment in the other jails which it appeared were not going to be replaced within a reasonable length of time. And this is precisely what we have proceeded to do—Grey-Bruce, in fact, is one of those jails—and most if them either have had renovations done or are having them done at the present time.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member would just contain himself, I will read him the list. Completed since December 31, 1967: Install shelving and floor tile clothing room, install stair treads, repair jail roof and drains, install—

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept a question at this point?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if the hon. member cannot wait—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member has directed numerous questions to the hon. Minister, who is attempting to answer them now. Perhaps he will wait until the Minister has answered those questions.

Mr. Sargent: At this point it is very important I ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sure it will be just as important if the hon. member will wait a minute.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Why does the Minister not let him ask it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Install window screens, renovate the medical office, install tile floor chapel and admitting room. Equipment purchases and installation since December 31, 1967: Kitchen equipment—assorted handtools, etc., laundry equipment, maintenance equipment—floor polisher, etc., medical equipment. Inmate supplies, clothing, playing cards, etc., security equipment, office equipment and staff supplies.

Approved and ordered but not yet received as of this date—in other words, there is money in the estimates which has been approved previously and these have been on order—corridor—cell equipment, beds and mattresses, office equipment, more laundry equipment—a washer and dryer, kitchen equipment—electric stove, and other maintenance supplies.

That, I certainly think, Mr. Chairman, is evidence that we are doing what we can across this province, having regard for the fact that we took over all of these old jails in one fell swoop and I am sure the taxpayer can understand that we have to do this within reason, having regard for how much money is available. There are renovations being made in these jails right across the province and plans are well advanced for some of them to be replaced.

Now, the other matter which the hon. member has raised, and which I will answer if he likes, is about his visit to the institution. Would he like me to answer that now or does he have another one in connection with equipment?

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask these questions now, Mr. Chairman. I am not talking about renovations, I am not talking about tile floors or floor polishers, I am talking about the principle of the punitive approach you have today in these institutions. Bearing in mind that some of the people in those places now are not guilty, they are in there before they are proven guilty, but you treat them like criminals in that they are held in these dungeon-like cells until they come to trial.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What would the hon. member suggest we do?

Mr. Sargent: I suggest that you take away those small, little narrow boxes they cannot sit around in, give them mattresses on their beds and give them decent plumbing and let them have some light so they can live like human beings.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just told the hon. member that this is precisely the thing we are doing. He mentioned beds and mattresses; I told him that these were on order.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister told me this six years ago, the same old nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not true, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I tell you that it is true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will get *Hansard* and read to me any statement I made of that nature I will be glad to apologize.

Mr. Sargent: That the whole matter was in hand; that it would be fixed up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was not the Minister six years ago and we did not even have any plans for taking over the jails six years ago. We just took them over in July of 1968.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister has a trying job in that department when the government will not give him the funds, but he should not say things unless he can back them up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will back up everything I say.

Mr. Sargent: He says it is unfair to taxpayers. Are these people not taxpayers? Is it not unfair to taxpayers that you are spending \$15 million for lush offices for yourselves? Do you worry about floor polishers or toilets or your operations in here?

These people are human beings and the Minister says it is unfair to the taxpayers, but you spend \$15 million for your lush set-up here and you call this democracy. I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister got a more humane approach and visited those jails and spent a week there himself sometime.

Mr. Sopha: He is the man who has two offices, you know.

Mr. Sargent: Two lush offices, right.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Did the member visit the jail when he was mayor of Owen Sound?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member like to answer the question that was interjected? When the hon. member was mayor of that city, when it was under his control, what did he do for it? He did not

put a dime into it. Why did he not when he was mayor?

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much. As members probably know, it was a combined city and county jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, why did you not spend some money on it?

Mr. Sargent: We did, we took it over and we started to spend money on it. Being a municipality, we had no money and I came in here and I said this to the Minister, and he said, "Don't worry, we are going to build a regional jail."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member did not give a damn what was happening to the inmates in that institution, and the only time they have been getting any attention is since the province took them over. Now they are getting some attention. And now that this province has taken them over you want us to go out and spend \$200 million overnight, and you know that is impossible.

We are doing everything possible to give them a humane place to stay in, and we are doing everything possible to see that it is done as soon as possible, having regard for the money available. That is all I can tell the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has said that I do not give a damn about the people in those institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said you did not while you were there.

Mr. Sargent: Even though the institutions were taken over by the province as little as two years ago, and four years ago *Hansard* will show that the Minister promised us—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In July of 1968.

Mr. Sargent: No, no, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of record that he kept telling us six years ago that this thing would be corrected, and the situation is still the same today and it will be the same ten years from now if we listen and believe this Minister.

Now I have never found the Minister unfair, but when he says I do not give a damn for these people, he is completely wrong—and every member of this House knows that is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but you would not put your money where your mouth is when you were mayor.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am saying very honestly we did not have the money. We had a tough time—we had to put in a sewage system.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is why we took over from you—so we could do it, and we are doing it.

Mr. Sargent: When?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are doing it now.

Mr. Sargent: You are not doing it now.

Mr. Sopha: After they are in office 24 years.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402?

Mr. Sargent: I am still speaking on this vote, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about the treatment of these jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked me another question. Will he give me a chance to answer it?

Mr. Sargent: Before you forget it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, because I am writing down the questions and I cannot answer more than two or three at a time. He mentioned something about going into the institution—and this is the thing I am upset about more than anything else—the attempt being made to create the impression, by two or three members of this Legislature, that we carry out some sort of a Gestapo system in our institutions; that when the hon. member goes in we will not let him speak to any of the inmates.

I will ask him this—

Mr. Sargent: Alone!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Alone, yes. I know what he is referring to. It is the policy of the department that nobody goes into the corridors unescorted, and that applies to me as well. When the Minister went into these institutions—

Mr. Sargent: I can believe that of you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will just wait I will explain why. There is a great danger involved.

Mr. Sargent: You are taking your life in your hands.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a great danger involved and I will tell the hon. member that sometimes he may be taking his life

in his hands if he goes into those corridors alone. I will also tell him there have been instances when prominent visitors—like the member for Grey-Bruce—have been used as hostages, which created a riot.

Mr. Sargent: Name one!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course there have been. Let me ask the hon. member this—was he not offered by the governor of that jail the opportunity to interview any inmate in the governor's office; to go into that office and lock himself in with any inmate he wanted to talk to privately, but he would not allow him to go into the corridors unescorted, for his own safety? Was he given this offer by the governor?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Was this reported immediately after this visit?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, it was reported immediately after, and this is precisely the reason why I mentioned that the other day. So that when a member gets up in the House and makes such an accusation the Minister is in a position to find out what in the world did happen.

He told me today he was not allowed to interview any prisoner by himself. Is it not just as well that the governor is in a position to say, "He objected to this but I offered him my own office in which to interview the prisoner by himself." Is there anything wrong with the Minister being advised so that he can give an answer immediately?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in this way I cannot answer the Minister's question, because when I came down to the governor's office there was a heated exchange, as you will understand. He said, in fact, "You could use that desk there, and I could stand here, and you could interview the prisoner over there". I said, "I mean in private." It was Jim Stanton. He is doing a damn good job, and I have no complaint against the operation. I am complaining about the overall policy of the punitive approach.

I asked the guard, "These questions I ask the prisoner, will the governor question you afterwards?" And he said, "Yes, he will; he will question me about what you asked the prisoner".

Now I ask you, what chance—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the governor agree to that? And do you prefer to believe the inmate or the governor?

Mr. Sargent: The guard admitted to that. The guard said, "If the governor asks me

what you asked the prisoner I have to tell him".

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the governor would ask the guard that—

Mr. Sargent: He said the governor would ask him and the guard admitted to this. We are not getting any place because you have got your hackles up and you are not going to do a thing, anyway. We used to have a train in Owen Sound that was always late. So instead of running by a clock they put a calendar up. Give this to the Minister please. It is a calendar; he can wear it on his wrist watch. That is how far he is behind the times.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the name of one of your companies on it?

Mr. Sargent: No, that is a free ride. We have on page 90 of this report the number of inmates remaining in custody as of March 31, 1968—2,916.

Mr. Sopha: It leads the way in Canada.

Mr. Sargent: We lead the way in Canada. And we have a total staff here of 3,553, and we have 2,916 people in custody. Now that is a pretty healthy, efficient operation you are running there. It is one and a half staff per person remaining in custody.

Mr. Sopha: We have twice as many in jail as in the province of Quebec. The population is one-fifth more.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the hon. member, he is referring to the number who are in reformatories, and he is referring to the staff which is covering reformatories, jails and training schools, which is entirely different.

Mr. Sargent: I am referring to page 90—number in custody in all operations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is male and female institutions. Those people as per the time of this report, are in reformatories only.

Mr. Sargent: How many employees do you have? Is this right, 3,500 employees?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, let us get the full picture on the record. As of March 9, 1969, we had in our reformatories, industrial farms and training centres, clinics, female institutions and on parole, a total of 3,820.

We had in the training schools—

Mr. Sargent: Where is that in the report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is in the report; you will find it in the training school section. We had in the training schools as of March 9, this year, 1,434 and 2,125 on placement. I have not even referred to the jails here. I do not have a list of the jails. At this particular time, the jails themselves must take about 800 employees, because we took over about 800 employees when we took over the jails. So the hon. member is getting his figures confused.

Mr. Sargent: Then what is the ratio of staff to inmates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It would depend upon the institution.

Mr. Sargent: I am asking overall.

Mr. Sopha: It is one and a half to one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Hardly that. About 1 to 3, I am told, overall.

Mr. Sargent: That is one employee to 3 inmates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So that the hon. member will not fall into a trap, he must remember that we have to have three 8-hour shifts—24-hour duty.

Mr. Sargent: Finally, a young chap came to me. He had been released from one of your institutions; he had no money and he had the old trouble of getting a job because everybody knew he was an ex-con of one of your institutions. I asked him what he was trained for and he said he was trained to sew. That is all he was trained to when he went out into life after two years in one of your colleges.

Mr. MacDonald: We need good tailors.

Mr. Sargent: And I find other chaps who are trained to make licence plates. We do not have too many of these institutions around, where you go to get a job to make plates. You have a monopoly on the licence plate deal. And the tailors pretty well cannot use these chaps. I have this fellow's name on file, and I will give it to you. But you will have some answers for that one, too. He is a special case—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member want me to answer it for him?

Mr. Sargent: I do not know.

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

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, regarding this vote we are speaking on now—rehabilitation for adult offenders—the total amount to be spent is \$32,721,000. It is a lot of money and it is a worthy expenditure. The Minister, a few hundred words back, answering the member for Grey-Bruce, impressed me in that a lot of work had been done in making improvements in the brick and mortar aspects of our institutions.

That was the start of the hon. member's complaint. I want to get back to this question of medical treatment for the adult offenders in the institutions. The member for High Park said in his opening remarks that this Minister has done a good job in his department over the years. But it is hard to see this, because the province—and I think we have to admit it—is far behind in up-to-date practices and treatments. But I have to admit, also, that a good job has been done.

But sometimes the attitude of the Minister makes me wonder. It is under some pressure that his impressions are given and he might not realize it. When he made the statement on the specific case related by the member for High Park that this was one of those chronic beefers, that you have those in the institutions, who long to write letters every day and make complaints, I would think those are the type of people that we have to give our attention to if we are going to carry out the main intent of this expenditure—rehabilitation of adult offenders.

If they are not given the kind of treatment in there, in regard to the future rehabilitation when they come out, it is not going to work. I am going to put it in this sense. The hon. member for High Park gave a specific case. I want to ask the question as to whether the inmates have a complete medical when they go in, including dental and otherwise, and if they have periodic dental inspection.

Everyone knows, in attempting to look after themselves physically, that dental care is one of the most important as far as their physical being goes. I go to my specialist twice a year, and it is a costly affair. He tells me each time that I had better smarten up because my gums are a little bit deteriorated, and if I do not keep up the treatment I am going to have trouble. To get back to the point I am trying to make, and that is the attitude of the Minister towards a person he would class as a chronic "beef", one that wants to write letters every day and to everyone he can think of. And those are the people, I think, we should give the attention to. I think they have got to be made to understand that if

they want to write a letter every day with a grievance, that grievance should be looked at and should be paid attention to if we are going to bring them out of there with some feeling that there is someone that cares and that they are going to be prepared to take the future treatment under parole, or whatever we have in the future.

I do not think that the Minister should say that the kind we are happy with are those that are subdued and timid and withdrawn; that just sit there and accept their part in life. They alone are not the kind we are really concerned with. Those people have to be pulled out and made to understand that there is something different in this life for them. Those that beef every day, have got nothing else to do I would assume, other than the usual routine; they have got to have an understanding.

I think that every letter they want to write and every grievance they have got should be listened to, if we are going to carry out the programme that is set out in this large expenditure. I do not like the Minister's attitude that they are chronic beefers. I think we have to set up someone in the institution to listen to the chronic beeper. So that by the time he is ready to come out he has an understanding that, well, my beefing has got to someone and I now understand that there are some differences.

Now if we go on to the after-care of adult offenders and the amount of money that we are expending in hand-outs to the Salvation Army, John Howard Society, Elizabeth Fry and so on, that is not enough money in my opinion. Sometime or other we have to take a realistic look at the contribution we make to those groups. We have to tie that in with the job that is being done inside the institution, with that being done outside the institution and it has to be a joint programme closely related so that the overall expenditure does show some results in the long run.

So, as a main question, do the inmates get a regular dental inspection, on admission and periodically while they are in there, so that they feel they have some attention being given to them in regard to an important element of their health?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I must tell the hon. member that they do not get dental inspection when they come in at every institution. I must also tell the hon. member that we do not have full-time medical men at every institution, either. That is one of our problems. Whether, if we could have a

dentist at each institution, we should, is another matter. I am not too sure we should. Every person is examined by a medical man when he comes into an institution. If there is anything indicated that needs some attention which cannot be had in the institution, someone is brought in or the inmate is sent out. We have often taken inmates to a hospital, or brought in other doctors when it was indicated.

I must tell the hon. member, in referring to a particular situation at Monteith, that I think perhaps if I had a long time to think about it, I would not have expressed myself in the way I did about the man being a chronic complainer, because it could give the wrong impression. I must tell the hon. member too, I must admit that it is very difficult, sometimes, not to become cynical about these things.

The kind of person I am talking about, I should say, the chronic complainer, we have files and files and files on them and, of course, we would like to help them. We would like to help them become different persons so that they would not have these complaints, but there is only so much you can do in one day. When there are members who will accept the complaint just on the face of it and start a lot of correspondence going, there is a lot of time and energy expended on something which, apparently has been gone into before on numerous occasions with no very great degree of success.

As far as, Monteith is concerned, I am advised that the inmates are screened through the medical office because the dentist in the district, that is at Iroquois Falls, asked for this. He says he is too busy to see everybody. He is just too busy to see everybody and he wants it done the way it is done. He wants the doctor to look at the inmate, and if it is the doctor's view that he needs a dentist that is the time to get in touch with him.

Now, in this case it was the doctor's view that he did not need a dentist, and that does not mean that I am callous regarding any person's needs in the institution. The fact is I am in the position of saying that the doctor in the institution says he does not need to see a dentist.

Now if I only had that, or ten or 15 others, at any one time to deal with, I could deal with them and even then perhaps take a chance and say, "well, doctor, look at this again," "look at another one again," and perhaps I might ask the doctor to make an exception of this. But the hon. member must appreciate that I am dealing with thousands

of inmates, thousands of them, right across the province. All some of them have to find out, is that all they have to do is write a letter of this nature, particularly if it is to a member of the Legislature, and in order for me to satisfy that member of the Legislature, I go over the doctor's head. This would not help, either for the discipline or for the rehabilitation in the institution.

The point I am making, perhaps not too well, is that I have to have confidence in somebody, and in medical matters I have to have confidence in the doctor at the institution. It will have to be a very serious matter before I take it upon myself to go over the head of the doctor, and, quite frankly, this is not the kind of case that seemed to be so terribly serious that I should go over the head of the doctor. It is the sort of thing that I think a doctor can give an opinion on. Now, if the hon. member for High Park does not think so, if he does not think the doctor should have given his opinion, then once again I repeat, it is a matter between two doctors.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not say the doctor should not give his opinion. What I said was, that the Minister received what appeared to be a legitimate complaint and he should have had a dentist see the man. Do not change the words I said, please, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is, I receive all sorts of letters like this.

Mr. Shulman: Well, you should pay attention to them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do pay attention to them, but after a while you just make up your mind it is impossible, it is just impossible to call in a dentist or a doctor or to order other medication, merely because an inmate feels he wants it or needs it. You have got to take the advice of the medical man who is in charge of the institution and that is what we did in this case.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that it is not often I disagree with the member for Hamilton East. But I must disagree with him on one thing. I do not think this Minister is doing a good job and if I gave that impression in my speech—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wondered whether you would let that pass.

Mr. Shulman: If I gave that impression in my speech, I certainly want to correct it.

What I said was, he is doing a good job in comparison with the palaeolithic who preceded him in that job and a neanderthal like the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), or the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), only in comparison to them, is he doing a good job. He is doing a terrible job.

However, to go on. The Minister cannot receive—

Mr. Gisborn: They both misunderstood me.

An hon. member: I agree with you.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister could not receive, from every member of this Legislature, I doubt, in total more than 200 letters a year if that. I represent my party in the department of reform institutions and I doubt if my secretary sends more than 20 letters in a year if that many, to the Minister about specific cases. Perhaps on the outside 30. Certainly it could not be more than that. Is it impossible for the Minister to answer the few dozen letters he receives from the members, to investigate them and to verify whether or not they are legitimate complaints and whether or not something should be done, instead—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely the hon. member does not think that the only letters I receive are from members of the Legislature. I get literally hundreds of letters, written by the inmates to me.

Mr. Shulman: And each and every one of them should require, some thought and some care.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They do get some thought and some care.

Mr. Shulman: You have a responsibility to do your job.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But, having regard for the information we have in the files, I have to make a decision on that basis. And on that basis, a medical decision of this nature, as far as I was concerned, as far as my officials were concerned, had to be left in the hands of the medical man at the institution.

Mr. Shulman: Well I do not wish to belabour this particular point but let me say again, you do not have a regular dental service. If a man is having a dental problem, regardless of what a doctor has said, if someone be it a member, be it the family or be it the inmate, writes a letter to the

Minister requesting an opportunity to see a dentist, surely this is not an unreasonable request.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is unreasonable having regard for the number of people we have in our care and the nature of a great many of them. It would just be utterly impossible.

I have just been handed a note by our director of professional services who states that the registrar of the Dental Academy agrees that although it would obviously be better if a dentist were available to diagnose all dental problems, the practicalities demand screening by available medical officers when a dentist is not readily available.

Mr. Shulman: No disagreement with you on that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that what happened?

Mr. Shulman: There is no disagreement with that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well is this not precisely what happened?

Mr. Shulman: That is not precisely what happened. The man did not get better because he could not get satisfaction. He wrote his member of Parliament, the member wrote you asking to see a dentist and you said, no. That is what happened.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to where we left off the other night because I have received certain other information that I am sure the Minister will appreciate and certain other complaints.

Before I start, I want to make reference to a letter that the Minister addressed to me saying that there were certain methods of communication of ideas and so on, as to the civil service, for discussion of change. In speaking to some of the residents at Burwash as recently as last night, Mr. Chairman, they tell me—and some of these are long time residents—that there has been no, just absolutely no method of communication for ideas with respect to parole or with respect to problems with the village. And, that this has been non-existent for years.

I might ask the Minister, if this did exist, why then were various services removed without discussing it with the people if there was an avenue of communication? That is one point.

The next point I would like to ask the Minister is, why the single men working in Burwash are not allowed to have a telephone in their room? I understand it has something to do with the prisoners getting at the telephones in the rooms. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is easily overcome. All you do is put a jack in the wall and the man removes his telephone and locks it up when he goes to work. But certainly, men who have been there for 15 years, certainly should not have to go to the church to see if they can make a phone call, as they are being forced to do at the present time. Certainly, the treatment of these people in Burwash, guards and people who work for this government, is just atrocious.

The next point—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Can we deal with that?

Mr. Martel: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The suggestion the hon. member makes is rather an intriguing one, sounds like a good idea. I think I said this about something he mentioned last year. As a matter of fact it is being considered in the new regulations.

I do not know why this could not be put into effect. The suggestion the hon. member makes is that the telephones could be put into a jack and pulled out, but, he obviously knows one of the reasons why it has not been permitted in the first place. I suppose at the time this rule was put into effect there were no such things as jacks. You had the phone affixed. I suppose, like a lot of other things in large institutions, particularly an organization like Burwash, some things which were put into effect years ago just have never been changed and should be changed.

Now what bothers me really, is the suggestion, or the statement, that there is a lack of communication. Does the hon. member for example, know whether this recommendation was ever made at the branch level?

Mr. Martel: It was discussed but it was turned down, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Turned down at what level?

Mr. Martel: Apparently with the superintendent. He just does not go along with the idea and apparently it was just thrown out the window, from the information I have received.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because, I recall a short while ago—a year or so ago, when there

was a discussion about the oil burners. They wanted to get away from the coal and this was brought up at the branch level and it was discussed. They now have oil burners. I am just wondering why this was not discussed. Perhaps it was. Perhaps it was found to be impractical. If the hon. member tells me that he has been told, by staff who have been there a considerable length of time, that this was discussed and was turned down, I will find out if in fact it was discussed and when and what happened to the suggestions, because, as I say, on the face of it, it appears like a good idea.

Mr. Martel: Well this is the whole point I am making, Mr. Chairman, there does not seem to be communication in Burwash. This is the thing that is disturbing the residents in Burwash, the communication between the people who work there and the Civil Service Association. Changes are brought about or are discussed or proposed changes that are discussed just seem to be non-existent. This is what they are so frustrated about. Things are withdrawn and they have no discussion or no communication whereby their position on these matters can be advanced. This is the problem in this area, Mr. Chairman, and this is what disturbs me so much.

We might have got away with some proper discussion on the store, if there had been discussion, but there was none, there was no dialogue between the residents who worked there and the fact that another service was being withdrawn. This is what is frustrating those people working for the department there.

The last point I would like to ask the Minister about is the material on the record. I mentioned it to him the other night after the House adjourned and he was going to look up the answer as to whether the material was now going on the records, as I had suggested last year, on the psychological makeup of the prisoners and so on. The Minister indicated to me that he would get the reply.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I think I did advise the hon. member that this had been done.

Mr. Martel: You were not sure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did I say I was not sure?

Mr. Martel: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I had the impression that I did not. In any case, here is the

answer: Senior officials of the department met in June, 1968, to consider this proposal. It was a proposal of the hon. member. It was agreed that information relating to medical condition, and that relating to a history of violent acts, could be placed on the identification card in code. Checking with the superintendent on March 9, 1969, revealed that the following data on each inmate was placed on the cards carried by each correctional officer: Name, institution number, where sentenced, photograph—if convicted of an indictable offence—notations such as follows: escaped, and the particular year, wanted by the police, history of drug abuse, epilepsy, etc.

That is, any unusual conditions are recorded on the card, which the officer in charge of the inmate picks up when he assumes responsibility for the inmate. And, Dr. Hutchison adds, it is felt that this should be adequate for the purposes Mr. Martel had in mind. I might tell him that I would think so too; and I might also tell him that this is perfect evidence that we are pleased to accept any good, constructive ideas that we get from any source, particularly a member of the Legislature.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the rehabilitation of adult offenders is one of the two most important functions of this department, and that, together with the juvenile offender rehabilitation, there is no doubt that the \$33 million that we are spending should be spent. I am just curious to know what results we are getting from the expenditure of this money.

Can the Minister indicate to me how many of the inmates presently in the institutions in Ontario are there for the second or third time and how many are first offenders, and if this is a decrease or an increase percentage-wise from last year, or how this measures up in terms of whether the rehabilitation is actually working, and whether the programme that you presently have is making any impact?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will find this information on page 94, albeit not a comparison with the previous year, because this is the first year we have had this kind of detailed information. I should also tell the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, that there are very few jurisdictions in North America which give this kind of detail, and this kind of detail was first provided to the Legislature a few years ago so that we could have precisely this kind of discussion.

He will note the information there shows—no previous reformatory sentence, 58.4 per cent; one reformatory sentence, 14.6 per cent; two reformatory sentences, 7.4 per cent; three reformatory sentences, 4.4 per cent; and four or more reformatory sentences, 15.2 per cent.

I think you will find that this does not really add up to exactly the same figure as the number of inmates we have had. It is because there are a number of instances where the information has not been provided or is not available.

Mr. Deans: I am not going to fight with you for two or three per cent. What I want to know is, is there any way to compare this? It is very difficult to compare the programme you presently have with what went on in years gone by because of the takeover of the county system, but is there any way that we might compare this with what was previously within the jurisdiction of the Minister, in terms of the percentage of first and second offenders and whether or not the money that we are spending—the purpose that we are spending it on, the reason that we are spending it—are actually producing anything in terms of the reduction of the returns to penitentiary, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is really referring to the question, do we have the kind of research that will provide this? He will recall that we set up a department of research for the first time, I think, maybe three or four years ago, and through this department of research this is what we are attempting to accomplish. It is not an easy thing, and at the moment I would say it is practically an impossible task, merely because we have an overlapping of jurisdiction.

We are now engaged with the federal government in a programme whereby, hopefully, we will have information funnelled, presumably to Ottawa, from all the various provinces and back, so that we will at least have some information to do this kind of research which will be required to bring out the true rates of recidivism. It is very difficult. I have been handed a quotation from the Third United Nations Congress on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders. I attended this meeting and I remember this was quite a subject for discussion, but I think just a couple of quotations from this will outline the difficulty.

In attempting to make a satisfactory assessment of the nature and extent of recidivism, one is immediately hampered

by the lack of the reliable and comparable data needed.

And further:

Indeed there have even been frequent calls for the establishment of internationally agreed upon norms for a working definition of recidivism to assist in its measurement nationally, and to allow for meaningful international comparability.

It is a most difficult task. I think I mentioned the other day, too, that even comparing one jurisdiction with another has so many implications that it would not necessarily be accurate. However, in spite of the fact that it is a difficult task, I am looking forward to the day in the not-too-distant future when at least we on this continent can have some proper records that will help us arrive at just how fruitful the work is that we are doing. That is the purpose of research to a large extent. Are we spending our money in the right way? What are we accomplishing? And we can only guess at it now to a large extent.

We did some research out at the Brampton training centre—I think I mentioned this last year or the year before. We did it for a period of five years after the inmates left. This, of course, was on a voluntary basis. We got it from the RCMP figures. About 65 per cent of those who left the training centre at least had not been convicted of another offence—for at least five years after having left the Brampton training centre. But, as I say, it is most difficult.

There are other figures. I could give the hon. member examples on parole. This is, of course, not too difficult to get. What are the percentages of paroles granted across the continent? What is the percentage of success that they have on their paroles? This sort of thing is easily available. The hon. member will also appreciate that another one of the difficulties is that after a man has served his sentence he is free to go where he chooses and he does not have to provide you with the information. Some judges, as a matter of fact, recently have been adding probation to the tail end of a sentence, whereas probation is generally known as a sentence in place of imprisonment—now the thought is that they give a probationary period.

There is a difference of opinion, I believe I can say, in correctional circles as to whether this should be done or not. There is a view that the probation period should be added at the end of a sentence so that the person having left the institution would be subject to some sort of supervision. If that became

the case, then we would be in a position to find out if, in fact, that person has really been rehabilitated. This would not necessarily prove it either; he may just be smart and stay out of trouble.

But obviously, in a general way, I must say to the hon. member that these figures that are thrown about by many people and sometimes by organizations who, in order to get public support for their work—worthy as their work may be—throw out some fantastic records of recidivism. I have heard the figure 80 and 82 per cent, and have never been able to nail it. I have tried for five years to nail down where that figure came from, and it is just impossible to do it. At least I have not been able to find it, nor have any members of my staff.

I do not know where they got this figure, because, obviously, if we have some 4,000 inmates in our institutions in any given day, and every year there was a rate of recidivism of 82 per cent, all the jails and institutions in this whole province would not hold all those who have been repeating over the last 20 years.

We have to be very careful, when we talk of the number of people in prisons, whether in Canada, or Ontario. I do not think anyone has ever said Ontario, I think they are talking about Canada generally in this respect—and they compare us with other jurisdictions. They say we have imprisoned more people than any other jurisdiction in the world.

But when we use figures we have to be very careful, because there are very many people who keep coming back for breaches of The Liquor Control Act, for example. In fact, I remember one man who had been in an institution 38 times in one year. So when you are using these figures you may be talking about 100 or 200 or 500 or 1,000 or 3,000 who are the ones who keep coming back. If that is the case, then the rate of recidivism in that particular group alone is high whereas generally it could be very low. I have tried to explain some of the things involved.

Mr. Deans: I can understand. I am pleased the Minister pointed this out; I had missed it as I went through them. In the group of the four or more reformatory sentences, there are more of that than any of the others with the exception of the "no previous" reformatory sentences. What special type of rehabilitation services are we presently undertaking to try to get to this very large group, this is 15.2 per cent of the total? Are we undertaking any special type of rehabilitation service to try

and meet with their particular needs? There is obviously something drastically wrong with this group of people. How do we cope with this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a good question but a most difficult one to answer. Some of these people—a great many of them—may have drug problems and they may have alcohol problems. It is most difficult. I should remind the hon. member—perhaps he was not in the House when this came out in the debates—that the hon. member for High Park mentioned some time ago the report of a select committee of this Legislature—I think it was in 1954—which went into the whole correctional system. As a matter of fact their recommendation, unanimously adopted by all the members of that committee, represented by all the parties in this House, was that we ignore 75 per cent of those people who come into our institutions in respect of rehabilitation; that they were not rehabilitative.

Mr. Deans: I do not believe it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is in the report. I read it in the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will get the report again. They said that 75 per cent—I think that was the figure—in their view were not subject to being reformed. Instead of wasting our time—if they did not use that term, that was the import of their suggestion—we should concentrate on the 25 per cent who are apparently reformable.

I do not agree with this. I will admit that sometimes one is tempted to come to that conclusion, but I do not agree with this. I would certainly hope that the proportion of those we can do something with is greater than 25 per cent, and we will have to try. Maybe they did not say 75 per cent; perhaps they said the larger group. I have an idea it was 75 per cent.

Mr. Shulman: You had to take that back last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that report. I do not think I took it back last year either. The hon. member can, while he has a spare moment, ask for the *Hansard*. He is pretty quick at looking these things up.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Does the Minister have a completion date for the regional jail at Quinte? I do not think that has been brought up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not too sure that it has gone to tender yet—it may have—so I cannot give the hon member the completion date. I think I did point out that we had called for tenders a year or so ago. The costs came in and they were much higher than we had calculated. We sent them back for further tenders, and then we had to make some changes in view of our decision to have a live-in, work-out programme.

The live-in, work-out programme is going to utilize the regional detention centre plan, so changes had to be made again. And it may very well be that tenders are out now. I would suggest that during the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works the member might ask him that.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, just one final question. I am curious, now that we are going to have the permanent licence plate in Ontario, as to what steps the department is taking to introduce some other occupational therapy, you might call it, into the Millbrook area, so that they will be able to be kept busy rehabilitating themselves?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is what the Trades and Industries Advisory Board is looking into right now. We appreciate we are moving away from at least the annual plates and that something—

Mr. Deans: We had hoped it was permanent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not in a position to say that.

Mr. Deans: The Minister has said it already.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The chairman of the Trades and Industries Advisory Board has been given this as a term of reference of fairly high priority, so we will be having an answer from him, I imagine, in a month or two.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister advise, Mr. Chairman, if he has any plans to increase the *per diem* rate of pay for people working in the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be rough with the hon. member, but really we went over this the other day. Did he read the announcement in his hometown papers?

Mr. Sargent: If I knew I would not ask the Minister. I am sorry I cannot be here all the time when he is making a speech. I

would like the information. Can the Minister not just tell me what I want to know?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We discussed it here.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry, I would like to know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not mind standing here and answering; I was just thinking about the other members.

An hon. member: We do not mind.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do not mind? Fine. The answer is, yes.

Mr. Sargent: How much?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All inmates in reformatories, clinics, and forestry camps, and so on, are going to get an incentive allowance up to \$5 a week, some of which they will be able to spend at a canteen and some of which will be put away for their release.

Mr. Sargent: What are the Minister's plans for training of people in county jails, say, over 30 days?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In county jails, if they are going to be over 30 days, we usually take them out of the county jail and bring them into the reformatory system—at least this will be so until the new regional detention centres are built.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister agree then that there should be nothing for them to do but play cards in county jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All the member has to do is read my own speeches. I cannot think of anything more demoralizing than sitting around a county jail doing nothing. That is why we take them out of the county jails if their sentence is longer than 30 days. I may be anticipating what the hon. member is going to say when I say that we cannot do anything about someone who is awaiting trial; there is nothing we can do about it. The law says he must be kept awaiting trial and he must be kept at a maximum security institution. Obviously, if he is being charged with a serious offence, he has to be kept in maximum security. There are very few things even under our new regional detention centre plan we are going to be able to do with this kind of a prisoner. In the first place, you cannot force him to work. In the eyes of the law he is an innocent man, and aside from keeping his own cell clean, there is nothing else you can require him to do.

Mr. Sargent: Is the Minister going to upgrade their library?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will read this again, if I have to.

Mr. Sargent: Do not bother — yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have not only upgraded them, but it was pointed out that as of last Tuesday or Thursday, we had already placed almost 5,000 new books in the county jails, and more are coming.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this has been mentioned before; if it has, I will look it up—as certain members should—in *Hansard*.

Item 5, a grant to the Sudbury board of education. It is not in the previous years, that I can discover. What is this \$450,000?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, I was trying to listen to two people at one time. The \$450,000 to—?

Mr. Lawlor: Sudbury board of education.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is an addition to the school being built in the township of Wanup. Instead of us keeping our old school and them having difficulty paying for their new addition, the department has decided that we would help them build the addition to the school. Children of the staff at Burwash will be attending this school on some financial arrangements which have already been agreed upon.

Mr. Chairman, this is the discussion we get into every year about the report of the select committee. The select committee, in fact, just talked about a large number, they did not talk about 75 per cent.

Mr. Shulman: Ah, thank you very much, the Minister has to take it back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, the hon. member is also playing with words, because when he brought this to my attention last year—you will recall that there was some discussion between myself and the hon. member for High Park as to the fact that I had misinformed the House—that was the term he was using last year—regarding—

Mr. Shulman: I am a little more direct this year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—regarding the report of the select committee regarding the number

of reformables and the number of unreformables, and at that time I said that it probably was in *Hansard*, as a result of being reported.

I have now had this *Hansard* looked up for me, and with your permission, sir, I would like to quote from page 399, *Hansard*, of March 8 of 1954, when the select committee report was being discussed. Mr. Stewart, who, of course, was the Progressive Conservative member on the Committee and the chairman, said, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, we made a study of this, and the ratio—

If one should recall parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, when he says that we made a study of this, he is referring to the committee:

—the ratio between jail reformables is about 30 per cent as against 70 per cent who are not reformables. In our provincial institutions about 20 per cent are reformable, while the other 80 per cent are not.

Further on in the same *Hansard*, page 403, the Liberal representative on the committee, Mr. Oliver, who was leader of the Opposition, I think it does not make any difference, he was a member of the committee—he stated, referring to the reformatory system, and I quote:

They are dealing with 100 per cent of the institutional population. There are, I suppose, only between 20 and 25 per cent—

Mr. Sargent: That is one thing you can believe in there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

—20 and 25 per cent of that population whom it is possible to reform, yet our efforts are directed towards 100 per cent.

There was some criticism later on, as to why we should really put all that work into the whole 100 per cent. The representative from the CCF at the time, Mr. Grummett, at page 406 states:

The committee believes the institution at Burwash should be made an Ontario prison and those who are not reformable should be sent to that institution, so that officers attempting to reform men can concentrate their efforts on the 20 or 25 per cent who are reformable.

So the fact that it was not actually the figure quoted in the report, but the fact that the leaders of the three parties who were on the committee mentioned this, I think, was a fair reason for my feeling that I was speaking the facts.

Mr. Shulman: You are misquoting the report. I have got the report and it just does not say it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402? The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The other day, in discussions of bonding, I addressed some remarks to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and gave some cognizance to what they were doing at the federal level, particularly through Larry Pernell, as he then was Solicitor General, and the John Howard Society. They were trying to work out some formulae whereby the people could be rehabilitated into the labour market, and I pointed out the enormous range of activities and work that men were excluded from—which of course obviously has the effect of driving them back into crime simply in order to live at all.

The Minister during those remarks made a number of interjections, protesting, as I understood it, that they, and that he personally, were very much concerned on this issue. But as I understood him he had some kind of relation with the insurance companies—that they were seeking to work out bonding relations—but I have never brought him to any state of clarity on this. Would the Minister care to tell this House what steps he is taking, what decisions have been reached, if any at this state, with respect to this whole problem of having people bonded?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have something prepared, Mr. Chairman, on this particular subject, and perhaps I might refer the hon. member to it: It is often assumed that anyone male or female, with a criminal record stands little chance of being issued a fidelity bond, but in general a bonding company rarely automatically refuses to bond an ex-inmate.

Mr. Shulman: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So far as The Department of Correctional Services is concerned, an aftercare officer for the department will approach an insurance company on behalf of the inmate considered to be a good risk. That is, we would assess the man in terms of his previous work record and dependability. This arrangement has worked satisfactorily for the last five years.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, that is not true. I gave an example to prove it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: However, it must be remembered that certain types of criminal records exclude some inmates from being bonded for certain positions. It must also be understood that bonding is not the total problem in job finding for this group of workers. Investigation has revealed that some inability to secure a bond and a job has been the result of an unsatisfactory work

record, rather than simply because of a criminal record.

Blanket bonding is becoming prevalent as more and more companies call for bonding of such workers as delivery men, truckers and some warehouse employees, whether or not they are handling money. All insurance companies will not issue a blanket bond that will include an ex-inmate. Some will, however, examine the ex-inmate's record and present status, with a view to issuing an individual bond. The system we are using at the present time is working fairly well, although we are always looking for improvements.

At the present time we are investigating the practices carried out in other jurisdictions as well as working with the federal government, who are also interested in this situation.

We recently had a man visit our office to thank us for our assistance in helping him to obtain a bond. We had referred this man to a bonding company approximately two years ago. He obtained the bond and has been working regularly since that time. He recently has gone into business for himself. The man in question, at the time he applied had eight previous convictions, three of which were penitentiary sentences.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I must confess some degree of disappointment with the reply of the Minister. I have spoken to high officials in the John Howard Society of recent date and I know in some publications made, I think, by Mr. Kirkpatrick—who was not the gentleman I was speaking to—of that society, that this remains an imminent and pressing and very grave problem for the John Howard Society and for anyone who is interested in rehabilitation.

So much so, that very searching and lengthy discussions went on in Ottawa about setting up a government bonding scheme whereby the government would subsidize the bonding of men. And I am sure in the literature of the John Howard Society, although I have not got it to hand, they speak of an automatic rejection, and that is within the past five years. In other words I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman, in the degree of complacency being displayed by the Minister under this particular head, that he brushes it aside as though things are working very well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said fairly well.

Mr. Shulman: They are not.

Mr. Lawlor: The point is that they are simply not. I think more far reaching discussions have to take place. If the insurance companies are not prepared to bond these individuals so that they can get back into jobs—not on a piece-meal, *ad hoc, comme ci comme ça* basis, but of a deliberate intent and in an overall way—then this government ought to move into the field again, if the insurance companies wish to abdicate it, and to see that adequate bonding is provided for people to take jobs and responsible positions in industry. It has been done in other jurisdictions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that we bond everybody?

Mr. Lawlor: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting by his comments “not to just bond them *comme ci comme ça*”, that they should be required to bond everybody that wants a bond?

Mr. Lawlor: No, but I would think that a good 85 to 90 per cent of people would be bondable—even those who have records with respect to the specific kind of offence, say larceny, a theft, breaking and entering—by the very fact that you place some kind of confidence in these individuals. Now a screening process would have to take place undoubtedly, but not the kind of exclusive screening process employed by bonding agencies in the business in order to make a profit and who will not take any element of risk, who eliminate the risk from the word “go”.

That, in effect, brings down upon your head the exclusion of a wide girth of individuals from the market. And really, in terms of what it would cost you in bonding, even for those who default, compared with what you are paying in welfare payments, in maintenance, in trying to subsidize the people in the community, in the recidivous rate that you breed by not having the proper book, in a hundred ways the cost to this government and to the people of this province; all this costs a good deal more, I suggest, than what it would be for the losses you would suffer. I see there are other jurisdictions, California being one of them, who have bonded them through government auspices, and who find that there is a negligible loss, an amazingly negligible loss that supervenes upon that.

One would think that there would be greater defalcations by individuals who were

habituated to specific kinds of crimes. Curiously enough, it does not seem to be the case. I am suggesting that you go deeper into this issue, and the thing is to rehabilitate men into the community once they are out of the jail, not to sentence them twice for the same offence. This is what this government is doing.

This is the whole mentality, not just this government but throughout the country, the whole attitude and approach to criminal matters. You can very much alleviate the financial burden on the community, make men responsible and have them enter into the life of the community. But by artificially setting a bonding restriction and not wiping those restrictions out to the greatest extent possible—to a far greater extent than what you have attempted to do at present through the private bonding institution—seems to me to be derelict in your responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a word on the bonding matter. The bonding is not working fairly well, it is not working at all. The Minister may recall, last year we brought a case into the estimates, Ron M. who had a record, who wanted to become a car salesman and was flatly refused by the bonding company on the basis that he had a record. Ultimately he got his bond only because after Ontario Automobile had refused to hire him another car company did take him on. The owner of that company put the bond up himself. And we made great efforts through the rehabilitation officer and through the department to have something done. This department did try to interfere with the bonding company, but they just would not listen. And something has to be done by government, because the bonding company are interested in one thing, and one thing only. They are not going to rehabilitate, they are interested in making money. And until government steps in and fills this void you are going to continue to force men back to crime who should receive bond and who should be in work, like selling cars, or other areas where they have to have a bond.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I just do not want to let the suggestion go by that we are complacent about the problem of bonding. If I were complacent about this I would not be engaged in meetings with the federal government and with the insurance companies. And I do not take it that insur-

ance companies are not interested in the problem because they cannot make a buck out of it, or anything of that nature. There are just as many decent people in the insurance companies as there are elsewhere, and sometimes they will do something.

Mr. Shulman: No, we are not suggesting they are not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are co-operating with us in an effort to find a solution—

Mr. Shulman: They did not co-operate with you last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to the problem that is viable. The hon. member for Lakeshore suggested that in his view 85 per cent of these people could be bonded. I must say that this is a great credit to our department, because he is suggesting that 85 per cent of them—

Mr. Shulman: Could be, in spite of your department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nevertheless, do not put any ideas into the hon. member for Lakeshore's mind. He said 85 per cent of them were bondable which, in fact means that in his view 85 per cent of them who leave our institutions have been rehabilitated and could be bonded.

Mr. Lawlor: You are always fishing for compliments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we can just convince the insurance companies—

Mr. Lawlor: Get away from that complacency.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we can just convince them that 85 per cent of the people who leave our institutions are bondable—

Mr. Lawlor: If you find the smallest sop to your wounds—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —we would be very happy. We are working with them, Mr. Chairman; we are having a fair amount of success. We want to continue our relationship with them. We think that we will come up with a better system than we have now. I am not suggesting the government is going to go into the bonding business.

Mr. Shulman: Well, more than 75 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I know what will happen if the government goes into the bond-

ing business. If the government goes into the bonding business, everyone coming out of the institutions would expect as their right that they would be bonded by the government. And you know what can happen to that. There has to be a certain amount of good, common grey matter put into this thing.

Mr. Sargent: You can bond the trust companies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You can be humane without being so soft-headed that you ruin the whole system. There are a lot of our people come out of our institutions whom I would not want on bond. There are a lot who should be bonded. There are a lot who are not being bonded who I think could be bonded, and this is what we are trying to accomplish. And we are working towards that.

Mr. Shulman: Well, they are not yet receiving the bonds.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what we are trying to accomplish, and we are working towards that. The hon. member brought one case up last year where the releasee was having difficulty getting a bond.

Mr. Shulman: Not a difficult time, an impossible time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, an impossible time. He found one case. I hope the man is working out very well now, I hope he is all right.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, he is working out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is fine. The fact that he was able to find one case—

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister like me to give him some more cases?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, please do not write any more letters. Give my staff a chance to do some work for the department.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is that the Minister is misleading the House. I deliberately said that I would bring one case in to illustrate the problem. If the Minister wishes—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wondered when he was going to start with that one.

Mr. Shulman: If the Minister wishes in all these things for me to give a number of cases I would be only too happy to do so. And then he gets up and complains of waste

of time in the House. We give individual cases to give examples of the problems. If the Minister wants a lot of cases we would be glad to supply them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I do not want to interrupt. Is the bonding clause through now?

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 402. The hon. member may bring up any point connected with vote 402.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I say with some sort of knowledge that I think your whole policy is one of degradation of a man who goes into your institutions. It is my considered opinion, after years of being in this business of dealing with people, that you are the only one I cannot convince of that. But I see in this item here you have industrial production and rehabilitation. Your second biggest item in revenue is 3,390,000 pairs of licence plates, which brought a revenue of \$780,000. Multiply that by two, and you have about 7 million licence plates for about \$700,000, so you are getting about 10 cents a plate.

Getting back to your income from your livestock, which was about \$1 million—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Twenty-three cents a pair.

Mr. Sargent: Twenty-three cents a pair is the breakdown. I was 50 per cent close; that was half way there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Closer than you have been for a long time.

Mr. Sargent: I always spoke well of you, too. The point I am making, Mr. Minister, is that somewhere along the line, if you would treat these people with dignity, it would help them to work towards coming out of there with some sort of a nest egg, some money to meet life with. But you in your grandiose generosity only give them \$5 a week. That is a big deal.

And I think that somewhere along the line you have a great source of manpower there, thousands and thousands of man-hours to put to work for the economy. You have a closed shop, as it were, in controlled production. You could do a great job for these people; involve them in working towards incentives so that they would have money when they come out. And you could make money—go on the market place for 23 cents for a set of

licence plates. They would cost you a dollar to buy them any place on the market place.

So if you could pass this cost on to the rightful place and make a decent profit, then you could do a better job of rehabilitation. This idea of giving stuff to The Department of Transport is lost in the shuffle anyway. I think you might look at a policy of dignity for these people and make it, income-wise, profitable for the whole operation. Any comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, but while I was looking at this page, Mr. Chairman, I might have mentioned that part of the industrial operations, where there were 445 dentures built and repaired, speaks something of what we do for some of our inmates—talking about looking after some of their dental work, which I think is very important.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, they are not for any of our correctional officers. These are for inmates and I thought that was an interesting comment I might make while I had this in my hand.

Mr. Sargent: Is there any reason why you cannot make this operation self-liquidating?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you mean you are suggesting that I go out and sell licence plates on the market?

Mr. Sargent: I suggest that you look at it from a business standpoint. You have all this great wealth of manpower that is going to waste, and you are giving it away for nothing. A man comes out of there and he has been taught to sew. I think that with all our technology and education we are bragging about in this province that you could draft that into your institutions and make it into an economic, self-liquidating unit. Now why can you not do that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is talking about setting up industries which will produce goods for outside sale and that we should pay the inmates a standard wage. Is that what he is talking about?

Mr. Sargent: No, there is a happy medium along the way somewhere to give a man a chance to make a nest egg for when he gets out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I went into this the other day, Mr. Chairman, in talking about the incentive allowance. I said at that time I would make a clear distinction here be-

tween the incentive allowance which we plan to introduce, and a system of payment of wages for work done by inmates. Industries operated within our correctional institutions do not produce goods for sale on the open market.

In addition, some institutions are geared solely to provide academic and vocational training. There will be no attempt to equate incentive allowance with wages in the outside community. Further on I said, as mentioned previously, we have not sought to equate the incentive allowance with wages in the outside community. However, I look forward to the day when inmates in our correctional institutions will be performing full-time work and earning standard wages, paying for their maintenance in the institutions, contributing to the support of their families, and paying taxes. This incentive allowance programme is a step towards that ultimate goal.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is progress—you look forward to the day. But can you give me any realistic reason why, Mr. Chairman, that if an item costs you 23 cents to produce and the cost to the market place is \$1.00, why would you sell it at less than the market cost?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not sell them outside the institution.

Mr. Sargent: Well, will you tell me why you would not do that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what we are looking into. This is what the Trades and Industries Advisory Board is doing.

Mr. Sargent: How can we afford to look into it forever? Let us do something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, if the hon. member suggests we are not doing it fast enough, I agree with him. I am never satisfied with the degree of progress we are making. I would like to make it a lot faster, like yesterday, except that it does take time, effort, money and people.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite one case in my home town. I will not use any name, but it is a first offender. He was sentenced to Guelph for three months. He was allowed out after two months and he went back to his employer to find out if he could get his

job back and his employer said "yes, I will certainly rehire you." So he had to go up to the police commission to get a license to go back on the job. He applied to the police commission—and the only decision they made was "well, come back in three months time and we will look at the case."

Now here is a young fellow, first offender as I say, he only had to serve two months, but now we are going to have to try to get him on welfare for the simple reason that the police commission will not give him a license. How are you going to rehabilitate a person like this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the hon. member find out for me whether that gentleman went to our Hamilton after-care office to ask for the assistance of our after-care service, because I would be very much interested in this.

I often wonder every time I get a case like this, how come that somehow or other an after-care officer is not involved. And usually, when I investigate, I find out they did not want to have anything to do with the after-care officer or they did not go near anybody. If there is such a case I would be very much interested, if the hon. member would find that out for me.

Mr. Davison: Well, there is such a case.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am asking if he can find out whether that person went to our after-care office to which he was entitled to go, and I am sure he knew it was in existence, because our after-care officer would, I would hope, go to the police department and ask them about this. I cannot imagine the police doing this unless there is some other particular reason we do not know about, so if the hon. member will ask that and perhaps he might even give his name and confidentially we can see what we have on file.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402? The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, I believe, was up first.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, several years ago a suggestion had been made in the House to alleviate the shortage of farm labour; to use inmates from various institutions. Was that programme ever proceeded with, Mr. Chairman, and what was the result of it if it were undertaken?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are two things involved here. First, this is also one of the

terms of reference for the Trades and Industries Advisory Board which has on it representatives from the farming community. But in connection with that, these two sections of our Correctional Services Act are going to permit us to allow these inmates to go out for periods of time for reasons of rehabilitation. This will permit us to allow them to go out on farms during the period when they can be used on farms, where it will be useful and helpful for them to learn the farming operation.

Mr. B. Newman: Until now you did not have the authority? Is that right, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we did not.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber—

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow this. May I ask of the Minister if the community colleges are going to be used by his department in an attempt to train personnel for his institutions, and likewise even rehabilitation officers?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member referring to something I mentioned the other day where some of the students of the community college are coming into our welding shops, for example, at OTC, Brampton? Arrangements are being made so that hopefully they will be going to the community colleges—

Mr. B. Newman: Well perhaps not inmates, Mr. Chairman, I thought that custodial officers could be given upgrading programmes or take upgrading programmes at community colleges to enable them to operate more efficiently; even rehabilitative officers could be given courses at community college.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are doing that now. Whether they are doing it at community colleges I am not sure, but they are certainly doing it at universities. If the hon. member will refer to the annual report, there is quite a list of the additional staff training, and the courses they are taking at some of the universities.

Mr. B. Newman: What page is that, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told it is on page 13. Correctional officers—29 of them from county jails—a total of 124 taking staff training courses—

Mr. B. Newman: What page is that, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Page 13. He will find down in the second section of that—does he have page 13 in front of him? Second section of that—certificate courses. Certificate courses, Corrections, McMaster University—115 members; certificate course in public administration—10; certificate course in criminology, University of Toronto Centre of Criminology—11.

There are other degree programmes. We have quite an extensive programme and I am advised that negotiations are presently going on with Sheridan College to provide such training on a fairly large scale.

Mr. B. Newman: That last item was the item I was primarily interested in, Mr. Chairman. I think that we should probably use our community colleges to an advantage, especially in this instance. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I was looking over page 19 which deals with the recreational activities that are supplied to the inmates of the Minister in the various institutions and I was again struck by the dearth of such recreational facilities in perhaps the places where they are most needed. For instance, the Ontario reformatory at Millbrook, i.e., the Correctional Institute at Millbrook.

Now I understand that if you keep your inmates busy you have less of a security problem and I was under the impression that the last time I visited Millbrook they did have skating equipment—hockey skates for the inmates—and I also thought that there was an area out in the exercise yard which was flooded—or at least I was informed it was flooded—for the purpose of a rink.

In going over this I see that they do not have ice hockey at the Millbrook institution, although I notice that they have it at the Mimico reformatory and the training school at Brampton, at the clinics and the training schools at Burtch and Burwash, as a matter of fact even the ones at Fort William, Monteth and Rideau.

Now I would like to know why there is such a dearth of recreational facilities at Millbrook, where they do have—according to the Minister's own statement—the most difficult behaviour problems, or the behavioural inmates, but where two-thirds of the inmates are not behavioural problems and in fact are either pedophiles or alcoholics or sexual

deviates. Why do they not have more recreational facilities for them?

For instance, badminton is something they could have there, or floor hockey. They could have volleyball, which is almost a universal game when it comes to dissipating energy. For that matter, they could even have lacrosse for the non-violent types. Would the Minister comment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, Millbrook does not lend itself to any more activities than there are here because of the very nature of the building. The philosophy of the department at the time Millbrook was built, was that it was for the purpose of holding these problem people and it was not envisioned that they would require anything but maximum security holding. So the facilities are limited. This will be changed under the new programmes, as I mentioned earlier, with the changeover of one institution to another, Millbrook will become a regional detention centre. So that people who are now being held in Millbrook will not be the ones who will be held then.

I am informed however, that it does have baseball and why it is not in here—I will have discussion with one of my staff about it later—and I am also told that there is skating, when it is able to be flooded.

Mr. Ben: I was told they allegedly did flood it and use it for that purpose. But it has been over three years, Mr. Chairman, since this Minister had it brought to his attention that at least the Opposition realized the folly of creating Millbrook, that it was not serving the purpose because there were not sufficient inmates of the type the prison was designed for to keep it occupied, shall we say.

And it became obvious, I think, even to this Minister before I raised it that something had to be done about this prison and that is why people like pediophiles, alcoholics, drug addicts and the like were brought into the prison. Now for those, surely since they were not security problems, since they were not behavioural problems as inmates, surely for these people, facilities could have been supplied outside of the walls. There was a camp not too distant from the walls where they had short-term prisoners. I am trying to recall the name of that camp. Could the Minister help me?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that we put the sex deviates out in that camp?

Mr. Ben: No. No, I am saying you could build athletic facilities outside the wall.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well the hon. member will appreciate that if we are going to change the aspect of the whole operation there, there is not much point in putting a lot of money into a building for this purpose. Because, within a reasonable time these people are going to be moved out of there to the clinics and so, there will not be any need for it. Certainly, we have an open institution, Durham Camp I think it is called, outside of Millbrook. That is an open institution and we would have to provide, for those inside Millbrook today, another maximum security area for recreational activities right next to or in connection with an open institution, which is not really feasible.

And if, as I say, we are going to make this major change very shortly—I had better not say very shortly, but in a reasonable time there is not much point in putting much money into this.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps we are not on the same wave length. I quite appreciate the Minister's dilemma. He does have some inmates in Millbrook who are either hardened criminals or security problems or both. But there are a large number of—the Minister gave us the figures on the first day of his estimates, indicating that approximately two-thirds of the inmates at Millbrook did not fall into the category of either hardened criminals or security problems. I believe about two-thirds were not in this category.

Now the Minister asks whether I would suggest that the sex deviates be permitted outside the wall for recreational purposes. Well, if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Chairman, most of those that are classed as sex deviates or who were pediophiles, that is, child molesters. Now, either the Minister is admitting that he is keeping children in their institution—and I must say that I did find a 16-year-old in that institution when I visited—or he is suggesting that they would escape while they are having recreational period.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has people in this institution that have no business being there. The prison was not designed for them. You have either nowhere else to keep them, and you brought them here, or else you have nobody to bring into this prison, of the type for which this prison was designed, so you brought these people in. Now you talk about rehabilitation. That seems to be your code for every year when the estimates come up.

You read to us or have it as a preface to your statement, what the objects of your department are. Surely then you should try to carry out these objects.

I grant you that the prison is small. It is extremely compact, but, surely you could obviate this handicap by giving those in the particular categories to which I have been referring, that is, to those other than a security problem or the hardened criminals, a greater recreational time allowance. You could have more periods of recreation. You talk about a baseball diamond and you say you have it. Fine, then you could give those particular inmates more time there.

Mr. Chairman, one of the activities that is listed there is hiking. I am not, for one minute, suggesting that you form a hiking club and start having them tramp over the fields of Durham county or to run in cross country races, but the fact is, there are still facilities and activities that they could pursue while they are still inside. I would ask the Minister to give more consideration to this.

Another thing that strikes me, Mr. Chairman, is that Mercer has so few facilities. I do not see a Vanier Institute listed so I take it for granted, perhaps I am wrong, then using the title of Mercer here you also include the Vanier Institute do you not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, the Vanier Centre was not opened—

Mr. Ben: Oh, I see—it was not—when this period ended, alright.

But I am struck by the fact that Mercer had no more variety of recreation than did Millbrook and I think that they were intended to serve completely different purposes.

I would ask that the Minister give consideration to doing something for those.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to tell the hon. member that really it is not the number of different sports, recreational activities they can engage in, it is how frequently they use the available recreational facilities and they do, I am advised, use them very frequently. So they have even at Millbrook, one, two, three, four, five, six—including the skating and baseball—seven activities and it depends how frequently they use them. I mean, you could have a wider range—I am not too sure if that would accomplish a great deal. The fact is that they do get a lot of recreation.

Mr. Ben: Well, if I may, Mr. Chairman. The reason I dwell specifically with Millbrook is that in Millbrook the reverse from

the norm was the rule. In other words, it was not as a form of punishment that people worked in the license plate shop I referred to previously, or the laundry, but as a privilege. In other words, there was such a lack of things to do in Millbrook that the right to work was something that was sought by the inmates. The complaint to me was that they did nothing but wash floors, unless they could get into the license plate shop or into the laundry. What other activities did you have there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A tailor shop.

Mr. Ben: Or the tailor shop, there still was not enough work for all these inmates. The reason I suggest more strenuous, body contact sports.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Carpentry work.

Mr. Ben: Making bird houses or they were making at least some benches I think, or something else like that. In any case there was not enough work and I challenge your advisors to satisfy me that there was enough work to keep all the prisoners going eight hours a day daily, Saturdays and Sundays excluded. There just was not enough and it is for this reason that I suggest that there be more of these active activities, these strenuous activities which would sap some of the energy of these inmates and perhaps give them a new outlook on life. They might find that playing bridge is just as interesting as dealing from the bottom of the deck, who knows? They might even turn their talents into more acceptable courses.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I am a little disturbed by the costs at Orangeville. I see that the cost for each inmate per day is some five times the average cost, and this particular jail stands out from all the others. I do not think there is anything that costs even half that, among the others. Can the Minister explain why these costs are so high?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not have to look at the report of the hon. member to see how many inmates they have, obviously the costs rise in adverse ratio to the number of inmates you have.

Mr. Shulman: But, Mr. Minister, that is not the explanation, because if we look at the costs—I do not see the number of inmates here in this table, but we do have the costs

of the officers' salaries which are greater than certain other prisons where the costs are much less. For example, let us compare Orangeville, where the officers' salaries are \$57,000 to Picton where the officers' salaries are \$45,000, yet the cost is only half that, so presumably you have more inmates at Orangeville, so there must be some other explanation.

Or compare it to Goderich, or to Cayuga.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The total number of persons committed during the year at Orangeville was 168.

Mr. Shulman: Well how does this compare to Cayuga?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: 176 at Cayugal

Mr. Shulman: Well why is it such numbers differ from the cost—the cost at Cayuga is a third of what it is at Orangeville?

Mr. Sargent: Hogan's heroes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The difference is that if the hon. member will take a look on page 103—the total days stay of the inmates—that tells the story. In Cayuga, while they only had 176 persons committed during the year there were 2,571 days stay of the inmates, and in Orangeville, there were only 988, and of course that would bring up the per capita cost for the inmates.

Mr. Shulman: Considering the small number of inmates at Orangeville, is there not another jail close by where you can send these people to?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is one of the recommendations we are going to get from the task force, as to which jails are going to be closed. In the not too distant future, before this House sits again, some of the jails which are in existence now will have been closed down.

Mr. Shulman: Obviously if you compare the cost per person, per day, in terms of guards it is quite uneconomical.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402. The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, are we able to discuss parole now?

Mr. Shulman: Are we going into parole before—

Mr. Chairman: I might say that some little while ago, while I was absent from the

Chair, I returned and we were on a wide range of discussion on parole at that time.

Mr. Sopha: It goes to show that you should not leave.

Mr. Chairman: Well if the member will now agree to restrict the parole until the end. About three quarters of an hour ago everyone was trying to get parole.

Is there anything further on provincial jails and reformatories? All right.

Does any member wish to take part on the debate on provincial jails and reformatories? The hon. member for High Park?

Mr. Shulman: I do. Before we leave that I have two or three minor matters to bring up. First of all Burtch. The matter of Burtch came up last year in some detail as to the terrible fire hazard there. What has the Minister done about that problem since then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The new training centre which I mentioned last year which was going to build, has been completed. I think it is entirely of brick. Public works now are working on plans for complete renovation of the balance of the institution.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister give us a time or date when he expects that to be completed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would suggest that you talk to the Minister of Public Works during his estimates.

Mr. Shulman: Well, do you not talk to him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Department of Public Works are preparing a master plan for the replacement of all framework buildings at this institution. Construction is planned in four stages, first stage being kitchen and dining room facilities, and The Department of Public Works advised this master plan would be completed shortly. That is all I can tell the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: When is this going to begin? When do the kitchen facilities begin? The first stage?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Department of Public Works advises this master plan will be completed shortly.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the other day I asked the Minister how many sociologists, psychiatrists etc., he was short. He was going to give me that answer. Does he have that available now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Social workers, psychologists and chaplains—

Mr. Shulman: We asked for psychiatrists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not have any psychiatrists on full-time complement. Whenever we need psychiatrists we call them in for consultation. Was it just psychiatrists the hon. member was asking about or social workers? We could take 20 within this range, either psychiatrists or social workers. We have room to take 20 social workers or psychiatrists.

It has something to do with the way the complement has been set with Treasury Board, this has something to do with the new policy of Treasury Board in which it says there is no use putting money in the estimates for a complement which you have been unable to fill in the last few years. Therefore, there is a complement of 20. You can fill them with social workers or you can fill them with psychiatrists if you wish.

Mr. Shulman: Has the Minister made a slip of the tongue? Does he really mean psychiatrists? Surely not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry—psychologists.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Has the hon. member for High Park finished?

Mr. Shulman: To pursue this psychiatrist problem—last year in the estimates there was quite a bit of discussion of the treatment of the mentally ill in the Don jail, and I understood the Minister at that time was not particularly proud of what was occurring at that jail. I would like to know what changes he has made in the lodging given to those mentally ill—in other words the cage they are kept in—and also what changes have been made in the mental examination?

As you know I brought a Private Bill in here requiring that prisoners that are referred for mental examination see a psychiatrist, instead of getting the one, two, three routine that they were getting at the Don jail. Have you made any of the changes that we requested?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A fulltime medical secretary has been engaged in the Metropolitan Toronto Jail who has a separate office adjacent to the medical consulting rooms in the jail hospital. A part-time psychiatrist who is also on the part-time staff of the Queen

Street Mental Health Centre has been appointed to examine, assess and treat inmates who have been referred to him for consultation by the medical officers of the jail.

He may also agree to psychiatrically assess inmates on his own time by direct arrangements with defence or Crown counsels, or with the court. Such arrangements are not within the purview of this department. The hon. member would appreciate that. The psychiatrist is a duly qualified medical practitioner in the province of Ontario, and holds a diploma in psychiatry from the University of Toronto.

A psychiatric ward in the new wing, consisting of ten private rooms, with private sanitary facilities, a common room, a private psychiatrists counselling room, and two utility rooms is in operation. For prisoners who do not medically adapt to private rooms, a large common observation room for ten, formerly called the hospital, which allows for interpersonal therapeutic relationships among inmates and staff is maintained in the older wing. The old observation ward is now used as an inmate dormitory.

The medical staff roster: Dr. William Henry Hills, full time. Does the member want the salaries?

Mr. Shulman: I might as well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Might as well, the member might strike pay dirt. Dr. Hills, \$21,500 per annum.

Mr. Shulman: That is an improvement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is a jail surgeon and a public servant. Dr. Osler B. Dickenson, three days weekly, \$12,500 per annum, surgeon specialist, on the casual staff. Dr. Howard Robert Bernstein, three days weekly, \$240 per week, industrial physician. Dr. Ida Kovacs, one and a half hours daily, \$3,880 per annum, venereal disease physician. Dr. Gary Prince, 18 hours weekly, \$50 for three hours, psychiatrist. At the Metropolitan jail we also have nine registered nurses full time. I guess all the member wanted to know was the Don jail, is that right?

Mr. Shulman: I am gratified, Mr. Chairman. The member for Lakeshore and I are pleased, if we do nothing else we have made one contribution towards the benefit of this department. But there is one thing that is not clear to me. If a prisoner is referred by a magistrate for a mental examination—and I would appreciate a straight yes or no answer—will he see a psychiatrist?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will have to check that. I want to make sure before I give an answer to the hon. member. I will get that answer for him. But I want to point out to the hon. member, regardless of what the conditions were at the Don jail at any one time, we just took the Don jail over in July of 1968.

Mr. Shulman: And it was the fall of 1968 that the Minister was defending the conditions that we were complaining about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was defending the conditions under which people had to work, having regard to the staff available and everything else.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister was denying the charges we made.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not remember what charges the hon. member made.

Mr. Shulman: They are the very things the Minister is changing now. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this go by.

An hon. member: Out of order.

Mr. Shulman: It is not. I am talking on the Don jail, Mr. Chairman. Last year we complained bitterly about the conditions under which the mentally ill were confined there; the Minister defended it. I am delighted to find he has changed it and has made the improvements we suggested; let us not backtrack on that.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think the member for High Park should take credit for all the changes in the penal institutions.

Mr. MacDonald: He just took credit for one.

Mr. Sargent: We have been harping for years that the crux of this whole penology problem is lack of good psychiatric help. I would like to ask the Minister—

Mr. MacDonald: I have news for the hon. member. For years we harped about it, and the members of his side supported the government.

Mr. Sargent: I know. I will give the member full marks; I believe that.

But this is the question I want answered. How many institutions are there in Ontario without the services of a full-time psychiatrist?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not have full-time psychiatrists. And I will tell the hon. member something else: He does not have a full-time psychiatrist; no one has a full-time psychiatrist. They are too costly. When you need a psychiatrist, you go to a psychiatrist and you consult at so much an hour. When we need a psychiatrist, we get the use of psychiatrists.

Mr. Sargent: Do not give me a lecture on this. We have a mental institution in Owen Sound and we have trouble getting psychiatrists too, but we do get them, and I think getting psychiatrists is the most urgent need you have in your system. If we are doing anything in the field of technology, surely we can train psychiatrists. The Minister says cost is a factor? Money is no object to him in his department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who told the member that?

Mr. Sargent: Then the Minister admits he has an opening for 20 psychiatrists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that I said we had an opening for 20 psychiatrists?

Mr. Sargent: 20 psychiatrists or sociologists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was corrected; I meant 20 social workers or psychologists. There is a great difference between a psychologist and a psychiatrist—I think about \$100,000 a year.

Mr. Sargent: All right, I thank the Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister will get in trouble for that statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Probably.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister says that he has a need for sociologists or people trained in the social services, and yet we have people coming out of the universities here who are graduates in sociology and they cannot get employment in this department. Now, the Minister told me last year in the debates here that there was ample work for these people, and they tried and there was no work for them. Now, who is running the store over there? Numerous times the Minister sits there and asks his department heads. I think we must get down to the nuts and bolts of what the Minister is trying to do in trying to rehabilitate these people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will produce 20 social workers or 20 psychologists, we will hire them, if they are prepared to come with our department and if they are prepared to work for the salary which the civil service commission has laid out.

Mr. Sargent: I think we should have on the record here, Mr. Chairman, that in front of this House the Minister tells the House, tells his own government, tells the Opposition and everybody else, that he has a need for 20 important posts and he cannot fill them in this age of technology we have today?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Mr. Shulman: The salary is too low.

Mr. Sargent: And we have ads running in the American papers and in the English press every weekend advertising for help in this great province of Ontario.

We are spending \$400 million in The Department of Education, and we cannot train people to run our own shop? There is something wrong with the Minister or the government. Who is wrong?

An hon. member: The government.

Another hon. member: Both of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have the answer for the hon. member. The answer to his question was yes, all court referrals are examined by psychiatrists.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, that is wonderful; I am delighted to hear that, thank you. The reason they cannot get the social workers and cannot get the psychiatrists is they just do not pay enough money. We raised this earlier in the estimates and the Minister said it was not up to him, it was up to the civil service association. The Minister is never going to fill those posts until he puts the appropriate pressure on and votes the money and does whatever he has to do to raise the salaries up to the going rate. He has to compete with industry, he has to compete with other jurisdictions, and if he thinks he is going to get sociologists to come in for \$12,000 a year, he is mistaken; he is not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact is we have a great number of very well-qualified social workers now.

Mr. Shulman: Agreed, there are a great number of dedicated people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the kind we want.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, that is the kind you want, and you are 20 short. And the reason you are 20 short is because you do not pay enough money.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, everybody is 20 short; you know everybody is short.

Mr. Shulman: No, I will not accept that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is not a department of any government that is not short of professional staff, in any government any place in North America, and the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, that just is not true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is true.

Mr. Shulman: I have had the opportunity of visiting different areas that are not short, and we can come back to Joliet again and go through that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member want to go through Joliet? Would the hon. member like to have a little discussion at 5.40 p.m. about Joliet?

Mr. Shulman: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I heard so much about Joliet the other day I decided to find out more about it; I made it my business because we took an awful shellacking the other day. We were told what a wonderful place this Joliet was; it was just about the last word in institutions. Let me tell the hon. member, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Shulman: I do not want the Minister misleading the House again. I pointed out a number of things about Joliet.

Mr. Chairman: Order. If the hon. member for High Park has risen on a point of order, would he please state his point of order?

Mr. Shulman: My point is I do not want the hon. Minister to again mislead the House about Joliet. I pointed out there was a number of great improvements that we could bring here. I did not suggest it was a wonderful place to live.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right. First, Mr. Chairman, I am now quoting from *Menard Time*, which is America's foremost prison newspaper, printed in Menard, which is a penal institution in the state of Illinois.

A new governor has just gone in there, a Republican governor, Governor Ogilvie—

Mr. Shulman: That is equivalent to Conservative.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right, and he is going in to clean up the correctional system there. Let me tell the hon. member what he is going to do. He is going to follow the procedures that were followed here in this Conservative government.

Mr. Sargent: Well, he is in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The governor's special message to legislators calls for these changes in crime-fighting forces of the state. I will not go into all of them, I will only go into those that refer to corrections. Listen to this:

Consolidation of the Illinois youth commission—

I should point out that the youth commission runs the training schools, and I suppose we will go into that in just a minute.

Consolidation of the Illinois youth commission into a new department of corrections, which would run all state correctional institutions and would have the power to close down inadequate local jails,

Which we have done here already. We have had a correctional department taking in all of these things except the jails, and we have just taken in the jails as well, so we are ahead of Illinois 22, 23 years ago to start with.

Mr. Sargent: What about Joliet?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am getting around to Joliet; I will be there in a minute, Mr. Chairman. Just hang on.

Ogilvie's message pointed out that his proposal for a new department of corrections was based on a model Act proposed by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

We did not need this. We did this 23 years ago in this department.

Mr. Shulman: That is what I asked you about the other day; you never heard of it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now we will go into the rehabilitation of Joliet, which the hon. member spoke about at great length here. He said, "I am not talking about the whole of Illinois, I am talking about Joliet. They have a wonderful system." By some peculiar happenstance, he went into a barber shop and sat down at a barber who happened to tell him that he learned his barbering in

Joliet. The barber did a wonderful job and, therefore, they have a wonderful vocational training at Joliet. I think he made the point, wonderful vocational training, and so on. Let us talk about that. "We speak of rehabilitation," said Ogilvie, "but we provide only one vocational officer to 50 custodial officers at Joliet."

I should tell the hon. member our ratio—throughout the department—not in our best places like the Ontario Training Centre—the Brampton Training Centre—where I think it is probably 1 to 3—but in our whole system is 1 to 30. And this is Joliet, the showplace as the hon. member suggests—they have one vocational officer to 50—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order again?

Some hon. members: Sit down, sit down.

Mr. Shulman: May I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Will the hon. member please state the point of order?

Mr. Shulman: My point of order is that the Minister is once again misleading the House and he has deliberately ignored the comments which I made—that university and other staffs were giving vocational training and as such they are not on the staff and do not count in the figures. He is giving you false figures.

Mr. Chairman: I see nothing in the Minister's remarks which could be considered as out of order. It is just part of the normal debate. The hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that we do not have advice from outside workers, that we do not work with universities? I just pointed out how we are working with universities. Our staff are taking courses at universities. We are working with Sheridan College. I told him the other day he should take it easy because I have gone the circuit, I have heard these stories, I have read all the wonderful brochures.

You know, in some Legislature in the United States somebody is getting up and holding up our annual report and saying, "here is what they do in the great province of Ontario, it is the greatest place in the world, why do you not do it down here?"

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I want to get this on record. "We speak of rehabilitation," said Ogilvie, "but we provide only

one vocational officer to 50 custodial officers at Joliet”.

In fact it is backward even to call them custodial officers now. “We have given our state a halfway house programme and work release programme, but we have not given a full professional department to administer these programmes,” added Ogilvie.

I can give him lots more in this thing, but he mentioned Joliet the other day. I could also give him, if he would like, some other figures relating to Joliet and I am sure the hon. member would forego me this pleasure because he was doing a pretty good job of Joliet the other day.

On the success of parole: The United States Board of Parole, the percentage paroles granted, 37 per cent; the percentage violated, 29.8 per cent.

Alaska—well we will not bother about that.

Arkansas—76.26 per cent granted; 22.7 per cent success.

California—we have not got the number of paroles granted but there is 21 per cent violations.

Connecticut—granted paroles to 47 per cent of those eligible and 20 per cent violated.

Delaware—paroles granted, 38 per cent; paroles violated 36.8 per cent.

District of Columbia—granted, 30.9 per cent; paroles violated, 31.3 per cent.

Florida—I do not have the number granted—but 27 per cent violated.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we are supposed to be talking paroles.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment. Suppose we just eliminate all the others and say Illinois—that great state which has Joliet—has granted 58 per cent of those eligible for parole and they have such a wonderful rehabilitation system that 35.4 per cent were violated.

Ontario—I will just read it out of the annual report on page 59 because the hon. member should have seen it there—our failure ratio is only 14.49 per cent—better than any of the states that I see here—against Illinois which has a violation of 35.4 per cent.

I wonder who treats their inmates in a more humane fashion? I wonder who does a better job on rehabilitation?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, if I may, first of all the figures that the Minister has

quoted as usual he does not understand. To explain this, to compare the parole violations in one jurisdiction that has one set of laws governing parole with another jurisdiction that has a different set of laws governing paroles, obviously is meaningless.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what I was telling the hon. member about Joliet.

Mr. Shulman: Why did you not remember it from one day to the next? You just said the other day how meaningless it was when you go ahead and do exactly the same thing yourself.

Second, the figures he quoted about Illinois, I am quite sure, are correct; the figures about Joliet I am sure are a different story again. And again he did not understand that Joliet is one prison that happens to have a good rehabilitation programme. There are other areas that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do you not compare it with our Brampton Training Centre?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, we are here to try and—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Compare it with Brampton Training Centre.

Mr. Shulman:—pick up the better ideas from other jurisdictions and bring them here, not compare the worst things and be satisfied as a result. Now the Minister has said something about education and unfortunately in our reformatories there is no way to get a university degree.

In my opening remarks the other day I mentioned Joliet and I mentioned how men can graduate from there and get the university degrees and go on to do other work and I have another similar quotation here. This is from the *Globe and Mail* of September 20 last, from Zena Cherry’s column, and it is a very brief quotation. I would just like to read it:

This month Sweden has opened what it claims to be the world’s first university prison. It is in the ancient university town of Uppsala and is equipped—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is Uppsala, I was there.

Mr. Shulman: Well you did not learn much:

—is equipped and entitled to award degrees of matriculation up—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell you what I learned in a minute.

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

—up to Bachelor of Arts in almost any subject: Students have been selected from Swedish penitentiaries and will be relieved of regular prison duties. Officials say it may be the world's least expensive prison and least expensive university to run. It has a regular staff of only four and other teachers are brought in as needed. There are no guards whatsoever. How humane, how intelligent.

Now I am asking the Minister—and I have other examples here from other jurisdictions—do you have any plans for the near future as you like to say, meaning some time in the next 20 years, to bring in university courses in such a way that prisoners may take these courses and either complete them if they are in long enough or continue at university and get their degree as a result?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the first thing I learned about Uppsala—as the hon. member should have learned, and he is doing exactly the same as he did about Joliet—Uppsala is a prison for long-term prisoners. The average term in our reformatories is between four and five months, and anybody who suggests that we can help them get a university education in four or five months is just being unrealistic.

Now insofar as helping anybody who is perhaps taking a university course to continue to take it, he knows the answer to that because we have already started that under the pilot project; and awaiting the new federal legislation under sections 19 and 20. Our live-in and work-out programme is going to permit us to allow anyone who can be trusted outside of an institution to continue their university education outside the institution and live in at night. So that is the simple answer to that one.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to follow along on that, please.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: A point of order?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to join this debate but I have been looking through the estimates and I cannot find how much is being voted for Joliet.

Mr. Chairman: I would hardly think that constitutes a point of order. The hon. mem-

ber for Port Arthur has been trying to get the floor for quite some time.

Mr. Shulman: Just to follow this live-in, work-out programme, would the Minister inform me how the earnings of the workers-out are to be apportioned. As you know in California I explained the other day how the earnings are divided between the state, between the families and the prisoner himself. How does the Minister intend to handle that particular problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The whole matter is now being studied to decide how much we will charge them for their keep. I cannot tell the hon. member what it will be now, but by the time the programme gets into effect I will have the figure.

Mr. Shulman: And what about the balance after you take off the keep?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is his.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of order.

Mr. Shulman: Who said it was a point of order?

Mr. Knight: Well I was recognized. You got up on a point of order.

Mr. Shulman: I did not get up on a point of order, I was questioning the Minister, I was completing my line of questioning.

Mr. Chairman: I gave the hon. member for High Park the privilege of speaking because he said he had one or two more minutes, and he wanted to clear up the one point. So that the hon. member for Port Arthur—

Mr. Shulman: I did not hear the answer, unfortunately.

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. Minister repeat the answer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Always depending upon how much the man is earning, first he will be charged for his keep at a certain figure which we will establish. If he is earning a certain amount, if we deem it necessary, we will put away for his release, a certain amount will be given to his family, and he will be paying taxes, whatever is required of a citizen on the outside, providing there are sufficient funds to do it.

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

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, it is most difficult to get a word in edgewise here, but I would like to go back to something that the hon. Minister said a little while ago when he was telling us that only 14.9 per cent of paroles are violated. How does he reconcile this with the fact that according to his statistics on page 94, 42 per cent—

Mr. Chairman: May I respectfully point out to the hon. member that the hon. member was reading out from some tables pertaining to parole. We were not debating the item of parole in the estimates.

Mr. Knight: Well, the statistics are misleading to the House and the province if the report is not read, Mr. Chairman, and I think they should be clarified, while I have a point here.

Mr. Chairman: I would say that anything pertaining to matters of parole in any respect should be left until we come to that particular vote.

Mr. Knight: Well, Mr. Chairman, that always seems to apply to me but it does not seem to apply to anyone else.

Mr. Chairman: It applies to the committee.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I respect your position, but you allowed the Minister to go on at some length about parole, and you nodded to me, "yes he was going to talk on parole." I said, "may we talk on parole," and you said, "yes we can."

Mr. Chairman: No, I—

Mr. Sargent: Well, you gave me the impression that we could Mr. Chairman. Now I think that when my colleague from Port Arthur wishes to speak on a point brought up on a point of order, he can make it a point of order, he can make it a point of order if he wishes to.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

If the hon. member will recall, I pointed out some time ago, about one hour ago, that in my view we had gone on to parole in my absence, because, when I returned, there was some discussion on parole. But the hon. member straightened me out and insisted that we had not come yet to parole. Now, the only matter pertaining to parole that has been discussed were some statistics read out by the hon. Minister, which in my view is not debate on parole. Therefore, if there is

nothing further on provincial jails and reformatories, we will move to parole. However, the hon. member for High Park is on his feet.

Mr. Ben: I rose simultaneously with the hon. member for High Park. Do you recall, you kept on looking to see whom you would recognize, and I said to you, he was talking so I sat down. The point about paroles did not arise until about 20 minutes later. In the interval every time he sat down I popped up, but the Minister beat me to it. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the very same point—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Would the hon. member for Humber indicate the portion of the estimates that he would like to discuss?

Mr. Ben: I want to deal with the psychiatrist which the hon. member for Grey-Bruce ended up discussing. I rose when he sat down. It has to do with the statement of the hon. Minister, still on the same point.

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce asked, who was running the store? The hon. Minister said that he would engage all the psychiatrists that they could get, that he would engage all the social workers that they could get, if—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Psychologists.

Mr. Ben: Oh, psychologists, "if they would accept the civil service rate," that is what he said. What irks me is that he did answer the question put by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, he said that he, the Minister, is not running the store, but the Civil Service Association is running the store. That is, in essence, what you said, that you cannot get adequate staff because you do not set the salaries, but the civil service does. In other words, you admit that you are not minding the store that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce referred to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well as long as the hon. member says, that is his interpretation of what I said, I have no objection to it, because it is not what I said, and not what I meant.

Mr. Ben: Well I do not know what you meant because you did not say what you meant. You said that the civil service set the pay scale.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is very simple, when his party takes over this government, thirty or forty years from today, he will find out

that every Minister would like to set the salaries for his own department but there would be chaos if he were permitted to do that. They would obviously, in the first place, be competing with each other for staff. Where my colleague, the Minister of Health, may offer \$50,000 a year, I would offer \$75,000; after all, it is just the taxpayers' money, you know, and it would be chaos. The point is that the only way you can run the store, as he calls it, is the way most civilized governments run it—a Civil Service Commission, who, through negotiation with staff and their representatives, decide upon certain salary schedules and this salary schedule is what goes. This is what applies, and I have nothing to do with that. I could, and I may, make representation to Treasury

Board that I cannot get certain staff, and that I want more money for staff, but they have to take that into consideration in respect of all of the other demands they have. In this manner, they come to a conclusion with the Civil Service Commission and negotiate with staff as to what the salaries are. Therefore I do not have anything to say about it except to make a recommendation and then appeal to the Treasury Board if I feel so inclined.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the hon. Minister that if he wants to overcome "Kaos," get "Smart."

It being 6.00 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

STATUUM

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Estimates, Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Grossman, concluded	2397
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2443

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1969

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (Concluded)

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I wonder, before you start on these estimates, if you could draw to the attention of the House that we have in the galleries tonight about 250 constituents from the riding of Scarborough North, many of them members of the Scarborough North Progressive Conservative Association.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would also like to bring to your attention there is a large delegation of young Liberals from York Centre riding in the east gallery.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, in the Speaker's gallery there is a delegation, mainly from the Riverdale riding, of the members of the Order of the Eastern Star.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure that all guests are most welcome to the House tonight.

On vote 402:

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, are we now on the paroles? I would like to get this over with, you know, so I—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Is there any further discussion on vote 402, other than paroles? The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A few brief matters, Mr. Chairman. I have been worried about another of the practices of this particular department, and rather than put it in my words, I could summarize it most easily by reading a letter from the customer of the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman) who has sent it to me. This is dated November 19, 1968, and is a practice which apparently must be fairly common, because I have three letters from three different inmates on this particular problem.

This young lady has written to me to intervene on her behalf with the Minister about a certain problem, which I have already done. I will leave that portion of the letter out, but I will go ahead with the balance.

While you are speaking to the Minister I wonder if you would also mention the fact that letters are being sent out to members of families, fiancés, etc., who are listed as members to whom one may write. This has happened twice in my case. In two instances, the persons advised of my incarceration were unaware that I was even in trouble.

I could understand their being advised if it were a question of parole, etc., but only three weeks after one's arrival seems rather upsetting, especially when I had no intention of requesting assistance in any way from these people.

I am told this information comes from the parole board office.

Sincerely,
Kathy H.

I want to ask the Minister if he will see that this particular practice is desisted in, because obviously it can be a very severe blow to the morale if relatives are informed of a person being incarcerated who does not wish them to know so.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Is the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, referring to an inmate of an institution who has received parole, or is it prior to parole?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, she has only been in three weeks, and after this three weeks letters were sent to all the people who apparently were listed on her card as being relatives, either being informed that she was in or requesting certain information and mentioning, *en passant*, that she was in jail; and she was quite upset about this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Apparently this is a form which is sent out to the names which are provided by the inmate for the purpose of getting information which would help the parole board arrive at a decision.

Mr. Shulman: But surely you are not thinking of parole three weeks after the person comes in.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that the process starts as soon as possible so that by the time the person is eligible for parole they have accumulated as much information as possible.

Mr. Shulman: Well, this is reasonable. Then may I suggest to the Minister that he inform the inmates when you are having them list these names that these people will be advised if they are in jail, because this has come as quite a shock to at least three inmates who thought that at some subsequent date, after they have had a chance themselves to inform their relatives of the situation, this would go out. Instead of which, the relatives were informed by this form letter, with great embarrassment on both sides.

Could you, in future, inform the inmates that the relatives are being written to?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that there are quite a few inmates who, when they are convicted and are committed to an institution, ask us not to let anybody know that they have been committed. Subsequent to that—presumably this may be one of those cases—when they have been asked to give us other information they have done so. Then a questionnaire went out asking for whatever information they could give us in respect of helping the board consider them for parole.

Mr. Shulman: The point I am making is that inmates are not aware that you are going to be writing to these people at this time. They thought perhaps this would occur a year later when they became eligible for parole. So would you please tell the inmates that you may be writing to these people immediately. That is all I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. member I will look into this practice and see if in fact there should be some change in it. I am not certain about the procedures of this particular aspect of the parole myself. I will look into it.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I have another brief matter I would like to refer to.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): You said that at 4 o'clock.

Mr. Shulman: Well, when I say brief I mean two or three days, so do not be in a rush, gentlemen.

I have a copy here of *Time* magazine, October 4, 1968, and they detail at some length, a new programme which was brought in in Colorado to try and improve the lot of convicts and also to help in getting them jobs after they leave prison.

I will not take the time of the House by reading this whole programme. The Minister, I am sure, is aware of it, but briefly it consists of taking teams of convicts from the state penitentiary at Cannon City.

Each team goes out with only one unarmed guard. They go on speaking tours throughout the states with a double purpose. First of all to warn others about the perils of crime; and second to tell of the routine in the prisons and of the work that is done there in an effort to get the support of the public for improvements in our prison system.

I certainly think we could well use that here. We are well aware that the Minister is making efforts to make improvements and with very little support, I believe, from his Cabinet, because we see what little improvements we do get. I was wondering if—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Be careful, you almost gave me a compliment.

Mr. Shulman: Not quite. Mr. Minister I wonder if you would study this programme and give it some consideration, because it appears to me to have great merit. I would like to point out that in the time this programme has been in effect, they have now spoken to some 750,000 Coloradians. They have sent out prisoners who have had very serious convictions, things like kidnapping, and there has not been one attempted escape. So it has worked out remarkably well in Colorado.

I am requesting that you give this programme some consideration.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have read about it and am very much interested. I would like to study the results of their efforts a little longer before we attempt to put it into effect here.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, before leaving this vote I would like to say a word. I do not think too much has been said about the rehabilitation of female offenders, adult or otherwise. And to perhaps end this vote I feel it may be in order to inspire the Minister, if not to anything else, to greater and better things.

To forward a commendation, we have visited Ingleside and we were favourably impressed, I think I can fairly say, by the way

in which female offenders are treated. They were able to dress in their own clothes. They had their rooms decorated in a very commodious fashion. They had dolls and various types of decor around which was completely civilized, and as a matter of fact the whole deportment of the institution was such as to be highly rehabilitative. Maybe so well was it laid out on the whole that many of the girls for the first time in their lives enjoyed half human surroundings and a decent atmosphere. Some of them did not want to leave.

Recently I had gone up and seen the opening of the Vanier Institute, and attended on that particular affair but was unable to go through the building—there were just too many people there. We will have to go on another occasion to see precisely whether you are carrying into the Vanier, in its plenitude, all the things that you attempted in the houses at Ingleside. I get the impression that there was a more restrictive atmosphere. There seemed to be dormitories and actually cells there. But I will give it a fair chance and we will wait and see what there is.

All I wish to say in winding it up: Is it the Minister's intention, and I sincerely trust that it is—you cannot duplicate the same situation with male offenders—but is it the Minister's long range intention to treat adult male offenders at Guelph in the same way? With respect to a place like Guelph, which you know I have inveighed against in this House and will continue to do so until the whole system is altered—is that the direction that you intend to somehow, analogously treat male offenders in the future, adult male offenders—in the same way. Because only under such circumstances, and in such surroundings, and with such a sense of human dignity, and with at least some kind of gesture towards civilization—which is wholly lacking, if I may say so, in the Guelph situation—only in this way, it seems to me, will you bring young people into states of mind which will make them amenable to the rules of society. Not to make them in any way knuckle under, because this would take any individuality out of them, but to make them into law-abiding human beings with a great personal initiative and a desire, when they leave the institution, to rehabilitate themselves.

Is it your intention to have the same breakdown, the same unit area, the same type of camaraderie that exists; the same access to communications media, the same right to comport our own lives as we see fit, to dress

in a certain fashion, not to be regimented, all that freedom and the give and take that exists in the female institution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the hon. member that is precisely our aim and that is why we have as our first goal to reduce the size of the institutions to no larger than will accommodate 200. That is precisely the point. I am sure he will find that not only is the programme going to be continued in Vanier that was in effect at Ingleside and at Mercer in the last number of years, but it will be extended.

And we will be able to improve upon it because of the physical surroundings. I take the liberty of sending to the hon. member this brochure—I do not know if he was at the opening, he would then have received one. This will explain precisely what is planned to be continued and expanded at Vanier Centre.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps all the members should get one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not want to be accused of wasteful printing again. If the hon. members are interested in this I would be very glad to send them all a copy.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further than after care and parole?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I should like to ask the hon. Minister to tell us, as of this moment, what is the percentage among female people in the institutions for which he has the responsibility of Indian women?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Chairman, we would not have a breakdown that way. This may be, in files on social histories, I rather imagine for the purposes of the treatment staff, but I could not give him a breakdown on the basis of race, religion, colour, or anything of that nature.

Mr. Sopha: Well, may I ask it this way? Is there any improvement in the situation to which the hon. Minister confessed last year, that is, of the shame of the fact that a far greater proportion of Indian women are in our institutions than Indians represent in our population?

Mr. Shulman: It has not changed, just take a look at the institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member mean are there fewer?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well if I do not have the figures, obviously I cannot tell him whether there are fewer or more. I can tell him this, we are very much concerned with the situation particularly as it exists in places like Kenora district jail and so on. I can also tell him that we have made some contact with the social worker from the Indian centre here in Toronto. We have had some discussions with her, and we have established a liaison with her concerning the problems of some of the Indian women who get into our institutions. We are hoping to be able to expand on this too.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask this additional question? Has any progress been made toward the implementation of a more humane policy of—as I suggest, and I will take the responsibility, of putting this adjectival phrase on it—of stopping putting people in jail for infractions against The Liquor Control Act?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this again is a matter for the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General. I have nothing to do with what happens prior to them to being committed to our institutions.

I am sure the hon. member will know that I agree wholeheartedly that there are a lot of these people who should not be coming to our correctional institutions. I have said this publicly and I say it now, and I can say it without fear of clashing with any opinions within the government.

As the hon. member knows, we have set up detoxification centres and there is one, in fact, now in Kenora which presumably is reducing the Indian inmate population in Kenora district jail. Hopefully, this will prove to be successful, and hopefully, we will have a vastly increased detoxification system so that these people will not have to go through the courts and correctional institutions.

Mr. Sopha: One additional question: Has any progress been made with the federal government to persuade that government to take over the care or the responsibility for the custody of people in our institutions for periods longer than one year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is, Mr. Chairman, a subject which is now under consideration—if it has not already come to its conclusions—of the Ouimet committee which will be reporting to the federal government. We should have this handed down, I am advised by my Deputy, within a couple of months.

I am not too hopeful that this is what they will recommend. As I mentioned earlier, I

rather imagine that the recommendations are going to be the reverse. I think now—and I am giving only a personal opinion—that correctional people in this part of the country anyway have come to the conclusion that the provincial system will probably be a better system for handling some of these inmates than the federal system.

Not that we are anxious to have them. But I think they are more anxious for us to take over more responsibility than the federal government. However, as I say, this is a matter now under consideration by the Ouimet committee.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, permit me to say I have never understood why in the Constitutional debate that we have heard so far there has been a great reluctance, led by the leader of this government, to talk about areas where there might be a trade of jurisdiction, to define specific areas here this might occur.

The member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) shied away from coming down to specific areas. But it has always seemed to me to be a tremendous anomaly in the working of our constitutional system that the federal government which has responsibility for the criminal law, determines those types of misconduct for which people will go to jail.

No one will argue that the great majority of the people who are in our institutions are there for infractions of the Criminal Code, a federal statute.

It is a great anomaly to me that the federal government can define why people should go to jail, and then expect the people of the province to pay the cost of their incarceration. And they do that under the heading of the administration of justice in the province.

It strikes me that if you want to talk about new federalism, co-operative federalism, that perhaps the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the other Premiers when they are down in Ottawa, might suggest to the federal government that they start to take over the financial responsibility for those that the federal government order shall go to jail.

That accords with my *a priori* feeling of common sense in a working participatory or co-operative, or whatever other adjective you want, to put on an ideal form of federalism.

I am rather surprised at the Minister's answer tonight, Mr. Chairman, because for almost all of the ten years I have been here, if not all of them, I remember successive Ministers of Correctional Services, and Reform Institutions before that, saying that

negotiations are going on with the federal government. And like a lot of other things in this country, those negotiations never seem to come to fruition, never crystallize in any action.

A few years ago all the talk was—and I followed this very closely—that the federal government would take responsibility for all people serving over one year. Well, according to the Minister's reply tonight, that no longer seems to be the mode. It is going to be some other arrangement.

Before sitting down I want to point out another anomaly. As I have said, the federal government determines what shall be proscribed conduct, and follow it with the jail sentence. The province pays for the custody, and yet it is the federal government that says when they will get out. If they are in more than a year, an application to get them out has to be made to the national parole board. Am I wrong in that?

I understood that the provincial parole board has jurisdiction over the indeterminate part of the sentence?

Hon. Mr. Crossman: It has nothing to do with the length of the sentence.

Mr. Sopha: That is right. Well, most of the jurisdiction then, or a substantial part of it, is with the national parole board. Whenever I try to get one out—that is fairly frequently—it is most often to the national parole board—

Hon. Mr. Crossman: They are on definite sentences.

Mr. Sopha: —parole board to which I write in respect of definite sentences.

So, here is a terribly mixed up criss-cross of jurisdictions. And being the centralist that I am, I am a centralist to this extent, that I am rather in a hurry to give the federal government responsibilities constitutionally that will cost that government money. Now is that being a good provincial centralist, I ask you?

I am willing to give it to them, and here is one area—the one they are sitting at around the table—that the provinces might well say to the federal government if you want that freedom to say what shall be proscribed in this country then you put up the money to keep these people in custody. I think that is only fair. I do not really see how the federal government could object to that.

But what do we ask, on behalf of the people of Ontario. Here in times of retrench-

ment and penury and cutbacks and all those other financial nightmares we are asked to vote \$46,422,000 to take care of people that the federal government says shall go to jail. That, to me, seems to be part of this federal system that is awfully unfair and a tremendous burden upon the provinces.

I merely urge upon the Minister that we get back to the vogue of two or three years ago where we were of a mind that that government would take the responsibility for those in jail, for more than one year. Indeed, I firmly believe that section 91, setting out as it does, responsibility for the criminal law in this modern age, 1969 must be read in line with good principles of criminology that include rescue and rehabilitation, and that government should assume a good deal more of the burden. And in what better area, Mr. Chairman, can one logically argue that there ought to be uniform standards across the country. Why should custody of people meet with wide variations from province to province, from regions to regions?

Finally, sir, I cannot sit down without referring to the fact that I am perennially grieved that in Ontario, which always leads the way—if the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) gets up; Ontario is leading the way in his jurisdiction; the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) is leading the way; the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), of course, is always leading the way, according to the last word from Venus and Mars—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, he is not!

Mr. Sopha: Well, Ontario is leading the way. It is always leading the way in the number of people in jail. Ontario *per capita* leads the way in the nation, 2.5 times the number in jail compared with our sister province of Quebec, Ontario has 2.5 times as many in the "crowbar hotels" across this province, and the population of Ontario, is over five compared to Quebec.

Well, it is not a statistic to be particularly proud of. In this great province of opportunity, there ought to be built into that slogan, the notion that people in Ontario have a greater opportunity to stay out of the hoosegow, or at least an equal opportunity with people in other provinces. But they do not.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Tell us the criminal statistics.

Mr. Sopha: Well, do not speak up because Ontario leads the way in the numbers jailed for infractions of The Liquor Control Act, which will be of great interest to the Minister of Revenue bearing in mind the amount of money he gets from the sale of that nefarious substance.

Well, what are the figures? I always have them handy. Liquor convictions in 1966 in Ontario 56,290; Quebec 15,440.

An hon. member: A very sober lot.

Mr. Sopha: The moral of the story is they can hold the hootch, in Quebec.

Mr. Singer: You left, three zeros off the end.

Mr. Sopha: Now, those are just convictions for being drunk in a public place, which does not include the Legislature of Ontario. Those are just for that one offence. Four times the number of convictions in Ontario over Quebec.

Will the Minister of Tourism and Information put that in the next pamphlet?

No wonder it costs us \$46 million in times of retrenchment. The member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), who shares some responsibility in the rehabilitation of these people would appreciate what I meant. No wonder it costs that kind of money with the large numbers that we have going in. It is a disgrace to this province.

It is nothing short of a disgrace to go to the magistrate's court and the provincial judge's courts, as I do most Mondays and Fridays, and see the number of people that funnel through those institutions on their way to jail for infractions of The Liquor Control Act. People suffering economic dislocation who cannot pay the fine are trundled off to jail, a very discriminatory offence.

If you have some money in your pocket, you get drunk in a public place, you can pay the fine, and the police will probably take you home the same night. I have no personal experience, mind you, but I am told. If you have not got the money, of course, the law discriminates against you. You are put in and usually sentenced.

You know the way the formula goes—\$10 and costs or five days the first time, \$25 and costs or 30 days the second time; and the third time an automatic three months, no option of a fine. That is the system of jurisprudence that operates in this province.

Mr. Shulman: What has that got to do with reforms?

Mr. Sopha: It is nothing short of a disgrace.

An hon. member: You would not understand.

Mr. Sopha: It has something to do with the people for whom this Minister is responsible, and is one of the chief deficiencies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been handling two departments' estimates here for three days.

Mr. Sopha: All right. The chief deficiency is the fallacy of the thinking here that the government can be divided into departments. That is the fallacy.

We live in a total environment and in a continuum and there really is no departmentalization of life in this province.

I have been waiting for a long time to make that point. Notwithstanding that the estimates in the government divide up into 22, it is all part of one protest, and—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, can you not keep order?

Mr. Sopha: All right, I have just about reached the end of my remarks, and this, I must admit, is an annual refrain on my part, but it strikes at the very root of any feeling for humanity we might have as legislators. Some day, soon, before many years go past, we must put an end to this assault on human dignity, stop putting people in our jails and to the care of this Minister and his staff when they are really suffering from diseases either physical or sociological.

You would think that in a day and age when we are putting people on the moon, that social appreciation of the afflictions that affect other people would have caught up some distance, so that we could be accused of being more humane and civilized than we are.

It is incumbent upon all of us, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to these things, and these things are far more basic in our approach to a philosophy of this department than those technical matters from Joliet that the millionaire prattles away about day after day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. member has, of course, gone far afield, and he has given, as he said, his annual speech on this, I do not see anything wrong with that. If it is a good enough subject, let him give it. I agree, as I have said before, that as far as I am concerned there are a lot of these people who should not be sentenced

to a penal institution. I agree with him on that, and I certainly agree wholeheartedly with him that the federal government should take more of the responsibility in this respect. I will certainly talk to my leader about it and tell him that he will have the support of the hon. member for Sudbury, hopefully his whole party too, when he goes to the federal government and says: "You make these laws, you take over the responsibility."

Because there are a lot of people listening today, I think that I would not want a wrong impression to go abroad here. What the hon. member is referring to is about the federal government taking over all those who have a sentence of over a year or more. There would be no sentence between six months and a year, and all those under six months would be in provincial institutions. This is actually part of the famous Fauteux report. I do not know how old that is now.

The trouble is that all that happened to the Fauteux report was that it was held up. The federal government did not do a thing about it all these years, and the provincial jurisdictions were afraid to go ahead in spending money on buildings and programmes when they did not know whether some of the recommendations of the Fauteux report were going to be implemented.

The hon. members will recall that this was the explanation I gave them, which they thought was an excuse at the time, as to why we stopped planning the new women's institution at that particular stage. Then another report came out from the federal government, I think it was by the late Mr. Favreau, that they were going to make some changes. Perhaps it was Cardin, I cannot recall.

So we stopped planning on the Mercer at that moment, because there was some talk about the federal government taking over some of this jurisdiction of the females.

This is what has happened to all of these reports—the Fauteux, the Archambault—and nothing has happened at the federal government level.

I agree with the hon. member there was a tremendous amount of confusion in respect of definite and indefinite sentences and the National Parole Board and the Ontario Parole Board and so on. We have done our best to eliminate this duplication.

We have, in the first place, asked the federal government at least at this stage to give us complete control of those inmates who are within our own institutions, so that we can eliminate the indefinite sentence. We

would have one sentence so it does not confuse inmates, the public, legislators and sometimes the lawyers as well. And we have asked for this.

This is one of those things the federal Solicitor-General said he would take into consideration. We have asked them to equalize their statutory remission and ours. In fact we do not have it. They have agreed to this and it is going into effect. I think this is in the bill before the House of Commons.

We have done everything we possibly can to eliminate these confused areas.

I do not want anyone to have the impression that I have given as my opinion that we should have the control within our jurisdiction all of the people that the hon. member has said should be, in his view, the responsibility, financial and otherwise, of the federal government. I was merely stating to him what I felt was a growing opinion amongst correctional people. They felt there was not too much action coming from the federal government, and they were getting more action in the provinces, particularly in Ontario, if I may say so. And they have more hope that more progress will be made here.

I was only giving him, as I say, my opinion as to what their feeling was. I am not saying that the Ouimet committee will report this because I do not know that this is, in fact, what they will recommend. I do not know about the question on the other matter which the hon. member raised. It is repeated every year and I repeat it again.

I think there are too many people going to the correctional institutions, I wholeheartedly agree with him. He talks of the detoxification centre programme of this government as a step towards this, and hopefully this will be a better way of dealing with these people, as I have mentioned earlier.

Mr. Sopha: What I am saying in an age of radicalism is that I am willing to take the responsibility of saying what I think should happen with people picked up for being drunk. There should be no stopover in a magistrate's court at all. The process should be a revolving door. There is no necessity, in my view, for those people to come before a provincial judge—formerly called a magistrate—at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I believe this is what is happening in the detoxification programme.

Mr. Sopha: Right: The police pick them up, take them some place, sober them up, and let them go.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is precisely what the detoxification programme does.

Mr. Sopha: Happily, if they have a home to go to, they take them to the home.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are already doing that. The government has already started such a programme.

Mr. Sopha: Well, let us get it to catch on like wildfire, and in no time at all—

Mr. Singer: How many do you affect in that; three, four, five? How many a week?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is why you have to talk to the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) about that.

Mr. Sopha: Well, let us get it to spread like wildfire across the province. We get them out of the magistrate's court entirely and then the magistrate, pardon me, the provincial judges, can get on with the trial of really important things. But it is bloody ridiculous—is that too strong a word—I say to my friend from Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook). You go to magistrate's court in the morning and you will sit there for an hour while he deals with the drunks and the adjournments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Everybody agrees with this.

Mr. Sopha: And by the time noon comes round people who are terribly inconvenienced finally have their cases called. I have always said, adjournments first, drunks second, QCs third.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Chairman would like to determine if there is anything further on vote 402 other than after-care and parole. All right, the hon. member for Wentworth?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out just exactly what is happening in the way of rehabilitation in the area of sex offenders.

It seems to me that the police right across this province are able, whenever a sex crime occurs, to go out and pick up all of the known sex criminals and lug them all in and pick out the one who committed the crime and have him sent away. And when he is sent away—as I understand it—what happens is that he goes into Millbrook and he stays there for whatever the length of his sentence may be, other than for the last six weeks. At that time he is moved from there to Brown's clinic in Mimico and he

spends six weeks there receiving psychiatric help.

After that he is turned back out into society and he becomes one of the known sex criminals. Then the police at another point come around and pick him up and away he goes again.

I am kind of curious to know exactly what takes place during the time that he is in Millbrook, for example. Does he receive constant psychiatric assistance? If no, why not?

There is very little consolation to the parents of a child who has been attacked, or to a victim who has been attacked, to know that the police can find out who did it. It is very little consolation to them to know that the person is going to be put away for a period of time.

What we really need is a programme that will assure that we can do something in the way of rehabilitating these people. Perhaps what we have to do is to have the parole extended at the end; that if there are going to be paroles, have it extended with the proviso that they are going to spend a considerable length of that parole time under psychiatric care.

Mr. Chairman: Let us not get on to parole.

Mr. Deans: I realize, but that is part of the rehabilitation service, it is part of the whole programme, and I just wonder if the—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): You cannot mention parole.

Mr. Deans: It happens, though, to be part of the in-reformatory care and out-of-reformatory care. I wonder if the Minister could tell me just what does go on at Millbrook? How much psychiatric assistance is there available there for these kinds of people who are sex criminals, and whether or not he is contemplating changing the system so that they will be under a more constant surveillance, and out of necessity go before psychiatrists and take psychiatric assistance and care?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had pretty well explained this the other day. However, there is some confusion here. The hon. member, in the first place, appears to be talking about the ordinary homosexual in the first instance and about pedophiles in the second.

Mr. Deans: I am talking about the whole area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, there is no treatment programme to date for the homosexual as such. He is merely put in Millbrook which is a maximum security institution and I have explained the reason for that. I explained what we had programmed for Millbrook to become a regional detention centre; that eventually the clinics at Mimico were to be expanded, and this is being proceeded with now—they are being expanded, and there will be a total programme there for homosexuals generally.

In the meantime, we have to have some priorities, and the priority was given to the treatment of pedophiles because homosexuals are not necessarily dangerous to the public, as the hon. member will appreciate.

In fact, as everyone here knows, the federal government is considering changing the Criminal Code so that homosexuality, as such, is not going to be an offence. It is the paedophile who is the danger to the child, and it is the paedophile for whom we do have a programme, and it is not just six weeks.

We bring him out of Millbrook for the last five or six months of his sentence and he is taken to the clinic at Mimico. There is a treatment programme for him and it is rather a novel one. I do not know how successful it is, but he is being treated for his sickness. As I say, there had to be some priority and this is the priority given.

When we make the change-over to the clinics at Mimico all sex offenders will be taken there.

Mr. Deans: If I might enquire, how many psychiatrists do you have at Mimico at the moment who are engaged in this programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mimico?

Mr. Deans: Yes, at Mimico. How many psychiatrists are engaged in this programme at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I believe it is three part-time psychiatrists.

Mr. Deans: And how many patients would you have there at any one given time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About 75.

Mr. Deans: So, in actual fact then their contact with the psychiatrists would be minimal, there would not be—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are other workers there besides psychiatrists.

Mr. Deans: I realize that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is all sorts of treatment, and therapy and so on. It is not all just a matter of psychiatry. There are all types of workers there.

Mr. Deans: In the case of Millbrook where they are going to be transferred from Millbrook to Mimico, what type of psychiatric programme is there at Millbrook?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is none.

Mr. Deans: None at all? You were saying about the homosexuals, there is no treatment at all for them and so they go in and they just sit there and wait and they come out and they are exactly as when they went in.

It makes one wonder at the advisability of having them there at all if they are just going to go in and sit and come out. It just means they are not going to be in society for that length of time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right. But what can we do about that?

Mr. Deans: You have indicated that there will be a programme initiated in the not too distant future. Is it such a difficult and costly thing to initiate this programme now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, everything is difficult and everything is costly anyway. As I said earlier, there has to be some priority. We gave the priority to those who are a greater danger to the public—the paedophile.

As far as the homosexual is concerned, I do not know how many we have at Millbrook. I think I mentioned earlier, 65 or so at Millbrook. That does not mean that 65 homosexuals are necessarily going to be the type of homosexual who are going to be considered by the sociologists or professional staff as being those who need treatment.

I mentioned the amendments to the Criminal Code, so apparently somebody is deciding it may very well be that these people are not treatable and so there would be no need, perhaps, to treat those people who do not want to be treated. I imagine, in fact I am pretty sure, there are some homosexuals who would like to be treated and to be cured if possible. But there has to be some priority.

The move at Millbrook requires half a dozen other moves which are in the process of being made now and which I explained, I believe, in detail last session.

Mr. Deans: Just one final thing on this. In the case of the people who come to the Brown clinic at Mimico for the five or six

months as you mentioned—and I am pleased to know it is longer than I had thought—with the three part-time psychiatrists and the staff that is there, at the time they are released, from that time on is there any programme that assures that they will be constantly afforded the opportunity for psychiatric and other kinds of assistance, say, over an extended period of time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those who are on parole, of course, will be supervised. The hon. member will appreciate that unless they are on parole or are prepared to accept voluntary supervision there would not be any good in forcing them.

Mr. Deans: Would you then consider such a programme that might insist that everyone who is released has some period of parole during which they must maintain their contact with the assistance they require in order to maintain that they are helped?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I said, I am advised that there are quite a few who voluntarily accept such supervision. I mentioned earlier in the context of another discussion we had here, that the only way you could legally require them to accept your supervision would be either to change the law or have every judge put a probationary period at the end of their sentence, in which case they would be required to accept supervision.

Mr. Deans: Have you considered making representation along that line; along the line of having an extended parole period when sentence is completed? The sentence really serves only one useful purpose, as I can see it. It is to properly assess the amount of mental incapacity, or whatever it may be that those people have, and I think that the parole period is perhaps the most important period of all.

Mr. Chairman: We have strayed off the topic again and are getting into parole. Can we not keep parole until the next section?

Mr. Deans: It is a hypothetical thing for there is none right now. I am trying to ask if he would not consider it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the question could be properly discussed when we are talking about after-care and parole.

Mr. Deans: It is very difficult, you see it is part of the rehabilitation. I will accept your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: The programme of activities is clearly defined in the estimates book. The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, my point had to do with after-care and parole.

Mr. Chairman: All right, the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I have here the public personnel review for 1969, which has just arrived today. There is an article in here which is on in-service training, which is called correction stepchild, and it lays out the amount of training which each correctional officer should receive after his initial training.

I would like to see how Ontario compares with the proper standards, how much training each correctional officer, each guard receives yearly, and I am not referring to his initial training. After that, what are the requirements?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In addition to the seminars and the correctional courses, the hon. member will find on page 13, the various courses they are engaged in and are encouraged to participate in as an incentive for promotion. I think you will find on page 13 a whole page of various departmental courses, certificate courses, degree programmes, and other conference seminars that they participate in from time to time.

Mr. Shulman: I have seen page 13 and I am aware that a number of personnel have taken these courses. What I am asking the Minister is, what is the requirement for every correctional officer annually? Or if you do not wish to take the courses, can you just take no training?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no required additional course for a correctional officer to take outside of his initial course. As I said, there are incentives for taking these other courses.

Mr. Shulman: The incentives, of course, are not requirements. May I suggest to the Minister that he is out of step again. According to Correction in the United States, Crime and Delinquency, volume 13, it is recommended that training of custodial officers should be considered of sufficient importance to warrant the budgeting of funds and the requirements that correctional officers take certain refresher training every year. May I suggest to the Minister that perhaps this is one other reform that he should bring into the department in the coming year or years, and would he consider that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that this is a desirable objective as are most of these recommendations of correctional organizations and publications. It is a desirable objective.

Mr. Shulman: Well, are you going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we cannot do everything overnight. We have set up these courses. Some of these courses are courses that were not in effect three or four years ago. There are a tremendous number of our people taking these courses. You just cannot do everything overnight.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Minister, this is something that you could do overnight. All you have to do is to set a requirement that every year every guard take, perhaps, one day, five days, a week?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that sounds very simple except that we have probably 3,500 people who are spread over the vast area of the province of Ontario. This is one of the problems that we have even with our seminars. We have so many people on duty. Take so many people out of that institution you leave it short of staff. It is not as easy a problem as the hon. member suggests.

It is a lot easier around the city of Toronto, except that we do not have any reformatories around the city of Toronto. This is one of the reasons why some of the institutions should not have been built where they are. They should not have been located where they are located. However, as I said, it is a desirable objective, the same as there are a lot of other desirable objectives which will no doubt come into effect in the future.

Mr. Martel: Give the course in the institution.

Mr. Shulman: The member for Sudbury East is quite right. A lot of these courses can be taken in the institution. It sounds as though you are short-staffed, if this is what you are saying. You said before you were not, as far as correctional officers go.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are building a new staff training college. We will be able to accommodate more at the new staff training college. Whether it is going to be sufficient to do the job as we would like to do it in a total programme is another matter. We are moving towards all these areas, and, as I say, there are so many priorities that—somebody was complaining about spending \$46 million—we could use \$46 million if we wanted to put all our programmes into effect at one

time, even if we could get all of the staff, which is not going to be easy.

I have a note here—training is an on-going process and one cannot say—this is from Mr. Penfold, the director of our professional services. One cannot say that training is for a set period of time. Training should be going on all the time and is a process of interaction between supervisory and professional personnel. I am glad he reminded me of that because this is, I think, more important even than the refresher courses. Refresher courses are an important thing, but I think the best thing is the on-going training, which has been going on within the institution, between the staff.

Mr. Shulman: Of course, training on the job is essential, but I am sure the Minister is aware with the rapid changes that are occurring in the modern correctional thinking that you have to get your guards out of your jails, out of those reformatories, down to somewhere else where they can learn modern thoughts. They are not going to learn it sitting in there from their superior officers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quite!

Mr. Shulman: But you are not doing it, you are only doing it with some of the guards.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are not doing it fast enough for the hon. member and not fast enough for me.

Mr. Shulman: Well, do it faster. You have the responsibility. I wish I had the authority instead of you. We would do it a little faster.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I think it is not only the prerogative, but probably the duty of the Opposition to say, "You are not going fast enough," to push us to go faster. And I am telling the hon. member, a member of the Opposition, that as far as I am concerned I would like to go faster. We can only go so fast, with so many hours a day, with so much money, and with so much personnel. We are doing the best we can with what we have.

Mr. Shulman: Then, may I make a suggestion to the hon. Minister? Let us suppose the minimum per year is one week. Do not start with that, start with one day. Get your guards out for one day a year down to the Guelph training school, and at least give them a glimpse of what can be done. As you get more staff, as you get more money, speed it up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, I do not think that would work.

Mr. Shulman: Make it two days, do whatever you can afford, make a start. You have guards that have not gone back for 10 or 15 years for any refresher work at all. And they should, I am sure you will agree with me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think a one-day trip would do any good.

Mr. Shulman: Neither do I, but it is a start.

If there is no other member I have another matter I would like to bring up at some length. During my introductory remarks to the estimates I made a few remarks about the problem of homosexuality in prisons, and the Minister has not made any comment on that particular problem. There were a series of editorials written in the *Daily Journal Record* in Oakville over the past few months on the problem of homosexuality in our Ontario prisons, and also the archaic way in which we are treating our prisoners. This series is called "Revenge or Reform".

It is fairly lengthy and I shall not take the time of the House by reading all of these editorials. However, I am going to take one paragraph out of three of them because it summarizes the problem of homosexuality in our prisons and brings to the forefront the solution which I have suggested to the Minister, and which last year, in any case, he spurned, which is that of conjugal visits.

I would like to quote first of all from these editorials:

Our prisons too often are schools for crime for young criminals learning to be proficient in their trade. Are not our penal institutions a demonstrated failure? Over 70 per cent of the prisoners leaving jails today will return within five years. And 70 per cent of persons arrested have records of previous arrests.

A recent study revealed the average prisoner spent 15,840 hours in jail. Only 30 hours are spent on rehabilitation and such rehabilitation that does take place during the prison term is usually the result of the prisoner's own do-it-yourself project.

Truly the time is overdue for the public to demand that we introduce a more enlightened system of penology which is not based on revenge, but rather it shift stress from custodial problems to progressive correctional ideas. Punishment is a vengeance concept based on the principle eye for eye, tooth for tooth, but even when goodness has been replaced by wickedness in an individual we cannot deny that with enlight-

ened treatment and guidance there is hope for redemption, regeneration and rehabilitation. It can be said that Canadian penal institutions as they now exist offer prisoners little hope of reform or reconstruction, although calling for a change in our system does not underline in a subterranean way the principles of law and order nor the principles of justice.

If we accept the belief that society cannot afford to waste one human being, one soul, then we find it unconscionable that we should be so reluctant to change and update a penal system that is based on revenge rather than restoring prisoners as rehabilitated members of society.

The chances of saving such an individual once he has been sent to prison is all but impossible because of the frightful sex problems in our "corrective institutions". It is known that the sex problems within our prisons are greatly responsible for the tension, the belligerence and discipline difficulties which prevail there.

Far worse, it is known that our prisons are centres of corruption, sending out thousands of men deformed for life by the sex practices forced upon them while incarcerated. Such studies that have been made show that homosexual practices in prison range from 60 per cent to over 90 per cent of the male inmates.

The book "New Horizons in Criminology"—in which the authors, Barnes and Peters, describe the struggle of inmates who go foraging for a girlfriend—is vivid in this problem. In many countries, this particular problem has been solved by permitting conjugal—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Take it as read!

Mr. Shulman: I am trying to teach him, and also I am trying to teach the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Who needs it?

Mr. Shulman: Well, perhaps the member does.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): He wants to hear it again himself!

Mr. Shulman: That is true, it is difficult for them to retain these matters so we have to repeat them.

Mr. Sargent: Why does the member not go into a room and talk to himself?

Mr. Shulman: Because, unfortunately, the Minister, unless we can convince the Legislature, is not able to make these changes. I am not sure he would not like to make them.

It is a shame the Liberal Party is not interested in reform in this particular area. When they do get up to speak, they say to the Conservatives, "Why don't you get in touch with the Liberal government in Ottawa and make these changes?" I often wonder why the Liberals here do not talk to the Liberals in Ottawa except at election time.

Mr. Sargent: We do not need them.

Mr. Shulman: They do not talk to you, that is what the problem is.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They have not been formally introduced.

Mr. Sopha: Why do you not take part of that million and make a model jail?

Mr. Shulman: To the member for Sudbury through you, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: There are two millionaires in the House and they are both in the NDP. We learned as recently as Monday that the other guy has \$2 million.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member is jealous.

Mr. Shulman: To the member for Sudbury through you, Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure him that in 1971 when I take over the portfolio of Minister of Correctional Services, I will be delighted to do that very project and at that time when the Conservatives are in Opposition I hope there are some Liberals still in the House to see this project carried out.

An hon. member: By that time the member will be in a straitjacket.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Wait until I read all the "Dear Dr. Grossman" letters to the Minister then.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I will be looking forward to that. Well, now, to get back to the *Oakville Journal Record*. I quote:

In many countries this particular problem has been solved by permitting conjugal visits either in jail or under certain circumstances by brief furloughs by the prisoner to his family. Countries taking this modern and civilized approach include Sweden, England, Ireland, Denmark,

Greece, Chili, Argentina, Colombia, Brazil, and Mexico.

In all of these countries the sex problem is not ignored, nor is it compounded by sending those with sex problems to jail when the need is for professional treatment, not punitive punishment. Such a civilized attitude would better serve society as well as the penal system and the individual himself.

Speaking on a programme in Brampton, a Reverend Libby, a young ex-prisoner who is now involved in the St. Leonard's programme, told how he had witnessed an inmate raped by seven other male prisoners. "He said, 'I learned more in six months about the sordid life than I have known in 19 years.'"

Along with being post-graduate schools for crime, Canadian prisons turn an innocent young man into a monster. Is it the purpose of prisons to create monsters, to create hardened criminals, or is it not the purpose of punishment to reform, reconstruct and rehabilitate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, how are we going to get these people bonded?

Mr. Sargent: The member is hepped on sex.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I had hoped to get a better response from the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member will.

Mr. Shulman: We have a serious problem which he prefers to ignore; and homosexuality in these prisons surely he should not ignore at this point after last week's horrible incident up in Burwash, where you end up sending men to jail for doing things which you are forcing them to do because of the circumstances in the reformatory.

Now, I say to the Minister again—I asked him last year—there is a very simple way that you can clear up this jungle that you have there and this is by permitting conjugal visits. It is not a question of allowing prisoners to have sex life, as one of the papers suggested, they are having their sex life anyway, but they are being forced into a homosexual life.

I suggest to you the civilized way, the way towards rehabilitation, if you are interested in rehabilitation—I am not convinced yet that you are—is to permit conjugal visits. Now, I ask the Minister, has he changed his

view on this matter? Has he come into the 20th century?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Give them colour television sets, too.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to give the hon. member my views on this. He knows that my views are that I do not agree with conjugal visits as he sees them, that is, the wife coming into the institution. I think it is one of the most degrading systems that anyone ever conceived.

Mr. Shulman: It is better than homosexuality.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me just tell about this. During his introductory remarks the hon. member for High Park advocated that we should consider the question of conjugal visits and I noticed that he changed his position a little from the bill which he has before the House now. He has apparently gone back again tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the Minister's position?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell you in a minute. In the bill he asked that wives be allowed to visit in prison. In his introductory remarks the other day, he added a rider, "or that the husbands should go out to visit the wives".

Now I know he did that, because he finally realized that our new Correctional Services Act is going to provide for this matter in a much more dignified way. This latter means that he has taken up our position, the position we have held for some time and the position which was incorporated into our new Correctional Services Act, which was just passed a few months ago here.

In this Act, Mr. Chairman, we make provision to grant leaves for humanitarian and rehabilitative purposes. We believe that it is degrading for a man and wife to come into a prison setting. We believe that family life is important, and we have already, in an Act in this Legislature for which the hon. member voted, made provision to permit men to go out to spend weekends with their families, not just their wives, but their families—it is the family which is important.

And the hon. member stepped into a trap when he read somebody else's editorial. He said that this is what they are doing in England, they are allowing conjugal visits. He is not quite up to date, we stay up to date, "More Love Outings from Jails." This

is the position that is taken in England, the same position as we have taken in our Correctional Services Act.

I noticed this week, in this article from the U.K. that the Home Secretary has taken the same position we took some time ago, they are following us.

Mr. Shulman: All you have done is talk.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I have not talked at all. The hon. member pretty well knows that there are two sections of our Correctional Services Act which require federal approval, which are now in the new bill before the House of Commons, have had second reading, and as soon as they become law, we proclaim our two sections and they become law. Let us not bring any red herrings into this.

Now the Home Secretary for the U.K., as I say, has taken the same position we took some time ago, before he did. The Home Secretary incidentally, the hon. member knows, is James Callaghan, the great Home Secretary of that great Socialist government in the United Kingdom. And he is quoted in this English newspaper that I am holding here:

Home Secretary James Callaghan disclosed last night, speaking in a Commons debate on prisons, that he will not allow wives to spend the night in jail with their husbands. "I do not believe it is possible to arrange for conjugal visits to take place in a way that would combine security with human dignity," he said.

This is precisely the position that I, and this government, took a few months ago when we passed the new Correctional Services Act. And further, I would like to read to the hon. members a letter which we received from Mr. A. M. Kirkpatrick, Executive Director of the John Howard Society of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Dear Allan.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:
Honourable Sir:

In reading *Hansard*—

this is dated March 3, 1969 on the letterhead of the John Howard Society of Ontario and it is addressed to me—

—of February 10, I note that an amendment is proposed to The Department of Correctional Services, 1968, to provide for conjugal visits—

Of course, he is referring to the hon. member's private bill.

—I note from an article in the *Globe and Mail* of February 13, 1969, that this matter has also been raised in the House of Commons, in Ottawa.

It occurred to me that you might be interested in the views of our society in this regard and I thought I would pass them on to you in the hope that they might be of interest in the discussions which will, no doubt, arise concerning this proposal.

One of the great problems in prison is the development of sexual deviations due to lack of normal outlet and this results in the development of homosexual practices among some inmates. It must be remembered, however, that a number of inmates had undoubtedly had homosexual experience prior to their admission to the institutions.

Our view is that rather than recognizing conjugal rights as an institutional privilege, it is important to reinforce and develop the total family life including ties both with wives and children and, in fact, the broader community. From this point of view some other method of bringing this about would be more in keeping with the prison setting and the cultural and ethical and religious views of our contemporary society than conjugal visits.

It is recognized that only a small proportion of the men and women in prison have valid marital ties and that there would be a problem concerning single men and those without valid marital relationships. Some of these men might be promiscuous though others undoubtedly would be continent.

It would seem undesirable to encourage a system in which the needs of all did not receive consideration and this leads to the question as to whether conjugal visits should be considered to include relationships between unmarried persons. There is the further problem that wives might feel some sense of being conspicuous in quarters assigned for conjugal visits. It is also quite possible that this might create various tensions in the prison population, as well as between the couples concerned.

In thinking of the problem of maintaining family and community relationships, at a level which recognizes human dignity as an aid to eventual re-establishment and as more desirable than conjugal visits, our view is that a system of leaves might be worked out on a merit basis for inmates, married or unmarried, promiscuous or continent. This would allow them to make

their own choice in these matters, but by returning them back into the community for their leaves would prevent the deterioration which often occurs in the prison experience and is far broader than that of homosexuality.

In this connection, we were pleased to note section 19 of The Correctional Services Act, which provides for temporary absence of the inmate for medical or humanitarian reasons, or to assist in rehabilitation. This provision should make possible the kinds of leaves we have in mind and with the second reading having been given to the federal bill C150, it would appear that this will be passed and enable the proclamation for this section of your Act.

Yours sincerely,

A. M. Kirkpatrick,
Executive Director.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this explains better than I can the position that I took in this place last year when we passed The Department of Correctional Services Act. It does the job in a much better way, and even those who have been allowing conjugal visits are now seeing the light and, as usual, Ontario is leading the way.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see how Ontario is leading the way; as yet we have not had one single convict given this privilege. However, I am sorry that the Minister has not thought the problem through, as obviously he has not.

Of course, everyone agrees it is better to let the prisoners go out and visit with their families. No one would argue that, but that is not going to solve the problem.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now he says—

Mr. Shulman:—solve the problem for the simple reason that even in an enlightened area like California, which has been using these furloughs for some 15 years, a maximum of ten per cent of the prisoners are allowed out.

The Minister, just a few minutes ago, talked about creating tensions in the prisons. What about the other 90 per cent who are not going to be allowed out because they are not going to be eligible for these leaves? I am quite confident that when we come back, a year from now, presuming the Minister has actually put this programme into effect, that far less than ten per cent of our prisoners are going to be given this particular privilege and everybody in the House knows it, including the Minister. That is why

conjugal visits could take up the problem where furloughs leave off.

Sure, furloughs are great. I would like to have nobody in our prisons. I would like them all to be home with their families, so would the Minister, I hope—

Mr. Sargent: It is window dressing. That is all it is.

Mr. Shulman: —I hope, but it is not going to happen. You are going to get perhaps—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Trudeau's bill will take care of that.

Mr. Shulman: —get perhaps five per cent of your prisoners—

Mr. Sargent: It is a snow job again.

Mr. Shulman: For once the member is right, it is a snow job again.

Perhaps you are going to get ten per cent of your prisoners—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the hon. member tell me what percentage he thinks—

Mr. Sargent: It will take him five years to think about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —what percentage of inmates he thinks have the kind of marital ties that would warrant a conjugal visit from a wife?

Mr. Shulman: One half.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: 50 per cent.

Mr. Shulman: Now may I read something—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that what he thinks?

Mr. Shulman: I am going to go a little further, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What are you going to do about single men?

Mr. Shulman: Well, may I read something to you which may perhaps enlighten you on that?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, have you accepted Kirkpatrick's views? What are you going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have accepted the proposition that a person who has shown he is well motivated, is well behaved, will be allowed out.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He will be allowed out for visits and he can make his own choice.

Mr. MacDonald: Great.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You mean reverse—we should allow him, a single man, to make a choice?

Mr. MacDonald: You have got to be consistent, and deal with the whole problem.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, then the hon. member has missed the point completely.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, this talk—

Mr. MacDonald: You are building a façade, as usual.

Mr. Shulman: —talking of missing the point, what the Minister has missed here is that among those 90 per cent who are not going to be getting the furloughs are the ones who are doing the rapes in your prison right now. And who are they going to be raping? They are going to be raping the same men, the young slight men, many of whom you will be giving furloughs. You are not going to solve your problem.

I would like to quote from the *Globe and Mail* for March 6, 1969. This is headed "Sex in Prison Called Desirable by U.S. Judge" and is a slightly more reasoned view of the matter than the Minister has taken:

A judge says that sex in jail between husband and wife is desirable to make a convict's future life worth living, "Otherwise, a prisoner won't be worth a damn," says Judge Raymond P. Alexander of Philadelphia Common Police Court. "We will still be sending monsters out into the community."

He said he would like some liberalization of normal sex relationships in prison involving married couples and also unwed inmates, if they have legitimate long term common-law relationships, backed up by sufficient evidence and not any phony set ups. Alexander went on: "Scandinavian countries permit this type of visit, so do jails in—"

and he lists the countries again.

He said in an interview he is not too optimistic for quick approval, "but I am not disenchanted. I think in five years normal sex relations in special areas in prisons, properly supervised, will be the practice in many states."

Mr. Chairman, it is not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The practice will be what we are going to put into effect here.

Mr. Shulman: I hope not, for the sake of the other states.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And it will involve—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, it is not degrading for the wives, because they do not come to cells. All of the countries that have brought in this reform—and it is a reform—have set up special quarters outside the prison itself on the grounds, where the wives can come without going through the staring or perusal of other inmates. There is a private entrance with a private guarded gate.

May I suggest that the solution the Minister has brought forth is not a solution. Once again, he is scratching the surface. He is making a pretence. Maybe he believes it—I do not know what his intellectual capacities are. I hope they are a little better than he is giving pretence to today, because this is not going to solve the problem—if he is seriously interested in solving the problem. Next year we are going to come back and we are going to find that something less than 10 per cent of his inmates have been given this privilege, and he is going to have the same homosexual problem that he has today.

Just to underline the extent of this problem, though I do not like to go to American sources too often, but they do not talk about this in Canada and we have to go to American sources. I have here the *Wall Street Journal* for February 25, 1969, and the heading is "The Jail Jungle."

Crowding idleness leads to homosexual attacks in county and city prisons. Youth is raped ten times.

Robert, a 20-year-old accused car thief and cheque forger should be in a county jail here, but even though Robert could not raise his \$800 bail, Judge Alexander F. Barberr, Jr., set him free to await trial. Why? "This boy simply would not be safe in a prison," the judge explained. "Even if he is guilty it would be a greater crime to keep him in prison than to allow him to repeat his offence."

Judge Barberr so ruled because Robert, a slightly built youth, was a victim of homosexual rape several times, perhaps as many as ten times, while held in pre-trial custody here. Triggered by the disclosure of similar incidents, one involving a 17-year-old victim whose only crime was running away from home, a recent two-month

investigation found that sexual assaults are epidemic.

This is not unique for this particular area. This is happening in every prison in the world where you isolate men and you do not find some solution.

Now, I am telling the Minister that the solution he has found is going to help a few men. It is not going to solve this problem. And we are going to have to come back and go through this again next year and the year after and he will make the charge, or his successor will make the charge. But it is going to come and you have got to bring your mind up to face this problem because you have not done it yet. Until you do, you are going to get up and say Ontario is leading the world while, in fact, you are talking beautifully and doing nothing.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402. The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I hope we can now get around to paroles.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further before we move to parole and after-care? All right. Vote 402 then. The three programmes of activity under general administration, care of adult offenders, treatment and training of adult offenders, is carried. We are now on after-care of adult offenders. The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, our present parole system is such that a man in a provincial institution who is working time off towards parole, works his parole off much slower—or works the time off much slower—than he would if he were in a federal institution. In other words, a man from a provincial institution can escape, be charged with another crime, go to a federal institution, and still be out sooner than—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I discussed this earlier.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, what we are doing in essence is that we are creating a situation where it is more beneficial for prisoners to escape custody than to stay in a provincial institution. They are out sooner by committing a second crime than they are if they stayed in the provincial institution. What we are doing is we are making the job of those people involved in provincial institutions much more difficult. The prisoners are aware it is advantageous for them to escape, to be resentenced to a federal institution and get out sooner than—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is reading my speech.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, maybe I am reading his speech, but I have had—I do not know how much—representation from custodial officers on this. When it is going to change, I do not know. Maybe because I was away ill when this was—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member like me to deal with that point? Actually he was here, I am sure, when I discussed that in the debate I had with the hon. member for Sudbury on statutory remissions. The hon. member will recall we discussed that.

I have, for about five years, or about four of those years, unsuccessfully asked the federal government to give us the right to institute the same statutory remission as is in effect for a person who gets a federal penitentiary sentence. I was successful finally, and in Bill C150, now before the House of Commons, we are getting the same system in our provincial institutions so that the statutory remission will apply to provincial inmates as well.

The problem is that the hon. member, being from Sudbury, is finding a lot of impatience perhaps on the part of some of the staff and some of the inmates—because they have heard about it in this place year after year. They have, because I have talked about it in this place year after year. I could show the hon. member the correspondence that I have read in this House in previous years with every Minister of Justice since I became Minister of this department. Finally, the present Solicitor-General—I suppose it is the Minister of Justice—put it into the new Bill C150. The time will be equalized and they will no longer have the excuse to say, as someone opposite said last week, that the reason they want to go to the federal penitentiary is because they can learn a trade there and they cannot learn a trade in the provincial institutions.

Mr. Sargent: Better treatment, too, better maintenance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I am sure the hon. member for Sudbury East who is smiling, knows how phony that is. They were telling this to a judge for a long time, and the judge was taken in for a long time, and they got just enough of a sentence to send them to a federal penitentiary where, with statutory remission, which is a quarter of their sentence automatically taken off, they served

less time than if they had not escaped. But the provincial judge got wise to this thing, and he settled that by giving them longer terms so it did not make it profitable. However, as I mentioned, this will now be changed after Bill C150 gets approval and that will give us the same statutory remission with our inmates.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402. The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: I am glad to hear the Minister make these statements. I must disagree with him, however; I was not in the House last week due to illness when this came up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was just an hour ago.

Mr. Martel: No. Now I would like to get on to another bit on parole. In my discussions with a good number of custodial officers they seem to have a great deal of difference with the parole board's contention that you do not advise a prisoner why a parole has been denied.

The Minister has given me some reasons in communication with him. However, I just cannot buy this, Mr. Minister, that in just telling a prisoner that his parole has been denied you are going to get better co-operation from the prisoner. The opposite, in fact, is occurring. Certainly there are some things where protection is necessary, to the family, as the Minister indicated in his latest correspondence to me. However, the great number of custodial officers I have spoken to find that where a prisoner has been denied a parole without reason, the prisoner becomes very sullen, much more difficult to handle, and invariably becomes a real problem.

He starts to wonder whether there is a family problem at home. The very thing that the Minister is saying he is concerned that they should not know, comes into the prisoner's mind, "Is there a problem at home? Is there no job waiting for me as I had anticipated." A whole host of things come to his mind and none of these make it easier for the guards who are working with these people because they do become sullen and they do become troublesome. Somewhere along the line these men are going to have to be given some indication as to why their parole is denied. Having taught for a good many years, I found that when you dealt with young men of 16, 17, 18, if you did not tell them why something was happening, you were asking for trouble. If it is this way with

young people of 15, 16 and 17, I am certain that it is even worse when you are dealing with an adult who feels that he is entitled to know at least why he has been denied a parole.

The second part I want to discuss is the method under which paroles are given. I have two cases before me now. One is a prisoner in Burwash who, according to the custodial officer to whom I spoke during the last week is a model prisoner and holds a top position of trust in Burwash; he has been denied a parole. On the other hand, you have a man who broke into one of the houses on the property and shortly thereafter was given a parole.

How do you reconcile that this man has been denied a parole and not told why and another prisoner is given a parole after he has broken into a home? We come back to the same problem. If he does not know why his parole was denied, he becomes more embittered. I hope to take the case—I do not want to mention the young man's name, but I hope to take this case up with the Minister and probably the parole people, because the guards in Burwash, the custodial people, say he is in the most trusted position of all. Yet his parole has been denied.

I ask the Minister. If you take these two cases—one breaking into a home and then getting parole and another one in the highest position of trust and is denied a parole—what type of prisoner are you going to create? A happy one, he does not know why; or are you going to create one who becomes sullen who is going to be a problem in the long run?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have to say—because it is a problem—that I question the propriety of members of my staff discussing government policy outside of the structure which is designed for the discussion of these matters. In fact—

Mr. Martel: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, the hon. member can object to—

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member have a point of order?

Mr. Martel: Let him finish.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Why is he so touchy about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a matter of government policy as I said. When the hon.

member's party takes over 20 years from now and the hon. member for Grey-Bruce becomes a Minister—

Mr. Sargent: You are living on borrowed time—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When he becomes a Minister he will expect that government policy shall be discussed within government circles and that civil servants should not publicly disagree with government policy outside the government circle—

An hon. member: They are people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a recognized system, this is the tried way.

Mr. Sargent: These are the untouchables, these people, are they?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is the traditional system of our government, of the governments under which the British parliamentary system operates.

Mr. Shulman: What has this got to do with the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member tells me that staff discussed with him—

Mr. Martel: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They discussed with him the parole system and disagreed with the system of the parole board of this government. This, I do not think, is a proper subject for them to discuss outside the service.

Mr. Shulman: That is a problem between you and your staff—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is not so.

Mr. Martel: You cannot really mean that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This should be discussed with staff and if they have any recommendations to make they make them to the officials within the department.

Mr. Martel: They do not have a line of communication.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: However, that is in passing so that those people who have been discussing this within the department will know how we feel about this sort of thing.

Now as to the method of the parole. The hon. member has the right to ask this question. He has a right to question government policy, not a civil servant. This is our traditional form of government, that civil servants do not disagree publicly with government policy.

Mr. Singer: I thought you said the parole service was independent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is another matter.

Mr. Singer: That is the point. You have always said they do not interfere; they have no opinions—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, I do not interfere.

Mr. Singer: —no opinion and you do not interfere with them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They operate under a policy laid down by the government.

Mr. Singer: But they are not within it. You cannot have it both ways.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, they are.

Mr. Singer: Nonsense!

Mr. Sargent: Who has got Viola off then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as giving the information as to why we do not give the reasons for refusal of parole, this is a very difficult subject. I agree with the hon. member it creates some hostility on the part of some inmates. I would say perhaps not quite as much as he thinks. Some of them may give the impression that they do not really know why they have been refused parole. The parole board assures me that generally speaking, when a person leaves the interview with the parole board he knows why he has been refused parole. I have explained this before. The hon. member has explained that he understands the reasons why we do not give the reasons for parole. We have obtained highly confidential information from people and this informational source would dry up if it was known that we divulged the source of our information. It may be that we got the information from the man's own family.

Mr. Shulman: You could give the results in categories.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We may have got it from his wife. We may have got it from his mother. It may be that because of something that is going on in his own home he should not be paroled. In some instances, if the parole board tells him this he may become more hostile and more dangerous than ever.

However, having said this, let me add that if we get down to much smaller correctional communities, for example, the Vanier Centre, it may very well be that we should consider that where you have a small therapeutic

community is where staff is in constant everyday relationship and a better rapport develops between staff and inmate—they can prepare the inmate for whatever has to be told him. It could be told him quite bluntly.

I appreciate the fact that under present circumstances the inmate will sometimes feel that the superintendent who has talked to him before his visit to the parole board, and who said to him, I think that you might be ready for parole, you have behaved yourself and so on and then after having been refused, the inmate may feel the superintendent is to blame and create a lot of problems. This is a very difficult area.

On the other hand, we have the other problem I mentioned. We have the problem of the wife, perhaps at that particular time living with another man. If we let him go and he goes home and finds this out, something horrible may happen. It may be that he has threatened his wife during the course of his incarceration, through a letter or something of that nature, and if we give that as the reason for not paroling the man, it may very well make him more hostile to his wife. I am not too sure.

Mr. Sargent: You certainly are not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sure about the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I can tell you that.

I am not too sure that we cannot try and experiment with giving this information. I am sure it cannot be done in a place like Burwash and it could not perhaps be done in a place like Guelph. On the other hand, we have a problem, too, even in this area. This is the kind of experimentation that if you try it, you may create problems in the other institutions. If you try it at Vanier or try it at some other small institution, where the staff has a better rapport with the inmates and the others find out, it could create a lot of trouble as the hon. member, I am sure, can appreciate. It is a very, very difficult area.

I can tell him the subject is not closed. At the moment, it is a very difficult problem to resolve. I think that perhaps during the year we may experiment with this, but I am afraid I will have to tell the hon. member it probably will not be in the kind of institution like Burwash because of its very size. Burwash and Guelph, as I have mentioned here before without any hesitation, are too large for the kind of correctional rehabilitation system we would like to operate. That is why we are reducing them as quickly as we possibly can.

In these areas there is not this kind of a relationship, you just do not have the time for it—the hon. member will know what I mean because he is closer to the picture up there than some other hon. members. You do not have that kind of situation where someone has established a relationship with an inmate—talked over all his problems—discussed his marital problems—and where the workers, correctional officers and the other staff in the institution have been discussing these problems and have prepared the man and got him to understand that this is for his own good and got him to accept the reason for his refusal which, when he is told, he will take in the proper fashion. It is most difficult and as I said, the subject is not closed.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402? The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to go back to this point the Minister raised about people in his department not discussing with anyone else, other than government officials, changes which should be made.

I found it rather strange, in discussing problems with people at Burwash, how fearful they are of their job. I have it in writing and the Minister has it. I submitted him a copy in writing. But that is beside the point.

Mr. Chairman, what makes this department so sacred? There is no communication in Burwash between the ordinary workers there and the echelons in that institution; there is just no communication. They have complained about it over and over again but nonetheless, even if there were communication, how to bring about change that perhaps the government does not feel it wants, outside of, maybe, pressuring them into change by imposing systems which are, in many people's views, wrong? I cannot see why the Minister objects to people discussing these things.

We represent those people. We represent the taxpayers who pay dollars to keep these institutions going. In a real sense we have a say as to what should go on in those institutions. For the Minister to get up and say that no one in his department should discuss policy, I do see now where this policy has become so sacred that it cannot be discussed frankly and openly. I think it is wrong for the Minister to deny people this right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We differ on the opinion of how our system of government is supposed to operate.

Mr. Martel: You are denying the people their democratic right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have a democratic right to discuss anything they like, but as civil servants they do not have the right to differ with government policy in public. My Deputy Minister may disagree with some of the things, some of the policies that I have put into effect or I am maintaining—he may disagree—the place for him to argue is with me. But it is not his business to go out in public and say he disagrees with the policy of the government. That is the way this system is supposed to operate. If the hon. member does not understand that or disagrees with it, I cannot help it. That is my view of government and I am sure it is the view of anyone who understands this system of government.

Mr. Martel: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the Minister not wanting the Deputy to disagree with him publicly. I mean, it would be foolish to have a Deputy Minister who is out opposing the Minister all the time and certainly I go along with that, but for other people who do not hold key positions to discuss problems, certainly they should have this right.

I cannot see why this government denies them the right to voice their opinion, and particularly in a place like Burwash where there is no communication, absolutely none. They have to discuss their problems with someone because apparently they have no one to discuss them with as it exists at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member feels that the channels of communication at Burwash or in any other department of government have broken down or are not as good as they should be, that is a proper subject matter for him to discuss. It is even a proper subject matter, I suppose, for a staff to discuss with him if they feel like it, because this is not a matter of government policy.

Government policy is that there is supposed to be good communication. I am not talking about that at all. I am saying they have no right to disagree publicly with government policy in public or to anyone else other than within the service.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Minister's statement that the smallness of institutions enables

them to give better service. To me it seems a rather backward statement because it is not completely true and I challenge the Minister to prove it.

For example, Vanier that he is speaking of, what distinguishes it from old Mercer is not its size, but the fact that it is a cottage-type setting. What difference does it make whether you have ten cottages, 100 cottages, or 1,000 cottages, providing that each cottage in the hundred group or each cottage in the thousand group, gets the same attention as it would be in the ten group?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the handicap or the liability in establishing this institution in a place like Brampton or away from a large city like Toronto or Kingston, university cities or towns, is that you have to keep them small because you do not have available as much skilled and trained staff as you would if you were located in the heart of a city, or on the outskirts of a city like Toronto or Kingston or another university town.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree with that.

Mr. Ben: Well then perhaps, Mr. Chairman, since the Minister has said that he does agree, perhaps a reappraisal ought to be made of disposing of the Mimico grounds, and perhaps this would be the place—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mimico is in the Metropolitan area.

Mr. Ben: Yes, it is in a Metropolitan area, but it a large tract of land in the Metropolitan area and if the criterion is having adequate staff—not simply five—but having a satisfactory ratio of staff to inmates, then perhaps what we ought to do is remain in the heart of the Metropolitan area because it has certain advantages, if for instance, we have enough land. If my memory serves me correctly—you can correct me any time—I think there are some 600 acres.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But it is in a Metropolitan area. I do not know what point the hon. member is making.

Mr. Ben: The point I am trying to make is that maybe we should come back to the Metropolitan area with these cottage type institutions, because in the Metropolitan area we can draw on a larger reserve of staff—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But with the cottage type we have them both, we have the best of both worlds. We have the cottage type system and it is in a Metropolitan area.

Mr. Ben: The area of Vanier?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course.

Mr. Ben: I think Toronto will be flattered to think that Brampton is in a Metropolitan area, but I do not think the Minister is going to be liked in Brampton when he implies that Brampton is in a Metropolitan area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, we have had no difficulty at all in filling Vanier with good professional staff. As a matter of fact, we have a surplus of applications. And good professional staff, some of the best. It is proof of the fact that we are in there where we should be, Brampton is certainly part of the Metropolitan area, and so certainly is Mimico.

Mr. Ben: Well then, Mr. Chairman, we are discussing size and the Minister left the implication that Vanier was effective because of its size. If, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is correct and they have a waiting list of staff for Vanier then why has it not been expanded two- or three-fold? Why is it used only as a female setting? Why not transfer more of the people from Guelph into a cottage type setting; that is males, not females, but transfer more males from the Guelph type setting at Guelph Reformatory—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have this in Brampton. We have the Brampton training centre.

Mr. Ben: That is a training school, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it is not a training school. It is the Brampton training centre for adult males, where we pick the best type from Guelph and they go to the Brampton training centre. As a matter of fact, we cannot fill it with suitable inmates. We have accommodation for 200 and there are only about 150 there. It is a completely open setting. I think the hon. member has the term wrong.

When I suggest “small” I am suggesting “small” in terms of the number of inmates. That is what I am talking about. Obviously, if you had a place with 500 people at Vanier it would not be as good a therapeutic community, as it is called, as we have there now, because the superintendent knows every inmate, and presumably every member of the staff knows every inmate. Once you start getting beyond 150, 200, 300 or 350 you lose this personal touch.

They now are able to establish the kind of rapport that gives them confidence in the

staff. If the inmate gets the kind of letter from someone which is very disturbing, she would discuss it with members of the staff, and that sort of thing, which does not easily happen in a place like Guelph or Burwash or any other place which has a very large number of inmates, and where security sometimes becomes too much of a preoccupation.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not going to convince me that in a setting like that each member of the staff knows all the inmates. I will accept that in a cottage-type setting the staff that is responsible for the cottage does get to know the inmates intimately, and it is quite conceivable that they may know the inmates of three or four cottages. But to suggest that each member of the staff knows all the inmates, I think is asking us to swallow just a little bit too much.

But we are still getting away from it. The Minister corrected me in that it is called the Brampton training centre, not training school. I always looked upon it as a school because predominantly that is why they go there, that it is an educational institution.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is vocational as well.

Mr. Ben: Vocational institution—I referred to it as a school for that reason.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But we have to differentiate whether it is a training centre or is for juveniles.

Mr. Ben: All right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is why we are thinking of changing the name from training centres, it is very confusing.

Mr. Ben: Then perhaps I was right in the first instance. At any rate the point I am trying to make—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I still think the superintendent of Vanier probably knows every inmate.

Mr. Ben: How many are there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About 90-odd.

Mr. Ben: Well, here is to the superintendent at Vanier.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Drink a good toast to him, he is a very good man, a tremendous operator.

Mr. Ben: The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman—and the Minister has already admitted it—it is not the size that is the

criterion itself, but the staff per X number of inmates. I am suggesting that if he used a cottage-type setting there is not the same limitation on size as there was in a Mercer-type setting or a Guelph-type setting, or a Millbrook-type setting.

It is the ratio of staff to inmates that governs. I am also suggesting it is better to establish the units closer to a Metropolitan centre where there are university facilities such as at Windsor or Waterloo.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which is what we are doing with every new building we are putting up.

Mr. Ben: Fine. I am gratified to hear that. If this is what is going on I am gratified to hear that, but I suggest that perhaps a mistake was made in removing Mercer, because I understand Mimico is going but the alcoholic clinic will remain, am I correct? Then perhaps Mimico should still remain and be turned into a cottage-type setting.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, before I go on to another matter here, I hope the Minister of Correctional Services will introduce himself to the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) because it is interesting to find the two of them saying exactly opposite things on the same problem.

We have just had hearings in the health committee where we were trying to impress on that particular Minister the importance of keeping the same staff because he changes the staff in the wards every three weeks. Perhaps you might pass your words on to him; it might be of help to us in that department.

In any case, I want to come back to parole. I think one of the very serious problems that has arisen in the field of parole is one that was brought up last year at some length. This was in relation to the fact that there is no possibility of appeal from parole board decisions. Some of us on this side of the House are not convinced that all those decisions are wise ones.

I have a number of cases here, but once again, I shall take one as an example because this strikes me as summarizing the problem very well. This, from Burwash, came in just last week and reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Shulman: It seems that in utter desperation I am forced to write to you and ask for aid. I am incarcerated here at Burwash Industrial Farm and my sentence

is six months definite and 22 months indeterminate.

My problem is I have been here almost a year now and my parole board refuses to grant me a parole. There were three of us convicted and sentenced for the same offence. We were all given the same sentence. The other two were released on parole at the end of the definite portion of their sentence. I was left behind. I cannot understand why. Since then I have taken and completed successfully the oil burner course offered by the institution. I then applied to the Ontario Parole Board numerous times for re-boards and have consistently received no action in return.

I have also applied to the National Parole Board for consideration. They inform me that because I am into the indeterminate portion of my sentence they have no jurisdiction. I even went so far as to write the Prime Minister. My letter was handed to the Solicitor-General and he informed me that no federal Minister could intervene.

My wife has contacted the sentencing magistrate and the MPP for our district and other officials that may have been in a position to help. All of this has been to no avail. We have been subjected to a form of buck passing which I am forced to find truly amazing. As for my attitude: all I want to do is go home, reunite my family, progress as well as I can in the oil burner service trade, and to try to provide as good a future as possible for myself and my family.

If it turns out that there is no way you can help me, perhaps you could at least offer some suggestions. Sincerely, Marcel R. L.

Well, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I say this is typical of many letters which I—and I am sure other members in this House—receive. For reasons which are completely incomprehensible to the inmate, he is being refused parole and he becomes embittered.

Perhaps there is a reason why they keep him in. Goodness knows I have given up writing to the Minister asking for the reason because we do not find out the reason. He says he does not know; he says he does not have the file. In any case we went through all that last year and he refused to answer our questions.

What it boils down to is this: We are not convinced the parole board is not making errors. This case could very well be one of them. What I am asking the Minister again

—as I asked him last year—will be to bring in a system of appeal from parole board decisions.

Perhaps the Minister will recall last year when I asked him this that he said there is no other jurisdiction anywhere that has such a system. I would like to ask the Minister again—does he still hold to that view?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know of any other jurisdiction, do you know of one?

Mr. Shulman: Well I am glad. I was hoping the Minister would give that reply. Yes, after the estimates last year I was rather interested to see whether the Minister was correct or incorrect, as he is more often—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How could I be correct or incorrect when I said I did not know of one?

Mr. Shulman: You said you knew of none and I presume correctly you knew of none. But, there are many, and this shows the limit and extent of your knowledge in this particular field.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This may prove I am stupid, but it does not mean that I gave you the wrong information.

Mr. Shulman: I agree with the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If I were brilliant, I would be a millionaire too.

Mr. Shulman: That is true. All right, Mr. Chairman, I wrote the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 44 East 23rd Street, New York, on July 18, 1968—immediately after the estimates, as you may recall. I wrote them that the Minister of Correctional Services has stated that the decision of a parole board cannot be appealed, as far as he knew, in any jurisdiction in the United States or Canada.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was not necessary to say that. You just had to ask them whether they did it.

Mr. Shulman: I thought I should just let them know that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why would you let them know that we have a stupid Minister here?

Mr. Shulman: I did not know you were that stupid at the time. I had not received the reply. In any case, to continue, Mr. Chairman, this is the reply I received:

This is not true of the United States. A parole board decision is certainly appealable in every jurisdiction. The chances of success vary depending upon the issue raised.

In quite a number of instances, parole board revocations have been reversed where due process of law was not followed or where the condition of parole was held to be invalid or not violated.

A parole board decision is appealable if the parole board is refusing to give consideration to the prisoner where the statute requires that it give such consideration.

And here is the key sentence:

A decision of the parole board may also be reviewed to be certain it has not abused its discretion.

This letter is signed by the Council for the National Council on Crime Delinquency—Mr. S. Buben.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did they tell you who reviews it?

Mr. Shulman: The courts. In any case, I am not so—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does that letter say that they were reviewing the fact that he was not given parole, or the fact that he was not considered for parole?

Mr. Shulman: Both, as I understand it; but they refer me to the Law of Criminal Correction and the last paragraph reads as follows:

I am enclosing for your information a circular describing the content of the Law of Criminal Correction. You will notice a chapter on parole. In it you will find a number of cases cited along the lines of my comments above. I trust they will be helpful to you.

I will reread that, in case there is some doubt in the Minister's mind:

A parole board decision is certainly appealable in every jurisdiction. The chances of success vary depending upon the issue raised.

Now this is a different matter:

In quite a number of instances, parole revocations have been reversed where due process of law was not followed or where the condition of parole was held to be invalid or not violated.

And then it goes on in the second paragraph:

A parole board decision is appealable if the parole board is refusing to give con-

sideration to a prisoner when a statute requires it to give such consideration.

And then comes the key sentence, I believe:

A decision of a parole board may also be reviewed to be certain it has not abused its discretion.

Now we can come back to Marcel R.L. This very well may be the condition here. The parole board for frivolous reasons—or perhaps for no reason—has not granted a parole. What I am suggesting to the Minister is that there should be some level of appeal from parole board decisions.

I do not believe they should be in the courts. I believe the Minister could very well set up perhaps a board of some public spirited citizens. It could be a level of appeal from parole board decisions. Perhaps there could be a judge—but not through the courts—a judge sitting alone. There should be some second level to which a prisoner can appeal.

Now we went through all this last year and the Minister rejected this out of hand. I think he made an error. I am asking him to reconsider this particular decision because the parole board consists of human beings and they can make mistakes. When they make a mistake, it is a tragedy for the individual involved. I ask the Minister, please set up an appeal level. It is a necessary reform, it is an easy reform and it does not cost any money.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid in this particular instance I have to accept, with great reservation, what has been said by the member for High Park. We, in this party, greatly fear setting up appeal tribunals that have as one of their members a member of the government side or go as high as into the government itself, because then you open yourself to favouritism.

In other words, the government's friends succeed on their appeals or the government's friends get paroled but if you happen to be connected with somebody who is not in the government, then you find your appeal—

Mr. Shulman: It is no different now.

Mr. Ben: This is exactly what prompted me to get up. There has been an endeavour to convince us that this was the decision made solely by the parole board. We may or may not accept what has been intimated to us. The fact is, as long as there is recourse to a government body by way of appeal, then there is the suspicion that the parole in certain, very delicate situations, was influenced by government intervention.

In Ottawa, when it came to immigration appeals, the Minister had a discretion and could overrule the immigration appeal board's findings. This led to considerable abuse. Both parties who have formed the government in Ottawa in the last decade have been accused of having favoured a certain unsavoury element in this country by using ministerial discretion to overrule immigration appeal boards and the present government, in its wisdom, saw fit to deprive the Minister of this discretion so that there would be no opportunity of anyone accusing the government of using its influence to overrule the decision of a judicial or partly semi-judicial body.

Now one could have a whole series of appeal tribunals without necessarily getting into the government level. By the government I mean elected officials.

Mr. Shulman: Well no one is suggesting it should be a board of elected officials.

Mr. Ben: Well all right—and an example of that is the Workmen's Compensation Board. People are apt to point to that as the epitome of justice, that you can appeal, appeal, appeal. The question then arises, are you having justice or are you giving justice by a continuous series of appeals from board to tribunal from the whole board, etc. and *ad infinitum*, each one called by a different name?

This is what also has to be taken into consideration. The best guarantee of fairness is getting a good parole board.

Mr. Shulman: Anyone can make mistakes no matter how competent they are.

Mr. Ben: Anybody can make mistakes. The Court of Appeal makes mistakes. Appeals were carried on to the Supreme Court of Canada and until not too recently they were taken right into the Privy Council, and they thought they never made a—

Mr. Lawlor: They never make mistakes!

Mr. Ben: They thought they never made mistakes and the difficulties we have now between the provinces and the federal government can be attributed to the mistakes that the Privy Council made in the interpretation of The British North America Act. Nobody is infallible but surely society—well aside from the speaker—but I am not going to brag about it, the—

An hon. member: I thought you meant the Speaker.

Mr. Ben: But the fact remain that in the conduct of human affairs we have to have a final determination of all our activities.

I am not going to pass judgment on the character of the appeal board. I have not had reason to question their judgment that much. I do not accept completely the decision in the McMillan case. They gave us some examples but I do not agree with the hon. member for Sudbury East that you should state the reasons why a parole is rejected.

There are too many instances where the one responsible for parole being rejected is the wife of the person seeking the parole. For example the Minister mentioned—and I myself have personal knowledge of at least a dozen of such instances—where the wife did not want the husband to come out of jail.

Now are we going to tell the inmate that? Or, for instance, let us suppose that the hon. member for High Park gets a request from the inmate to put in a good word to the hon. Minister, recommending—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He gets lots of them.

Mr. Ben: —recommending a parole, knowing they are such good friends—

Hon. Mr. Randall: A "Dear Doctor" letter.

Mr. Ben: —Dear Doctor—is the parole board going to say that the hon. member for High Park wrote to the parole board saying, no way, no way let this man out? All right. Those are just examples—

Mr. Shulman: I did not suggest that—

Mr. Ben: All right. Those are just examples that could arise. These are delicate situations. I know that I have received requests for recommendations and I have had to just refuse to make the recommendation. But I certainly would not want the parole board to notify the prisoner that a letter was received from the member for Humber where he pointed out that the prisoner had a very poor record and his wife does not like him and the neighbours have been complaining about him and the member does not know whether the inmate is the kind of guy that should go back into that environment.

So things are not as simple, in black and white, as the hon. member for Sudbury East would make them or the member for High Park. We do not want to extend bureaucracy. If the hon. member for High Park feels that the members of the parole board are incompetent and for that reason you need—

Mr. Shulman: No one suggested they were incompetent.

Mr. Ben: Well, all right. If they are not incompetent we have to trust to their good judgment in these matters.

Mr. Shulman: Will the hon. member accept a question?

Mr. Ben: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Shulman: Am I to understand that the position of your party is that you are against having an appeal system for parole? Is that correct?

Mr. Ben: Yes, that is the position of our party in this matter. We see no need for it because this is not where a prisoner asks something as of right. This is not a right. There is no right to parole.

Mr. J. Renwick: Why is it not?

Mr. Ben: Because it is not. The judge imposed a sentence and society then determines whether or not the man has already been rehabilitated by the term he has served and it is society that decides, not the prisoner.

Mr. MacDonald: I venture to predict when your caucus discusses that, you will not have their support.

Mr. Ben: Well I do. You may venture the prediction but I took the pains to enquire, before I rose—

Mr. MacDonald: Good, if that is your position it is well that we all know.

Mr. Ben: And that is our position.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402?

Mr. Shulman: Where do Conservatives stand?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I do not know why anyone would feel that our parole board has not got a progressive approach and is not really—

Mr. Shulman: No one suggested that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman—is not really paroling everybody who it is indicated should be paroled. From the period of April 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, 65 per cent of those who were eligible for parole were granted parole and the same applied in the previous year, 65 per cent in the last two years.

So I think the parole board shows that they are anxious to parole people where it is indicated that they should be paroled. Now just let me read something to the hon. mem-

ber that we prepared on this, because we knew this question was going to be asked.

It is possible for any inmate, any member of his family, his lawyer, a friend, his employer, a member of our own staff, or any other person who knows him and is concerned about his future, to request the Ontario Board of Parole to review his case. Such a request may be made or repeated at any time during the person's sentence.

Let me say right at the beginning again, to put it on the record within the context of this discussion that we are the only parole board that I know of—and maybe the hon. member will find some other place, I do not think he will—where an inmate does not even apply for parole. Every inmate who is on an indeterminate sentence and whom our parole board may parole, is automatically and personally interviewed. Not by mail, as is done with the National Parole Board. He does not have to make application as is required by the National Parole Board.

Now these requests for review by any of these people I have mentioned, are given full and careful consideration by three members of the board. As the board consists of seven members, it is unlikely that the three members who review his case will be the same as the three who heard his case in the first place. This is the common practice of all parole boards, and no board to my knowledge—outside of the information that the hon. member for High Park has given me and I am still not sure that he has made a clear cut case as it appears on the surface, nor that we are talking about the same thing—has its review cases heard by some other independent body.

There appear to be good reasons for it to be done in this way. All parole decisions must reflect a co-ordination of a good many factors. The inmates' ability to learn, their insight and their motivation must be considered. The stage they are at in treatment must be considered. Their progress in furthering their education and taking a trade must be considered. Their future plans and the opportunities that exist to effect must be considered and finally, but by no means least, the person's attitude must be considered.

The timing of the parole process therefore becomes a matter of vital importance. No one passes through all of these stages at exactly the same pace. Such a review board would, therefore, have to have at its disposal all the information that was available to the parole board. Its decisions must reflect the same concern about co-ordinating all the factors

involved and timing the release so that successful rehabilitation is likely to be the result.

Another matter that has not been mentioned here is that if we did have a review board such as the hon. member suggests, the terms of sentences in our institutions are so short that by the time the man's case could be reviewed and all the processes that would go into such a review could be handed over to such a review board—and he got his time in court, as it were, at the review board, he would probably be released, because his discharge date would have occurred.

Mr. Shulman: What about the case I just gave you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know about the case. As a matter of fact when I discussed the matter of parole with Mr. Justice McRuer, he expressed the opinion that a parole decision was very much like a treatment decision. All the factors that can contribute to such a decision must be considered and the persons best qualified to make this decision are the people who considered the information and developed the plan around it in the first place.

The setting up of a separate appeal board would immediately establish, in the minds of our inmates, that parole is a right. Parole is not a right. It must be earned, and the applicant for it must demonstrate that he is ready to complete it successfully. Obviously, if it is looked upon in any other way, the inmates would overlook the necessary changes that have to be made in their former way of life.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Humber made some of the points which I was going to make and has made them very well. I think in view of this—in view of the percentages of paroles which are granted we may have every confidence in the parole board. The setting up of a so-called review board would, I think, be not only impracticable, but would accomplish nothing.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me make one thing quite clear—no one here is suggesting that the parole board is incompetent. What we are suggesting is they consist of human beings, and human beings are not always correct. Thus there should be an appeal board, so when decisions are not correct there is somewhere to go.

The member for Humber mentions the Workmen's Compensation Board. I have had many complaints about the Workmen's Compensation Board, but at least, they have had the common sense to realize that they are not always right. They get up and they say—we have the Minister of Labour reporting here, saying we are right 99.2 per cent of the time—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, they have a right to workmen's compensation if they have a legitimate claim.

Mr. Shulman: And they have a right to parole if again they have fulfilled the requirements of good behaviour and rehabilitation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have no right at all.

Mr. Shulman: Just as much as they have a right to compensation—yes, they have.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, sorry.

Mr. Shulman: This is where the Minister and I part company.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You and I not only differ on this; you also differ with Justice McRuer.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I do not always agree with Justice McRuer. He has brought a great number of wonderful ideas down, but you said something and I am not sure if you are quoting Mr. Justice McRuer or not, but you suggested that if you set up a review board you will be suggesting to the prisoners that parole is then a right.

Why would that be suggesting that to them any more than the fact you have a parole board in the first place? It is exactly the same situation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member knows the point I am making. He knows it is valid.

Mr. Shulman: No, I do not agree. All right, let us pursue this a little further.

In applying for parole do you allow prisoners, of course, as in a—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They do not apply for parole.

Mr. Shulman: Well, when they come up for parole then—when their parole hearing—By the way, is the prisoner always present at his hearing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: All right. At a parole hearing, is the prisoner allowed to have counsel assist him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Shulman: Then may I suggest, once again, as I suggested the other day, that perhaps the Minister should read the model penal code. I have here the proposed American Law Institute Code. It contains this provision, and I quote:

A prisoner shall be permitted to advise with his own legal counsel in preparing for a hearing before the board of parole.

Of course, the reason for—

Mr. Ben: Would the hon. member accept a question?

Mr. Shulman: Sure.

Mr. Ben: Would you please tell me what, precisely, in the American constitution sanctifies everything the Americans do that makes it perfect?

Mr. Shulman: I am not suggesting that everything the Americans do is perfect. We certainly disagree with them violently in a number of their international adventures, but we are trying to take the best from Scandinavia, from the United States—

Mr. Ben: No one is saying this is not a good idea, but why always quote American sources as if they were holy writ.

Mr. Shulman: I am afraid that, once again, the member for Humber has missed the point.

Mr. Ben: You are always quoting the United States sources as if everything they do is the last word.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I will quote anywhere that has a better idea than we have and in this case they have a better idea than we have.

We have been quoting from Sweden often. We quote from Saskatchewan—what is left after the Liberals have mangled things there. We quote from anywhere where things are done better than they are done in Ontario.

Mr. Ben: It is not, as I say, as if they are infallible.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this can be settled very easily.

The hon. member believes that parole is a right of the inmate.

Mr. Shulman: Provided that he fulfills certain requirements. Those requirements are

rehabilitation within the institution, good behaviour—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One of the requirements is that he has satisfied the people who are on our staff that he is ready for rehabilitation.

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So that is the provision. Not that he thinks he is ready—

Mr. Shulman: Of course.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But that “they” think he is ready.

Mr. Shulman: Of course.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then how do you? If they have refused him parole, then that has been fulfilled, that is the point—

Mr. Shulman: That is what I am saying. They may have made an error and there should be a way of review.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a matter of judgment. It is a matter of value judgment.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it is a matter of judgment. Can they not make an error?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then you are saying that he should put somebody else's value judgment in place of their value judgment.

Mr. Shulman: That is right, as an appeal, exactly.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let the prisoners be the judge!

Mr. Shulman: Well, we are on to a different point now. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on the model penal code which is—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the neanderthals are getting restless again.

I would like to come back to the—

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): We are here all the time.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): You do not say anything.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the member for Grey-Bruce and the member for Grey South have one thing in common: neither understands what is going on.

Mr. Winkler: You had better get with it, too.

Mr. Shulman: Now, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. The model penal code has suggested that because parole is such an important thing that a lawyer be present with the prisoner before the board. I personally do not think that would be a good idea, but that he be allowed to consult with his counsel before appearing before the board so that he can be advised as to the best way to present his case.

I am suggesting to the Minister that this perhaps would be a good introduction—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not understand the hon. member. If there is an inmate in any of our institutions and he wants to see his lawyer, he can see his lawyer before, or after, or in between parole.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister well knows that practically all of these, or many of these, inmates do not have the finances to arrange to have a lawyer. What you should have is what other jurisdictions have, a paid service. We cannot get this through legal aid.

There should be someone who will advise the inmate of what is the best approach to take before the parole board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What the hon. member is suggesting is sort of an adversary system. The same as there is in the courts.

Mr. Shulman: No I am not. I am certainly not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is ridiculous.

Mr. Shulman: An advisory system, not an adversary system.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is ridiculous. A lawyer is not going to wind up being an adversary and the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Shulman: No I do not know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The lawyer, in the very course of his profession, is taught that he is supposed to do everything to get his client what his client wants.

Mr. Shulman: Out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That he wants out.

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now is this, in his view, the best way to run a parole system? Where we have people who are qualified and who have been experienced in deciding just when this inmate is ready for parole, having regard for all of the circumstances, and would suggest that you make a sort of adversary system out of this thing? That is ridiculous.

Mr. Shulman: I am not thinking of an adversary system, but that is quite clear.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, if you have a lawyer you are going to have that.

Mr. Shulman: It is very, very clear that some inmates are glibber than others and some inmates who are glibber get out, while others who do not speak well are going to be staying there, because they are less well able to present their case.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, these are probably the ones who get out a little sooner.

Mr. Shulman: I am not convinced.

Mr. Winkler: The doctors know them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think we have pursued this as far as we can. There is an obvious difference of opinion as to the right for parole and I have said that it is not the view of the government and it is not the view of Mr. Justice McRuer that the inmate has a right to parole. That is a matter of treatment—treatment by the staff.

The hon. member, in his view, says he has a right to parole, providing certain other things are involved. There is a difference of opinion here which will not be resolved tonight, or at any other time in the immediate future, Mr. Chairman, and there is no use pursuing it.

Mr. Shulman: I just want to ask one final question. Is the Minister then determined he will not give consideration to bringing in an appeal board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can see no point in it.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, the offender against society may not have the right to parole, but he certainly has the right to a fair chance once he has served his time. This is the point that concerns me, this stigma of notoriety that is attached to every offender against society, because we live in a society which will not allow an offender to forget.

I feel I can speak with some authority on this matter because I have been participating in the destruction of names and reputations through my profession for the past 15 years as a broadcaster, a news broadcaster. And I must say that even at this point I have not reconciled myself to the fact that I have had to be one of those to tell the society around about people who have committed crimes, because the follow-through has come later on when acquaintances of mine have left

these institutions and tried to get a decent start in life once again.

I am sure that everyone in this House has at some time or another known people, acquaintances, who have been in the same type of situation. This stigma of notoriety seems to ride along with people wherever they go. It does not matter what they do or what they try to do, there are always those people who are suspicious, finger-pointing, rumour-mongering, nattering, spiteful type of people who, when they find out about someone who has committed a crime, even though he has done justice and served his time, they still help him to return behind those walls.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the figures from the annual review of this department indicate or bear up what I am saying. If these figures are correct, 41.6 per cent of the inmates in our institutions in this province right now are repeaters. And who knows how many of the remaining 58 per cent are there because of the influence from those other 41 per cent.

So I say that I think this is a matter that should be of great concern to this department. I am sure it must be. And I am wondering what new theories the department is evolving to help the ex-inmate to overcome the stigma, this horrible stigma of bad reputation, as it were, that carries on.

I would like to make a proposal, although it will certainly sound quite radical I am sure, and the proposal is that we release these people from institutions with a similar amount of fanfare with which we introduce them to the institutions.

In other words, instead of making a secret of the fact that Joe Blow has now served his time and is going back home to take up his place in society, let us be proud of the fact this man has done something pretty good here.

He has served time, he has been rehabilitated to the satisfaction of this department in which we in the province of Ontario must trust. So rather than treat it as a secret let us make a big deal out of it. I mean, his wife, his children, his immediate acquaintances, will receive him with open arms, will they not? And if this is not a hypocritical society, if this is a true, just and truthful society, then why should this man be made to feel that he has to go along very carefully and very quietly?

The experience I have had with a few of these people is that they have left this system, the system which is headed by the

hon. Minister, to all appearances quite rehabilitated. Even their health looks good, and certainly their mental health. There are two fellows I am thinking of right now in the broadcasting profession. They were very anxious to get a new start. In one case a fellow went along for two years and all of a sudden someone in the TV station found out about his background and this started coming back to this particular fellow, and the first thing you know he recapitulated.

What he could not stand were the pointing fingers, the suspicious eyes and so forth. I think these inmates leave these institutions with this psychological problem, this feeling of guilt that society has not forgiven them. Sure they have been let out of prison, but they are still in it because notoriety is waiting for them at the gates to hound them the rest of the days of their lives.

So I think there is a sickness in our society that has to be cured, and I think it is in the hands of this department to set up programmes of education for the people, to change this whole attitude about the prisoner. After all, if the man has done justice, if he has served a certain period of time and he has been rehabilitated and we in society accept that, then surely to God we are going to give that man a fair chance.

We hear a lot of people screaming about discrimination against their race or their colour or their religion or whatever it may be in the society, but I doubt if anyone suffers greater discrimination than the ex-inmate in our institutions. And there is the man who needs help.

My feeling is that this is a very serious area and I would like to see this department launch programmes of education, a whole new attitude, and I think they should start by making it public when a man leaves one of these institutions. I think those in the profession which I serve, the news media, should attempt in some way to give equal attention to the accomplishment of these men after they have served their time and become rehabilitated, as we do when we talk about them as being offenders.

I make no apology for broadcasting news about offenders in the society or court cases. I do not think that our profession needs to apologize, it is a service that we render the public in notifying them that certain people have entered into this particular era of danger, of suspicion, or possible danger.

However, once they have served their time and they are rehabilitated to the satisfaction of this department, then I think we

should follow through with integrity and try to do our fair share in helping to get them started again. I am wondering what new theories the Minister and his department may be working on along this line.

And I might just add in conclusion that I do not think the "Shulmanization" of the names of certain inmates in our institutions in this House by using the names of these prisoners in connection with certain suspicious actions and so on, albeit in letters to the hon. member, I throw no discredit on his intentions, but only on the act of reading letters and using the names of these people in this House. I do not think it does them a bit of good. I think it would be just as well to say "Joseph T." or "Bob J." or whatever the case may be, without using the names of those people.

Mr. Deans: Is that any worse than broadcasting it over the air?

Mr. Knight: I think the hon. member is present. He can speak for himself.

Mr. Deans: I am sure he can.

I wonder if I might just return for a moment, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, may I have an answer from the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Port Arthur has asked my views on his suggestion. First, I must say that I agree with him that names have been bandied about too much in the past here, not to the benefit of the inmates, or their rehabilitation.

Mr. MacDonald: The Tories are in agreement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am not in agreement here because certainly I do not think—

Mr. MacDonald: So far the Minister is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —that we should publicize these people's names. It may be just as well to say now that there are thousands and thousands of people over the years who have been in our institutions and have disappeared into anonymity and have taken their place in society.

There must be, as I mentioned earlier, or we would not have enough institutions to contain them all, because we have 61,000 go into our institutions every year. Over a period of 21 years we would have 1,200,000 or some-

thing like that and we would not have room for them.

Lots of people find their way and one of the reasons is their anonymity. Actually, there are only a limited number of people who really know that a person has served time in an institution. Only a very limited number know.

Also the hon. member said something about "when we know he has been rehabilitated." It actually takes a long time before you find that out. We really cannot say when a person has left our institution that in our view he has been rehabilitated. We may think he is on the way, but this has to be proven after he is outside in society where he finds it quite difficult to become reoriented to outside society.

So we could not tell at that stage anyway, and I do not think it would be in his best interests if other people knew that he had served time in an institution, because—there is no doubt about it—it would be a stigma, as far as society, as we know it today, is concerned. It is a stigma in the eyes of many people that someone has even been in a mental institution. Many things are a stigma which should not be today.

As a matter of fact the hon. member may be surprised how strongly I feel about this if he looks up *Hansard*. About 10 or 12 years ago as a private member in this Legislature, I even took exception to the fact that people's names were mentioned as having been picked up before they were even charged. What a shellacking I got as a result of that statement, not only from the press, but from the then Attorney General, because I still think—no, I had better not say it now—I would just tell the hon. member how strongly I feel about the use of names when it is unnecessary to do that.

As far as any new ideas we have in respect of rehabilitation, we are constantly trying to do what we can to get the inmate, the releasee, back into society, to get that first step back into society, which is a most difficult one, because that is when they face some of their worst problems. You will find many of them while they are in the institution are well behaved, well motivated. They have the best of intentions, but when they get out many of them get back into the same milieu and get into difficulties again. Our latest attempt at bringing in something new is community involvement, which I think bears some relationship to what the hon. member mentioned. We feel that community involvement and

community support is most important in any correctional programme.

We do have presently a great deal of such involvement. However, in order to strengthen the impact of the work we are doing now, I have recently appointed a committee to look into the matter of citizen participation and to explore ways in which correctional volunteers may complement the work of our department. As a matter of fact, I am pleased to advise the hon. members of this House that the following have agreed to serve on this committee:

Miss Phyllis Haslam, executive-director of the Elizabeth Fry Society of Ontario;

Lt. Col. W. C. Poulton, Salvation Army;

Mr. A. M. Kirkpatrick, executive-director of the John Howard Society of Ontario;

Mr. Harold King, of the Harold King Farm;

Father Sidney G. West, director of the Anglican correctional chaplaincy, diocese of Toronto.

The terms of reference—I do not have them here—but generally speaking the committee are going to look into the whole matter of community involvement as we have it today; look into the matter of the people, some well-intentioned, some not so well-intentioned, who want to get into this work; see that they are properly directed, that their desires to help are channelled into the proper sources; and see if we can expand the community involvement so, in fact, the releasee's opportunity to become readjusted into the community has a greater chance of success.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I would pursue this a little bit further, just to clarify. I am thinking of members of A.A. for example. Most of them do not hide the fact that they are members of Alcoholics Anonymous, or that they have led a sort of wayward life, that they have been the victims of a certain disease and that they have been picked up out of the gutters. Many of them go around telling their story in all humility. It is the one thing, this honesty, this truth, with themselves and with society that helps them to walk the straight and narrow.

Today the policy, I believe, is to tell adopted children just as soon as they are old enough that they have been adopted and to be proud of that fact. If a person has been an offender against society and he has served his time, he comes out of there to greet the world. If he thinks he is greeting a world that is not going to give him a fair break, you know his chances are pretty slim. There

are a lot who have been able to rehabilitate themselves.

But those are great people; they are very great people. I think in many cases it has been a lot harder on them than it should have been because the truth of the matter is that notoriety is a far greater punishment than anything any court in this country is going to deal out to a man. I think that something has got to be done to start changing this attitude in society. I think we live in an age of truth and of straightforwardness. I think this would help the prisoner to know that it is not being done in a secretive way but in a wide open way. He has done a good thing—he has served his time, he is coming back into society, and he is going to get the fair benefit of the doubt. Anybody who does not give it to him, in my books, becomes a criminal.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 402—the hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, earlier this evening I was discussing persons convicted of crimes where they were obviously mentally incapacitated. I was trying to get down to the point of whether or not some were sex offenders at the time. I made the mistake of mentioning parole and the Chairman cut me off.

What I would like to know is this. First of all the length of term that he serves—for most of this term there is really no rehabilitation work done at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you talking about sex deviates?

Mr. Deans: Yes, in fact just try to clear this up for my own benefit, for most of the term there is generally no rehabilitation effort undertaken on his behalf, psychiatric-wise.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Except for the pedophile.

Mr. Deans: Yes, but for the last 5 or 6 months there is some psychiatric effort made.

Since it is admitted, I believe, that he is suffering from some mental impairment of some kind—it is maybe not sufficient to have him put in a mental institution but certainly sufficient to keep him out of society and require some medical assistance—the period he spends in jail is for the purpose not so much of punishing him, because you cannot punish someone for something that they are doing without any real will of their own, you are actually holding him there in order to determine what kind of assistance you might give him.

I am curious to know whether you have made any representation to the Attorney General, for example, to alter the sentencing structure so that they might spend only that period in confinement that is necessary to determine what kind of treatment they can get and to get the treatment underway for, say, the 6-month or 9-month period. Then from there the remainder of the sentence might be served as a probationary, or as I mentioned before, on a parole basis. It may be a much longer sentence over-all than the one that they presently are serving in numbers of years, but the last 60 per cent of the sentence may well be served out of prison on parole or on probation, if you want to call it that, and under psychiatric observation so that they have to report and take proper training and treatment. Have you made any representations along that line at all?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are doing that with the parole board now in many cases. It is a question of how far this can be extended. Actually we would like, as I mentioned earlier, to have pedophiles brought out immediately instead of waiting for the last six months—there just is not room for them, that is all. The same as there is no room for the homosexual. That is why they are kept at Millbrook.

I think this will resolve itself as we move into the clinics and the clinics are enlarged. The hon. member's idea is quite sound and it is something that, while we are doing it to some extent now, I think, is very worthy of extension.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402—the hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, we are still on the subject of parole. To obtain the release of a prisoner on parole is one aspect but perhaps not necessarily the most important aspect. I think what is important is creating an environment on the outside or modifying the environment on the outside to make it as easy as possible for the inmate to fit back or adjust himself to that environment. I think that too many former inmates go wrong again because society is not quite as ready to accept them as we would and as the hon. member for Port Arthur would.

Too many of them find that, regardless of how well they have reformed and rehabilitated themselves, they reach a certain point beyond which they can go no further in advancing their careers on the outside. And that point is when they reach such a position in their trade that they have to be bonded. That

is when they can either go no further or they lose their job because their employer finds out for the first time that they have a record. I think this is a disgraceful situation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will permit me at this stage, because we discussed this earlier today. If the man, if the releasee, is working with our after-care officer, there would be no need for him to withhold this information from his prospective employer. Because our after-care officer will explain this, will interview the prospective employer and if the prospective employer requires a bond, we will help him get a bond; we have done this in many cases. So this is not quite the problem some people say it is, although it is still a problem. The problem is—and I should have explained this earlier—because there was a confusion here—as a matter of fact the hon. member for High Park at the time he was referring to the bond was referring to a man who had received a fidelity bond. Our people got him a fidelity bond, even though he had been out of the care of our department, I think it was for two years. In the particular case the hon. member mentioned our after-care officer got him a fidelity bond, but he then applied to a firm which had a blanket bond and that firm refused to take him in because they would not cover him under the blanket bond. And it was at that stage that he went—

Mr. Shulman: The bonding company refused?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, the bonding company, presumably because the man having a bond already—I wonder whether in fact the bonding company which had a blanket bond with that employer really did refuse the man, because I did not see that they would run any risk. The man had a fidelity bond anyway.

Mr. Shulman: The fidelity bond was only for \$3,000, the company required \$100,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Required \$100,000? That is a little different. The point I was making with the hon. member was that it is not necessary for him to tell a lie if he is working with our after-care people. They will go with him, they will attempt to discuss the matter with the employer. And many employers are very considerate when it is handled in this fashion. And many bonds are able to be obtained in this fashion if the man goes to our after-care people.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to what the hon. Minister had to say but there are some—maybe in the opinion of the Minister few—but there are some at least who when they get outside those doors say, “Thank you very much,” they will blow you a kiss, fall five times to Mecca, and hope they never see you or your people again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are lots of them.

Mr. Ben: All right. There are a lot of them that strike out on their own. Now, we are still getting back to this business of bonds. It is fine if they are working with the after-care officers, but there are a great number who have been out on the street, if I may use the vernacular, for four or five years before the light flashed on and The Department of Reform Institutions, now called The Department of Correctional Services, set up even what I still today deem not totally adequate after-care, at least an improvement in after-care services over what there was years ago.

What I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is a system where an ex-inmate who has rehabilitated himself, finds that he requires a bond, he can apply to a company and then the government of the province of Ontario, who released this man, can guarantee such a bond, and the guarantee company would be required by law to keep secret the fact that this particular individual does have a record. In other words, he should be judged on his immediate past history rather than his long gone by record, so that he does not have to fear exposure after a number of years.

I had an instance just recently, Mr. Chairman, where a fellow had worked for a firm for many years and was making fairly good money. His employer knew he had a record. He saw advertised a position for which he qualified and for which he would have been paid considerably more money. He applied for that position and he got it, but he lasted only, I think, about six months when his employer found out that he had a record and dismissed him. As it was, Mr. Chairman—I am not giving it exactly correctly—the firm for which he went to work was taken over by an American firm and the new employer, the American firm, discovered he had a record and dismissed him.

Now, the fellow could not go back to his old job because it had been filled. He was out of a job. The result is he went on a papering spree, papered half of Toronto with

bad paper and he is back, he is one of your customers—no, he is not one of your customers because he got two years, so he is in another jurisdiction.

All employers are not as considerate as his first employer and too many of these ex-inmates—I am not saying whether they are right or wrong, I am not passing judgment—prefer to keep their past a secret of their own. They do not believe in broadcasting it. They feel they have done wrong, they repent, and they like to live their past down, not because it is a stigma on their escutcheon but because they feel that they did wrong and they do not want to remember it because they are trying to live it down.

And when does it come to the surface? When they require a bond. I think there should be a law passed which requires bonding companies to keep secret the fact that an applicant has had a record, that they can apply to the government and ask the government if they will guarantee the bond for an additional premium like they guarantee CMHC loans.

And if The Department of Correctional Services or the Attorney General's Department is satisfied the prisoner has been leading an exemplary life since his release, then they can back the bond and the person can continue to lead a normal and useful life. This is what I am suggesting to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is recommending that the government do the bonding?

Mr. Ben: Guarantee the bond.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, guarantee the bond, the same thing. I do not know, this is a very complex problem. It is a question of whether you should force somebody else to take a risk and whether in fact you are going to be giving some privileges to an ex-inmate which you do not give to a citizen who has never gotten himself into trouble and may find difficulty in getting a bond, I do not know. This is something that we have been studying—we have read some material on this—and something which is going to be in our consideration.

I do not know whether it will be in the next year or so, but there are some jurisdictions which apparently have some sort of plan of this nature. I am not too sure just how deeply they go into this thing. We will be giving it some study to see whether it is practical.

Mr. Ben: May I, Mr. Chairman, just point this out to the Minister, because it is not as complicated as he may perhaps think. For example, let us say that a company—

Mr. Lawlor: The federal Liberals rejected it.

Mr. Ben: I cannot say that they have, I do not know, so I am not going to either deny or admit the hon. member's statement, but let us say that prisoner "A" approaches company "B" for a bond and divulges to company "B" that he has a record.

Now company "B" can then go to a department of this government, that department can check and can then say to company "B", we will pay an additional premium of "Y" dollars to you or we will pay a premium of "Y" dollars to you in addition to the premium that you are getting from "A" if you will bond with him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In every case?

Mr. Ben: In every case that you deem this is required.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will not work.

Mr. Ben: Now just a second, let me finish. I would suggest that the small amount of that additional premium per annum would be infinitesimal compared to what it cost to keep a person in your institution per annum. And there is a good chance that this individual just may end up there when he is denied that bond and prevented from leading a useful life.

You have to weigh the costs of it. I do not believe that the costs would be that great. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that in his department they could probably save the amount of those premiums by not using their pencils to doodle with and just using them to calculate with. That is how small it would be.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just to point out some of the problems inherent in this. The hon. member's suggestion, of course, is that the department should recommend those cases which the government should guarantee the bonds on. Correct? In other words, not to take every releasee and say bond. So the department is in the position where it is, in fact, going to make recommendations to those who, in their view, are worthy of bonding.

Now, if the hon. member would just give this some thought, this presupposes that we are, in fact, going to say to a lot of releasees:

"We do not think you are worthy of bonding"; and in fact make them more hostile than ever. Because we have said to one man, we have said to "A", "We think you are good enough and we are going to recommend you for bonding." "B", who may in fact be a borderline case, but in our view we do not think we should recommend him, we will be destroying that man. I am not saying this is—

Mr. Ben: Is that not exactly what you are doing with the parole system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not saying this is insurmountable. I am just pointing out that it is not quite as simple as the hon. member points out.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, the procedure he described is exactly the procedure he, in essence, follows with parole. He says to certain prisoners: "We back you, we think that you merit something different. We are letting you out before your sentence is finished. We are not going to just give you the \$20 which is the statutory limit, but in fact, if you require something extra to get rehabilitated we will help you with that. We have our after-care officers available. We will let you use them."

You do that with one group, but with the other group you say, "No, we do not trust you. We do not think that you should be—"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we do not do that.

Mr. Ben: When you deny them probation, in essence what you say is, "We have no confidence in you as yet. We may change our minds, or you may serve your sentence, or we may never get confidence in you." That is the very essence of your system.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. It is not the same.

Mr. Ben: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not quite the same because what we say to that 35 per cent to whom the parole board has not granted parole, we say, "We do not think you are ready at this moment." He knows he is going to be out in two or three months anyway. It is a considerably different thing.

Mr. Ben: I do not see the distinction at all. Well, all right, you want to say that this rose has 53 petals and this one has 54. All right.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402. The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Of the 1,200 or 1,195 parolees this year—or at least in your annual report—what percentage of the people placed on parole violated that parole?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On page 59.

Mr. Lawlor: I am looking at page 90.

Mr. Shulman: Fourteen, it says in the book.

Mr. Lawlor: I see the answer—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: 14.49 per cent.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, it is improving somewhat.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Violated parole!

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, through you, I am looking here at a parole agreement. It is not yours, it belongs to the federal government. I take it that you do have a parole agreement signed by a prisoner being paroled, would that be so?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is correct.

Mr. Lawlor: I would assume—correct me, of course, if I am wrong—that it would probably contain terminology analogous to the one I am looking at; namely that he is not to move out of the jurisdiction—I would take it as being the province of Ontario—without prior permission.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is correct.

Mr. Lawlor: And permission from his parole officer and the federal one. It reads as follows:

That the prisoner to secure advance approval from the regional representative through my supervisor, if at any time I wish to (a) purchase motor vehicle, (b) incur debts by borrowing money or installment buying, (c) assume additional responsibility such as marrying, (d) own or carry firearms or other weapons.

Would the Minister's parole agreement go thus far?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that the answer to (a) is no; the answer to (b) is no; the answer to (c) is no, and the answer to (d) depends upon the circumstances. If there is something about his job or something of that nature, driving a motor vehicle or something of that nature is put in a special condition.

Mr. Lawlor: First of all, might I see a copy of your parole agreement? Not tonight necessarily.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, we will be glad to provide the hon. member with it.

Mr. Lawlor: Very good. Are there any terms with respect to his deportment in his personal or financial life that you do require him to be beholden to the officer for in fear of or under penalty perhaps?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Some parts of it, yes.

Mr. Lawlor: What would it be?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He must assume and continue his family responsibilities.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At the moment, we cannot think of anything else.

Mr. Lawlor: Would that include common-law responsibilities, or is that considered a family responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes, I am advised.

Mr. Lawlor: Would that include responsibilities of being putative father of children?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is, it might.

Mr. Lawlor: Would it have to be so adjudged by the family court, or would it be of a more informal kind?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Depending on the circumstances, I am told.

Mr. Lawlor: I see. Fine. Now there is just one other area that I am interested in exploring. The business of after-care touching a number of areas, the provision of employment for instance and board and lodging has been arranged in some cases and meals, etc. I am interested, how is this done? Who provides the meals, and where are they provided?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Depending on the circumstances, it would be done by outright handing over of funds to look after this provision or sometimes, depending upon the circumstances, with some restaurant, depending upon whether you feel this money better not handed over for fear it might be used for alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, let us take a case where the man is completely down and out. He has been out for a couple of weeks and the money that he came out with has been exhausted. He is at loose ends, leaving aside the Sally Ann and the Harbour Light

and maybe any number of other places with soup kitchen type of things.

Is there any service provided by your department? He has served out his time, he is perhaps not actually on parole, but he is in derelict circumstances. Where would this man turn to and what would the department do to alleviate his condition?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He would turn to our after-care service and our after-care service would help him so long as it appears to them he is properly motivated and anxious to be helped. They will help him in any way possible—financially, with lodging, food and clothing, tools for a job, anything of that nature, arrange interviews with employers and so on.

They stay with him just so long as it appears that the man is anxious to go straight, is anxious to do a good job and is prepared to work with our after-care officers.

Mr. Lawlor: Let me quite understand this now. If he were in this plight he would be supplied with meals, the department would pay his rent if necessary and provide him with tools in order to get a job. You would do all these things just as long as it were necessary for him in order to establish himself?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So long as he appeared to be properly motivated and his record was such that it was indicated that this should be forthcoming. In other words, if he had been helped on numerous occasions and he just proved he did not care, that whatever money you gave him he went out and got drunk and came back the next day or something of that nature. If he did this often enough, then of course there is not much point in continuing to give this man long term help, or money for tools or anything of that nature.

Generally, the statement I make applies. If he is well motivated, we will do everything possible for him as long as it is indicated.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 402?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could start a new subject now under vote 402; the revocation of paroles. May I ask the Minister: when you revoke a man's parole, is a hearing granted?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Is the prisoner granted the right to counsel at this hearing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Shulman: Who is present at such a hearing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The parole board.

Mr. Shulman: Do I understand then, that before a parole is revoked, the prisoner appears before the parole board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The parole board is the only body which can cancel his parole. This is done at a hearing. The after-care officer brings the man in to the parole board, brings him back into custody and he appears before the parole board. Is that the answer to the member's question?

Mr. Shulman: But he does appear before the parole board before the parole is revoked? Is that right? I want to make sure there is no misunderstanding.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It must have been revoked for a period or he would not have been back.

Mr. Shulman: But he has a hearing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has a hearing.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Vote 402 agreed to.

On vote 403:

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not again, not tonight. Let us go to the showers.

Mr. Shulman: Whenever you are ready.

We are now coming to juveniles, Mr. Chairman, and there are a number of matters I have here. Perhaps I should start off with an individual problem which has to do with Guelph.

Mr. Chairman: Might I ask the hon. Minister if it is his desire and that of the committee to deal with this particular vote under activities, or will we take it as one total vote?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will take it as a total vote.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: There is a Mr. Joseph Reingruber of 579 Stone Road East in Guelph. Is the Minister familiar with his problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suggest the hon. member forgets about it.

Mr. Shulman: It is all very well to say forget about it, but I have a big sheaf of correspondence here and apparently the Minister has not been able to solve this problem. If the Minister can inform me that a solution is at hand, it will save us going into this problem in some detail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have to advise the hon. member that this is a situation which we have attempted to resolve in a variety of ways, none of which apparently has proven satisfactory to the complainant. The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Haggerty)—I am sorry he is not here—has taken a personal interest in this case and he is aware we have gone to considerable lengths in the matter. He has raised the question on numerous occasions.

At the request of this family, arrangements were made for a newspaper reporter to meet with me, my Deputy Minister and the administrator of training schools, in my office to discuss this whole situation and the action taken by the department to solve the problem. The two main complaints of this family are: The boys at the school have, on occasion, shouted obscenities at members of the family; and that their privacy has been infringed upon because the boys in residence on the south side of the building can see into the living room when the drapes of the home are not drawn.

The following corrective measures have been taken at the school: 1. The recreation area has been moved to another section of the school. 2. Supervision on the side of the school adjacent to the home has been increased. 3. Drapes have been installed on all windows. These drapes have been drawn during the winter months at 5:30 p.m.

I strongly disagree with the contention of this family that the superintendent of this school has displayed a lack of interest in these complaints, referred to in the letter.

I quote from a letter to the administrator of training schools from the superintendent of March 14, 1968, in which he stated:

I have every sympathy with this family if they feel so strongly that their privacy is being invaded.

Later in this letter, the superintendent stated:

I explained to Mr. and Mrs. Reingruber—

I was not going to mention the name, I had a blank in here, but the hon. member mentioned the name:

—that only once previously during my time had she complained and that I had taken

every possible precaution to eliminate a recurrence and I would again take appropriate action. Mrs. Reingruber was not satisfied and took my reply to be a lack of interest.

In one of her letters—I have gone through this correspondence until I am blue in the face—she took it to be a lack of interest on his part. He was not too happy about the suggestion that he was not interested. He further states:

This I regret because—as I stated earlier—I feel for Mrs. Reingruber but I think everything possible has been done by the school. I render my apologies to Mr. and Mrs. Reingruber if they feel I was not interested in their complaints.

In a subsequent letter to the hon. member for Wellington South, the Deputy Minister asked the member to convey the superintendent's apology, and I presume he did.

There is an allegation in there that I had promised the reporter that I would go to Mrs. Reingruber's home to view the situation and discuss it with her. As to this allegation, I made no such commitment. My Deputy Minister and the administrator of training schools recall no remarks that could even have been construed this way. I did invite the reporter to visit the training school when she went to visit this family.

We contacted the reporter—I think it was yesterday or the day before—as we could not understand the statement that I had promised to visit. The reporter has denied that any such commitment was given. The reporter also stated that she felt that the department and the officials at this school had made every effort to deal with the complaint of this family.

We could go into all the complaints, but it is really one of those things where you just cannot give satisfaction.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can save a lot of time because there is only one complaint that really worries me here. I am not interested in whether or not someone was civil to them, it is really not important enough to bring up here. But, this is a family in the very unfortunate position of having their home within a very, very short distance of this Hillcrest training school.

I am not quite sure how this peculiar geographical proximity developed, but, in any case, it is so close that the boys from their house side windows apparently are able to overlook the yard of this family. There are two females in the family who have

apparently received considerable abuse of a verbal sexual nature from the boys.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): What a sadistic mind.

Mr. Shulman: And this problem apparently all arose—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is there anything in any of the letters from the Reingrubers that said they received verbal abuse of a sexual nature?

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which letter was it? Quite frankly, I am firmly convinced, after going into all of this, that if the family was not looking for trouble, they would not have any.

Mr. Shulman: This may be the Minister's opinion but—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps he has gone into it more deeply than I, but it seems that all the trouble developed when the school changed windows. The windows before were glazed, and quite properly I think on that side—so that the boys could not look into this family's windows and into their yard.

For some reason the windows were unglazed and all the trouble began at that point. Putting drapes across has not solved the problem because they are moveable drapes. The Minister could solve this whole problem—and it is a public relations problem in addition to everything else—if he would just be willing to glaze the windows on that side. Is this an impossible request?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman—with all due respect to the hon. member—this is another one of those areas where you can do a lot of nit picking from now until the cows come home. The hon. member is suggesting that we glaze the other side of the windows. It just means that our training school children would not have an opportunity to see out of the windows. They are entitled to have some consideration, too.

I am convinced that everything has been done for this family. I am convinced this family will not be satisfied so long as the training school is in that location and it is not this department's intention to be black-mailed into doing anything other than what we have done now to satisfy this family. Everybody has apologized and attempted to be nice to the Reingrubers. They have had a reporter up there. The reporter has said

we have done everything that could have been expected to have been done; I do not know what else we can do.

If the hon. member is going to pick out a lot of these little things as he goes along during the course of any of the estimates—where every person who has any little complaint, which has really no foundation except in the particular emotions of the particular person, then we could be here until the cows come home.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. First of all, we may have to come here for 12 months of the year and if so it will not be a great disaster. But let me say that the complaints brought up in the House are ones that had justification, certainly as far as I am concerned, which we have not been able to satisfy by writing to the Minister.

One of the members in the Opposition has written a number of letters to the Minister about this. It is a very, very simple request, not to move the training school, but to return the windows to the state they were before, so that this family will not be badgered.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not like this—just let me give a chronological event of some of these things.

February 1, 1969, at 7.20 p.m.—Mrs. Reingruber called that the drapes were open in the dining area.

Mr. Sopha: Well, what is her beef anyway?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The boys are looking out and seeing what is happening in her yard.

Mr. Sopha: Well, what is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know.

Mr. Shulman: Do not misconstrue—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are a lot of people in the city of Toronto and in any other town who are living right next door to school yards where they have hundreds more young people to contend with, and they are not always easy to contend with.

Mr. Sopha: I doubt if anyone by the name of Reingruber exists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mrs. Reingruber called that the drapes were open in the dining area. The reason for this was a boy was

scrubbing the walls. They took the boys off and closed the drapes.

February 3, 1969, at 9.30 p.m.—called that the drapes were not drawn in one section, so they were drawn.

February 5, 1969, 6.25 p.m.—drapes open in the dining area of two sections. Five minutes later she called again before the supervisor could get there. There were no boys in the area at that time.

February 13, 1969, 5.50 p.m.—telephoned over to report the drapes were not drawn. This was because of a broken hook, there was just a gap. This was corrected and the drapes were closed.

March 2, 1969, 6.50 a.m.—telephoned that the drapes were open in D section. The night men had opened them at 6 o'clock in order to open transoms to let in air. This was explained to her and reasons why the drapes were open.

March 6, 1969, 8.55 p.m.—she telephoned over that there was a boy looking out between the drapes. This could have been possible as the supervisor was preparing them for their showers.

Does the hon. member really want to waste the time of this House with this sort of nonsense?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: All right, let us go on to something else.

I have here the reports of the National Council of Crime and Delinquency which reads on the front "Think Twice Before You Build a Detention Centre." This is in reference to young people, juveniles, and has reference to the building of places like the detention centres you are building for children. This is a fairly lengthy document.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which detention centres do we build for children?

Mr. Shulman: Training centres.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Training schools?

Mr. Shulman: Yes. There are different expressions in different jurisdictions, depending on—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what I want to know. Detention centres here are something else again.

Mr. Shulman: This is a 16-page document.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member sure he is talking about training schools and

not the holding units for children which are under The Department of the Attorney General?

Mr. Shulman: They are referring to both. They are suggesting that as an alternative to detention there should be a different plan used, because these children should not be in detention.

I will not read the whole 16 pages but I would like to read the three alternatives which they suggest, because I think this makes good sense as an alternative to detaining children.

Three specific alternatives to detaining children can drastically reduce the number detained and their length of stay:

1. Intensive probation services between adjudication and disposition to provide relationship surveillance that helps the parents and the child assume responsibility for his behaviour.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, is talking about detention centres which are the holding units before they go to court. This is under The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I think I know what I am talking about. This is specifically referring to both types.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But not the one you referred to.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, you are incorrect. This first point applies to one of the types which happens to be under the Attorney General. May I read the rest of it to you?

Unlike police surveillance, relationship surveillance provides daily contact with the child, the parents, the school, and the community to obtain co-operation, give support and help work out problems caused by pressures which contribute to delinquent behaviour. It gives the delinquent youth an opportunity to show his good intentions by rectifying delinquency-producing behaviour immediately.

New York is successfully using probation officers with case loads of 10 to work with adjudicated delinquents on suspended detention remand who would otherwise have been detained pending court disposition.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are back again on detention centres.

Mr. Shulman: I am still on the same point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just take it up with The Department of the Attorney General. I have handled enough of his estimates for two days.

Mr. Shulman: The member for Sudbury has already brought this up. Unfortunately the two are intermingled.

Now this is another point, if I may digress for a moment. Your probation officers, and the parole officers should be working together. In fact, they should be under the same development. This is where there is an artificial split. Again I must give credit to the member for Sudbury—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is under consideration.

Mr. Shulman: It is "under consideration." It is common sense; why do you not do it instead of considering it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We always consider things before we do them in this government.

Mr. Shulman: You could do them for the past 25 years and now you say you are still considering them.

Mr. Sopha: The answer is yes.

Mr. Shulman: They consider but they do not do. I will continue the quotation, Mr. Chairman:

This procedure pays off by obviating institutional placements.

Mr. Sopha: Is that an American publication?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: New York city.

Mr. Sopha: Well, he is a neo-colonial.

Mr. Shulman: It does not say. It just says "copyright 1968 National Council on Crime and Delinquency." Maybe it is a Canadian National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Well, where was I:

—effective probation is the most important alternative to detention. Improvement of probation services may be more important than establishing or enlarging detention centres.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Attorney General's Department, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: "Point two—" We now come to this department.

Mr. Martel: Can anybody over there tell the time?

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

Emergency shelter care when removing a child from his home is imperative, but secure custody is not.

Michigan, Florida, New York and a few other states use shelter care successfully for delinquent children pending court disposition.

Thirdly—special group homes, medical hospitals, or other facilities for children with very severe emotional disturbance, mental deficiency, or mental illness, children who do not belong in detention—
and this is the point I was really coming to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You still have not gotten to our department.

Mr. Shulman: Oh yes, I have, because—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is the Attorney General's Department.

Mr. Shulman: This is not the Attorney General's. You have children's training centres where you have mentally ill children.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those are the detention centres I am referring to. The hon. member is getting confused—they are referring to detention centres because he mentioned "pending court decision," and pending court decision they could not be in a training school.

Mr. Shulman: All right. Well just to find out who is confused I will read you the first paragraph of this lovely little book which begins:

Think twice. If you wish to build a detention home or juvenile detention centre, juvenile hall, you probably live in one of the 2,800 counties in the United States that have no place to detain delinquent youths except in jail or jail-like facilities.

Now does not this apply to your estimates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. What the hon. member is reading is the deficiencies in that great American system he is talking about where the counties handle children and training schools. What they are in fact saying, if I heard him correctly, is, "you have to keep them in county jails because you do not have detention centres."

Mr. Shulman: Oh, no, no.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do not have detention centres.

Mr. Shulman: This is explaining why you should not build detention centres.

All right, let us try again. They are explaining why you should not detain these boys in detention centres—they call them detention centres and I am saying it is like a training school.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it is not. It is a detention centre.

Mr. Shulman: Well all right—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member does not understand it, because if he will read it again, it says "before court appearance."

Mr. Shulman: "Before court appearance" applied to one group. Let us go to the general branch of detention—and I believe the Minister will agree, he detains these people, and detention has three malignant effects. First, holding the detained youngster in forced association with other delinquents intensifies his hostility to society and exalts his status in the delinquent group. I hope the Minister will agree with me, this is what does occur in the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, the hon. member is still talking about detention centres, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: All right, in training schools.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, these do not come within the correctional system.

Mr. Shulman: You see we are arguing about semantics, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Not that, it is not semantic but that it is out of order if it has nothing to do with these estimates.

Mr. Shulman: Well, the training schools certainly have to do with these estimates.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member must restrict his remarks to training schools as they apply to these estimates, then.

Mr. Shulman: All right, I will—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister had clearly indicated that the topics discussed by the member were not in his department and they are, therefore, out of order.

Mr. Shulman: All right. Does the Minister agree that training schools are in his department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no need to get sarcastic; get to the point.

Mr. Shulman: Well, the point I am going to make is that holding detained youngsters in training schools in forced association with other delinquents, intensifies their hostility to society and exalts their status in the delinquent group. Point one, would the Minister agree with me?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. I still think you are confusing the fact. I think what the book is saying is that they are forced to keep them in training schools because they do not have detention centres.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps the Minister will forget the book. I am now talking about—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wish the hon. member would forget the book.

Mr. Shulman: I am suggesting to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that keeping these boys in training schools intensifies—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the hon. member answer a question for me?

Mr. Shulman: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In all these jurisdictions which have such wonderful systems, so much better than Ontario, how is it that some are having just as much trouble with juvenile delinquency and most of them are having more trouble than we do here?

Mr. Shulman: Sad to say, Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, no jurisdiction has found the overall answer to juvenile delinquency or crime, but we are all trying.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do they—if they have such good systems as the hon. member is always quoting to us—why do they have so much juvenile delinquency? In fact, why do they have so much more than we, in most of those cases?

Mr. Shulman: Well, sad to say, their particular problem is a racial one which, fortunately, we do not have here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not always a racial one.

Mr. Shulman: Well, that is the reason for the high rate of juvenile delinquency. However that, I am afraid, is not going to solve the Minister's problem. The Minister has a problem here which he is attempting to look after. We have suggestions to make to improve that problem and I hope the Minister will listen to them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Fine, but I wish he would make his point instead of just quoting these long statistics from other jurisdictions.

Mr. MacDonald: He might be able to make it if you would quit interrupting him.

Mr. Shulman: The second point they make here is that these boys should not be separated from their home and familiar environment to be put in training schools or whatever you will call them. The suggestion is that separation from home and familiar environment makes a child feel he has been abandoned. "If no one cares about me, why should I care?" Most delinquent children have been rejected by their home, their school and their community. Confinement in a training school heightens their sense of rejection and lowers their self-esteem, and self-esteem is one of the most valuable deterrents to delinquency.

Thirdly, detention underscores failure. It denies the child an opportunity to assume responsibility for his own behaviour under close supervision in the community between adjudication and court deposition or after sentencing. Now the point which they are suggesting—and I am asking the Minister for his views on this, he has had more experience in this than I—this group—the National Council on Crime and Delinquency are suggesting that it is an error to take these lads and put them in groups such as we are doing in our training schools because they are getting in with other delinquents where they are learning other forms of crime. What they are suggesting is that it is better to have them off in foster homes or under supervision in cottage type jurisdictions, where there are only two or three boys.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Cottage type training schools?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, but the training schools I have been in contain 50, 60 or more boys.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the hon. member been to Hagersville?

Mr. Shulman: No, I have not been to Hagersville.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, try that.

Mr. Shulman: All right, I will try that. How many boys are there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You will find out, or try Port Bolster?

Mr. Shulman: How many are in Hagersville?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, they live in cottages.

Mr. Shulman: How many are in Hagersville?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About six or eight to a cottage.

Mr. Shulman: And how many are there all together?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About 60.

Mr. Shulman: Well the suggestion here is that this is an error because when you have a group of 60 associating together, you are going to get the problems which we have just been discussing. It is better to get them off in homes where there are two or three maximum; where they will not have the opportunity to be learning the various crimes which a group automatically have known among them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will send them out to your house.

Mr. Shulman: I would not mind—

An hon. member: That would be a good idea.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister consider this approach?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will table that document I would be glad to read it. I think he has it confused and I would like to read it.

Mr. Shulman: I may have the document confused but I do not have my suggestion confused. This is the same suggestion that my colleague from Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) made to you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member is suggesting that we would be better having smaller training schools, or cottage type training schools, I agree with him. We are doing that. Hagersville is a place which is showing a great deal of success. There has been a tremendous amount of interest shown in it. He has visited so many other institutions I would suggest that for a while he stay out of the jails and visit Hagersville which is just the other side of Hamilton. He would find a tremendous programme going on there where the youngsters are living in cottages and living in a little village, as a matter, associating with the children of the staff.

There is a great deal of hope in this particular area and we are building a new training school in Sudbury which is of the same type, the cottage type.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 403. The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, what is the date on that article?

Mr. Shulman: It is 1968.

Mr. Ben: 1968. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that what the hon. member for High Park is trying to bring forth in reading that article is something that Professor Grygier brought out about four or five years ago. For the benefit of the hon. member for High Park, Professor Grygier was with The Department of Correctional Services. I believe he is now the head of the department of criminology in Ottawa.

Grygier carried out an empirical study and I believe one of the institutions he used was Brampton. What Grygier stated was that contrary to commonly accepted beliefs everything tends towards the norm when it comes to institutionalizing people. In prisons, the opposite takes place. In other words, when you put people in prison, the reverse occurs, contrary to the accepted belief that they tend towards the norm and the bad improve a little bit, maybe the good become a little bit worse, but everything tends towards the average. However, by putting them in prison the bad become worse and the good become better. This is what his empirical study showed. So naturally, the question then arises, why put good people into jail—they are already good, and if you put bad people into jail they come out worse.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ben: This is, in essence, what this article is saying. In fact, it is not original. They are just stealing from Grygier and I think what they are saying is that prisons are wrong *per se*; that they do not serve the function the people have thought they served.

An hon. member: The crime of punishment.

Mr. Ben: That is right; punishment in itself is a crime. Perhaps the solution ought to be putting everybody on probation to a citizen or a group of citizens in a community. I find myself questioning the end result of implementing what Professor Grygier's conclusions would lead one to believe because you have many situations where parents can-

not handle children. Nothing has led me to believe that by placing them in a foster home, the foster parents are going to be in any better position to handle those children than the natural parents.

It is true that, in many instances, it is the failure of the parents that leads to the difficulties the children find themselves in—but it does not always necessarily hold. The question arises, what are we going to do with those children if we do not institutionalize them? I am asking that question—I am not trying to make a point—because, frankly, I have not decided and I would welcome somebody else's opinion.

Grygier says that it is wrong to put people in prison. Only the good improve and we should be satisfied. If they are good, we should not ask for any improvement. The bad become worse, he says. The last people you should put in prison are the bad ones, because they are going to come out worse. So what do you do?

This man was head of the department of research for quite a while, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, he brought out this paper while he was still employed by the department. So the Minister might perhaps have a comment. Where do we go?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I forget what he called that, I was just trying to remember. I might point out that Dr. Grygier—and this is more to the point because we are talking about juveniles now—Dr. Grygier did suggest that there was some evidence that it might be better to put children in a training school in the first instance. He thought a good three months of discipline, which is something most of them had never had, might be better for them. I do not necessarily agree with this, but this was one of his postulations, one of his theories, and he thought there was some evidence of this. No one really has the answer to it. I am not too sure that he is right; I am not too sure that he is wrong. But to come up with these glib answers—there just are no glib answers to it.

The hon. member for Humber has brought up the fact that most of these children are in training schools because they have not been able to function in their own family setting because, in fact, it was not a real family. We try to create as close to a family situation in the training schools as we can. We succeed more in some than we do in others. And when the child appears to be ready, we send him out on placement under supervision and I think we do a fairly good job.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a few remarks at the member for Humber in this regard—that is one of the damndest theories of criminology or penology that I have ever heard. I would like to know what he means by somebody being bad and getting worse under these conditions. I know there is an eminent judge in this province—I have heard him speak on occasion—who, having sat on the criminal bench for many years, believes that human beings are born criminals from the word go. If that is the sort of thing that moves through the mind of the hon. member, then there is very little hope for penology at all, I would agree.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was not postulating any theory, I was stating the results of a paper that was presented by Grygier. These are not my theories, not my postulations—

Mr. Lawlor: What is the definition of bad?

Mr. Ben: Please do not refer to it as my theory because—

Mr. Lawlor: I daresay the member is misstating him to start with. Secondly, if the member is stating it correctly, what is the definition?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is that expert advice—

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me we are straying somewhat from the rehabilitation of juvenile in the estimates.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Has the Minister any plans to set up new foster homes for children leaving the training schools? How many are there now and how great is the shortage, and what may be done to eliminate the shortage? Could the Minister give me some answers to those, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You will be around all week, we are not going anywhere.

Mr. Ruston: It will not take long.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not set up the foster homes. We arrange for foster home placements the same as the children's aid society does. I do not know that there is any particular shortage at the present time. We have some 1,600 or 1,700 children out on placement, mostly in foster homes, some of them in their own homes, back in their

own homes again. I do not think there is a shortage.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, one of the papers I get great pleasure in reading is the *Cobourg Sentinel Star* and I have here the issue of September 4, 1968. On the front page, you may see, there is a series of pictures and under these pictures is "vandalism", "vandalism", "vandalism". Apparently nine boys from the training school got out and created a great deal of damage. There is a long article here—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Another Reingruber case.

Mr. Shulman: It is not a Reingruber case; a series of homes were damaged. It is especially serious when the paper printed a front page editorial on the matter. The Minister may not think it is serious, but the people around Cobourg do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many homes are on there?

Mr. Shulman: There is the Harper home, the barn—I can read the article if the Minister would like.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How many homes? The member said a series of homes.

Mr. Shulman: I do not know that, quite honestly. I do not recall.

Mr. MacDonald: Once again the Minister is doing nothing but interrupt.

Mr. Shulman: The point is that the people in Cobourg were very disturbed because the training school had not warned the public that these nine boys had escaped. And if I can quote the last lines from this article, and they are now quoting one of the people whose home was damaged:

I would like to know who is going to pay for all the destruction. The boys' parents can't, they have no money. What makes me so mad is, if my cattle get out on the road, the police can charge me. This is beyond all common sense. It is not right. Somebody has got to draw the line somewhere. One or two boys, yes, but nine since yesterday and they do not even let us know they are out.

It appears unreasonable to me that in this administration if an escape like this occurs you should not notify the local authorities. I would like to ask the Minister two questions. First of all, why were they not notified, and secondly, who did pay for the destruction?

Did the department make any contribution toward that particular problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On August 28, two staff members and 13 boys took part in a day camp programme from Brookside school. This is a programme of healthy activity off the school property which has been in operation for about six years. In the course of the camp programme nine boys, who in the course of a game were not under immediate surveillance, absconded. The supervisors on duty made a quick survey and when it was determined that they had indeed gone, the school was informed according to normal procedure.

Six boys had previously absconded from this day camp, 33 others from the training school proper, during the fiscal year. From the school, all available personnel were rounded up immediately and a search of the area was instituted. The search continued until well after dark. A total of 18 members of the staff were involved as well as local and provincial police. One member of the staff used his private airplane to assist the search. No trace of the boys was found until a phone call was received from the police on the following afternoon, indicating that the nine boys had been spotted at Camborne.

A number of staff under the direction of the deputy superintendent proceeded at once to the village where they were met by the police and informed that the boys were on a forested hill behind the village. All nine boys were returned to the school.

During the time that they had been away from the school, the boys had wantonly damaged property of the Harper residence near Camborne. Although there have been previous instances where boys absconded from school and damaged public property, it has usually been in the form of stealing cars or other articles. The superintendent of the school and the deputy superintendent visited the home to survey the damage and the owner, Mr. Eric Harper, was informed that the school would do all it could to clean up the mess that had been made.

The boys were returned to the school and questioned as to why they had left, without satisfactory results. They were confined to the grounds of the school for one month, lost all merit marks earned to date and detailed to clean up the Harper residence. The boys have since appeared before a juvenile court judge and all pleaded guilty to charges of (1) unlawfully breaking and entering a dwelling, the property of Eric Harper; (2) did wilfully destroy and damage the property of Eric Harper.

The house was scrubbed out and everything cleaned that had been fouled. Repairs were effected by maintenance men at the school, linoleum was replaced, materials costing approximately \$100 were purchased to replace broken windows, door hasps, and so on. An offer was made to Mr. Harper to have the tractor repaired at one of our institutions but this was turned down. A piece had been broken from the stove which had previously been severely cracked and no action has been taken with respect to this. The tractor has now been repaired at Guelph Reformatory and has been accepted as being in good repair by Mr. Eric Harper.

It is interesting that, in the opinion of the motor mechanic in Guelph who repaired it, of the \$313 total cost of repairs, only \$52 could be attributed to the damage caused by the boys. The rest was replacement of worn parts caused by normal wear and tear.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think you did very well in this case. The one point that is left bothering me is that the paper here suggested that local police were not notified until the next day. Is that incorrect?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They were notified immediately.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Vote 403 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Correctional Services.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go to the order paper and consider legislation and, if time permits, carry on with estimates.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.45 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 19, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 19, 1969

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch	2447
Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	2447
OSC study on mergers, takeovers and conglomerates, statement by Mr. Rowntree	2448
Metro expansion, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	2449
Student employment, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent	2450
Employment ads in European papers, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent	2452
OSC and conglomerates, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Deacon	2453
Pollution in Lake Superior, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Stokes	2454
Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported	2454
Ontario co-operative credit societies, bill respecting, reported	2457
City of London, bill respecting, in committee	2457
Town of Burlington, bill respecting, reported	2461
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, reported	2462
Bobier convalescent home, bill respecting, reported	2462
Town of Lindsay, bill respecting, reported	2462
March Diamond Drilling Limited, bill respecting, reported	2462
Town of Parry Sound, bill respecting, reported	2462
City of Cornwall, bill respecting, reported	2462
County of Ontario, bill respecting, reported	2462
Town of Mitchell, bill respecting, reported	2462
County of Peel, bill respecting, reported	2462
Board of education for the city of Windsor, bill respecting, reported	2462
City of Belleville, bill respecting, reported	2462
Township of Teck, bill respecting, reported	2462
Maimonides Schools for Jewish Studies, bill respecting, reported	2462
Carleton University, bill respecting, in committee	2462
Tilbury public school board, bill respecting, reported	2463
Co-ordinated Arts Services, bill respecting, reported	2463
City of Sarnia, bill respecting, reported	2463
City of Peterborough, bill respecting, reported	2464
Banks Alignment Limited, bill respecting, reported	2464
McMaster University, bill respecting, in committee	2464
Town of Mississauga, bill respecting, reported	2464
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. White, second reading	2464
Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld	2466
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2484
Erratum	2484

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1969

The House met today at 2.30 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today is scout day. We have in the east gallery a scout group from Kitchener; and in the west gallery, five scout troops from St. Catharines.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) presented to the House the following reports:

1. The annual report for 1967-68 of the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute for the year ending March 31, 1968.
2. The annual report of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) for the year ending March 31, 1968.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for an increase in the minimum automobile public liability coverage from \$35,000 to \$50,000, on an inclusive basis, effective September 1 of this year. I am informed that presently over 80 per cent of insured drivers have coverage in excess of the new minimum limits and will, therefore, not be affected.

The bill also deals with a number of routine and housekeeping amendments designed to update the Act and adopt uniform language across Canada as recommended by the Association of Superintendents of Insurance.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker has a ruling before the orders of the day. Last week the member for Sarnia directed a question to me as to when a division actually occurs. "Lewis'

Parliamentary Procedure" in Ontario, at page 85, makes it quite clear that the actual division is when the members stand to record their votes for or against the question. This is supported by "May's Parliamentary Practice," 17th Edition, at page 422, which states that the division occurs when the members separate into the two lobbies for the purpose of being counted, for and against the question.

I believe the member's confusion arises from the wording of clause (a) of rule 107, which states:

Upon a division, the yeas and nays shall not be entered upon the minutes, unless demanded by five members.

This appears to contemplate that after the division takes place, it will not be recorded unless five members so request.

However, the application of this rule that, to the best of my knowledge, has always been followed in this Legislature, is that the division itself does not take place unless requested by five members, and if so requested, is recorded. Clause (a) then goes on to provide that on motions to adjourn the House or the debate only the numbers are recorded.

It should be noted here that when the House is in committee, a division is not recorded for the reason that only the committee's report is recorded. I suggest that clause (a) of rule 107 should more properly read:

The yeas and nays shall not be entered upon the minutes unless a division is demanded by five members; and on questions of adjournment of the House or of the debate, the numbers only shall be entered.

I believe the member's primary concern is with the application of clause (b) of rule 107, which says:

On the question being put every member in the chamber, with the exception of the Speaker, must record his vote.

As the whole of rule 107, along with rule 106, deals with divisions, it appears obvious that clause (b) refers to the putting of the question after the division has been called. The clause obviously refers to a division and

provides that every member in the chamber when the question is put at the time of the division must vote.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my gratitude to you for clarifying this ambiguous rule and, if I might, congratulate the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) on his consistency. He is wrong again.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite out of order.

The hon. Minister of Correctional Services has a statement.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, last night during the debates on the estimates of my department the following dialogue regarding Don Jail took place between the hon. member for High Park and myself at approximately 5.30 p.m. and I quote:

Mr. Shulman: If a prisoner is referred by a magistrate for a mental examination and I would appreciate a straight yes or no answer, will he see a psychiatrist?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will have to check that. I want to make sure before I give an answer to the hon. member. I will get that answer for him. But I want to point out to the hon. member, regardless of what the conditions were at the Don Jail at any one time, we just took the Don Jail over in July of 1968.

After approximately a five- or ten-minute lapse, I received a note from Dr. Norman Goodwin, director of medical service for our department, and I then stated in answer to that question:

I have the answer for the hon. member. The answer to his question is yes, all court referrals are examined by psychiatrists.

Just so, Mr. Speaker, there would be no misunderstanding, I want to read into the record a memorandum from our director of medical services, Dr. Norman Goodwin to my Deputy Minister. This memorandum is dated March 19, today, and it is to the Deputy Minister from Dr. Norman Goodwin, director of medical services:

Re Metropolitan Toronto Jail—psychiatric assessment.

A question was raised in the House last night respecting the examination of inmates remanded to the Metropolitan Toronto jail for mental examination. My interpretation of this question was with respect to those remanded for psychiatric examination. In

all cases, when a person is remanded by the courts to the Metropolitan Toronto jail for a psychiatric examination, such examination is, in fact, carried out by a psychiatrist. I therefore sent a note to the Minister advising him that the answer to the question was yes.

After adjournment, you advised me that your interpretation of this question was different from mine. I therefore wish to clarify the situation. As I have already stated, all cases remanded by the courts to the Metropolitan Toronto jail for psychiatric examination are, in fact, examined by a psychiatrist.

When a person is remanded for a mental examination, this examination is carried out by two of the physicians at the jail. One of the jail doctors and the governor hold a case conference every day, Monday through Friday, with a visiting psychiatrist. During these conferences all border line cases are referred to the psychiatrist for consultation and/or examination.

I hope that this has clarified the procedures followed and regret any misunderstanding which may have occurred as a result of the note which I sent to the Minister during the estimates.

It is signed by my director of medical services, Dr. Goodwin.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Has the system remained the same in that the Don jail doctor is being paid on a piece-work basis in addition to his salary for the mental examinations?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. I explained this last night. The hon. member asked me that question and I even read out his salary, if the member will recall. He is no longer operating on any basis whereby he gets a fixed fee plus so much per examination. He gets a fixed salary. He is a member of the civil service—I should say public service.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs has a statement.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I have for some time been observing the increasing numbers of mergers, takeover bids and consequent formation of companies known as conglomerates.

Note has been taken of the public interest in these matters, which has been expressed in the daily papers and news magazines, not only in Canada but in the United States and

Great Britain as well. Discussions have been held with the Ontario Securities Commission and the chairman, and we consider that the matter is of such a nature that a study and review of the situation as it exists is desirable.

Accordingly, I have asked the Ontario Securities Commission—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—do I take it this will be the order now, when a member has a question, that the Minister jumps the gun and makes the statement before the question comes up?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member raised the same question by way of point of order yesterday, and I dealt with it yesterday as I will do with it today. Ministerial statements as to matters of policy and otherwise within their department are quite in order, it has been the custom to have them at the beginning of the orders of the day. If there is a question asked, then in due course the member placing his question may ask his question and that is the ruling of the Chair and it applies on this day too.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have asked the Ontario Securities Commission to conduct such a study and review all aspects of mergers, takeovers and conglomerates. The terms of the study are being now finalized and I shall have a further statement on these matters in the next few days.

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

Is the Cabinet continuing discussions with Metro Toronto on the possibilities of north and east expansion, or is the decision to restrict further Metropolitan growth definite?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there never have been any discussions between the Cabinet and the Metropolitan Toronto council.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, for clarification I would say of leading members of the Cabinet, surely the decision would be considered by Cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course. I must make it clear that one Minister has been involved and I have told the House this in answer to a question. But that does not necessarily mean that the whole Cabinet is involved. They are two entirely different things. So my answer to the question is—if I could just find the question it would help, I have it here some place.

Mr. Nixon: We are asking for clarification.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The answer is quite clear to me. It may not be to you. I really wanted to read the question so I can answer it in proper terms in order to satisfy the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: All right, let us hear it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The Cabinet is not continuing discussions with Metro Toronto because it has never commenced them. Any discussions that have been held, as I say, have been held by the Minister himself.

On November 28 in this House I said that the government, in implementing regional governments, would seek community participation in the formation of regional governments and, where possible, we shall strive to achieve community acceptability of these proposals.

That is precisely what we are doing and that is precisely what the Minister is doing. But I do not think I can let the assumption go that is involved in the question, that the Cabinet was sitting down discussing it with the Metropolitan council because it was not.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to pursue this, if the Premier will permit a supplementary question. Would he tell the House that he, as leader of the government, was involved in these discussions, as was reported? I believe he answered affirmatively on a previous occasion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I answered a question here, I do not recall what day it was, saying that I had never been involved. I was not involved in the meeting. These were the meetings where this was mentioned as a speculation, I believe, in one of the newspapers, which prompted the question in the first place. I was not involved.

Mr. Nixon: Well, as a speculation in one of the newspapers, is the Premier aware that the statement was made yesterday or in this morning's paper that the Minister, presumably having consulted with the leader of the government and certain Cabinet colleagues—I would think it would be a Cabinet decision—had announced that there would be no further possibility of Metro Toronto expansion.

I would like to ask if that is firm policy or if this is still under discussion by the Cabinet, the senior members of the Cabinet, or perhaps only the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough)?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes a great many assumptions in this question and many of them are not valid.

I can only say that government policy is as it has been spelled out in this House. You refer to the statements I have made myself, a quote of what I said on November 28. Certainly there will be a lot of negotiation necessary, but the fact of the matter is that if you do anything in these matters you have got to take a position and you start from there, and that is what we have done.

There will be discussion about these matters, but that does not mean that presently the situation is open. I read the press reports, and what is building up here is whether we are to say that there is going to be a firm wall built around Metro Toronto or that there is not. The question can never be that black and white and I think any member of this House would realize that.

On the other hand, if we are to get on with the whole process of establishing other regional governments in the area, you have to take a position and start from there. So if you want to know what government policy is, it has not changed since the statements that I made in this House and those made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: If I could pursue this — one further question if I may. The statement that the Premier has read to us calling for continuing involvement and consultation is all very well, but according to press reports the Minister, who speaks for the government in this regard, is announcing perhaps — he is not back from the announcement yet according to the newspapers — that there will not be further expansion permitted in the Metropolitan area towards the north and east. I wonder if the leader of the government might be able to confirm that that is in fact irrevocable policy.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, as I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a decision which was made here and has been announced. But I will not permit the government to be put in a position whereby if we do find out that it is necessary as the discussions continue that there be some alterations in the boundaries it will immediately be thrown back at us that we said it was a fixed, immutable rule that we would not change the boundaries of metropolitan Toronto. One has to use a little common sense.

Mr. Nixon: So if you do not want to be in that position —

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. I do not want to be in that position and I point out to you, you have got to use a little common sense when you start to deal with matters of this kind. We took a position from which to start; we have set out how we propose to deal with it, and that is it. It is all there in our statements.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is the answer to the question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for High Park wish to speak on a point of order?

Mr. Shulman: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been accepted practice in all Legislatures that announcements that are going to affect the market price of securities should be made after the market closes.

I think a serious gaff has occurred here today, sir, and that those who are in this Chamber are now aware of certain information—three quarters of an hour before the market closes—which is going to seriously affect the price of a number of stocks on the Toronto Stock Exchange. I would like to suggest to you, sir, that this has been a very serious error and I hope that you will impress upon the Minister he should not make this error in the future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has two questions from yesterday of the Prime Minister and one today.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the question to the Prime Minister today is:

1. Will the Premier advise the House how he can equate the listing in the parliamentary guide which shows the Premier of Ontario receiving \$30,000 a year, and the Premier of Quebec receiving \$22,000 a year; the members of the legislative assembly in Quebec receiving \$18,000 a year, and the members of this legislative assembly in Ontario \$8,000 plus \$4,000 expenses.

2. How can the Premier equate the paying of janitors in high schools of the province \$11,500 a year, which is equal to the payment which members of this Assembly are now receiving?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have not checked these figures. I do not know what the Premier of Quebec gets and I do not equate figures of this type; I do not consider that part of my function. So when you say how do I equate, I say I do not equate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has two questions from yesterday of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Further to the Premier's statement on jobs for students this summer, will he advise why he will not consider a tax concession plan for industry to employ students during the summer months—which is in effect in New York State now—the augmentation of a plan similar to the one under way in Nova Scotia to employ students building low cost housing as a part of the construction force this summer? And will the Premier advise why he cannot cut \$10 million off highway construction this year and supply 20,000 university and high school students with summer jobs to give them \$500 each to continue education this fall?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member says, "will he advise why he will not consider"—nobody has asked me to consider tax concessions until his question came along. I will now consider it and tell him that I am not really convinced that this is any answer to the problem. I think that the approach we are taking, when we are asking for—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well if you want an answer to the question, you might listen. If you do not care, be quiet and I will tell the rest of the members the answer to your question.

We do not have to grant tax concessions. We think that there are job opportunities available in this province for students that can be developed without dipping into the public purse to the extent of making tax concessions. I do not know what the tax concessions would be and then I think, of course, we are right into the situation we wish to avoid — where we are subsidizing young people for doing work that is not worth what they are paid to do it. I do not think that is good either for the young person involved or for the taxpayer.

Secondly, the augmentation of a plan similar to the one underway in Nova Scotia—well I believe that there was an article in one of the newspapers regarding this. But it is a pilot project only. It has not been accepted by the Nova Scotia government. I do not know that it would be applicable in this province and, in any event, as I have pointed out to you already, we have our own programme which we would like to see work for

a year before we consider any other changes there might be.

Mr. Sargent: What is your programme?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well if you had been here when I announced it, you would know all about it. Just refer to *Hansard* and you will see it all laid out. Do you say it will not work until you have given it a chance.

Now in reply to the hon. member's third question—

Mr. Sargent: All you are doing is—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Wait and see. You want me to advise why I cannot cut \$10 million off highway construction and supply 20,000 university and high school students with summer jobs, and give them \$500 each to continue their education.

I do not quite understand what you mean. There are several interpretations that may be put upon this question. If you were suggesting that we take \$10 million off the highway budget and distribute it to 20,000 university and high school students at the rate of \$500 each, that is one question that we would not consider, of course.

We have a question of loans and bursaries already—loans and grants to university students. Out of the public purse we pay about \$3,000 for every university student in the province. Now you are suggesting that we cut back in the highway programme.

I do not know whether that would be in the riding of the member for Sudbury, who wants more roads up there, or whether it would be up in Grey county. You want all the roads dispensed with and then a handout of \$500 to 20,000 students—

Mr. Sargent: What is the programme?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will get to that. That is the other interpretation.

Are we to take the taxpayer's money and cut down on the number of highways we build in the province, in order to make work where jobs do not exist? I do not think we really want to do that either. We do not think that is an efficient approach.

We will, as a government, employ more than 8,000 students this summer, but as a matter of policy none will be working at jobs that are not meaningful jobs. They will be paid for what they do and they will provide effort in the job equivalent to what they are paid.

We do not propose to introduce a new method of subsidizing university students by

creating jobs where jobs do not exist, simply to put money in their pockets—and particularly if this is going to mean—in terms in which the member phrased the question—that we are going to cut down our highway construction programme in some part of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will continue with his question.

Mr. Sargent: I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people would be glad to get a letter from the Prime Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member has another question which he will place, please.

Mr. Sargent: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Prime Minister—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Ask him that one about the pay again.

Mr. Sargent: All the men behind the Prime Minister are laughing at him, not with him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the member look behind himself?

Mr. Sargent: A fine-looking group.

Will the Premier advise the House why the Ontario government is advertising in London newspapers and other European papers, offering jobs to people to come to Ontario to work, in view of the high scale of unemployment in this province. Will the Premier advise why, with all our technology and resources in Ontario, with the vast amounts spent on our educational system, we cannot find Canadians and train them for the large list of job openings being advertised in Europe?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say this, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario immigration service provides a specialized service to employers in this province who cannot obtain the skilled labour here that they want. Those ads are placed by the Ontario immigration service. They are paid for by the employer who wants the skilled help. During a meeting this morning that we had with the Ontario federation of labour, the Minister of Trade and Development pointed out it is estimated that each skilled worker of this type probably produced about another seven jobs.

These are highly specialized jobs for which industry in this province needs certain people and we attempt and co-operate with the employer to find these specialized skills. There

are some school boards and hospitals that regularly recruit in the United Kingdom; occasionally Hydro does for very specialized skills. We have had a very high demand for a good number of years because of the expansion of industry in the province for certain specialized skills. There are shortages.

“In view of the high scale of unemployment in this province”—once again you have allowed a statement of fact in a question, which should not be there because it is quite erroneous. There is not a high scale of unemployment in this province. In fact, in January, unemployment in this province reached the lowest seasonally-adjusted rate it has been for a long, long time, 2.7 per cent. At that rate, you really are talking about full employment. Even at that rate we are employing 152,000 more people in this province in January, 1969, than we employed in January, 1968. I think the rate of 2.7 per cent is about as close to full employment as anybody is ever going to get. It simply means that the inference or the statement in the member's question is not right.

As far as training people for particular jobs—why we cannot find Canadians and train them for this large list of jobs—we still permit people to decide their own way of life in this province. We do not direct people into courses. We let the market place exert its influence and by and large people will train themselves for those areas in which their employment might more easily be felt.

Quite often we have shortages of skills or skilled workers which arise in certain areas and which can happen very suddenly in a localized way. That is why we have the machinery that we have to fill these jobs. But we are examining our courses all the time. We relate the courses that are offered to the needs and the forecast needs of industry in the province in order that we may provide the courses that will train people for the jobs that are going to be there when they finish. We have not yet reached the point, and I hope we never will, when we take a group of people and say “thou must be trained in this”. We leave that freedom to the individual to decide what training he will take.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): A question of the Prime Minister:

In view of the Prime Minister's statement that only a nucleus of key men would be hired from outside the area to work on the Ontario Hydro Lower Notch project at Cobalt,

and in view of the high unemployment rate in northeastern Ontario—

(a) will the Prime Minister instruct the appropriate Minister to take immediate action to prevent the importation of 23 workers from Mont Joli, Quebec, by subcontractors, Messrs. Bijou and Rice, for work on the project?

(b) will the Prime Minister further request the appropriate Minister to instruct both prime and subcontractors to hire all workers, other than key workers, through the local Canada Manpower office as long as workers are available from that source?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think a practically identical question was asked of the Minister responsible yesterday and he said he would take it as notice. Now the question is redirected to me in precisely the same form, so the answer will appear in due course on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: May I point out to the hon. Prime Minister that it was directed to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) and by him referred to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales), who reported to Mr. Speaker who then reported to the House that it did not fall within the jurisdiction of either of those two departments. Therefore, the question was redirected to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Nixon: So I guess the Premier is stuck with it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is what happens, Mr. Speaker, when you are not here for a day. I would be quite happy to take this as notice and I will do the necessary research to provide an answer.

Of course, we do not control it. These men are employed by the local contractors who have been awarded the job, and I notice, too, that you have made the exception for key workers. I will have to find out who these people are that are coming in from Quebec. There will have to be a little work done to find out what the facts are, because I have already learned from long experience in this House that I cannot rely completely on the facts as set out in the questions addressed to me. I will do the best research to find out whether the facts in this question are correct.

Mr. Jackson: Will the Prime Minister accept two small supplementary questions?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Even a large one.

Mr. Jackson: First of all, will he tell us who the appropriate Minister is and, sec-

only, would it not be advisable for the province to write in these conditions on contracts before they are let?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I want to find out, as to what, in effect, is in the contract between the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission and the contractors. I believe in some of their contracts matters like this are dealt with. Probably we will find when we get to it the whole thing revolves around that question of key workers; that may not be so but I am quite prepared to find out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre now has the floor.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I had three questions for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. He answered them in part but I want to repeat these questions because I want to ask a supplementary, to cover the question he did not answer fully.

Is the Minister considering legislation to deter non-cash or non-monetary acquisition of control by conglomerates; secondly, has the chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission recommended such legislation; and thirdly, does the Minister share the concern about such takeovers publicly expressed recently by the chairman of the Securities Commission?

In fairness to the Minister, I would like to say I do not think that his statement will have any market effect on these stocks because this is not the first jurisdiction that has been giving consideration and has announced action on conglomerates. Thus the market already has had a drop as a result of previous jurisdictions taking action.

But I would like to ask an additional question—a supplementary question of the Minister—in view of the considerable material that is now available on the subject of these non-monetary takeovers and the mounting pressure for such takeovers, has the Minister given a target date for completion of the report so that legislation can be introduced in this session?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is that I do not have legislation before me with respect to non-monetary acquisitions of control.

Secondly, no recommendation about such legislation has been made by the chairman of the commission to me.

Thirdly, the answer to the third question, I do not think, can be given in any yes or

no fashion. I think one would have to look at the circumstances and the circulation surrounding any particular transaction so that it could be assessed in its right light and right circumstances.

With respect to the time factor, I think I agree with the hon. member that there is material available. One of my hopes is that this material which is available can be brought together quickly and we can assess from it just what further material is required to give us an adequate picture of the situation as it exists as quickly as possible.

I cannot give a target date but I am not talking in terms of a two-year study or anything of that sort. I would like it to be done as quickly as possible. Then, when the study is completed, we can look at it and see what action, if any, should be taken from the facts as presented.

Mr. Deacon: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister advise me if this target date does mean he could consider recommending action by this Legislature, or not recommending it, during this session? This is my great concern.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not think, in all fairness that I could give a specific answer to that question. I shall ask as I have asked, that this study be proceeded with, with all despatch. It could be that it will not take a long period of time. On the other hand, if there is much research to be done, it could take a further amount of time and there is the question of how long this Legislature is going to sit. I certainly have no control over that matter and if, for instance, we were to wind up at the end of April, I doubt if the study would be completed by that time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the interdepartmental study on the effects of DDT been completed yet? If so, when will it be made public? If not, when will the study be completed?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member; this question should be directed to The Department of Energy and Resources Management because the chairman of the committee in question is the Deputy Minister of the department.

Mr. Deans: Pardon me, might I enquire, did the hon. Minister say to the irresponsible Minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I just told the hon. member, the chairman of this committee comes under my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. His department is responsible for this report and naturally it should be directed to him.

An hon. member: That is your problem.

Mr. Deans: Might I, Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question, enquire of the Minister of Lands and Forests why it is that on the three previous occasions I asked of him the answer to this same question, he answered me?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker will transfer the question to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management for answer tomorrow. The hon. member for Thunder Bay has a question.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. What were the findings of the OWRC in their investigation of pollution of Lake Superior by Zenmac Mines at the concentrator at Selin?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the investigation revealed that due to severe icing conditions in the tailings impoundment area, there was some deterioration of effluent quality. The company has been requested to take appropriate corrective action by increasing the retention time within the holding base.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 24th order, committee of the whole House; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

THE APPRENTICESHIP AND TRADESMEN'S QUALIFICATION ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill 56, An Act to amend The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964.

On section 1:

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, just a brief question. I wonder if the Minister would explain those persons referred

to as the "other persons exempt" other than those that are specified in the section?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, this refers to tradesmen who are employed in industrial plants and performing their work there. Under a change in the regulations these people are no longer included if they are working in industrial plants.

Mr. Gisborn: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, that is what I assumed and I mentioned that, on second reading, but there is nothing in the regulations, or in the Act itself, that spells out those that are exempt. You know, the regulations and the Act, tell us who are allowed to be certified, if their trade is designated, but there is nothing that makes exemptions. The Act only states what we know, that if they are industrial plants, they are exempt because they are not covered by the Act. In no place, does the regulation or the Act, say that employees in an industrial plant are exempt from the Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act. This is the question I am trying to arrive at.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I wonder if the member is aware that we changed the regulations, in pursuance to the report of the general advisory committee in reference to apprenticeship. Those recommendations were changed last year and now this provision is included in accordance with the recommendations made to us by the general advisory committee.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who are not expert in this field, would the Minister tell us what the classes are, that are exempt under the regulations from this section?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, for example, an industrial electrician or sheet metal worker employed in an industrial plant, is exempt, so long as he is working within the industrial plant, performing work there. If he were working independently outside, then he is not exempt.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have the regulations here which provide for that exemption, or not?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I have an excerpt from them. I do not have the entire regulations here. They are under regulations 342-68. But, there is a provision for persons—

—permanently employed in an industrial plant while performing work entirely within

the plant and premises or on land appertaining thereto, except work performed in the maintenance and repair of motor vehicles, trailers or conversion units registered for use on the highway under The Highway Traffic Act or (b), while engaged in a trade or occupation that, in the opinion of the director, is not one in respect of which compliance under sections 8 and 9 and subsection 2 of section 10 of the Act is required.

I would be glad to send this over to the hon. member if he would care to see it.

Mr. J. Renwick: I think it would be very useful, Mr. Chairman, because I certainly followed the first part, but I was completely lost in that reference to the last part—"in the opinion of the director."

In other words, not only is it to be established by regulation but then within the regulation there is a matter which is then within the opinion of the director, as to whether or not the exemption takes place. I think it is very unclear, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a further clarification, if I may, and I should like to give some sort of an example, to arrive at my question.

At the present time the Steel Company of Canada has their own apprenticeship programme negotiated by the union and the company. I understand that a few weeks ago, there was application made by a representative of the apprentices in this particular plan—and the plan is registered—to have those apprentices under the negotiated apprenticeship plan. The Steel Company of Canada was to receive certification in their relative trade once they completed their apprenticeship programme under the apprenticeship plan in Stelco.

Some of those employees, I understand, have had an answer in the affirmative, that yes, they can now be registered and if they submit their names they will be registered under The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen Qualification Act. I am sure that there is a misunderstanding somewhere. They are of the impression that when they complete their apprenticeship programme under the Stelco plan, they will be certified tradesmen under their relative trade.

My opinion is that this is incorrect. Can the Minister enlighten me as to whether they would be entitled to have been certified as a tradesman completing their apprenticeship under the Stelco programme, or not?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, Mr. Chairman, I had not heard of this particular situation previously. But it would depend on whether the plan in this particular trade—and the training course—has been approved by our department. In any event, I will look into the situation since you have raised a particular case. I will see what we can do and I will advise you of it.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, this morning I was approached by a constituent who has a small roofing and sheet metal business. He is experiencing a great deal of trouble in keeping personnel, who seem to be frightened by the apprenticeship programme. Even though these chaps are experienced roofers and sheet metal people, they seem to be chaps that, somehow or other, are frightened off by the programme they find themselves having to enter into. I suppose they are not used to the book work and paper work and things like that.

I am wondering if the regulations and the flexibility, or discretion, you leave with the director is to help maintain the *status quo* condition. I understand this is your principle when you are bringing in these tradesmen regulations—that someone who has been in the trade for several years and has had experience in the trade, even though he does not exactly come up to the mark, there is room for some degree of discretion on the part of the director if there is a feeling that this man is qualified to work in that trade.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, the matter to which the hon. member is referring is under subsection 3 of section 10. It is a different section, and that is what we refer to as the “grandfather period,” where a person has been working in a trade which is to be made compulsory. If a person has been working in that trade with the experience and for the length of time required for training, normally he is given his licence initially during a particular period after the date for compulsory certification. It is a different section.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Just on that point, I was of the understanding that the grandfather clause had expired. Is that not so?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I am speaking in generalities. I am talking about a general situation and he is talking about a sheet metal trade and the difficulties in that.

I was dealing with the general situation.

In reference to the particular matter raised by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce and by the hon. member for York Centre, I am not aware of cases where people are being frightened off—I think that is the term you used—from the difficulties of the trade.

I think we should bear in mind that the manpower section of my department will always deal with these people and endeavour to assist them by providing extra guidance from our counsellors, if it is necessary. It may be at times that these people are not aware of all the requirements and perhaps need greater explanation than they are getting from their employer.

If you would care to give me the name or the particular area where they are employed so that we can deal with it with some particularity, I would be glad to do so.

Mr. Deacon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will give the Minister that name.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, if I may just clarify the point in relation to the grandfather clause. Am I to understand that the grandfather clause differs with each trade insofar as the length of time is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it does not. It depends on the time when it is going to be announced—the time when the trade shall become compulsorily certified—and it is worked from that time.

There is certain flexibility, but we try to keep it uniform for each one.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if in this bill there is any protection to the apprentice from being laid off by the concern to whom he happens to be apprenticed?

I can specifically refer to the Ford Motor Company a year or so ago when they were having the changeover; one of the class of individuals that did suffer were the apprentices in the tool and die industry. These apprentices looked forward to permanent employment with Ford Motor Company in developing skill in tool and die making. All of a sudden, they found themselves released by the company and unable to continue in their tool and die apprenticeship programme at the Ford Motor Company.

I know The Department of Labour in town did attempt to place the individuals throughout the community, but I think there should be a little more protection for the apprentice. Once he engages upon an apprenticeship programme he should be allowed to complete that programme.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, that is another matter that is not included within the principles of the bill presently before us.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, is there actual protection for an employee, or an apprentice, somewhere in the regulations, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously there was a problem in the case that you recite of the Ford Motor Company. They were laying off a large number of people because there was no work there.

If that situation generally develops then I think it cannot be avoided, but the Ford Motor Company, in that instance, undertook to retain, or bring back, those people as quickly as possible. There were a number of them who did not find positions, as you and I know, because we tried to work it out, but normally if the work is there the training programme is to be continued and to be finalized.

Mr. B. Newman: Normally the programme would be approximately four years, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Chairman. Surely industry should know, or should be able to programme themselves, so that for a four-year programme they would know that they would need X number of apprentices. I think it is incumbent upon industry and the department here to see that once individuals are taken on in an apprenticeship programme that they be allowed to continue that programme to completion.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 56 reported.

ONTARIO CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETIES

House in committee on Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Ontario co-operative credit societies.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr2 reported.

CITY OF LONDON

House in committee on Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the city of London.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The hon. member for Elgin has an amendment to this section and he is absent for a

moment. I wonder if we can hold this bill until tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman: Hold that section?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Hold that section, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Could you not read it for him?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) This is highly irregular.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I could read the amendment but I have not got the supporting documents if there is any argument.

The amendment would say that section 3—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The hon. member for Elgin is here now.

Mr. Chairman: Bill Pr3—you have an amendment for section 3.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr3, an Act respecting the city of London, be amended by adding thereto a new section 3, as follows:

Notwithstanding any special or general Acts the board of education for the city of London shall continue to be composed of seven members to be elected at large by a vote of public school supporters only, and two members to be elected at large by a vote of Roman Catholic school supporters only, for the city of London by renumbering sections 3 and 4 as sections 4 and 5.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member could explain the necessity for that amendment. It was not discussed at the private bills committee.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): How do you know?

Mr. McNeil: Yes, I think I can, Mr. Chairman. Apparently when the city of London had an annexation a few years ago, the Ontario Municipal Board ruled that there would be a school board of seven members to be elected by a vote at large and two to be elected from—that is, seven members to be elected from public school supporters and two from separate school supporters.

Then, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, when the new Act came into force last year, they were under the impression that this municipal board ruling would be continued. But they found, after the bill had been introduced and passed by the private bills committee, that the new legislation superseded

the municipal board ruling. That is the reason for the request of this Act. Just a little detail.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Just housekeeping.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a little confusing. I was not able to follow the explanation too clearly. I wonder if the proper notice has been given of the intention to introduce this amendment to the public school board and to the separate school board. If this, in fact, is the case, can the member tell us how this notice was given? Was it given by registered mail, by advertisement, and is there any proof that can be brought to us to show that proper notice was given? Because this is the reason for all the elaborate procedures before the private bills are dealt with. Most unusual way of proceeding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McNeil: Yes, there has been a resolution tabled in council. There has also been a letter from the school board supporting this. They have all been tabled with the Clerk of the Legislature, and I can assure the hon. member that everything is quite in order. This is a request of the city of London. There is no opposition to this legislation and I would not think you would be in a position to oppose it at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McNeil moves that Bill Pr3, an Act respecting the city of London be amended thereto by adding a new section 3, as follows:

Notwithstanding any special or general Acts, the board of education for the city of London shall continue to be composed of seven members to be elected at large by a vote of public school supporters only, and two members to be elected at large by a vote of Roman Catholic school supporters only, of the city of London, and by renumbering sections 3 and 4, as sections 4 and 5.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the member about the two individuals who would be elected at large by separate school supporters? Must those individuals be separate school supporters? The individuals themselves, must it be separate school supporters who run for the office?

Mr. Singer: Very good question.

Mr. B. Newman: Because apparently, according to The Municipal Act in other municipalities and even my own, a member who was a public school supporter was

elected to the separate school board. We discussed this in the House and attempted to have a change made so that only separate school supporters could stand for office to a separate school board.

Mr. McNeil: Mr. Chairman, that is good question. I understand that separate school supporters elect two separate school members. This is the way it has been explained to me.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment states that two members to be elected at large by a vote of Roman Catholic school be supporters only of the city of London.

Mr. B. Newman: That is right, I understand that. But the individual running for the office to be the representative on the separate school board, he does not have to be a separate school supporter. He could be a separate school supporter and still run to be elected to the separate school board.

An hon. member: That would be highly irregular.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, it is all right to say that it is highly irregular, but it did happen in my community, and if I am not mistaken it happened in North Bay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What would happen as a result?

Mr. B. Newman: Why should not then a separate school supporter be allowed to run for a public school board office?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do you not bring that up on another bill?

Mr. B. Newman: I am asking now because this happens to be apropos to the amendment to the Act.

Mr. McNeil: Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here from Mr. Mitches, who is the solicitor for the school board of the city of London, and I might quote this letter Mr. Chairman.

As we mentioned when annexation was ordered by the Ontario Municipal Board on October 3, 1960, to take effect January 1, 1961, it ordered that the board of education for the city of London should be composed of seven members to be elected at large by the vote of Protestant school supporters only, and two members to be appointed by the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic schools for the city of London.

As a result of the recent new legislation which consolidated school boards, the order

of the Ontario Municipal Board has now been superseded, which means that the board of education of the city of London would have a minimum of 14 members. The reason that the London board did not move earlier is because at first, the opinion was that the Ontario Municipal Board had the power to review the matter and extend its order.

But this is not the case, and, secondly, because final solicitors' opinions were not obtained until February 6, 1969, by the board of education for the city of London, and February 25, 1969, by the city council.

The board has given serious consideration to this matter and has decided to retain, if at all possible, the present numbers. To support this—

—and I have in my possession a photostatic copy of a letter dated March 3, addressed to His Worship Mayor McClure, and members of the council of the corporation of the city of London, and signed by Dr. H. Dorothy Smith, chairman of the board of education for the city of London. If the members so desire I would be quite prepared to read that letter.

As chairman of one of our local boards, the board of education for the city of London, I beg to inform you that the trustees have passed a resolution which recommends that the present number of trustees be re-elected at the next municipal elections for the purposes of school Acts, that is, namely, seven public school trustees, and two Roman Catholic separate school trustees.

We appreciate that at present your council has petitioned the Legislature of the province of Ontario for the passing of a private bill. We would appreciate your council's assistance and consent if the necessary motions and approvals are obtained from the Legislature by the board of education, your council would permit a part two to be added to your private bill, which would petition the Legislature for the granting of a total of nine trustees elected as herebefore set out, to the board of education.

We would ask that the council consider this matter this evening, and we would respectfully request that your council support us in this regard.

And, Mr. Chairman, a resolution from council:

I hereby certify that the municipal coun-

cil at a meeting of March 3, 1969 adopted the following resolution, namely;

That the Clerk of the legislative assembly be advised that in the event that the board of education is able to secure permission to incorporate in the city of London private bill, being Bill No. 3, of an additional part 2 dealing with the matter of electing and the number of trustees to serve on the board of education, the council of the corporation of the city of London consents to the said addition, which would have the effect of authorizing the election of seven public school trustees and two Roman Catholic separate school trustees as members of the said board of education; being understood that any costs involved would be borne by the board of education in accordance with their undertaking dated March 3, 1969, and that the solicitor for the board of education be authorized to inform the Clerk of the House and the private bills committee of this action, and further that the city solicitor be authorized to render any assistance as may be necessary to secure inclusion of the foregoing provision in the said private bill. Minute No. 203.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member still has not answered my question. The question is, may a public school supporter run for trustee to represent the separate schools in the city of London?

Mr. Chairman: That really has nothing to do with this amendment, because the way the law is now will still apply.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Mr. Chairman, in listening to the member for Windsor-Walkerville, I believe this exists within all the separate school boards in Ontario, does it not? I do not think there is anything that says you must be a separate school supporter to be a trustee under The Separate Schools Act, is there? That is my understanding, but I am not sure of it.

Mr. B. Newman: Then may a separate school supporter become a trustee on the public school board? I am simply asking for reciprocal treatment, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If that is a matter of government policy. Should this have a bearing on this private bill?

Mr. B. Newman: Sure, it may be. I am simply asking if in this bill a public school supporter may run as a trustee—that is all.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has suggested this amendment does not change whatever the existing law is at the time. Does the member's amendment carry?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, let me speak further to this. I started this discussion off perhaps with a bit of tongue in cheek, but as I have looked at the Act and listened to the hon. member, I think there is really a much more basic objection to this amendment.

The city of London bill, which was processed through the private bills committee in accordance with all of our procedures, deals only with hospitals. Now, without any notice to us, without any notice to the private bills committee, without any notice to any of the people who live in London, suddenly the member for Elgin gets up and introduces a bill dealing with the separate school board and the public school board.

If we are prepared to accept this and do away with all the safeguards that we have built up procedurally over the years to protect people and give them an opportunity to be heard when private bills are dealt with, then there would be nothing to prevent—on a dull afternoon with minor attendance in the House—somebody coming in under the guise of a city of London bill or a city of Toronto bill and introducing something that has never been properly considered.

There is no Cabinet Minister here. The Minister of Education has given us no opinion. He would have had his representatives at the private bills committee had there been an educational matter there. We have no idea what The Department of Education thinks or any of their officials. We have no idea other than what the member read to us about what notice was given, what advertisements were made, if any. There was nothing like this before the private bills committee.

I think this is highly irregular and I would urge the member, to save us all some embarrassment, that he withdraw this amendment. If his amendment was in line with something that was in the bill, that had something to do with hospitals, and generally was within the principles of the bill as laid down and it was a grammatical correction or a correction to change some slight oversight, I would say fine, let us accept the amendment. But here he comes in with a completely brand new principle, nothing to do with what was before the private bills committee, nothing to do with what was before the House before, and I think this amendment should be withdrawn.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, I cannot shed a great deal of light on this, except to make one or two brief comments. Obviously this is being handled by the member for Elgin because of the death of the member for Middlesex South (Mr. Olde) in whose name this bill stands. I do point out to the hon. member for Downsview that the amendment went on the order paper Tuesday, March 11, so that the House has had notice of this for more than a week. Whether or not that notice was likewise given to interested parties in London, I cannot say.

I do not know the appropriate procedure and I do not want to offend my friend, the member for Elgin, but the idea occurs to me that this might be taken back into the private bills committee, if that is acceptable to you, and that would give an opportunity to the members of that committee to consider the pros and cons of this request—which apparently has the support of the school board and of the council and perhaps of others in the city of London.

Mr. Singer: I think that is the least—

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): I think, Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, there is obviously some misunderstanding or there is still some information necessary about this bill. So with the permission of the House perhaps we would just leave private bill No. 3 on the order paper in committee and then have all these questions raised. If the member would not have any objection.

Mr. McNeil: I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to it going back to the private bills committee. As I understood it from the Clerk of the House, when there is legislation of this type that is being superseded by a public Act then it is not necessary for it to go back to the private bills committee—but I am not opposed to that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out there was notice of this.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to accept the suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Revenue and the House leader, but let me enunciate this principle very clearly. I do not think that we should ever establish a policy that where we have dealt with a bill in a certain form in the private bills committee, an amendment purely extraneous to its content should be introduced here unless whoever introduces

it comes with the advice and the assistance of the appropriate Cabinet Minister and with appropriate proof of notice and advertising and so on. Otherwise there is no point in having a private bills committee.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The notice is here.

Mr. Singer: No, that is not sufficient notice. We have no way of telling at all, whether all of the other safeguards have been looked after. Those safeguards are there for good reason.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In fairness to the hon. member for Elgin, he pointed out he was advised by the Clerk.

Mr. Singer: I would reiterate, and reiterate as forcibly as I can, that if these procedures are meaningful at all, then they should be adhered to if it is going to be government policy. Out of the blue, we have an amendment that has not been discussed before—that is fine too, we can deal with that in the appropriate manner. As I say, I am quite prepared to accept the suggestion offered by the House leader.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not a matter of government policy.

Mr. Singer: It is government policy if the government is going to bull it through this afternoon. And if the hon. Minister is not prepared to accept that statement, we can argue about it further. Does the Minister want to divide the House on it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not want to divide the House on anything, I want to make that clear, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member advised this House that he was advised by the Clerk of the Legislature that this was the manner in which to proceed with this bill. In all fairness to him, the suggestion should not be made that anybody is trying to bull anything through or that he was doing it in an improper fashion.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if that was the advice given by the Clerk, then the advice was wrong, and if the government had any intention of bulling this kind of an agreement through the House it was undemocratic. If the government wants to carry on with that kind of thing, we will divide the House on it, we will make our speeches about it and we will let the public judge who is right.

Hon. Mr. White: I think we are all in agreement—

Mr. Chairman: We will not proceed with Bill Pr3.

Hon. Mr. White: If I may just say this one word, I think we are all in agreement that this change should be looked at by the private bills committee, that being the wish of the Legislature, and if that meets with the concurrence of the hon. member for Elgin, I should like to say that this is an extraordinary situation. Of course, the bill is standing in the name of a deceased member. I personally would like to commend and thank the member for Elgin and the member for Lambton for assuming the responsibility of ushering this bill through. They have done a commendable job and the fact we now prefer that the matter go into committee is no reflection on the able way in which they have presented the case to us.

Mr. Chairman: Bill Pr3 will now be held over—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): May I raise a point of order here, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Young: It is just this: A bill of this nature which introduces new material from the city of London—there is nothing of this in the original bill—is a different proposition, a different subject matter. Should this not be vetted through the regular committee dealing with stationery and printing, through which all bills of this nature go at the beginning? It seems to me the process has to start there and move on through in the proper way, go to the committee and come back to the House. There is a stage there I think that we cannot forget.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, this is the point that has been made and we certainly concur in this. I hope we will agree that the whole exercise has been very informative and very instructive and a very innocent series of events.

If you will withdraw Bill Pr3 may we go now to Pr5?

TOWN OF BURLINGTON

House in committee on Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr5 reported.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

House in committee on Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Sections 1 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr6 reported.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): On behalf of the people of Niagara Falls, thank you very much.

BOBIER CONVALESCENT HOME

House in committee on Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Bobier convalescent home.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr7 reported.

TOWN OF LINDSAY

House in committee on Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the town of Lindsay.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr8 reported.

MARCH DIAMOND DRILLING LIMITED

House in committee on Bill Pr9, An Act respecting March Diamond Drilling Limited.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr9 reported.

TOWN OF PARRY SOUND

House in committee on Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the town of Parry Sound.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr10 reported.

CITY OF CORNWALL

House in committee on Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Cornwall.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr11 reported.

COUNTY OF ONTARIO

House in committee on Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the county of Ontario.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr14 reported.

TOWN OF MITCHELL

House in committee on Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the town of Mitchell.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr15 reported.

COUNTY OF PEEL

House in committee on Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the county of Peel.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr17 reported.

BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF WINDSOR

House in committee on Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of Windsor.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr18 reported.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE

House in committee on Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr19 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF TECK

House in committee on Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the township of Teck.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr22 reported.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the township of Teck, I thank the committee.

MAIMONIDES SCHOOLS FOR JEWISH STUDIES

House in committee on Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Maimonides Schools for Jewish Studies.

Sections 1 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr23 reported.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Carleton University.

Mr. Chairman: On section 1:

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on Bill Pr25, on section 1, I am not a member of the private bills committee and I am quite confused about the provision of section 1 of the bill. It indicates that there is now going to be a number of students who will become members of the faculty board, which is a body which has existed in Carleton University and in Carleton College before for some considerable time, in accordance with procedures to be established by bylaw.

I have no intention of embarrassing in any way the member who is sponsoring the bill but I simply point out to the committee that the Act itself, under which Carleton University and before it Carleton College was constituted, makes provision for the bylaws to be passed by the board of governors of the university. It also provides certain limited authority for the senate of that university to pass bylaws provided the board "has not otherwise determined".

Had the member been here who was sponsoring the bill, I would certainly have wanted to be advised as to what kind of bylaw is going to be passed under the authority of this revised definition of faculty board and whether the procedures which are going to be established by bylaws are going to provide for some, at least, minimum representation of students on the faculty board. I think we are entitled to know when this bill comes through committee of the whole House that, in a matter which is of such widespread public importance at the present time even though this procedure of a private bill is still used, we should have a very clear idea as to what kind of bylaw the university expects to pass, pursuant to the authority which we are about to confer on them.

I can make these comments again on section 2 of the bill, but I want to draw to the attention of the committee that in passing this bill there is no indication whatsoever as to the composition of the faculty board, other than the very general statement or general clause which is included in the bill—

Together with such students of the faculty or school as may be chosen to be members of each faculty board according to procedures established by bylaw.

It may be that the member who sponsored the bill would be able to provide some explanation to the House about the bylaw which is going to be passed, or about at least the framework within which the university is considering passing the bylaw. I will

defer any further remarks, Mr. Chairman, until you get to section 2 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill then?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, what happens in the Legislature in this event, where there are questions to be asked of specific clauses, quite specific questions, and the member who sponsored the private bill is not present nor is the Minister who would normally be responsible for the department?

Mr. Chairman: I think under the circumstances, in fairness to the sponsor who is otherwise engaged, it would be wise to withdraw the bill from consideration at this stage until the sponsor is here to provide the information that is required. Perhaps we could leave the bill on the order paper in committee and consider it at such time as the sponsors return.

TILBURY PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD

The House in committee on Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the Tilbury public school board.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr26 reported.

CO-ORDINATED ARTS SERVICES

House in committee on Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Co-ordinated Arts Services.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr27 reported.

CITY OF SARNIA

House in committee on Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Sarnia.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, on section 1, just as a matter of inquiry. I notice in my copy of the bill as reprinted on page 2, it contains the words "confirmed and declared to be legal, valid and binding".

It has been the policy, since I have been on the private bills committee, that the word legal should not be put in, since we have come to the conclusion that the courts construe legality. Has the word legal been deleted?

Mr. Chairman: The word legal is not in my copy.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is not in your copy?

Mr. Chairman: No—just “declared to be valid and binding”.

Mr. Bullbrook: Fine, sir.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr28 reported.

CITY OF PETERBOROUGH

House in committee on Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule A agreed to.

Bill Pr29 reported.

BANKS ALIGNMENT LIMITED

House in committee on Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Banks Alignment Limited.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr30 reported.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill Pr32, An Act respecting McMaster University.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on the same point as Bill Pr25, I think this should be held over. There are a number of questions that we might like to ask.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am sorry; I should have caught that. The sponsor is not here this afternoon, sir.

TOWN OF MISSISSAUGA

House in committee on Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the town of Mississauga.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr34 reported.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee rise and report certain bills without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report several bills without amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The thirty-fourth order; second reading of Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue) moves second reading of Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) was on his feet first.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. White: I wish to remind the hon. members of the changes which this would effect. And then at the end of the debate I should like to have the opportunity of rebutting some of the criticism.

These remarks will be very brief, because the Treasurer did explain in some detail on March 4 the changes that are being proposed and the reasons for those changes. Hon. members will find these comments on pages 25 and 26 of the Budget statement.

The amendments to the Act respect four major changes which can be summarized as follows:

1. Acceleration of corporations tax instalment payments.
2. Raising the rate of capital tax from one-twentieth of one per cent to one-tenth of one per cent, with a minimum of \$50 per year, except for some special cases where the capital tax will be \$5 per year.

3. Providing for capital tax and other special taxes to be paid in addition to income tax otherwise payable.

4. Abolishing the general place of business tax.

A system of bi-monthly instalment payments will replace the quarterly system and will apply to all corporations whose fiscal year commences on or after March 15. The first instalment payment on the bi-monthly basis will be made on the fifteenth day of the third month for the fiscal year in which tax is payable, with the remainder of the instalments falling due at regular two-month intervals thereafter.

This has the effect of accelerating the first instalment by two months and the last instalment by one month. The acceleration of instalments does not apply to those companies, the fiscal years of which commence prior to March 15, 1969.

No changes were made for the due date for payment of the balance of tax for a current year, which remains at six months following the close of a fiscal year.

The rate of the capital tax has been increased from one twentieth of one per cent to one tenth of one per cent, but in no case will the capital tax be less than \$50 per year, except for those corporations previously subject to the specially reduced place of business tax of \$5, in which case the tax for these corporations will remain at \$5 payable as a tax on capital, rather than as a tax with respect to place of business.

These changes apply to corporations the fiscal years of which end on or after March 15, 1969 and subsequent fiscal years.

Another significant change involves the repeal of section 12 of the Act, which permitted deduction of income tax from capital tax, place of business tax and special taxes. This means that the deduction will no longer be permitted and that capital tax and other special taxes will be payable in addition to income taxes. This applies to corporations, the fiscal years of which end on or after March 15, 1969 and subsequent years.

Payment of the capital tax calculated at the new rate will apply to those corporations whose fiscal year ends on or after March 15, 1969. This additional payment will be due on or before the fourth instalment date, which is the fifteenth day of the second month following the close of the fiscal year which falls in the transitional period.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a brief condensation of the legislative changes that are contained in this bill.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the recommended changes on the whole in this section are incorporating some of the recommendations of the select committee and of the Smith committee.

One of the points that I was not quite able to unravel, in going through this Act, was the elimination of place of business tax. This applies still, I suppose, to non-profit organizations and the co-operatives, but no longer applies to a corporation's share capital. I would appreciate clarification of the exact position there.

The capital tax of one tenth of one per

cent is something that causes a lot of returns. The recommendation of the select committee was that we have a flat tax of \$65, which would, in effect, bring in the same total amount of revenue. It would require a lot less fussing and return making on the part of corporations as they change their amount of capital.

It is not an onerous amount of money and the amount of money now being paid in is really just sufficient to cover the cost of the operations. It is not a source of important revenue to the government, and it seems odd that we should still ignore the need for simplicity and keep this complicated form of calculating the capital tax on a basis of some percentage.

Otherwise, in the Act the new basis of paying income tax in six equal instalments seems like a reasonable way of making use of a corporation's money as it is earned. In view of that, I am in full support of this amendment.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, all I wanted to say was that any comments that we wish to make on this bill can be dealt with just as readily when it comes through committee of the whole House, clause by clause.

Mr. Speaker: Is there anyone else wishing to speak on this bill? Does the hon. Minister have anything further to say?

Hon. Mr. White: No, Mr. Speaker. I quite agree with the member for Riverdale that we can discuss the details of this better in committee. Permit me to deal with one or two points made by the hon. member for York Centre.

We are eliminating a place of business tax entirely, for both profit and non-profit organizations. In certain instances, however, the capital tax will apply where previously it did not and where previously the place of business tax did apply. We are simplifying the situation to an extent by having one tax instead of two taxes.

The select committee recommendation of a flat tax of \$60, or \$65—my memory tells me it was \$60, but the hon. member has used the figure \$65—was found by us, on scrutiny, to be less than would be needed to produce the amount of revenue which we require from this particular source. I think it is not entirely fair to say this ignores the simplicity of it, because we have moved to a \$50 minimum—we have moved from two taxes to one tax.

We are making certain other administrative changes, all of which are designed to make the application of the tax more simple and the administration of the tax easier and more efficient both for the department and for the taxpayers.

I point out to my hon. friend that these several points—I am not including acceleration of corporation tax instalment payments, which turns up \$42 million—will produce another \$17 million per year.

It is for those reasons, of course, that the changes are being made—to make the taxes simpler, more efficient, more equitable and more productive.

I will be very glad, Mr. Speaker, when the bill comes before the committee of the whole House, to answer questions in greater detail—to clarify the intent and the effect of these various clauses.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 42nd order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, I am delighted again to report to the members on the activities of The Department of Tourism and Information, The Department of Public Records and Archives, and the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology.

You will note as our estimates progress that we seek only modest increases for the 1969-1970 fiscal year to cover the natural and inevitable rise in operating costs. The one exception is the Centennial centre, where I am asking the Legislature to vote about \$1 million more than last year. This reflects, not only the final development costs leading up to the public opening of the centre on September 26, but also the projected operating expenditures for the remainder of the fiscal year thereafter. Of course much, if not all, of this amount will be offset by revenue.

My department plans no major new programmes in 1969-1970, Mr. Chairman, but it should not be taken from this that the year will be one of consolidation. During

my tenure as Minister I have been gratified that we have been able to limit increases in departmental overhead in order to maintain flexibility in promotional expenditures. The result has been a far greater growth in programmes, as compared to maintenance, permitting us to extract the greatest possible degree of efficiency from a relatively small but skilled staff.

There exists in my department a high level of enthusiasm for the development and promotion of the travel industry in Ontario, even if there is sometimes discontent at the resources available to do the job. But if such difficulties do in fact exist, our people seem to be able to make up for it by giving a little more of themselves.

For this, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my thanks to all members of my department, not only for their spirit and their vigour, but also for a quality of performance that is unsurpassed anywhere.

A major undertaking of the information and promotion division this year will be the preparation of a comprehensive document outlining the role and functions of the 36 regional tourist councils in the province. This study, we expect, will provide specific guidelines to assist councils in getting the most benefit out of their promotional funds and efforts.

This year, the division will begin work with the St. Lawrence parks commission to prepare a promotional programme similar to one provided for the Huronia historical parks a year ago.

Interest in tourism marketing plans prepared for eastern Ontario and Metropolitan Toronto has led to discussions with other regional groups considering similar marketing plans for their areas.

Preliminary work on such a plan already has been started in southwestern Ontario at the request of the newly-organized co-ordinating council of the "Land Between the Lakes" tourist councils. When completed, this plan will provide a comprehensive and long-range study of tourism marketing and development needs for an area stretching roughly from Windsor to Dunnville and northward to Tobermory and Collingwood.

This year we seek \$1,875,000 for advertising outlays and publications, an increase of \$155,000 over last year. However, this amount will not, in fact, be sufficient to cover rises in advertising rates and production costs and, therefore, there will be no expansion of last year's programme.

My department will continue to use colour television commercials in 15 major United States metropolitan markets. These commercials are really miniature documentaries of Ontario vacations that had great acceptance in 1968. Hon. members will recall that they received two international awards: top prize among 163 entries in the festival of the Japanese radio and TV council, and third prize in the international film and TV festival in New York City.

We will also continue our print campaign in US and Canadian magazines. The creative approach for our US magazine ads utilizes large, enticing pictures, light-hearted, but provocative headlines, and copy that has been geared to our research findings.

Again we have a special programme for northern Ontario, featuring some of the more rugged personalities of the north photographed for us by Yousuf Karsh. This will be the third year we have used this particular approach and we feel it has been most effective in creating a favourable image for travel in northern Ontario.

We will continue the programme instituted last year of inserting full-page, full-colour advertisements in a US hunting and fishing publication, hopefully with the co-operation again of the more than 170 members of the northern Ontario tourist outfitters who joined with us in this venture in 1968. A direct mail piece incorporating our ad and the ads of the operators was made into a merchandising piece and distributed at outdoor shows and through US sporting goods shops, a co-operative effort that greatly increased the impact of Ontario's outdoor story.

Enquiries that result from our advertising campaigns are backed up with a number of alluring and informative books, or brochures, which are distributed on a wide scale. We believe literature is the most tangible means of portraying Ontario's image to the travelling public. In addition to a general lure book and regional route books, we produce of course, a series of special interest publications, such as "Ontario Fishing", "Ontario Hunting", "Rocks and Minerals", "Ontario Travel Facts", "Ski Facilities", "Ontario Campsites", and so on.

For the last two years we have co-operated with the Quebec Department of Tourism, Fish and Game in the production of a joint publication called "Heritage Highways". This book depicts the pleasures and attractions of a motor trip from Niagara Falls through to the Gaspé. Once again we propose to carry out this co-operative venture sup-

ported by an advertising and promotional campaign in our major US markets.

An off-shoot of this co-operative programme has been the development of a very real entente between my department and the department of my Quebec colleague, the hon. Gabriel Loubier. Contacts at the Ministerial and senior official level have led to a continuous and valuable interchange of ideas between Quebec and Ontario. Mr. Loubier has won the admiration of all of us in Ontario for his imagination and for his concern in the development of tourism in central Canada. It is a pleasure to work with him.

Mr. Chairman, we are gratified that "Man and His World" will again open its doors in 1969, for it will give impetus to travel throughout central Canada. This is a wonderful tourist attraction which, I must admit, causes some envy on our part. However, I assure my friends from Quebec it is not a petty envy. All of us hope that "Man and His World" will be a resounding success—just as we expect the new Ontario pavilion at the CNE and the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology will be real competition for "Man and His World."

The press relations section of the publicity branch has added the names of 400 trade publications to the mailing list for "Synopsis"—the name given to a story and photo service designed exclusively for US and Canadian weekly news papers and house magazines. This mailing list now has grown to 2,059.

In addition, the press relations services 445 US daily newspapers within our prime tourist marketing area, as well as 238 members of the Society of American Travel Writers and 1,039 North American outdoor writers.

This year my department will participate in the first Canadian conference of the American Society of Industrial Editors in Toronto April 29 to May 2, where we will be hosts at the opening luncheon.

In conjunction with the State of Minnesota we are planning pre- and post-convention tours of northwestern Ontario for the Outdoor Writers of America in early summer. Our press relations section plans this year to invite more and more top freelance travel and outdoor writers from the United States to tour the province's major attractions and gather material for articles.

As part of our convention promotion programme we will soon publish a special supplement on Ontario's convention facilities and attractions in "Sales Meetings" magazine,

circulated to 46,000 decision-makers in the convention and sales meeting market. In cooperation with the Canadian government travel bureau, we are looking forward to welcoming a group of convention planners from the United States later this year.

Recently my department has released two new Ontario travel films, one dealing with the attractions of northeastern Ontario, and the other, which was shown to members of the standing committee yesterday, on fresh water sailing. Added to our catalogue of 27 films, these will have national distribution through my department and international distribution through the travel film library of the National Film Board.

Last year our film on Sainte-Marie among the Hurons, produced for the Huronia historic parks branch of my department, won the Canadian Tourist Association's maple leaf award for the best 16-mm. film on travel and recreation in 1968, giving us another valuable addition to our travel film library.

Two new films are planned for 1969. One will feature fresh water fishing in all sections of Ontario, while the other will depict Ontario's winter attractions. We also plan another series of one- to three-minute capsule films on Ontario's various vacation attractions to be made available free to television stations for us as fillers.

My department's advertising and publicity programmes are specifically designed to create an awareness of and interest in the province of Ontario as a vacation destination. Ultimately, the responsibility for converting this awareness and interest into a vacation decision rests with the information branch.

The 1969-70 fiscal year will see a gradual expansion and upgrading of the three basic approaches with which the branch communicates with those who have shown an interest in visiting our province.

An increasing emphasis is being placed on giving a more personal touch to all mail replies emanating from the branch. This is done by means of a programmed automatic typewriter which is able to provide specific answers to questions from a large supply of prepared, written material.

A second function of the branch is the distribution of department literature, both in bulk quantities to travel information offices in Canada and the United States, and individually in response to written enquiries.

This year, the branch will begin a programme of pre-packaging of literature kits to cover specialized interest fields such as camping, hunting, fishing, rockhounding, and so

on. This will provide the prospective visitor with a comprehensive description of the facilities and attractions available and will ensure the material reaches him without delay.

The third aspect of the branch, of course, is personal travel counselling. The branch maintains a year-round counselling office in Toronto and during late spring and early summer supplies trained counsellors to work at Canadian government travel bureau offices in our key US market areas.

In addition the branch provides booths and staff for a programme of travel and sportsmen's shows.

During 1969 the tourist industry development branch will review and, where necessary, revise the regulations made under The Department of Tourism and Information Act respecting the licensing and inspection of tourist accommodations in the province. The regulations ensure that the travelling public is provided acceptable accommodation at the stated prices.

The development branch representatives throughout Ontario work with the tourist industry in counselling operators in methods of improved management and service, as well as staging seminars within the industry to improve operations and hospitality. Seminars will be held in high schools to acquaint students with the importance of the tourist industry to the local economy, and to inform them of job opportunities in the tourist field.

Nineteen Ontario government reception centres will be operated in 1969, most of them at border points. Seven now remain open on a year-round basis, while others are opened at peak traffic periods.

Studies to be carried out by the research branch this year will lay stress on the motivation of visitors to specific tourist attractions in Ontario so that we may better know how to aim our promotional appeals at our prospects.

A survey of visitors to Sainte-Marie among the Hurons, and a similar survey of visitors to the Shaw Festival at Niagara-on-the-Lake, will provide an analysis of marketing data which will help us shape future advertising and publicity programmes.

The same objectives will be carried forward to a study of visitors to Manitoulin Island. This will indicate not only the socio-economic characteristics of these visitors but also, in simple terms, their likes and dislikes in accommodation and visitor facilities.

Information will be gathered on the characteristics of cottagers in Ontario, including their origins, how much they spend, how many visits they make to their cottages, and how often they entertain guests in the cottage areas. Such data will help determine the impact of cottagers on the local economy, as well as providing information for future development of cottage areas.

During 1969 the research branch will examine the local economic impact of the size of tourist establishments and the viability of different-sized facilities. In a previous study, it was shown that hotels and motels with 30 rental units or more have a higher occupancy rate than smaller facilities. If this trend is confirmed in the future, the policy of the department would evolve towards recommending the construction of larger tourist establishments.

The research branch also will attempt to complete a study begun in 1968 on the ratio of transient or tourist rental units to population in selected Ontario cities. To date this has indicated the ratio tends to remain static over long periods. For example, in Toronto there are approximately 5.5 tourist rental units per 1,000 of population. This figure has remained much the same for the last 20 years. Giving validity to this information may permit us to forecast the number of tourist rental units needed in our cities up to the year 2000.

Mr. Chairman, as we progress with the development of the major tourist attractions of our Huronia historical parks branch, we also note their emergence as a new and major resource for English- and French-language Canadian educators and students. This is especially so of the reconstructed Jesuit mission, Sainte-Marie among the Hurons, near Midland.

In Sainte-Marie we have on the one hand a valuable tourist attraction and on the other, a unique tool of teaching. Educational field trips in this re-creation of Ontario's first European community gradually have extended beyond the single-day visit. In more than one instance, teachers and students have devoted up to a week of their holidays to explore the learning potential of Sainte-Marie.

A substantial increase in Quebec visitors seems to mirror an appreciation of Ontario's contribution to this important segment of New France's history. This reaction is accentuated by a warm response to the bilingual hostess-interpreters at the site.

Last year there were 134,442 visitors to Sainte-Marie, including 44,051 students on

education field trips from Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan and New York State.

During the forthcoming year we will begin the screening of the award-winning Sainte-Marie among the Hurons film, which I mentioned earlier, in the twin theatres of Sainte-Marie's orientation centre. This film also is scheduled for nine showings on The Department of Education's ETV series.

A highlight of the year will be the official opening of the museum of the Upper Lakes at Wasaga beach, site of the sinking of the Nancy during the War of 1812. At Penetanguishene, restoration and reconstruction of the British naval and military establishments will add to the nearly score of structures already completed.

Mr. Chairman, credit must be given to the Canadian government for its contribution to the recreational and cultural assets of the Sainte-Marie complex. The Canadian Wildlife Service of The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is establishing the Wye Marsh Wildlife Centre nearby, providing a unique situation whereby we will have interpretation of natural and human history in a single valley through the co-ordination of our two levels of government.

Before this session ends, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to extending an invitation to all members to pay a visit to the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology. However, I plan to delay this invitation as long as possible so that members will be able to see the Centre in as advanced a state as possible.

The centre will be officially opened on September 26, this year, and it is my firm belief it will shortly thereafter become known as the most functional science museum in the world.

Each member will have the opportunity of inviting a limited number of guests to the opening ceremony and to a preview of the exhibit halls before they are opened to the general public. Once the members have had a chance to view the centre in its late stages of development, I am sure they will want to take advantage of this opportunity.

I should just remind you that the Centennial Centre will emphasize the present and the future, instead of the past. Achievements in science and technology are given a significant place, but the accent is on man's expanding horizons—our limitless opportunities to discover, to learn, and to improve the quality of our life.

Thus one of the centre's major objectives will be to stimulate inquiry and a thirst

for knowledge among our youth. To this end we have made provision for the proper integration of visits to the centre with regular scientific and social studies. It is fitting the centre should open at the start of the 1969-70 school year.

During 1968 the training and organization related to the establishment of a records services branch within the archives department was completed.

Under the guidance of the Treasury board's records management committee, and with the assistance of our branch records analysts, we began systematic records scheduling of the records of all government agencies. Departmental records officers have been appointed by the various departments, and during the coming fiscal year it is expected that most of the major bulk series of government records will be under schedule.

Our central depository for non-active departmental records at Cooksville now takes in some 40,000 cubic feet of records at a space cost of approximately \$1.50 per cubic foot. Previously these records occupied departmental operational space costing approximately \$7 per cubic foot.

Another 40,000 cubic feet of dead records were examined and scheduled for destruction, at an approximate space cost saving of \$5 per cubic foot. More will be disposed of in 1969. In addition to space savings, improved reference services offered by our centre's staff should greatly assist information retrieval from less active records.

As a by-product of increased emphasis on records scheduling throughout government agencies, many documents of permanent research value have been identified and transferred to the archives proper.

Use of the archives' public research facilities has been increasing yearly, sparked by enlarged university enrolment, increased awareness by other government agencies of its research potential and a general growth of public interest in the local and regional history of the province. These trends are expected to continue in the coming fiscal year, necessitating a moderate increase in archival staff to keep up with our expanding holdings and research demands.

An active and continuing programme of marking historical sites will be continued by the archives' historical branch next year to bring the total marked to some 600. Two of these will be outside the province, one to the Hon. George Brown at his birthplace in Alloa, Scotland, and other other to Sir Isaac

Brock on his native Guernsey in the Channel Islands.

Two plaques already have been erected overseas—one in Glasgow, Scotland, commemorating the birth there in 1820 of Canada's first Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald, and the other at Wolford Chapel in Devonshire, England, marking the burial place of Lieutenant-General John Graves Simcoe, Upper Canada's first Lieutenant-Governor.

The historical branch also will undertake research in connection with government and local reconstruction projects, archaeological investigations and architectural inventories, and will be responsible for answering inquiries from tourists and our own citizens relating to Ontario's historical attractions.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to having an opportunity to amplify on these few remarks during the debates to follow.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure again this year to be assigned the role of critic of the government's "propaganda department"—The Department of Tourism and Information. If only this department would spend more time and money on realistic ways to attract tourists here and less on bragging about Tory achievements, we would have last year's tourist revenue of \$1.2 billion tripled and quadrupled in no time.

But with all due respect to the most likeable Minister in the House, he does not seem to have any pull at all with his government. This is perfectly obvious in the hon. Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton's) Budget, which makes Tourism and Mining bear the brunt of the new tax increases.

It is almost as though the tourist industry had been singled out for destruction in this province. Meals, liquor, motel and hotel accommodations, theatres, gasoline for pleasure craft and Ski-Doos all are hit squarely by the Budget. The Minister of Tourism must be really embarrassed by all this. I know I would be!

But I invite the front row hierarchy to take a good look at him. He is not such a bad guy. Why pick on him? I would not want to have to open the mail he will be getting this summer from those tourist operators—oh, boy!

Hon. Mr. Auld: I had a very good meeting this morning with the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White).

Mr. Knight: I have something to say about a report from them which the hon. Treasurer has received or possibly received just before he headed south, I understand.

I'm sure the hon. Minister pleaded with his Premier (Mr. Robarts) and the Treasurer not to do it, but to understand, as he tells us in his department's annual report, that "the tourist industry of Ontario is fast being realized as a major factor in the economy of Ontario." Maybe he should not have spoken out so plainly or so honestly. The Treasurer obviously took him at his word, and levelled his tax arrows at the tourists. "Little arrows . . . little arrows . . ." How does the saying go? Well, the tourists got it this year.

The question now has to be: Once those tourists realize this Robarts Government is "socking it to them" this year, will they return in 1970 to the Province of Opportunity? They have already seen the price of hunting, fishing and camping shoot up. I am very concerned that this government is pricing our province out of the key tourist market with these continuous increases. People can be taken once; maybe twice. But you cannot fool them after that.

You are certainly not going to catch Ontario residents spending their holiday funds in their own province, now that they know how much more meals, motels and other holiday ingredients cost due to the Treasurer's budget. So you are driving the domestic holiday dollars out of Ontario. Maybe this is why the hon. Treasurer has not been around in his seat for the last little while. I understand he is spending his tourist dollars outside of Ontario. I stand to be corrected but I would not be surprised if he were.

If the Minister of Tourism is looking for another portfolio, I don't blame him. He is getting no encouragement at all from his Premier and Cabinet.

It seems to me that not too long ago I counted three Cabinet Ministers on that side for these very important estimates and about four members of the hon. Minister's party in the House for his speech.

I can see the Treasurer's point. If you have got to increase taxes he thinks it's just as well to put the bite on outsiders as on Ontario residents. However, that kind of logic has a way of backfiring because so many of our Ontario residents depend on those same outsiders to earn their livelihood. Communities like the one I represent enjoy an economic shot in the arm during a good tourist season, so putting the tax bite on

tourists is really putting the bite on our own people, who will suffer in the long run, and it will not be very long, because these tourists catch on fast.

And what about the great potential in convention promotion? These tax increases hit directly at conventions, too, Mr. Chairman. This is all the more disturbing when you consider that this department to the Minister's credit, recently has been gearing itself for a big push on the promotion of conventions in Ontario. So we find that just as the Minister and his department do something good and long overdue for conventions, along comes the hon., the troubled Treasurer, to throw tax hurdles in front of his hon. colleague. Even though he has long legs, the hon. Minister of Tourism will never be able to clear these obstacles.

Nor has he been able to glean greater funds from the Treasurer for his department this year in order, one might suspect, to offset with promotion these damaging tax increases. Surely, the hon. Treasurer was aware of what he was doing and upon whom his tax increases would fall heaviest? The tourist! In all his great financial wisdom, did he really think the \$424,500 increase for tourism this year—the gain to be made would be sufficient to neutralize the adverse effect these increased costs will most certainly have on the industry? However, the hon. Minister of Tourism realized it. I was watching his face when the axe fell on his department. His debonair expression wilted to a ghostly, pallid smile.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knight: This is the truth, Mr. Chairman. I was watching him especially because I know how I felt when I heard it. Even though he must have had some inkling of it in Cabinet, the news seemed to hit him like a Mack truck.

He may not appear to fill the part but this Minister has become the Cinderella of the Robarts government. If they want to gloss over the ugly interior of anything, this department can do it. They are promotion specialists, and that is what this department, in its present context, should be called—the Promotion Department—nothing else. The Minister and his experts are professionals in promotion. I would not attempt to knock their award-winning films, or 60-second TV commercials, nor the magnificent lure brochures they produce and circulate, nor, more especially, the invaluable assistance they give to community tourist councils all across

Ontario. Nor their historical parks developments—I think all these things are wonderful. We can all be proud of these things. At this they are simply excellent. I am in the promotion business and I think I can speak with some authority.

But what good is all this expensive “come-on” if tourists only come for one year, find out the truth, and not only do not return, but tell their friends to go elsewhere?

A letter and a brief recently addressed the hon. Provincial Treasurer of which a copy was also sent to me and, I suppose, many others, I think supports what I am saying about these taxes and the adverse effect it is going to have on the tourist industry.

This brief is signed by the Canadian Restaurant Association, the Canadian Tourist Association, the Ontario Motel Association, the Association of Tourist Resorts of Ontario, the Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters, the Convention and Tourist Bureau of Metropolitan Toronto, and the Ontario Hotel and Motel Association.

Now it goes back to the last page, here, where we sum up the conclusions of this brief, and if I may, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to read these conclusions.

In our opinion, the proposed changes to broaden and increase the retail sales tax base could have a negative effect, and, in fact, impede those segments of the economy which the government is trying by other means and measures to encourage. We suggest that a decline in the number of tourists in the province of Ontario will effect a proportionate decline in retail sales and other revenues such as those derived from gasoline tax. At the present time the hospitality industry in Ontario has a very distinct competitive advantage over other jurisdictions and we respectfully suggest that this advantage should be maintained.

And this brief points especially to that eight per cent sales tax that hits the tourist industry in the province of Quebec at the present time. Now, of course, the advantage that Ontario had is gone. And this report makes several recommendations that I would like to include at this time also.

(a) There should be no tax on the sale of hotel and motel rooms. However, if the government does not seek to change its position in respect of taxation of hotel rooms, we suggest that at least the implementation of such tax be delayed until

October 1, 1969, instead of being implemented on April 1.

Now, I think the reasons for that are obvious.

And then that the tax on food and alcoholic beverages should be maintained at the present five per cent level:

The 5 per cent tax on food sales should apply to all sales in excess of one dollar and not be restricted solely to restaurants.

The discriminatory practice of not taxing directly competitive suppliers should be abolished. Liquor purchases under banquet permits should be subjected to sales tax based on the retail selling price of a drink. The gasoline tax should continue inasmuch as it applies to the daily operation of tourist establishments.

Well, there you are. This Minister and this government has had its warning from the authorities in the field of tourism in this province, excluding myself, in this letter. I do not think the Minister's chances with the hon. Treasurer or the Premier or his Cabinet are worth a hoot. However, as I said before—the Cinderella of the Robarts government.

If this department is really going to handle the business of tourism in Ontario, in my mind it has got to be able to turn some of that commercial charm on the Robarts Cabinet which makes decisions on roads, parks, campsites, licensing, travel trailer accommodation, water pollution control, marina development, dumping facilities for boats and trailers, and on and on. These are the real factors involved in building a multi-billion-dollar tourist industry. This department at this hour is just playing at Tourism. It is a game of promotional commercial arts that lures the tourist into the trap, but does not hold him there, nor will he ever get caught again. There is just no follow-through, and that is what bugs me.

I would like to ask, how long will this government be content to cater to the rich American tourists for whom costs are no obstacle? When are we going to make it economically feasible for those millions of other would-be American tourists to holiday in Ontario? They are the ones who now travel by trailer, bringing all the expensive gear with them, so that they will not have to buy it at Ontario's high cost.

If they were loaded down with provisions last year when they arrived at the border, you can imagine what those trailers and cars are going to look like in the immediate years ahead.

I repeat my suggestion of last year at this time and place. Develop trailer park sites on each of those hundreds of community fairgrounds across the province—every community has one lying idle 90 per cent of the time. Trailer caravans of hundreds of units that travel the United States every year just do not come to Ontario. We cannot accommodate them.

Such a trailer site at the CNE grounds here in Toronto would make it possible for the traveller to live right downtown, spending money in our stores, restaurants, theatres, public transit—you name it. The trailers would stream into the CNE grounds, it seems to me. I do not see why the city of Toronto does not adopt the idea. But perhaps it is too Drapeauish for Metro Toronto to consider. If I suggest the idea to the hon. Minister over there, I am sure he will say, "What can I do? I am in the business of promotion and information."

Every centre in the province, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, should consider this idea of making greater use of its fairgrounds.

Mr. Chairman, I just happen to believe that it is practical ideas like this one that the Minister and his department should be promoting. He should be seeking ways to offer the tourists at the lower income level ways and means to holiday in our land of opportunity, even if he has to be knocking on the doors of the Ministers of Highways and Lands and Forests and Energy and Resources Management and Education every day regularly. The hon. Treasurer will not listen to him; perhaps these other Ministers will.

Speaking of Toronto, I note with a certain amount of self-satisfaction, the Premier's announcement for a \$13 million pavilion on the Metro waterfront which will complement the CNE and will include a marina. This was one of my suggestions of last year—the Toronto marina, that is.

Now I wonder if we will follow through and make a network of these marinas possible in waterside communities all along the Great Lakes system? We are blessed that the province of Ontario touches on all of the Great Lakes. It takes seven states in the United States to cover the same area to the south. I do not think we are making enough use of that great waterway.

It is also interesting that this one proposed expenditure for Toronto—\$13 million—is more than the entire budget appropriated this year for Tourism all across Ontario, which is \$12,510,000, of course. And it is even more

interesting when we consider that \$3,608,000 of that is for that white elephant, the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology. And that is almost one-third of the whole Tourism budget. What that centre has got to do with tourism, I will never know. It should be part of the Education department as far as I am concerned.

My concern is amplified by the fact that tourism is considered to be the third largest industry in my part of the province, north-western Ontario right after lumbering and mines. As tourism grows up there, so grows the great northwest. And let us not forget that the great northwest part of this province is almost as big as Texas. When I see this government playing at something which has such great potential for my area of the province, I see red, and so do the people I represent.

Tourism is glanced over so lightly in the order of values down here that my remarks today and those of the Minister probably won't make the last page in the great Metro newspapers. And yet, if you go to any major resort area elsewhere, the tourist is king.

Everybody moves for the tourists' comfort. People become tourist conscious in these places. In this province we resent them, let us be honest about it. Maybe not so much now that we see how the hon. Treasurer is able to use them for an extra buck.

Really, why should tourists come here, when they can go to Nassau, Miami or Barbados, where the spirit of welcome of local governments and residents permeates the very air around them? Tourists do not mind spending the dollar, but they want to feel important. They have to be wooed by the natives.

And this leads me to my major recommendation: I think this whole department should undergo a major shake-up. To begin with, toss out that white elephant Centennial centre! Archives and History—give that to The Department of Education too! The department is doing a magnificent job on straight come-on promotions with its films, TV and brochures and an equally great job at counselling with these historical parks and cities. I say keep those and keep up the good work!

What this department needs is a section that gives it some teeth, teeth that will take it out of the Cinderella field and into the era of practical tourism development. Teeth that will move the Cabinet to spend dollars where Ontario tourism really needs it. This department needs another section that educates Ontario residents towards a whole new attitude and approach to the tourist. Ontarians

must recognize the tourist dollar for what it can mean to our economy and to our employment situation.

I envisage here a selling job. Put your master "come-on" men to work on our own residents, so that Ontario will be converted into a Nassau or a Jamaica that makes the tourist feel like a "million bucks", instead of this present narrow-minded parochial attitude too many of our residents show with expressions like: "Oh, there goes a lousy American." This department, in my view, Mr. Chairman, is missing the boat right here at home. Like the National Film Board, it has great influence in the foreign market place, but none whatsoever with its own government for the people at home. Yet, right here is where it has got to start concentrating!

How about another section to make summer job openings for our students with programmes like The Department of Lands and Forests has been fostering, because summer, students and tourism go together automatically. We must have co-operation from The Department of Education to train these people at our community colleges for the tourist industry, in line with the announcement on student summer employment with my hon. leader.

Besides which some of these students, I feel, would have an awful lot to offer this department by way of ideas and energy if we would only get them involved. This department has got to clear out the dead wood that has little or nothing to do with tourism and concentrate on really manufacturing tourist dollars.

Theatres—there is another \$150,000 item that does not belong in Tourism so far as I am concerned, because the calibre of films that are corrupting our community movie screens these days indicates to me "theatres" matters should be transferred to the Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart's) department. Maybe he will do something about those "adult" and "restricted" signs outside theatres which, in my mind, hypocritically pretend to assure parents their children will not be admitted to the rough pics. While all the time we know they are nothing but a great big lure to suck customers into the theatre. We all know that—and it does not really matter how old the customer is as long as he has money.

Mr. Chairman, that is a matter for the Attorney General. Right now we are concerned about tourism. I say a whole new spirit of determination has got to come alive within this department—a spirit that would

fan out and affect every tourist operator and every resident of this province with an awareness of the potential of this great industry. Unlike the brief, a part of which I read to you, which reflects nothing but pessimism and fear and that is the truth of it.

Then must come that great united push to make this the land of welcome. That is the kind of promotion that has lasting value—Ontario, a real land of welcome. It is not the thin veil that are films and TV commercials which fade in a moment of time or glossy brochures which wind up in the trash can or gathering dust on a shelf. Tourists will remember a land of true welcome. They will come back and they will bring their friends with them.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I have read the annual report of The Department of Tourism and Information with interest, particularly the section on press relations. I note that a special effort has been made to reach the trade publications.

A few years ago, I suggested that we should endeavour to place articles in the publications of such industries as the Steel Company of Canada, Canadian Westinghouse Company, Bell Telephone Company, Ontario Hydro, Imperial Oil Company, to mention a few. Almost any company of any size publishes a magazine or paper which is sent or made available to its employees. Also, I suggested at that time that articles be sent to the trade union publications. Some local unions will also have their own publications, such as that excellent paper *Steel Shots* published by Local 1005 United Steelworks of America. This paper has won awards and has been the subject of a National Film Board production.

Articles placed in these publications would receive the attention of a concentration of large numbers of people who are more likely to notice articles in a publication which is of personal interest to them because they concern their place or conditions of employment.

Many of these people are interested in skiing and spend ski weekends or vacations in the province of Quebec or the state of New York and there would be no reason why we should not be promoting this type of holiday in Ontario ski resorts. Also I happen to know of a bus load of employees from the Steel Company of Canada who, this very week, are off on a golfing holiday in the United States. Now I know we can not promote golfing holidays in Ontario for this time of year but perhaps we could consider a promotion of

this kind of holiday beamed to capture the interest of the readers of these publications from early spring to late autumn at the many good golf courses available throughout this province.

Your reports over the years have indicated that Ontario residents are their own best customers when it comes to touring Ontario. I can well believe this, because the average Ontario worker, with an income of \$5,000 or less, is pretty well limited to his own province. Motel and hotel rates are too expensive for his pocket book and he must rent a cottage or make use of Ontario's camping facilities.

Camping is becoming more and more popular as families are discovering the economics of such a vacation because it costs very little more than the gas to travel with. They can picnic on the way, using our many wayside picnic tables.

On this matter of wayside picnic tables, I must say I was impressed as I travelled last year through New Brunswick. They seemed to space their roadside tables further apart but then they used a larger area and grouped perhaps 6 to 8 tables together. What is even better, they provided toilet facilities at each of these roadside picnic spots. I believe this is a service we should now supply for the motoring public in Ontario.

We are soon to face another problem and that is providing a method of disposing the waste coming from the toilet holding tanks which an increasing number of campers are installing in the many and varied types of trailers which are now such a common sight on our highways.

Today's campers are a luxurious group, compared to those of a few years ago. Gone are the days when a camper pitched a tent and stayed on a camping site for the duration of his vacation. He is truly on wheels now and wheels are made to make moving around easy. Today's camper has either a camper trailer, which can be set up in minutes, or he has a house trailer or the kind that is part of a truck.

We must now provide the type of service the camper on wheels needs and the most serious need is dumping stations for his toilet holding tanks. It is serious, not only from the standpoint of the camper's convenience, but from the point of pollution prevention.

I believe a dumping station costs in the neighbourhood of \$3,000 and I do not think we can look to anyone else, but the government to meet this need, although I understand that one oil company, Fina I believe, on Highway 400 at the Cookstown inter-

change, has provided a dumping station. However, it is a pretty expensive method of attracting trade and that would probably be the only inducement for private capital to provide this service.

The Department of Lands and Forests has provided this service in most of our provincial parks but this will not meet the constantly increasing need. It is estimated that more than 2 million trailers will be on American and Canadian highways by next year and presently there are only about 3,000 dumping stations in the whole of both Canada and the United States, with most of them in the United States. As far as I know, it was planned that about 80 of our provincial parks would have this kind of service in operation by the end of the 1968 camping season, and the one private installation which I mentioned. Eighty-one in all of Ontario is not sufficient to meet the needs of the campers in this large province.

What will the camper do? Dump it in a ditch on the highway or side road as has happened in the United States? We all know the length of time it has taken to educate the public to avoid littering our roadsides with paper, bottle and can waste, which, after all, was mainly a matter of avoiding an unsightly mess. This problem is much more serious. It is a health hazard and one which must be taken care of very soon before bad habits are formed. This is also a problem shared by boaters who presently have nowhere, that I know of, to dispose of this type of waste and will be adding to the pollution of our waterways.

I do not know exactly which department has this new responsibility, but certainly it would seem to me if we want to promote the tourist industry, The Department of Tourism and Information must endeavour to discover the needs of the tourist. Indeed, it must try to anticipate them through research and then follow through by urging the proper department, or perhaps several departments, to provide for these needs.

I notice that several hundred plaques marking historical sites, events or persons have been erected throughout Ontario—something like 40 just this past year. This is very good—very desirable—but do we really believe the tourist will consider it worthwhile to make a stop just to read the words on a plaque and gaze at the countryside or a building? Compared with the sense of participation in another period of the history of our province that one holds after touring Upper Canada Village or any of the other pioneer villages, or from wandering through

Dundurn Castle in my own city of Hamilton, viewing an historical plaque gives you nothing.

Yet these plaques commemorate places, persons or events important in our historical background. I believe we should do something to bring these situations to life in the imagination of the viewer. We should do something to make them sufficiently interesting as to cause the traveller to stop and learn something more of our rich heritage. I am wondering if we could install a sturdy display case containing a miniature scene of some activity related to the site.

As it is now, they are just markers of interest only to the student of history. They fail completely to capture the interest or imagination of the tourist, and I think it is to be regretted that we have failed to make history live in this regard.

We discovered the great interest in things historical when the Centennial trains and trailers toured Canada and a lot of this interest was created through the reproduction of little scenes from our past. Perhaps we could put this knowledge to good use through installing miniature scenes in display cases, as I suggested. In any event, surely we can find some method more visually interesting than a plaque to mark our rich historical background.

A billion-dollar industry, such as tourism, deserves encouragement. The hon. Minister has stated that for every \$1 spent on tourist promotion the revenue returned is \$372, with an additional tax revenue of \$20. That is almost \$400 received for every \$1 spent on promotion. Quick figuring indicates it is proposed to allot an increase over last year of only two per cent of the department's budget for promotion and information. I question if this is a sufficient allowance, in view of the possible returns.

Our vacation habits have changed. No longer is travel the privilege of the wealthy. No longer is the average worker who wants to provide his family with a vacation limited to visiting good old Aunt Mabel on the farm. Anyway, most likely good old Aunt Mabel is off travelling herself. He may not be able to afford the best hotel or motel accommodation, but he is on wheels and determined to see this land of ours and of our neighbour to the south.

If we want to induce the vacationer on wheels to come to Ontario and to explore this province with its abundance of vacation attractions, then we had better not only do

a good promotion job but we simply must provide better services for the vacationer.

Your figures show that the Ontario resident is our biggest and best customer and we must induce him to explore his own province thoroughly before he ventures off to further fields. We must remember he is the individual with the greatest opportunity of exploring the province, not only on his annual vacation but on weekends as well.

One last thought, Mr. Chairman, before I close. We are all aware of the interest Canadians have in a winter vacation in sunnier climates such as Florida and we are exposed to constant southern winter vacation promotions. I know we do a large amount of our promotion in the United States. Our money is spent there in 15 major Metropolitan areas, I believe mainly through one-minute TV commercials. I would like to know if we are reversing the coin, so to speak, and promoting Ontario summer vacations in places like Florida where one would think a desire to escape their hot, humid weather would cause them to look favourably on a summer vacation in Ontario?

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister have a reply to the members at this time?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I do not know in what context the hon. member was using the term "Cinderella". I do not know whether I am complimented or worried but I want to thank him for his kind remarks about the work of my own department.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Sounds like the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman).

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, except that it came from the other side, rather than from me.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): You know what I meant.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member for Port Arthur spoke at some length about the effect of the Treasurer's budget on the tourist industry. As I have said before—and I think any Minister in any department where taxes are imposed which may affect the work of that department would say the same thing—I was not delighted.

On the other hand, I also said that I do not think that it will have a severe effect on the tourist industry. It is not going to help but as the hon. member pointed out, or read from the brief which was presented to the Minister of Revenue, myself and the Deputy Treasurer and others this morning, the industry in

certain aspects has had a very substantial competitive advantage tax-wise in the past. Some of this has been lost by the effect of some of the tax changes, but the industry itself, I think it is fair to say from the discussions I have had with members of the industry—and I am sure all members would realize that I have had a number since that Wednesday—feel it can survive. It is unfortunate—there are certain aspects they would like to see changed.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Yes, but why did you not ask the insurance companies and people like that what—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would love to discuss this with the hon. member when we are discussing the estimates proper, Mr. Chairman, but I do not think this is the place to discuss that.

As I said, I feel that the industry will continue its efforts and the industry makes great efforts on its own behalf in promotion. I think we will continue to grow and this time next year we will see that we have had another substantial increase in total tourist dollars, generated both within our own province and without.

Mr. Knight: What about 1970?

Hon. Mr. Auld: 1970 is the year I am speaking of, next year. I think we will see another increase, just as we have had an increase last year over 1967 in the overall, which a lot of people felt would not happen.

Mr. Knight: Is the Minister prepared to rise or fall on that statement?

Hon. Mr. Auld: He would be prepared, if the Attorney General would let him, to make a little wager with the hon. member, which would be far more profitable to me, I might say.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He would just have to rise and fall, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not know if I can do that with those tight glass slippers. However, there were many interesting suggestions in the remarks of the hon. member for Port Arthur and the hon. member for Hamilton Centre. Generally speaking, they relate, as the hon. member for Port Arthur said, to the work of other departments. He pointed out, although he disagrees with it, that the job of this department is promotion.

We, of course, work with The Department of Lands and Forests in connection with

Parks and recreation, game and fish. We work with Highways in terms of highway signs, and we work with all departments in many aspects. But our specific job, and the job which is involved in the money in the estimates before the House at the moment, is in the promotional field primarily. I have made notes of the comments of the hon. members and no doubt they will have an opportunity again to raise them in the estimates of the various departments charged with specific responsibilities, such as parks, roadside tables, and so on.

I would make one comment to the hon. member for Hamilton Centre. In that part of the estimates which are involved at the moment, the estimates of my department, are included the St. Lawrence Parks Commission and the Huronia Development area. In the St. Lawrence Parks Commission, facilities are being added for dumping stations for trailers. We recognize, as does The Department of Lands and Forests, that this is a growing need and that the camping habits of the people are changing a bit. People who used to camp in tents have now moved into campers and trailers and so on and other facilities will be required, although I doubt that the province will ever be in a position to supply these facilities all over the province rather than in provincial installations.

I know in California that the oil companies have got into this field as a competitive thing. I think as this kind of camping grows in this province, private enterprise and municipalities, as well as the province, will be involved in providing those facilities which are certainly most necessary and which, if not provided, literally drive people to practices which we would not want to see.

I was interested in the comments of the hon. member for Hamilton Centre about our use of his suggestion and that of others some years ago in dealing with industrial magazines, company magazines and so on. I am not sure whether *Steel Shots* is on our mailing list at the present time. My understanding is that we deal with a number of trade union publications but I can assure him that if it is not on the mailing list at the moment, it will be tomorrow. As he points out, this is an excellent way to reach just the kind of audience in our own province that we want to reach.

I would say in that vein that while about 70 per cent of our advertising expenditure is spent in the States and outside the province, we have a substantial programme within the province to encourage our own people to

travel within our province even more. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, there is the joint programme with Quebec. We have worked with Manitoba in the past; we have worked with the adjoining states as well, to get inter-provincial travel.

Ontario is very fortunately situated in relation to those with whom we co-operate; if we have any success at all we are going to generate more traffic throughout our province because of our geographical location. And we are very keen to do this and we are doing it on a regional scale.

I would disagree slightly with the hon. member for Hamilton Centre about the value of our historic plaques around the province. Certainly, from the information that we have received and the comments. They are important; they are of interest to people. They are certainly not of as great interest as something like Upper Canada Village or Sainte-Marie among the Hurons, or Pioneer Village or Dundurn Castle, or a whole host of things. But I think they are of great interest to our own people who, perhaps, have their appetite for our own history heightened a bit or they are led, by seeing a plaque, to read a bit about events that have happened in Ontario. They are certainly of great interest to travellers who indicate in replies to any questionnaires I have ever seen, that history is somewhere around two, three or four in the fields of interest that people have.

Certainly no one would be more delighted than I if we had a whole host of attractions like Sainte-Marie and the Nancy museum at Wasaga and so on. We are gradually doing these things as funds are available. But I think the plaque programme has a real part in our overall promotion as well in the education of the province.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister move over to his mike; we cannot hear him.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was doing that so I would not bore you. I had finished what I had to say, so I hope you can read it tomorrow.

On vote 2101.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Knight: I notice that the first item in vote 2101 here has to do with salaries and it seems to me there is a cutback of \$64,000 indicated from last year. I wonder how the Minister explains this. Is there some kind of a programme for mass firings being contemplated?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, there is actually what appears to be a \$4,000 decrease, but in fact the increase is about \$18,000. Last year this item included the administrative costs of the Ontario Heritage Foundation which, as I recall, was something in the order of \$21,000. That has been transferred to the archives and history programme, which is further along in the estimates. There is no increase in staff; there are four people fewer on the staff, but the rates of salary have increased along with all the others throughout the service.

Mr. Knight: On item 2, I just wondered what travelling expenses would this \$18,000 be contemplated for? Possibly Osaka?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I might say, hopefully.

Mr. Sargent: Is it true you are taking the whole House over there?

Hon. Mr. Auld: By film.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The Minister will not win an award for that one.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This is all the travelling expense of the Minister and Deputy Minister and the administrative branch.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, the third item really puzzles me because that has to do with maintenance. I just cannot understand what maintenance would cost \$125,000, just for administration, unless the Minister is planning on extensions and embellishments to his office.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the maintenance vote of \$125,000—is this the one to which the hon. member refers?—includes such items as printing and stationery, furniture and equipment, maintenance and rental of equipment, communications, expense of department-owned cars. I can give the hon. member the figures; printing and stationery, purchase of equipment, communications, personal services, advertising—that is personnel advertising—department trucks, express, postage—which is a very large one now that the postage is charged to the department rather than to the Provincial Secretary—moving, staff training and \$2,500 for “other”.

Mr. Knight: This is strictly a Queen's Park office? It does not pertain to maintenance of any other buildings owned by the department throughout the province; strictly here in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, just to the head office on Bloor Street.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the Minister that now the estimates have taken on a different form in the estimate book, that his annual report follow the estimate book. That way it would be easier for us to follow the estimate and get right into his annual report and be able to discuss more intelligently the various votes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the annual report for 1969 will follow the new form of the estimates.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, during a recent meeting of the committee on tourism, I raised the question of the value of that committee to this department and to the department of natural resources, whichever departments that involves. During the committee meetings we sit and we listen to dozens and dozens of briefs. However, there is absolutely no chance for any discussion on those briefs. The report from the committee is brought into this House without the committee ever discussing a brief more than two or three minutes at the most.

I would like to ask the Minister how he thinks this committee should conduct its business in order to facilitate the operation of this department? How should they conduct their business in order to give the people that come before that committee a fair hearing rather than just a façade of a hearing? How should we go about conducting our meetings of this committee so that we, as members of the House, have something to say in it? And does he also believe that it should be separated from the natural resources part of the committee and would it do a better job if it were separated?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to suggest to the committee how it should carry out its functions. I do not think that I would be very popular if I did so. But it does seem to me that the committee, under whatever name it may be, has a valuable role to play as far as assisting our department is concerned. And perhaps more important than that, it has a valuable role to play with the industry and the people who come to—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That is just not true.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, I think it has a valuable role to play. I have not said whether I think it is playing it or not. I would not presume to comment on the work of the committee.

In the industry the great problem—and I think this was indicated in yesterday's committee meeting. It certainly has been in the past and I think yesterday's meeting and the comments I have heard from people who presented briefs there, was an improvement over the past.

In the past, people have come from the industry to make proposals. They make them to us but we are not the operative department. If it has something to do with fishing, the dates for a fishing season or the expansion of a park or some discussion with Highways about their signing policy, a whole host of things, the committee is there and can hear briefs.

And when you get the briefs in advance they can ask representatives—preferably the Ministers from the various departments concerned—to attend there. It means that these organizations can attend in one place, and put forward their proposals, their complaints, their suggestions. After having come from a great distance, they do not have to be told they have to come back next week to some other committee for some other part of their brief. In this kind of thing, it can be a valuable co-ordinating agency.

I think—as I think the chairman of the committee said yesterday—if the committee so wishes it can sit down, have a meeting of its own without presentations from departments or without presentations from witnesses who want to appear before that committee, and thrash out material that it has or ideas that its members have, and put forward in its report to this House, resolutions respecting certain things.

I think that this can be a valuable function of the committee and I think other committees have done this kind of thing in the past.

Mr. Jackson: Just to go on with this a little further. The Minister has said it is a co-ordinating body, it brings together all of the Ministers and all the interested people. I will agree with him there. But when the Minister receives these briefs previous to the committee meetings and we receive the brief with the comment from the department which is, in my opinion—and I think in the opinion of the most of the members—an extension of government policy on that resolutions or brief, what purpose does it serve for us to be there? You have already passed your judgment on that brief. You have stated to us that this is what the department wants.

Now during the committee meetings last year the same thing was brought up—that we

serve no useful purpose—and yet again this year there are 20 to 25 of us sitting in there, three and four hours and sometimes longer listening to briefs and giving these people that come from hundreds of miles away—in fact, some of them from thousands of miles away—the mistaken belief that we can do something for them, that we are even listening to them.

Most of the members are there to fill seats and if we are not going to serve any meaningful purpose then this Minister, if he really believes that we can do something, should take an active part in changing government policy and saying to the chairman of the committee and to the Prime Minister, if necessary, and to the Speaker of the House, whose committee it is, that instructions should go out to the committee that they will hold meetings and have a discussion rather than just sit there and fill seats and serve no purpose.

I can assure you that while we are there, filling that seat, we are letting our other work sit—work that most of us could be doing and I am quite sure that most of us have to do. I just cannot understand why the Ministers who are involved in these departments, if they feel that committee can do something to help their work, to facilitate their part of the estimates of this government, should not be working to make that committee work.

I believe it is the responsibility of the Ministers who are involved. I am rather puzzled when we go in there and we see what is happening and we go on year after year after year. Although this is only my second session, I have talked to other members and this is not something new. It has been going on for many years. Now unless we are going to change it, we might just as well forget going to committee meetings. I am one person who believes the committee can do something about it. We are going to have to have some action from that side of the House before we will serve any useful purpose.

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

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, this is a very functional department and as the Minister pointed out in the meetings of yesterday, his department serves two main functions; one to get tourists to come to Ontario and secondly, to ensure that the establishments that are providing accom-

modation for the tourists that arrive meet some kind of minimum standard.

I would suggest that there are two areas in which his department is deficient. Number one is in the development phase of tourist business in Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, can we deal with that under vote 2102?

I wonder if I might ask the committee, because of the form of the estimates this year, if this would be agreeable. I think it might be simpler for everybody if, when we get to vote 2102, which has the bulk of the departmental activity in it, we deal with this. Instead of sub-items one to eight, by these programmes. Say we deal with promotion service, St. Lawrence Parks Commission, Huronia Historical Parks, tourist industry development services, and research services. I think that this might assist the committee in dealing with things in order.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further under 2101, the head office, department of administration?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the total vote last year was \$11,500,000?

Hon. Mr. Auld: \$10,875,000.

Mr. Sargent: And your total vote this year is \$12,500,000?

Hon. Mr. Auld: \$12,510,000.

Mr. Sargent: Well that is an increase of possibly \$1.75 million in your vote. It is really more than that. It is another million on top of that because last year you had almost \$1 million for Centennial in there. This year, you do not have that cushion, right?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Last year, Mr. Chairman, I think the Centennial Centre was \$2,500,000.

Mr. Sargent: Two and a half million—well here again I am following with the big book—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is \$2,526,000.

Mr. Sargent: The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is we have an increase of \$1.7 million in your estimates, but then you do not have the expenditure of Centennial so really you are up a lot more than \$1.7 million then? What is the reason for the increase? You are really \$2.7 million up.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am not sure that I understand. There is no Centennial planning

branch, you know, this year which was in last year.

Mr. Sargent: That is the point—we do not have that expense. Now where is all the money going?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think if I could suggest to the hon. member, in the major items there is approximately \$1,050,000 increase for the Centennial Centre for Science and Technology. There is no Centennial planning branch but there is—

Mr. Sargent: That is a capital cost out of your department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is a capital cost in the sense that it is the artifacts and the administration of the centre. It does not include the structure which is in Public Works.

Mr. Sargent: Well let us leave that, but in effect then we have a 25 per cent increase in your estimates this year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In the total?

Mr. Sargent: In the total, yes.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is about 18 per cent I would think. The difference is between \$10,875,000 and \$12,510,000.

Mr. Sargent: That is quite a jump—17 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well as I mentioned in my opening remarks, the major increase is that additional \$1,050,000 under the Centennial Centre for Science and Technology, which is vote 2106.

Mr. Sargent: Is that a one shot or a continuing item?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. This is the final year for major expenditures for the contents of the centre. I think I mentioned last year that we anticipate we would be updating about 20 per cent of the exhibit content each year at probably—I could stand corrected—about \$225,000 a year in the future.

I am advised, too, that in this year's budget in total salaries there will be something in the order of \$350,000 increase over last year. That is the same number of people, but at the higher rates of salaries after the last civil service revision. This would come to about \$350,000.

Mr. Sargent: Will this Centennial Centre ever be revenue producing? Can it ever be self-liquidating?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It will be a revenue-producing operation as soon as it opens. We anticipate that our revenue will cover the operating costs of the centre, excluding any special educational aspect.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to speak for a few minutes on departmental policy. I would like to refer the committee to a news report that was in one of the Lakehead papers as the result of the unveiling of a plan for tourism, or an assessment or a survey of tourism, in northwestern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if that would come under vote 2102 under the research branch?

Mr. Stokes: No. This relates directly to the policy of the department, although I suppose the actual unveiling of it would come under the research department. But I am talking about statements that the Minister made at that particular time.

In it he says that there are 12 government departments directly or indirectly responsible for tourism. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if it is really possible for this government to deal with tourism in a co-ordinated or a meaningful way when there are 12 different governmental departments directly or indirectly responsible for or concerned about tourism in this province.

I think it is a particularly fair question to be asked by a member coming from northern Ontario where we only have the mining, the forest products industry and the tourist industry. I think if there was one government department that was really concerned about tourism, it could devote all its efforts to tourism, rather than have this sort of disjointed and unco-ordinated approach.

I think the Minister made reference to the close liaison that he had with The Department of Lands and Forests, and with The Department of Highways and, by his own admission, nine other departments within this government. I am just wondering how he thinks we are going to get a co-ordinated approach and the best results from a disjointed effort such as this.

He did make mention of a new committee to co-ordinate government activities. He said he was speaking of a special government committee to prevail upon Cabinet for a better co-ordination of government activity with regard to tourism. I have something more to

say with regard to policy, but I wonder if the Minister would like to comment on that particular aspect of it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I wonder if the hon. member could tell me a little more about what he just mentioned, that I had suggested there was a new committee, or some separate committee to co-ordinate activities to be set up.

Mr. Stokes: I would just like to quote. It says:

Twelve government departments are now directly or indirectly responsible for various aspects of the tourist industry, and he proposes that the new committee co-ordinate all government activities and carry out a tourism development programme. Mr. Auld told a public meeting that the main recommendation is not one that we can deal with automatically in view of the regional development apparatus that is being established by the government overall.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member is referring to one of the recommendations that was in the report of the northwestern tourist study. In fact, that was the first recommendation as I recall. I think I commented at the time that the study was being prepared when The Department of Economics and Development—now the regional development branch of the Treasurer's department—were working out their new proposal for co-ordination of government agencies and departments.

I think at the time we presented the report in Kenora, I mentioned that while this was obviously an important recommendation of the committee that put the report together—the consultants, I should say, that put the report together—it would have to be looked at now in the light of the area development programme and committee which had just been set up at the time. I think perhaps the hon. member for Rainy River who, I think was there, would recall that is what I said. As a matter of fact this is presently being pursued. As I say, that report, if you want to discuss the report itself, should come under the research branch.

Mr. Stokes: What has been done to co-ordinate the activities of the 12 government departments that are directly or indirectly responsible for tourism in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I said 12, I suppose I could equally have said 10 or 14. As I mentioned, I think, in the standing committee yesterday I suppose every government department has something to do with some aspect

of tourism, because tourism affects just about everybody in the province. As far as those departments with whom we work on specific things, we have standing or continuing liaison through committees of our own staff and staff in those departments. I think we mentioned Lands and Forests yesterday as one because we probably had the closest common interest and so on with Lands and Forests.

Here is what the report that the hon member referred to said:

At the present time the following provincial departments are directly or indirectly responsible for various aspects of the tourist industry: The Treasury Department, regional development branch, as I mentioned; The Department of Highways, The Department of Transport; The Department of Tourism and Information; The Department of Education, recreational programme for children and adults; The Department of Lands and Forests; The Department of Municipal Affairs; The Department of Agriculture and Food; The Department of Health, for instance, is responsible for standards of sanitation facilities used by the public; The Department of Energy and Resources Management, Hydro-Electric Power Commission; The Department of Mines.

This will vary, of course, in various areas of the province. For instance, in my part of Ontario, eastern Ontario, The Department of Mines would be involved practically not at all because there are very few mineral rights, unpatented lands, and so on.

All I can say to the hon. member is that we work closely with any departments which appear to be involved in any projects that we are undertaking. We act as a channel of communication from the organizations and the accommodation and food end of the industry. Generally speaking, they channel inquiries through us and we direct them to the proper department. The Department of Health, for instance, two years ago, about swimming pool regulations—this kind of thing.

Mr. Stokes: Well, to get back to what this department is responsible for in regard to tourism. How does the Minister coordinate his efforts with regard to, say, the inspection of tourist accommodation with The Department of Health?

I had occasion not long ago to ask someone in government who was responsible for inspection of certain accommodation. As a matter of fact, I think it was the brother of the member for Rainy River. I asked him if

he was responsible in his capacity for inspecting certain facilities. He said, "Oh, no, that is The Department of Tourism and Information. If it was a little bit different type of accommodation, it would be done by another government department."

It is obvious to anyone travelling, as I do, by automobile from here to my home town in Thunder Bay, that obviously very little is being done by way of inspection, because the condition of some of the accommodations is atrocious. That is why I ask why the overlapping of responsibility with regard to inspection? Why the lack of liaison, the lack of coordination in the effort—particularly in the field of inspection of accommodations—with regard to health and sanitation?

It appears to me that it is a very disjointed effort. That is why I would like to get to the bottom of this and say, why is there the overlapping? In a good many cases it is quite obvious to me that no inspection is being done at all, or lot of these places where they serve food would be closed up—a lot of these places where they have washroom and restroom facilities would just automatically be closed up.

I could not conceive of any department of government, whether it is this department, or The Department of Health, or any of them, allowing conditions like this to exist in the province of Ontario, particularly at a time when we are trying to attract, not only people from other provinces, but from other jurisdictions, particularly from south of the border. It is amazing that people even patronize this kind of thing.

But in the north where you have accommodations spaced 50 to 75 miles apart, obviously the tourist is at a disadvantage. He is at the mercy of these operators. It is quite obvious to me that there is not adequate inspection, or I think these various establishments would have been closed up long before now.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that we are responsible for licensing of tourist establishments and the terms of our regulations really relate to space—so many square feet of space per person; a certain space in the washrooms, and this kind of thing.

I suppose it is inevitable—I suppose it may become even more complex, but it is an age of specialization. I think the hon. member would agree with me it would be very difficult for us to train a man to inspect for The Department of Health which requires its own special training and constant updating

to keep abreast of changing rules and changing concepts.

The Hydro Electric Power Commission, who are pretty technically competent people, if they are to do their job properly—say The Department of Labour, with elevator inspection, in those places where they have elevators, a whole host of things.

What we do is inspect sort of generally; we inspect for general cleanliness and so on. If we find, in view of our inspection, that a place appears to be poorly operated and there is a health hazard, we will report this to the Health people. If it appeared that there were electrical hazards, we would report this to the hydro people.

Our own staff do not pretend to be competent to enforce regulations of other departments, some of which are quite technical and quite complex and change quite often. So that here, again, we look at the accommodation end of it in terms of physical space, the general standard of upkeep.

I like to think that our people are more counsellors than policemen and we have our men trained in hotel accounting, hotel operation, motel operation, this kind of thing, so they can give counselling assistance.

We do enforce the regulations, of course, and from time to time we suspend a licence. In the other technical fields, this is done by other agencies of government who are skilled in that field and may be called in by us if they have not caught these things in the normal course of their work.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under vote 2101?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the Minister wish to discuss licences under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think this should be vote 2102, development branch, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Knight: Just before we adjourn, I think I should clear up the stigma of Cinderella that I labelled the Minister with in my opening remarks. I think I should qualify that by saying it just seems to me that the Minister and his department are a joe-boy of the Cabinet wherein, if you do not know what to do with something like archives or something, well, you drop it on the Minister of Tourism and Information because he does not seem to have too much to do. From this point of view and in the order of priorities, it would seem to come last and thereby be the Cinderella and I would like to give this Cinderella some teeth. I hope that clears it up.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I will be able to sleep tonight with my door unlocked.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will do some legislation. We are anxious to turn to some third readings and perhaps later on in the afternoon, the Lieutenant Governor will come in to give Royal assent to some legislation. Time permitting, we will return to the estimates.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM
(Monday, March 17, 1969)

<i>Page</i>	<i>Column</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
2313	2	41	Statement beginning at this point attributed to Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East) should be Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River).



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Tabling report, Ontario law reform commission, Mr. Wishart	2487
Homes for Special Care Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	2488
Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	2488
Nursing Homes Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	2489
Pesticides Act, 1967, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	2489
Department of Health, bill respecting, Mr. Dymond, first reading	2489
Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	2489
St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, first reading	2489
Coroners' Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading	2489
Citizen participation in urban renewal, statement by Mr. McKeough	2490
Oakville police association negotiations, statement by Mr. Wishart	2491
Dr. G. L. Waldbott, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Nixon	2491
Federal Medicare, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Shulman	2492
Pesticide advisory board, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald	2492
Romeo Rousseau, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Martel	2493
Doctor shortage, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Sargent	2493
Prescott water services, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. J. Renwick	2493
Hamilton psychiatric hospital, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Deans	2493
Study on effects of DDT, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	2493
Canadian Westinghouse, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Davison	2494
Metro waterfront property, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Young, Mr. Deans, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Trotter	2494
Resident angling licences, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. R. S. Smith	2497
Essex water expropriation, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Burr	2497
Prescott water services, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. J. Renwick	2497
OWRC project in Chinguacousy township, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Sargent ..	2498
Death of Nicola DiFederico, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. De Monte and Mr. Shulman	2499
Property tax rebates, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Deans	2501
Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld	2503
Recess, 6 o'clock	2525

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are from the 4th Markham Girl Guide company, Markham; and in the west gallery, the 4H Agricultural Club, Stirling, and members of the Young Progressive Conservative Association, Port Rowan; and in Mr. Speaker's gallery, we have students from the Intercollegiate Student Council of North York.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to table the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission on protection of privacy in Ontario.

The bulk of the report is a preliminary study conducted at the request of the commission by Professor Edward F. Ryan of the faculty of law at the University of Western Ontario. This study was authorized because of the concern which we all share for the preservation of the privacy of the individual.

While the commission report is very brief, it adopts the preliminary report of Professor Ryan and suggests various methods by which a study in depth might be undertaken in this particular field. The commission recommends that either a Royal commission or special task force be established to pursue the matters raised in the report.

As the hon. members are probably aware, the House of Commons at Ottawa has referred the subject of electronic surveillance and similar matters to the standing committee on justice, in order that the standing committee may study the problem and report thereon to Parliament.

I have, therefore, forwarded copies of this report to the committee, since the information should be of great assistance and considerable interest to the men who will be preparing the report to Parliament on substantially the same subject.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the standing committee of Parliament will, in the national sphere, provide a good

deal of the study and deliberation that the Ontario Law Reform Commission recommended might be given by an enquiry at the provincial level. Indeed, this is a subject that perhaps relates more closely to the responsibility of legislators than to any other persons, at this stage when we have all been directing our attention towards legislation to control electronic surveillance and wiretapping.

The report I have tabled covers a broader field than wiretapping and associated eavesdropping devices and it relates to many phases of communication, information retrieval and computer applications that are having an increasing effect upon people throughout our country. However, it must also be apparent that the immediate problem is that related to electronic eavesdropping.

It is my own opinion, as previously expressed in this House on many occasions, that a national law controlling electronic surveillance is necessary and desirable and I am sure that the government of Canada is working towards that objective. Certainly this has been my submission to those with whom I deal in that government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose that at this particular point in time we should appoint further Royal commissions or enquiries as recommended in the report, although I fully realize the merit in the study which has been undertaken. It does seem reasonable that we should co-operate and promote in every way possible the enactment of a national law in the area that is most urgent and demanding and then direct our attention to these other areas in the context of the new federal law.

In the meantime, we may all consider this report and the very interesting and challenging issues which it raises, for they are of significance and deserve our consideration.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could address a point of clarification to the Attorney General? Do I correctly understand from his statement that at the moment he proposes no action—that he is merely tabling the report for study and reference by the federal authorities?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, the report which—as I have pointed out—was the study done by

Professor Ryan, was adopted in its entirety, I believe, by the law reform commission in a very brief report from the commission proper.

My thought was, as I say in the statement, that since a study is going on at Ottawa and since I feel that this is really a national field, generally, and particularly in the electronic eavesdropping area, that furnishing that report and that study to that commission would be sufficient at this time, and that we should not set up, at this time, a Royal commission by the provincial government.

I believe the studies which will be completed at the federal level, with this as one of the submissions being made to it, will take care of a very large area of the subject.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, what I had in mind was not just the Royal commission, it was whether or not the Attorney General proposes to take any action within the fields that he can in this session of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I did not quite answer the question. We are certainly studying the report to see what areas we may move in, but I did want to make clear that I do not propose to suggest the appointment of a Royal commission.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, a question about the report.

Mr. Speaker: No, the only question the hon. member may ask is on a point of clarification, not about the report but about the Minister's statement.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that the Minister has no recommendations as far as follow-up on this, would you clarify the fact that the overlapping or duplication of the two, federal and provincial, and the cost of the report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, it is not quite fair to say—or correct to say—that the Minister has no recommendation. We have received the report, we are studying it. We have considered the recommendation regarding a Royal commission and we feel that, since there is presently a commission at Ottawa studying this matter, the best contribution that we can make is to let them have the report.

We will continue to study the other areas where we may find it possible to bring in legislation, but we have not had time to make a policy on that yet.

I do not think the cost is a very large item. Professor Ryan did the preliminary study. The commission is a standing commission in

any event, it is a commission which is a continuing commission, I should say, and this is part of its work. The law reform commission I regard as a commission which will probably continue to assist us through the years.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for clarification purposes under this head, too. Arising out of what the Attorney General has just said, am I to understand that so far as reports and studies—leaving out Royal commissions and all that sort of thing—but as to ongoing studies with respect to invasions of privacy of all kinds, not just in electronic equipment but in polygraph tests, lie detector tests, and so on, that these studies are now terminated or is there a determinate policy of indefinite studies of an ongoing nature?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I would say they are ongoing now, from a departmental point of view, using the report. But I do feel that the committee at Ottawa be able to deal with most of it. As I have expressed many times, I feel that a great deal of this area is something that should not be separated—one thing in one province, something else in another, nothing in another, and so on. I feel that many of these subjects will be covered from a national point of view at a national level and, I would hope, with national legislation at the federal parliamentary level. We are studying the report to see if there are any areas where we can, as a province, cover certain of the suggestions and recommendations made in the report.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HOMES FOR SPECIAL CARE ACT, 1964

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Homes for Special Care Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to regulate the location of homes for special care.

THE PHARMACY ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this amendment may be termed a housekeeping amendment. It deletes a clause making the Act subject to any Acts of the Parliament of Canada. It is redundant insofar as the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction.

THE NURSING HOMES ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Nursing Homes Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there are three amendments here. The new provision provides for the relocation of residents in an unlicensed nursing home. The proposed amendment authorizes regulations respecting the location of nursing homes and general penalties provided for contraventions of the Act.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a point of order at this point?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I would like to ask the Minister one brief question, sir.

What does the Minister mean by "location" of nursing homes or homes for special care? What is the implication of the word "location" in regulations governing the Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The implication, Mr. Speaker, the intention, is to ensure that the homes be placed strategically rather than they be centralized in one particular area and so the patients would have to come from long distances.

Mr. Lewis: Throughout a community?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes. It is not a case of saying that a nursing home shall be on this particular block; we do not mean that.

THE PESTICIDES ACT, 1967

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pesticides Act, 1967.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments to this bill. The definition of land extermination and structural extermination are amended to include prevention and to clarify the intention that termite extermination is the function of a structural exterminator.

Members and officers of the pesticides advisory board are exempted from personal liability for anything done in good faith under the Act or regulations.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The Department of Health.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to codify the functions of The Department of Health, which have heretofore been unwritten.

THE DOG TAX AND LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY PROTECTION ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, this bill, this amendment to The Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act, is simply to clarify the position of the kennel operator with the requirements of the Act for dog tax.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PARKS COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the amendment permits the transfer to the commission of jurisdiction over roads now under the jurisdiction of The Department of Highways, and provides for the division of responsibility where a road is assumed by agreement with a municipality or The Department of Highways. It also permits the same controls over controlled-access highways of the commission as applying to those of The Department of Highways and to exercise similar controls over land adjoining controlled-access roads.

THE CORONERS' ACT

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Coroners' Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to provide that the jurisdiction of each coroner shall extend throughout the province instead of on a county basis, and that where a coroner's appointment is revoked by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, he is entitled to a hearing before the public service grievance board.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, the Clerk of the Assembly, who is also secretary of the Ontario Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, has an announcement which I would like him to make, followed by a statement by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, I have to inform the House that with your approval in your capacity of president of the Ontario Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, copies of the constitution of the association were ordered in sufficient quantities to furnish a copy to each member.

Unfortunately one parcel appears to have been mislaid in the mail. Therefore the number received will be divided between the caucus offices and delivered this afternoon. If and when the missing package turns up, the remainder will be delivered.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order. The Speaker made a ruling on this, but this Minister has laid an egg again and he is going to—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is entirely out of order. The hon. member has no point of order, or if he has he has not stated it. If he has a point of order he will state it and he may have the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I wish to state my point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Right.

Mr. Sargent: The chair is recognizing the fact that a Minister has an important and embarrassing question coming up in the House and the chair allows him to make a statement in anticipation of the question. I think this is entirely wrong and unfair to the Opposition.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): The question is anticipating the statement.

Mr. Sargent: He knows what we are going to ask him.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Mr. Speaker has already ruled on this and he will not repeat his ruling, and that is that. A Minister is entitled, regardless of whether there are questions or statements by other members or other Ministers, to make a statement before the orders of the day with respect to his department, its policies and affairs, and, therefore, the hon. Minister has the floor.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, perhaps the member should have some support on this side of the House. This is three days in a row that members of the House have put questions in and the Minister—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has no point of order, or if he has it has been dealt with in the Speaker's ruling that these statements are proper in the way they are being made. The only recourse as far as I am concerned is for the House to indicate that it does not wish to abide by that ruling of Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Minister has the floor.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Last year, I announced in the Legislature that general guidelines on citizen participation in various phases of urban renewal were being prepared. The guidelines were being prepared on a basis of consultations with various groups and individuals actively engaged in either planning for, or in the implementation of urban renewal at the local level, as well as with individual citizens.

This approach rightfully required further consultation as principles and procedures emerged. A number of drafts were prepared, and the final version now available, was completed last fall, but its introduction was delayed pending the report of the federal government's task force on housing and urban development, which was released at the end of January this year. Copies of the guide are being mailed to the municipalities and will be placed in the member's mail boxes.

The guidelines are contained in a publication entitled "The Three R's of Citizen Participation." The publication outlines basic principles underlying citizen participation in urban renewal, and offers specific suggestions for guiding both citizens and municipal officials, including consultants engaged by municipalities.

It is extremely difficult to offer definite guidelines on a subject as complex and varied as citizen participation that would apply to each and every community in the province

of Ontario, or even to different parts of the same community. Many of the suggestions, therefore, are general and deliberately flexible to permit experimentation and adaptation to local conditions.

In one community, for example, citizen participation might be effected through a series of open forums, or through the formation of block committees; in another, through the co-ordination of representative groups or individual door-to-door interviews. It is most likely that all of these forms will, at one time or another, have to be utilized to some extent, and it is imperative that the news media be thoroughly informed as the programme develops.

The day-to-day mechanics of participation, from community to community, matters less than the fact that a genuine, sustained and carefully thought out effort be made to enlist the co-operation of all residents in each area where a renewal scheme is contemplated.

Any such effort will require satisfactory documentation by the municipality during the preparation and implementation of the scheme as a basic requirement to the necessary approvals and financial aid from either the province or the federal government.

Whatever the content of a given programme, two guiding principles should underlie its organization: comprehensive citizen representation, and responsible participation by both citizens and municipal agencies alike.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice has a statement.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent comments respecting the appointment of an arbitrator to resolve the negotiations between the Oakville Police Association and the board of police commissioners, I thought I should advise the House that I have now appointed Cecil L. Snider, QC, to replace Judge Moore.

Mr. Snider has had a distinguished career in the service of the public. He has just completed 11 years as chairman of the Tax Appeal Board of Canada; before that he had served Ontario for nine years as Deputy Attorney General and for nine years as an assistant Crown attorney in the city of Toronto. He is a man of demonstrated capacity to understand and recognize the nature of a problem and at the same time has the legal and judiciary experience to develop reliable solutions to difficult problems.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman

will be of great assistance in resolving the difficulty which has arisen in these negotiations in Oakville. I should also mention that I have appointed Mr. Snider to act in a similar capacity to arbitrate the matter in dispute between the police association and the board of police commissioners in Windsor.

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

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question from yesterday of the Minister of Health, if I might put it at this time.

Was Dr. G. L. Waldbott, of Detroit ever licenced or otherwise authorized to carry out medical examinations of a clinical nature in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I can best answer this question by stating that Dr. Waldbott, to the best of my knowledge, has never been licenced to practise medicine in Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: I have a number of questions of the Premier (Mr. Robarts), who is not in today. The fourth question is entered in your office in my name incorrectly, Mr. Speaker, and I would like the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) to ask that question, if that is convenient for you, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Later, that question only will be asked. It will be asked when it comes the turn of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if that is agreeable to the hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I had two questions of the Prime Minister but one had to do with Medicare and I am wondering if it is possible to put it to the Minister of Health. It is a very simple question.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the Minister of Health would take it; or he may take it as notice, if he is not prepared to answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the Prime Minister dispel all the speculation regarding Medicare with a statement as to the government's intentions?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there is another question not totally unrelated to this item.

Mr. Shulman: I think that is my question.

Mr. Speaker: There is one from the member for High Park and one from the leader

of the Opposition. If the leader of the Opposition will place his perhaps—

Mr. Nixon: Will the Minister comment on statements made by private insurance companies, as reported by the CBC, that the insurance companies are being required by provincial authorities to adjust their policies to accommodate Medicare in Ontario by July 1, 1969?

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member for High Park ask his question directly of the Minister?

Mr. Shulman: It is for the Minister directly. It is in three parts.

1. Has the Department of Health informed private medical insurance companies that Ontario will join the federal Medicare system on July 1?

2. Is it the policy of the department to inform the insurance companies of these major decisions before informing this Legislature?

3. Is the reason for this policy the sizeable donations made to the Progressive Conservative Party by these companies?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South, I would say that while we have had conversations with these parties no decisions have been made, no directions have been laid down and no conclusions have been reached. When they have, this House will be notified before anyone else is.

In reply to the question put by the member for High Park, I would say the answer to number one is no; number two is, therefore, irrelevant; and number three, in my view, sir, is not worthy of a reply.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in fact, this is a point of order, but I have a question as well of the Premier which might be directed to the Minister of Trade and Development since the ministry is prepared to respond that way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health indicated that he was prepared to accept the questions.

Mr. Nixon: This has to do with the land on the lake front.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): I have questions on the same subject. Perhaps if those who have questions for me ask them, then I can go ahead and answer the one the member would like to ask.

Mr. Speaker: In order, then, to accommodate the leader of the Opposition, and the Minister, we will take the questions of the Minister of Trade and Development. He has said that after they have been asked, if the leader would ask his they tie in. That is what the hon. Minister has said.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I had a question some days ago of the Minister of Health with regard to the membership in the Pesticide Advisory Board, and—

Mr. Speaker: There are several from another day and the hon. member for York South should place his now, of the Minister of Health.

Mr. MacDonald: That is just what I am doing. I placed it some days ago and I am soliciting the reply.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I did not realize the hon. member had placed it. The reply is to question 916.

The members of the Pesticide Advisory Board are: Mr. D. F. Manson, Dr. G. S. Cooper, Mr. J. L. Baker, Mr. P. H. Richardson, Mr. F. Scott Pierce, Mr. W. L. Smith and Mr. K. B. Turner.

Three vacancies now exist. Mr. Ralph Troup was The Department of Health representative; he resigned because he left the government service in January. Mr. A. G. Sellers of Cedar Vale, tree expert, resigned because of pressure of business. Mr. Manson, the chairman of the committee, resigned because of a difference of opinion between himself and the department. And only yesterday I received the resignation of Mr. P. H. Richardson on health grounds.

The duties of the board are clearly spelled out in subsection 4, section 5, of The Pesticide Act which states the board shall:

Examine applicants for licences and recommend the issue or refusal thereof, recommend after hearing a submission of written reasons the cancellations, suspension or reinstatement of licences, and perform such other functions as the regulations prescribe.

The board was recently formed and the pressure of a backlog of applicants for licencing has kept it quite busy to date. As soon as this backlog has cleared up—and should other matters of importance to the department come up—they would naturally be referred to the board.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister, unless I missed it has not addressed himself to a

portion of the second question—that the board had never been asked for advice or suggestions on any really important questions. Do I take it that the Minister's reply is that the specifications as to their jobs are laid down in the Act, and that answers this question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would say so, Mr. Speaker. In my view, no matter of real importance which the department could not clear up on the basis of the advice provided by the staff has come up—and therefore no question has been referred to the board as yet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East has a question of this Minister from the other day, March 19.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A question of the Minister of Health. Is the Minister aware of the refusal of two Sudbury hospitals to admit Mr. Romeo Rousseau, a recipient of workmen's compensation, who was brought from St. Charles to Sudbury by ambulance, and who had to turn himself in to the Sudbury police in order to get treatment from the doctor who services the local jail? Will the Minister conduct an investigation into this matter?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this. Naturally this information would not come to me, since I have nothing to do with the hospital's admission or discharge of patients. However, if the hon. member wants to give me more specific details, I would be very glad to conduct an enquiry into it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a question of the other day of this Minister.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Health. Could the Minister advise with regard to the doctor shortage if he, and his Ontario health authorities, are investigating the Russian health care system which is using specially-trained paramedical workers whose training ranks somewhere between nurses and physicians?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I personally went to Russia three years ago to look this situation over. I was not impressed and I do not think it would help the care of the people in Ontario in any way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale placed certain questions. Oh, he is in his seat now! I was going to have one of the other members who had spoken to me ask them.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health. Will the Minister direct the public health officer, in whose jurisdiction the town of Prescott, county of Grenville, is located, to take all steps necessary to have water service restored to those persons who have refused to pay the capital surcharge imposed by that commission, pending the decision of the county court in the application brought to test the legality of the surcharge set down for hearing on March 31 next, because of the health hazard involved?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, in looking into this matter, I am advised that the problem is really a legal one. We have, however, asked the medical officer of health to see to it that no person suffers from lack of water, and he has given us an undertaking that he has the matter under constant supervision and will attend to that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I wondered if I might place a question to the Minister of Health on behalf of the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Gisborn), who asked me to do so.

Mr. Speaker: If that is so, it would be good if the hon. members could advise me at the beginning so that I could have them in order too.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Health:

1. Is it correct that two patients in Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital committed suicide this year?
2. If so, does this indicate a lack of proper supervision?
3. Have inquests been held as yet? If not, when will they be held?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer to the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is yes. To the second part, no. To the third part, inquests have not been held. This decision rests with the coroner.

Mr. Speaker: Now the hon. member may wish to place his own question.

Mr. Deans: A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Has the inter-departmental study on the effects of DDT been completed? If so, when will it be made public? If not, when will it be completed?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the advisory committee on pollution control is continuing its study on the effects of DDT, and has already instituted certain controls working through the member departments. I have recently received an interim report from the committee, and it is my intention to make a statement on this subject and table copies of the report before the Easter recess.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, might I enquire, by way of supplementary question, whether the Minister intends to ban the sale of DDT in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Now we have come to the Minister of Trade and Development and there are a number of questions, some of them related. Perhaps if we ask the questions of the Minister of Trade and Development not connected with that particular matter, and with the permission of the members, I would like to indicate them.

Then we will take this conglomeration of questions from various members with respect to the waterfront in Toronto, which is the source of several questions. So, perhaps the member for Hamilton Centre would ask his question.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): A question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

What is the amount of the forgivable loan made available to Canadian Westinghouse for their Orangeville operation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No forgivable loan has yet been processed for Canadian Westinghouse Company in respect to their Orangeville operation, but there is one under review.

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

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Development.

Has there been any justification for the 30 per cent increase in the price of lumber in the province during the last two months, and has this increase had any effect on recent contracts signed by the Ontario Housing Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not get that question today. I will take it as notice and get the answer for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview has two questions of this Minister with respect to the lakefront.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): One question from yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

Is the charge accurate which, according to a story in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, has been levelled by Samuel Cass, Metro traffic engineer, that the Minister has:

1. Been breaking two local bylaws in hauling fill to a new project in the Canadian National Exhibition property?

2. Held no consultation with local authorities in respect of this bylaw-breaking traffic?

3. Never asked for, or sought, permission to dump fill?

What steps does the Minister now plan in respect of this situation?

Now this may be tied in with the question I have today. Do you want me to go ahead and ask that one?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I think we should have these questions asked. The Minister indicates that he may be able to answer them all.

Mr. Young: Another question of the Minister.

Does the Minister consider that his ultimatum to Metropolitan Toronto in respect to the lakefront property he claims for the province is preferable to orderly negotiations in respect to this situation?

Will the Minister make a statement to the House in respect to provincial claims to this territory?

Does the Minister plan to seek the co-operation of the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) and the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) in order to send in armed OPP patrol boats and parachute jumpers to occupy this territory?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate perhaps today when you read the press, it looks like a "Keystone Cops" comedy over two small bylaws, but I will answer the first question:

No it is not accurate.

1. Metropolitan Toronto bylaws 2990 and 1551, as a matter of strict law, do not apply to the Crown and its agents. Nevertheless, as a matter of courtesy, and as a matter of normal government practice, officials of the Ontario government consulted throughout this project with Metro officials as to concept and implementation.

2. (a) The department and/or its agents met with CNE and Metro officials to discuss landfill operations and traffic in connection with the proposed Ontario CNE pavilion on March 6, 1969;

(b) They again met with Metro officials, including the deputy-commissioner of traffic, Mr. F. J. Sanson at City Hall on March 7, 1969;

(c) They again met on March 14 in the morning and again in the afternoon of the same day;

(d) On Monday, March 17, 1969, Metro road work crews began to effect changes to the site of the proposed Ontario landfill project to permit construction to start.

3. Answered by the above.

Now, insofar as the other question is concerned, I had no intention of releasing a letter to Mr. Allen until after the executive committee had met tomorrow, when I think they will meet and change these bylaws. However, as some of the letter has been released to the press, I would like to read into the record at least one paragraph which I think will give the hon. member and the members of the House the information they require.

I quote from a letter I wrote to Metro Chairman Allen dated March 18, 1969:

As you are aware, the province has been reviewing its position with respect to the Metropolitan Toronto waterfront plan, as by far the most substantial proportion of the lands to be created under this project would be on provincially-owned water lots. As part of this review, a study was undertaken by The Attorney General's Department as to the status of various leases and grants which had been made in an earlier period.

This study would indicate that a substantial proportion of the lands to be included in the harbour city development, including lands south of the CNE to which you refer in your letter, were improperly deeded by the federal government and are, in fact, the property of the provincial government.

This matter is still under study by the Prime Minister, and that is why we have not discussed immediately the position of the Lakeshore Road/CNE lands with the corporation of Metropolitan Toronto.

I hope, Bill, that this letter reviews once more the urgency of this programme for all concerned, but particularly Metro. It does not seem to us that we are creating

any problems for Metro council that are of any significance, as ownership of all lands that could be disputed can, as we have assured you, be settled to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question which I think should be put first, and then we will come back to the leader of the Opposition and the member for York South.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Trade and Development:

Would the Minister elaborate on his statement in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, March 20, that the federal government made an error 50 years ago when it deeded the lake front land west of the Toronto Island Airport to the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In answer to that question, in general our position is that certain water lots to the west of Bathurst, some filled and others not, were not part of the public harbour in 1867. Consequently they did not pass to the federal government in 1867 by virtue of section 108 of The British North America Act.

Mr. Speaker: The questions which I have left pertaining to this problem have all been asked of the Prime Minister or the Premier. I would think that we might find out from the hon. Minister if he would care to have them asked and then if he can answer them, all right; if he cannot, perhaps he will take them as notice. Would that be satisfactory? It will clear the deck at this time.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know what the questions are, Mr. Speaker. I do not mind them asking; I will see if I can answer them. If I cannot, I will take them as notice.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, part of this question I would like to put to the Premier when he returns, but one part that this Minister might deal with, is:

Will the land title difficulties interfere with the timetable for the construction of the new Ontario government pavilion at the Canadian National Exhibition announced last week, which will be located on the off-shore islands?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We do not think it will, if we can get on with the fill job. That is why when we made our announcements we got under way immediately.

There are two factors at the moment. If we can get started on Monday again, which

I hope we can, I do not think the delay this week will mean too much. On the other hand, there are construction talks coming up in May, and if they develop into a strike and there was a six-week or two-month delay, then fill would not be available. This is one of the hazards that we face at the present time. Again, it is one of the reasons why we wanted to get started as quickly as we did.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary to that: It appears from the stand taken by the Metropolitan chairman that he is not prepared to accept the provincial proposition that the federal government made a mistake in the configurations 100 years ago. It looks as if you are going to be involved in a court case and very properly so. Is there any alternative to that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I think there is an alternative. We are going ahead to improve the lands and if, when we are finished improving, they belong to Metro, fine; if they do not, we will settle it, as I said earlier, to our mutual satisfaction. This has already been discussed with all the people involved. In the meantime, we said we would not hold up the waterfront project; we would get along with it. If there is a discussion on lands later, as to who own the lands and who is the rightful owner, that can be discussed without any difficulty.

Mr. Nixon: Finally, if there was so much consultation with senior Metro officials, how can the Minister account for the fact that the Metro chairman now refers to it as a land grab?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot account for what Mr. Allen has said. There must be other matters. I see in the press that he has other difficulties with the government; perhaps this is a combination of many problems.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has a question?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I think my question to the Prime Minister has been covered to some extent, but perhaps I can put it, and then a supplementary emerges.

Why does the government not openly negotiate with Metro Toronto with regard to developments along the lake front, instead of unilateral decisions secretly made?

Now the Minister's reply, in effect, has been that there have been negotiations and he detailed some of them. My supplementary question is how is it conceivable that Metro

chairman Allen would not be aware of these? Is the Minister not getting himself into a state of cold war, not only with Ottawa, but also with the municipality? Can he fight on two fronts at the same time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Frankly, I do not think it is a cold war. I said I think it is a tempest in a teapot and I outlined here the other day, on a question from the hon. member for Parkdale, the meetings that have been held with Mr. Allen and his officials. Now if he has not communicated with his officials, that is not my responsibility. I was not aware that he was not aware of what we were doing and the discussions we were going to have with reference to those plans.

I might say that if the member walked down to the lake front here he would see some billboards about the Metro waterfront plan. That includes 5,400 acres of land to be filled in, in Lake Ontario. Any land filled there belongs to the province and there are only 200 acres out of that 5,400 in the Toronto harbour which is not ours. When you look at land fill in Lake Ontario, which is worth about \$250,000 an acre, I think the people of this province have a right to know who is dealing with their land.

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if the Minister would feel the solution to the problem is that he send a copy of all minutes to Mr. Allen so that he might be kept in contact with his own officials. Is that the Minister's view?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. I think we will make sure he gets a copy if he has not already got them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale has a question, but I presume from the wording of it, that it would be preferable to have it answered by the Premier.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I think this question could be answered by the Minister, if he wants to attempt it. It is on the same subject.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will try it.

Mr. Trotter: The question is this, Mr. Speaker:

What provision has the government made for boating activities inside the sea wall, which will be stopped because of the government's unilateral action of dumping fill in front of the CNE grounds, in connection with the construction of the new Ontario government building?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me first say that we have not dumped any fill into the water as yet. We are taking care of the first stage, which is on the mainland. Discussions were held with the CNE official, Mr. Bert Powell, with reference to the boating activities. He felt they could move them further west and there would not be any delay or any difficulties experienced.

Mr. Trotter: I was wondering, as a supplementary question, is the Minister aware of the activities of a club, like the Argos, let us say, that has been operating for years; with the type of boating they do, I do not think there is any other place for them to go. I did not know if this land had been taken into consideration.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we have had discussions. In fact, I think the Argonaut Rowing Club has already been talking to my staff with reference to the difficulties that could be experienced. Let me say that before the project is finished, I think somebody will be inconvenienced; but when the project is finished, they will have better waters to race in than they have at the present time, so it is a matter of having a little patience and getting the job done as quickly as possible.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have just one more supplementary question. Would it not be better if the Minister gave the public some idea of what plan he did have? All these questions really would seem to be answered, but he asks them to be patient. But they just do not know what is going on. I wonder if the Minister does.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, of course, I know what is going on, as I think most people do who have been associated with the project. I am quite sure, unless we had announced this project, we would not know who had any objections. Now, I think the minute you announce a project, you are going to have people come forward and say, "I object", and when they start to object we can, we hope, sell them out of their objections. So, by announcing the project we now find people are coming forward and saying, "Well, what are you going to do about this and about that?" and we will find the answers.

But we cannot foresee what is going to happen to some of these people who may want to use the waterfront during the time we are building this building. However, I think we will find a solution for them. As I said, we have talked to the exhibition people. We do not want to delay any activity of the exhibition, we need all the activity they

can get. But I think the exhibition also needs this concept that we are putting up for them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing has a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands and Forests:

How many charges have been laid against residents of the province under the new regulations, effective January 1, requiring resident angling licences?

Is it the policy of the department to issue warnings for the first few months?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Nipissing, 42 charges have been laid. A large majority of the charges were laid after warnings had been issued that angling licences were required.

The answer to No. 2: Yes, it is our policy to issue warnings. However, after a period of giving warnings our officers are instructed to lay charges wherever it is felt warranted.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside. He has a question from yesterday, actually from March 18, of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

In 1958 the county of Essex expropriated ten feet of about 200 properties along E. C. Row Avenue with the intention of widening the road. On January 1, 1966, the city of Windsor annexed the E. C. Row area.

Whose responsibility is it now to carry out the promised compensation?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, from our knowledge of this situation, it would appear that this is a matter that would be taken into account by the Ontario Municipal Board when it makes an order under section 14 of The Municipal Act. This is the section dealing with the adjustment of assets and liabilities between the local municipalities and the counties. As yet, they have not made such an order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale has a question from yesterday of this Minister.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

What action will the Minister take to require the public utilities commission of the

town of Prescott and county of Grenville, to restore water service to those residents who have refused to pay the capital surcharge imposed by that commission, pending the decision of the county court in the application brought to test the legality of the surcharge set down for hearing on March 31 next?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, The Public Utilities Act authorizes a municipal corporation or a public utilities commission that is entrusted with the control and management of a public utility, to shut off the water service when the rates imposed therefor are in default. This Act is administered by my department but it does not authorize me to take any action to restore water service to those residents in the town of Prescott who have had the service shut off, because they have refused to pay the capital surcharge imposed by the public utilities commission.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit a supplementary question, I take it from that that there is no authority the Minister has then, of any kind, to deal with the arbitrary action of the public utilities commission in the case of the imposition of a charge which is subject to test in the courts.

Perhaps the Minister would see whether or not in such circumstances he should not obtain the authority?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I think really this is something that can be worked out at the local level. I have no power to interfere with what might be determined as an arbitrary act of people refusing to pay their bills.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a question of this Minister.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

In view of the report in this morning's *Globe and Mail* that the Minister is unaware of the implications of an \$88 million OWRC project in Chinguacousy township to the population growth of that township, how could the Minister of Municipal Affairs be so unaware that a population explosion of this magnitude could occur so soon on Metro's western doorstep? I might say he was 5,000 per cent wrong in his estimation of it. How could the OWRC sign agreements for the construction of the lines without informing the Minister what it would mean in terms of development?

And how could the officials preparing the MTART study ignore in their final publica-

tion what must have been apparent as far back as the winter of 1966 when the report was first given to Cabinet? And how could a decision, even a tentative one, on forming a regional government for the Peel-Halton area be taken so soon after the disclosure of this information, which, if proved to be true, would mean that a city larger than Hamilton would be nestling up to Metro?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the ultimate population figure mentioned in the press did not in fact originate in my department. This is a figure advanced by the township officials as their estimate of potential development for the township. In other words, a speculative figure which might apply to any area of the province. The hon. members are aware that any area has a potential to accommodate population that will probably never be realized in our lifetime.

The eastern trunk sewer of the Ontario Water Resources Commission is in the initial phase of design. This phase covers a projected growth for 30 years. Over this period, the system will have a capacity to accommodate up to approximately 150,000 persons, plus industrial wastes in the township of Chinguacousy. However, the installation of sewer and water facilities does not automatically dictate the development which will occur in any area. Many other factors have to be taken into consideration, one of which is the tax base of the municipality. The official plan of the township of Chinguacousy as of this date permits the development of up to approximately 60,000 persons for the total urban area of the township.

Therefore, notwithstanding the potential of this or any other area, the actual rate of development will be controlled by the official plan of the township as amended from time to time.

The MTARTS report presents a series of alternative plans for the development of the Toronto region. The government is currently examining these various courses of growth to determine which one, if any of these, should form the basis for provincial policy. One of the major functions of regional government is planning on a regional basis. It is obvious that regional planning is imperative to determine development policies on a broader area.

It seems entirely logical to establish the necessary machinery to carry out this function.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this, would the Minister accept

three supplementary questions? I realize that the Minister has many things going on and I doubt that anyone could know all the answers, but am I right to assume, Mr. Speaker, that the press was correct and that the Minister was led to believe that the population would be 56,000 instead of 560,000? He was out 504,000 people in his estimate, is this true?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The township officials are very optimistic.

Mr. Sargent: No, I want to know the answer, this is very important.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Just like the Budget, sometimes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think probably it could be said that we are dealing with two figures. One is a figure advanced by the township officials, 560,000; however, the official plan of the municipality as approved at this point, uses a figure of about 60,000, plus industrial wastes from that area. It sounds like a wide variation. Who has been misled, I am not prepared to say at this moment.

Mr. Singer: Since when are people categorized as industrial waste?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, I think the hon. member will find, if he would like to talk to the Ontario Water Resources Commission, that they often deal in population plus a percentage. It is a very involved formula, depending on the kind of industry which might be involved.

If I can put it this way—560,000 might be a reasonable figure if they were all homes and there was no industry, no commercial areas at all, which of course is impractical.

Mr. Sargent: Can we assume that the press figures are right and that you were a half million wrong?

Will the Minister then advise of the figure of \$88 million for the OWRC development—how could the lack of liaison between these two important bodies in an amount that big, how could that happen?

Mr. Speaker, he says he does not know how it could happen and this shows a serious situation—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member asked permission to direct a supplementary question.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is a shocking situation.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: How can they laugh about \$88 million? No wonder we are broke.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions which I took as notice, one on February 13 and one on March 17. I have the answers and I should like to give them to the House.

The member for Dovercourt (Mr. De Monte) asked a question along with the member for High Park in February:

Why did the coroner and Crown attorney in the inquest of January 24, 1969, into the death of Nicola DiFederico, city of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, refuse permission to the union representative to ask The Department of Labour representative at the inquest whether the employer, the Algoma Steel Corporation, was in violation of The Industrial Safety Act?

I investigated this very thoroughly, Mr. Speaker, and would now inform the House that an inquest was held in the city of Sault Ste. Marie on January 24, 1969, into the death of Nicola DiFederico, an employee of the Algoma Steel Corporation, who came to his death on January 4 of this year.

As to the question—"why did the coroner and the Crown attorney refuse permission to the union representative to ask The Department of Labour representative at the inquest whether the employer, the Algoma Steel Corporation, was in violation of The Industrial Safety Act?"—I would say, Mr. Speaker, this is not a correct statement. That statement is not correctly framed.

I am informed that a few days prior to the inquest, a senior representative of the union contacted the coroner, Dr. Sullivan, in an effort to have questions blaming the company for the accident put forward, and the coroner, of course, declined.

Immediately prior to the inquest the assistant Crown attorney, Mr. Douglas Gaetz, was approached by a senior representative of the union who requested that the Crown be asked a prepared question regarding a previous conviction of the company under the provisions of The Industrial Safety Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that the majority of the hon. members of this House

are conversant with the rules applying to a coroner's inquest. An inquest is a hearing to determine the cause of death, the circumstances surrounding the same, and any fault relating thereto. Recommendations with respect to an accident would be made by a jury upon hearing all the relevant evidence.

Mr. Martel: An exercise in futility.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Crown attorney, after listening to the request, advised the representatives of the union that in matters such as the one before them, questions involving previous convictions would be irrelevant, prejudicial and of no probative value. During the course of the inquest, Mr. Bruno Rebelatto, an industrial safety officer with The Department of Labour, gave a complete and objective report of the accident and of the directions to the company as a result.

At the conclusion of the inquest, the coroner asked in general whether anyone present had anything further to add and there were no further submissions from anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I have made extensive inquiries into this matter and I am of the opinion that all relative information was brought forward for the consideration of the jury. I do not propose to reopen the inquest into this matter. I trust, **Mr. Speaker,** that the length of my reply to these questions will convince the members of the House of my interest in the matter.

And I would add this, **Mr. Speaker**—and I think I should make this very clear—that even in a criminal prosecution, a question as to previous conviction, as to record of the accused, is never permitted. It is strictly against the rules of evidence.

It is not relative to the matter being tried and would not be relative, or of probative value at an inquest. Even in a criminal prosecution it is only after conviction when the accused has been found guilty, that one may then inquire, relating to sentence, as to the matter of previous conviction.

So it was entirely out of order to suggest that, in a coroner's inquest, a question should be asked as to whether the company in this case had been guilty of a previous conviction.

Mr. Shulman: No one suggested that.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. Attorney General, for record purposes, could provide the number of that question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think perhaps I can, **Mr. Speaker.** Question No. 537 was the one

asked by the hon. member for High Park and the similar question asked by the hon. member for Dovercourt was question No. 606.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): **Mr. Speaker,** on a point of clarification—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may ask a supplementary question if the hon. Minister will answer it.

Mr. De Monte: A supplementary question, **Mr. Speaker.** Am I not correct in assuming that this is not a criminal prosecution?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Certainly.

Mr. De Monte: Am I not also correct in assuming that the purpose of the inquest is to discover how the person died and if there is any culpability attached thereto? Am I correct in that, **Mr. Speaker?**

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not get the question.

Mr. De Monte: It is not a prosecution, I understand.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Mr. De Monte: But it is a probe to find out how the person died and if there is any criminal culpability attached to the death. Am I not correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, no; the member is absolutely wrong.

Mr. De Monte: All right. I am correct in my first question, am I not? Well, would not a question presented by the union to probe into the cause of death be relevant to the inquest, and would not that question be a relevant question, **Mr. Speaker?**

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The question submitted by the union was as to whether there was a previous conviction. Now surely the hon. member is aware that the facts relating to a death, to a situation, to a circumstance, a happening, has nothing to do with something which occurred months before.

Mr. De Monte: But if I may—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

The hon. member has directed supplementary questions to the hon. Minister and this is not the time to engage in a debate. If the hon. member has another question by way of a supplementary question and the hon. Minister wishes to answer it, he may ask that permission.

Mr. De Monte: Would the Minister accept another supplementary question?

If the inquest is trying to establish the cause of death, would it not be relevant to show the inquest that this has happened before? Not to show whether anybody was guilty or innocent, but relevant to the inquest to show that it had happened before and that the condition should be changed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would ask the hon. member a question by way of answer to his question. If he were defending an accused for breaking and entering would he think that the fact that the man had broken and entered some store or place some months before would be relevant to the trial of his guilt on this offence?

Mr. De Monte: No it would not, but—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is the answer then.

Mr. De Monte: My respectful submission is that this is not a prosecution, it is an inquest, and there is a difference.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have another question. It was asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition. That was No. 908. A very similar question comes from the hon. member for Wentworth, No. 917. The question of the leader of the Opposition was:

Is the Attorney General aware that Waterloo Crown attorney William Morrison has refused to prosecute thirteen property tax rebate cases in the Galt area, saying that the courts should not be used as a collection agency? And what action does the Minister intend to take in this matter?

A similar question from the member for Wentworth:

Is any action contemplated against Crown attorney William Morrison of Galt, who refused to prosecute 13 persons charged under The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act?

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make very clear that the assistant Crown Attorney, William Morrison, did not make the statement which is attributed to him by the Press "that the courts should not be used as a collection agency."

Nor did he walk out of the court in the sense that the headline in the Press indicated. I investigated this matter through the Crown attorney for the county of Waterloo, Mr. Dawson, and I should just like to expand a little bit on the circumstances:

Mr. Dawson, in his correspondence with us, said:

I am dictating this letter with Mr. Morrison with me at the time. He did not walk out in the sense indicated in the article, but left in the usual manner, after being excused by the court. And he denies saying anything about the court being used as a collection agency.

Also, he today was in communication with the reporter representing the *Evening Reporter* newspaper in Galt, from which the Canadian Press got its story. This reporter, whose name is Ray Struthers, admitted he made an error in attributing to Mr. Morrison the remark that the courts should not be used as a collection agency. And he also admitted that there was nothing in the actions of Mr. Morrison that would justify the headline of "Crown attorney walks out and won't prosecute landlords."

An hon. member: Where did the remark come from?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I could inform the House where it came from, but it came from someone outside the court. It was not a remark made by the Crown attorney or anyone acting in the Crown attorney's office.

I think it might be of assistance, Mr. Speaker, if I did review briefly for the hon. members, the statutory provisions involved, and the manner in which they relate to the Crown's responsibility to prosecute offenders in this province. Hon. members are no doubt aware that section 7 of The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act does two things. It makes it an offence, punishable on summary conviction, to contravene the provisions of section 4 or the regulations and, more importantly, it authorizes the judge to make an order directing the payment of the rebate of the portion then unpaid.

There are thus two features of the section—quasi-criminal offence and the civil judgment. Under section 14 of The Crown Attorney's Act—Crown attorney aids in the administration of justice—the section provides an imperative duty to prosecute only in the case of indictable offences. In summary conviction matters and private prosecutions, the Crown attorney has a supervisory capacity, firstly to ensure justice towards the accused, secondly to prosecute any public interest.

He has a statutory responsibility also to advise justices of the peace. Crown attorneys in the province have been advising justices

of the peace on these particular matters, and the justices of the peace have been informing themselves about these matters as they are entitled to do.

However, the Crown attorneys do not, as a matter of ordinary practice, prosecute these private prosecutions where the information is laid by a private citizen against a private citizen. In some cases, the Crown attorney has prosecuted one or two cases to establish the proper procedure and practice and this has worked very well.

I would draw to the attention of hon. members that in Highway Traffic Act cases, for instance, which are quasi-criminal, they are prosecuted almost entirely without the intervention or the assistance of the Crown attorney. He may advise—he does advise—the justice of peace. Generally he does not remain in court. He walks out when his cases, indictable cases and those more serious cases are finished. Generally he is excused by the court and this is the case in this type of prosecution.

These, as I point out, are informations laid by private individuals against private individuals, and there is no obligation. In fact, it is not our practice at all that the Crown attorney should prosecute.

I would take this occasion to read from the section 14 of The Crown Attorneys Act the language of the Act which sets forth his duty, and that is 14, subsection d:

The Crown attorney shall watch over cases conducted by private prosecutors, and without unnecessarily interfering with private individuals who in such cases prosecute, assume wholly the conduct of a case where justice towards the accused seems to demand this interpretation.

We do not, as a matter of practice, get into those cases with The Crown Attorneys Act.

Mr. Nixon: May I ask the Attorney General, is it not a fact that there have been prosecutions by Crown attorneys in these cases in other areas of the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There have been a very few to set a pattern as I mentioned in my reply. But we do not feel an obligation here at all, and it is not our usual practice in this type of statute.

Mr. Nixon: In fact, you as the chief law officer are advising the Crown attorneys that they should wash their hands of any responsibilities in this regard at all, and that it is an action between private individuals.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, that is not quite correct. We have tried to indicate that way these cases should be prosecuted and, as I say, there have been some. But if we were to have Crown attorneys acting in every prosecution of not just this Act but of this type of case, including highway traffic, we would need another 200 or 300 Crown attorneys in this province.

Mr. Nixon: I ask the Attorney General, surely he would agree that while this legislation is still in its trial stage, and that in fact it may be abandoned in another year, that this is the sort of thing that sets it apart from the standard type of legislation with which the Attorney General has been trying to equate. I think that the government should accept its responsibilities and assist in prosecutions in a general way.

Mr. Singer: Certainly it gave a pledge to do that when they brought the Act in, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs said he would do it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, just to pursue this for a moment, I would point out that these cases were conducted without any difficulty. The presiding justice has a duty in respect to them. There were convictions rendered, there were settlements reached, there were orders made. There was no difficulty in the prosecution of any of these cases.

Mr. Nixon: Well, how did the role of the prosecutor ever come to the fore if they were represented by attorneys privately?

Mr. MacDonald: Bad reporting.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Represented by whom?

Mr. Nixon: By attorneys they hired as individuals.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not sure that they were. I do not think that they were.

Mr. Nixon: So they were unrepresented.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The accused or the prosecuted?

Mr. Nixon: The prosecuted.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think they prosecuted themselves and there was no difficulties with the cases.

Mr. Singer: No, except in Metropolitan Toronto where the chief justice of the peace will not accept any.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney General, since he is clearing questions, will check on question 493 which I believe he took as notice on February 4.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is that the one where the hon. member was to furnish me a copy of the letter? I do not think I have it.

Mr. Shulman: Did you not get it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I asked in a note for it the other day.

Mr. Singer: That is what your memo said.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 64th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

(Continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2101:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, in his opening remarks the Minister went out of his way to give a lot of credit and praise to the activities of his counterpart in the province of Quebec. It is still fresh in our memory that the information that came from Quebec indicated that the Minister of Tourism there was very fullsome in his praise of this Minister and, as a matter of fact, had indicated that Ontario had brought her tax situation into line with that in Quebec so that there would not be discrepancies that would be not in the best interests of tourism in Quebec.

The Minister denied that there was any sort of an agreement or even collusion in this regard but this might be a chance where, the rules being a bit different than in the question period, he might expand a little on that.

Perhaps he would tell us to what extent he does co-operate with The Department of Tourism in Quebec, and to what extent there were discussions that would tend to bring our taxing and cost situation for tourism into line with Quebec.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to. Perhaps I might clarify the matter. After I saw the *Canadian Press* story and the matter was raised in this House, I got in touch with the Minister in Quebec,

and he sent me the following wire. This is dated March 17.

Some Montreal newspapers in their March 11 edition have reported their interpretation of the press conference which I gave at Place Bonaventure on the occasion of the annual exhibition of hotel and restaurant suppliers. In answer to a question from a newspaperman, I have stated that co-operation between Quebec and Ontario was quite close and successful in the field of tourism at large.

I have also underlined the fact that new taxes in Ontario on rooms, meals and liquor were helping to bring competition on a more equal basis between Quebec and Ontario, especially when both were looking at conventions and important tourist groups. I have also stressed the excellent relations between yourself and myself, and that we were trying together to launch joint programmes that would appeal to customers of both provinces and would help cut promotional expenses, while giving better results to both provinces.

I sincerely regret that part of that press conference was interpreted contrary to the spirit in which it was given. The conference was given in French without any prepared text.

signed,

Gabriel Loubier,

Minister of Tourism, Fish and Game

To expand on that, I can only say to the leader of the Opposition that our co-operation is in the promotion field and not in tax fields or fields outside the realms of our two departments. In fact, while we have discussed, for instance, certain fish and game laws, simply because this is a matter of interest to Mr. Lobier, it is not to me. He has mentioned things to me and I have suggested he talk to the Minister of Lands and Forests in this province.

As I think I mentioned when I answered the question in the House, the Minister in Quebec did mention to me that he had been receiving many representations, particularly from the Montreal area about the eight per cent room tax, and that it was a great problem for him. I simply said I sympathized and was glad that at that time we had no such tax. I, of course, gave no undertaking to recommend to this government that we should impose a room tax. I do not think the hon. leader of the Opposition would expect that I would have, no matter how great our co-operation in the promotional fields were.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): In this vein, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Minister thought that this new tax in Ontario would hurt the hotel and motel business in Ontario? Obviously, it has hurt business in the province of Quebec. Is there any reason why it will not hurt business in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. member was here yesterday when I answered that same question. I think, in essence, I said that it was not going to do it any good, but I did not think that it was going to do us irreparable harm. I expect this year we would have an increase in business over last year, as we had last year over the year before.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. Could the Minister advise us of the result of the meeting of the motel and hotel operators with the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) and, I believe, yourself yesterday, and the request to have this put off until the fall?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that it was a very cordial meeting.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you very much.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind the Minister that during the opening of these estimates he mentioned that the department operates several vehicles. Can he tell me how many vehicles and who carries the insurance on these vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are three vehicles and the insurance is carried in the same policy, I believe, as all government vehicles, through The Department of Highways.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale has a question?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister about the format of his estimates and whether or not, instead of mingling The Department of Public Records and Archives, he would in future years separate the two departments so that we can clearly differentiate between The Department of Public Records and Archives and The Department of Tourism and Information.

I notice, for example, that The Department of Public Records and Archives appears, somehow or other, to come under vote 2103. If the Minister is the Minister of each of these departments, then I think it would be most helpful to have the functions separate.

I know that people can consider The Department of Public Records and Archives to be a rather, perhaps, marginal department from one point of view, in terms of its financial commitment or the financial cost to the government. But from another point of view it is a very essential part of preserving the historical records and tradition of the province. I find it, on the one hand, confusing; I also find it to be a downgrading of what could be a very important, separate segment of the government's administration.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to discuss this with the Treasury people who, in effect, set up the form of the estimates. I think the hon. member is aware that it is a separate department, except that, being relatively small in number, its administrative work is done by the administrative people of The Department of Tourism and Information.

As a matter of fact, since I have been Minister, I have attempted to stress the fact that it is a separate entity, and a very important one, and I believe it is. There are some functions of the department in the historical branch having to do with museums and the plaque marking programme which relates it, I think, to The Department of Tourism and Information more than it would any other department. But I would agree with the hon. member that at least its function is quite separate. While it is a separate vote here, it may be that we can have the estimates rearranged to have it as a separate entity in the estimates, if this would be the wish of the House.

Mr. J. Renwick: I hope so because, for example, at the Canadian National Exhibition, The Department of Public Records and Archives' particular booth was really quite a fascinating display and was very interesting. I think that most members of the Legislature would not have recognized that it was established as a separate department and that it has that status within the government service.

On the same point, it would seem to me that the status and the position of the archivist for the province would be much enhanced if his department were treated as a separate and distinct department. The displays down the hallway here are a very important historical part of the province's activities. More and more we are going to have to preserve those items of the tradition and history of the province of Ontario from encroachment. We are going to have to preserve not only their records but the actual physical

establishments in which they were part and parcel of the social and political life of the province.

I am glad to hear the Minister would give consideration to it. I would certainly like to endorse that and I would ask the Minister now to give us some indication of the status and position of the archivist of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I do not have in front of me The Act of The Department of Public Records and Archives, but perhaps I can get it here. The archivist of Ontario has certain specific duties analogous to those of a Deputy Minister—certain special duties regarding the preservation of documents, and the approval of the destruction of documents which are not considered to be of historical value. To sum it up, I can just read section 2 of The Archives Act:

Department of Public Records and Archives, hereinafter called the department: 2(i) There shall be an officer in charge of the department to be known as the archivist of Ontario, hereinafter referred to as the archivist, who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and shall hold office during his pleasure and be in charge of administration of this Act under the direction of the member of the executive council to whom the charge of the department is from time to time assigned. The archivist has the rank of a deputy head of a department and in relation to the department has all the power to perform the duties of the deputy head of the department.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, to repeat what I said a few moments ago, The Department of Public Records and Archives, to all intents and purposes, is a separate entity. But for reasons of economy and administrative convenience, the personnel matters, the purchasing and the other administrative functions are carried out by the administrative branch of the Department of Tourism and Information.

I would agree with the hon. member that the archives department is an extremely important government function. It is becoming more so with the records and management programme, for instance. The day will no doubt come when it will be economical and more convenient to have it completely self-contained, rather than only partially so as it is at the present time. I do not think that I could at this moment give an undertaking on behalf of the government that additional personnel will be added to the department

to do those administrative functions. I can, as I think I have done, give an undertaking that we will continue to recognize its importance and to make the department itself better known to the people of the province.

I have found in my travels around that it is not well known. In fact, we are suggesting we do certain things to make it well known such as indicate its existence on the historic plaques that are put up. In that magnificent display which was put together by The Archives Department—and particularly the museum section which is in this building on the ground floor—at the time we opened it I noticed that the department's name was not mentioned and I had it put on because I think it should be recognized.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is the archivist paid at the same rate or same level of pay as the Deputy Ministers of other departments?

Hon. Mr. Auld: He is not at the rate of Deputy Minister. He is very close to it, and I think the reason for that is that his salary was just reviewed and a substantial increase was made in October. We are perhaps a little out of order. That should be on 2103.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we are out of order at all because it comes under the general vote of this department. As to whether or not there is going to be a recognition of this department as a separate entity, that is a matter of policy I would think. I agree with the Minister, there is no need to duplicate personnel just for the sake of duplicating, but from the point of view of the presentation of the affairs of that department, I would hope that the Minister, as he said he would, will take up the question of a separate presentation and of raising the status of the archivist to that of a full fledged Deputy Minister of the government. I think it deserves that importance.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, under this vote, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister that in southwestern Ontario, we have one of the largest ports of entries of American tourists at Windsor. Before Highway 401 was opened for traffic, the tourists used Highway 2 and Highway 3 and Highway 98. A lot of businessmen built motels, restaurants and service stations, along 2 and 3, and invested many, many thousands of dollars. But after 401 was opened, the tourists left those Highways 2 and 3 and used 401.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, could I interrupt the hon. member? I think he is talking about our border information centres that should be under 2102.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2101 carried?

Vote 2101 agreed to.

On vote 2102:

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps the hon. member Mr. Chairman, could continue.

Mr. Spence: These businessmen invested thousands and thousands of dollars in motels and service stations and restaurants. But after Highway 401 was opened to traffic the tourists did not use Highway 2 and Highway 3, but used 401.

I am not objecting to that; we need 401. But the signing on 401 leaves the feeling in southwestern Ontario that it is not sufficient to stop the tourists there. In fact, it directs them right through to the Quebec border as I understand it, Mr. Minister.

They discussed this with the government and were told that maybe the traffic would come back after a number of years to Highways 2 and 3. But the traffic has not come back. So this leaves the men who invested thousands of dollars in motels and restaurants and service stations in a very difficult financial position. They think, Mr. Minister, that you should take a different stand in regard to advertising at Windsor to encourage more tourists to use Highways 2 and 3 to help these men who have invested thousands of dollars. Highways 2 and 3 are scenic sights. There should be a different approach to advertising. Maybe there should be more and better advertising on Highway 401 advertising 2 and 3.

I wonder if you have looked into this, or made any study, or will you look into this at Windsor to see if there could be some different approach to advertising Highway 2, Highway 3 or Highway 98 which would mean a great deal to these businessmen who have invested thousands of dollars, and who today are facing a very heavy financial position?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as the signing policy on highways is concerned, this is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme). Perhaps I could sum it up this way.

To those people who stop at our information centres at the border points or on 401, we indicate to them the most direct route

to where they wish to go and the other routes. I think it is fair to say that our policy has been to suggest to people that as tourists they will find it more interesting to drive along the non-controlled access routes.

The situation to which the hon. member refers is of course not unique to that area. It is one which has affected communities adjacent to any of the controlled access highways. I would presume that this will continue.

While I do not say that it is going to make anybody feel any better, or that it will help, a similar situation has happened to people who have had an investment in an area where, for instance, a bypass has been built. Again, this is getting into policy of another department, but I know in my own riding there have been strong representations made to the Minister of Highways to bypass a community for traffic or safety's sake. Then there are strong complaints from the same community once the bypass is built and the traffic pattern changes.

I do not know how this can be avoided in all places, and it is a problem. However, to sum up I would simply say that the policy in my department in giving travel information is to recommend that people take the non-controlled access highways to see the scenery, to see the local sights and to find accommodation.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the Minister what his policy is going to be in relation to the tourist reception centres in the city of Windsor?

Earlier in the year, I asked the Minister in questions before the orders of the day concerning the keeping of the centre on Huron line at the Ambassador bridge open on a year-round basis. When I look in the annual report, I notice that outside of Point Edward there is no centre in Ontario that has as many visits into its reception centre as does the combined total of Windsor tunnel and bridge. We have 104,000 at the tunnel and 85,000 at the bridge and probably the 85,000 is as a result of the centre at the bridge not being open on a year-round basis.

If it were to open on a year-round basis, I would say that it would surpass the Windsor tunnel in visitors seeking information.

Would the Minister explain his policy concerning the reception centre on Huron line outside the Ambassador Bridge?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I can expand very much on

what I said when I answered the hon. member's question a while ago. As I recall, at that time I said that we were looking at this situation because it would appear that there was considerable change in the traffic pattern.

One of the matters which will affect this is US Highway 75, which is not entirely completed on the US side, but it is virtually completed, I understand. I think what I said a while ago, and which I would have to repeat today, is that we are watching the situation, that it may be that we will keep the Huron line centre open all year round instead of the one by the bridge and by the city hall.

The reason for this, of course, is primarily finances. It may be that we would make that change and we might then find there was a need to have both open the year around. In which case we would attempt to do it because we are attempting, of course, to give service to those people who want it, and we have to operate to some extent experimentally in these things.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister will not at any time consider closing either of the two. In fact, I think it is a backward step closing the one at the Ambassador Bridge during the winter months. You try to sell winter activities in the province of Ontario and then you close the door. You have one of the nicer tourist reception centres in the province at the Ambassador Bridge; it is unique; it is unusual. Why build it, if you are not going to put it to use? Why use it only on a part-time basis?

We criticize educational authorities for not having schools open in the summer. Here you have a facility and you close it in the winter months. It just does not seem to make sense. If the Minister looks at his own statistics, he will find that practically all other centres in the province do not draw as many visitors to the tourist reception centre as does the one at the bridge and this is on a part-time basis. How many more would they attract if you had it open on a full-time basis? And the Minister is the one who wants to sell the province of Ontario to our visitors. I certainly think he should not even consider closing the place, even on a part-time basis. There are enough university students that could use this employment. If you do not give them employment here, you give it to them in a loan.

I hope the Minister reconsiders any thoughts that he does have concerning that, Mr. Chairman.

May I ask the Minister at this time if he contemplates the use of a slogan on licence plates? This has been recommended by chambers of commerce for years and years and years, and so have we on this side of the House. You had it one year; it was excellent. Why is a thing like that given up?

Hon. Mr. Auld: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is of course, licence plates are a responsibility of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett). When I was in that portfolio I almost had a slogan on the plates.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it is easy to push it off on the Minister of Transport. But this Minister sits in the Cabinet with him, surely he has some weight in the Cabinet.

An hon. member: That is no asset.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can only suggest to the hon. member that he ask the Minister of Transport.

Mr. B. Newman: I will ask him, Mr. Chairman, but I would like an answer from the Minister now. Has he approached him?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The member can tell him, if he cannot find it, I still have a plate I had designed.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Would you like a slogan?

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask of the Minister if he would consider the development of Peach Island, Peche Island, in the Detroit River, as a tourist attraction on the same basis that he has the Upper Canada Village development at the eastern end of the province? Upper Canada Village loses 50 cents per person visiting the village. In other words, we subsidize everyone who drops into the village to the extent of 50 cents a year. Why would the Minister not consider—

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is not right.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, you do, because our revenue from Upper Canada Village was forecast at \$1,402,000 and the budget is \$2,600,000 for the whole complex of the St. Lawrence Parks.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps when we get into the details; that is in the next item in this vote. But I point out to the hon. member that he is talking about the budget for the entire commission on the one hand, and revenue from the entire commission. I would tell him that the Upper Canada Village just about

breaks even, give or take a few dollars either way, in its operating costs.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, when I look at the annual report for St. Lawrence Parks and then I look at the annual report, I do not find it as such. I find that you lose 50 cents per visitor.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps when we get—

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister then, has he anything in mind in the way of the tourist promotion project in the most important entrance to the province of Ontario—the garden gateway to Canada—in the Essex county and Windsor area? Years ago, I made mention to the Minister of a seignery that had been promoted by residents of the area. Has the Minister given any further consideration to anything for the local area?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that my answer will not entirely satisfy the hon. member, but perhaps I can put it this way: At the present time, we are completing the Huronia project, Sainte-Marie among the Hurons, which will be virtually completed this year with the exception of the museum, which will be about two years from now. The military and naval establishment at Penetanguishene, which we hope to complete for 1971. The museum of the Upper Lakes at Wasaga Beach is completed.

Once those projects are complete I hope that we will be able to undertake another similar project somewhere in the province; we are looking at a number of areas at the present time. I have not forgotten about the seignery programme, although I think I mentioned at the same time this was the kind of project which might well be undertaken locally. In fact, I think the Essex tourist association made some investigations, had a study of the thing, to which we contributed, I think, a good deal of information.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister why should it be undertaken locally? It is for the development of tourism throughout the whole part of the province. The St. Lawrence Parks Commission was not undertaken locally, so why should any other community undertake it locally?

I think it behooves the Minister to have his department study the feasibility of implementing some type of programme with the idea of tourist promotion in the area. The Minister well knows he has the Greenfield Village and the Ford museum in Detroit, and he knows the tremendous tourist attraction

these are. We have all those millions who come into the Detroit area who could be very easily attracted to something in the Essex county area, because it is only a matter of, maybe, one half-hour's drive from the Ford Dearborn museum into the Windsor area. It is a natural to have something developed in Windsor. Once we get our tourists into Essex county and they see how nice it is, they will want to see the rest of the province of Ontario.

May I ask of the Minister if he uses any type of trailers for the promotion of tourism in the United States? Several years ago I made mention that you could have a trailer where you would have a motion picture projector. You could drop in, say, in the city of Dearborn and set up, and some summer evening show the motion picture showing the highlights of the province of Ontario or even have "A Place To Stand," production run over and over again. I think this method does have a lot of potential. I wonder if the Minister has ever considered it, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, we have considered it. I think at the time, two years ago, when the hon. member brought this up, I commented on it. Our position really has not changed; there are certain advantages to this type of promotion, but in terms of our judgment we do not feel that it is a priority at the present time compared with, say, our media advertising programme of television, magazines, newspapers and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I think we agreed yesterday that we would go through this vote by these items: the first one, Promotion Services, St. Lawrence Parks Commission, Huronia Historical Parks, Tourist Industry Development Services, and Research Services. I think I might mention that Promotion Services include the advertising programme, the publicity programme and the information programme in the reception centres which we have been discussing. I think the others are self-explanatory so that if there are other questions regarding promotion we might deal with them at the present time and then we can go on to the next item.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Would licensing come under this vote, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, licensing would come under this, but under the tourist industry development branch which is in—

Mr. T. P. Reid: All right, we will save it for that one.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It would be after Huronia Historical Parks.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would like to ask the Minister how many photographers do you have working in the department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Four.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Four. I have a question on the order paper dealing with this matter. I have here in my hand photographs by Karsh. Could you tell me how much that cost? I understand it is a series.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think \$1,500 per photograph, and that includes the copyright.

Mr. T. P. Reid: \$1,500 per photograph. How many photographers?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Four.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Four. Does that include one of yourself?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Unfortunately, no.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Can you explain why your department has at least four photographers? They are always very much in evidence when the Minister is travelling around, taking pictures of the Minister shaking hands and patting people on the back and so on; I am sure there must be more than four. It looks like a personal bodyguard. But can you explain to me, if you have four photographers in your department—on our northwestern tour we had more photographers from The Department of Lands and Forests than members, why we spent a total of \$6,000 on these photographs?

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I can do it briefly, Mr. Chairman. I think all hon. members are aware of the prestige which Mr. Karsh has in the photographic world.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is it costly?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am not sure that all hon. members were aware of what his fees were until you asked the question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I just cancelled my appointment.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will be glad to arrange for one of our photographers to take the hon. member's photograph at a considerably reduced fee.

The purpose of the programme is, as I outlined last year, to reach an audience which we do not reach in any other way, in essence, very—I do not like to use the

word but I do not know of any other—sophisticated. I hope that defines the audience which we are trying to reach, in one specific series, to spotlight northern Ontario.

The use of Mr. Karsh as a photographer was decided on because of the prestige which he has, in not only the photographic world but in North America and, in fact, in the world in general. From all reports—and this will be the third year that we have undertaken this programme—it is getting the kind of response, generating the kind of enquiries and, presumably, producing the kind of business which we had hoped to achieve.

I think that our photographers are very competent but they are not portrait photographers.

Mr. T. P. Reid: They are always taking yours.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think that they perhaps may be a little biased, but I do not know that those photographers get the kind of use that Mr. Karsh's do, if I can put it that way.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Do you have to pay him a fee each time you use these?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, I mentioned this was a copyright.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You mentioned a sophisticated audience. Now I do not know who is writing your material but there is one line in this particular ad that says, "Of its lakes you lose count after you pass 100,000". If that is aimed at a sophisticated audience, they must be translating from Zulu into English. Of spectacular rock, sky and forest panoramas". Who is writing this stuff? The wording of this ad negates the whole impact—if that is the word—of the picture itself.

Really, how much more awkward can you get? Of its lakes you lose count after you pass 100,000". It sounds pretty amateurish to me, and if you are spending this kind of money on these ads why not have somebody who knows how to write ads.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I tell you there is going to be great distress tomorrow on Bay Street when they read this at the agency.

Mr. Singer: Maybe you should try another one.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Are you satisfied with this one?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am, and from the studies that have been made of readership—I believe it is called the Starch study—it has been achieving the results we want. I hope the hon. member would not want it to be phrased something like this: “When you get to Ontario you really have to take your shoes off if you are going to count all the lakes” or something on that order.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I do not know about that. Surely “Of its lakes you lose count after you pass 100,000” is kind of a tongue twister. You must agree that that is rather awkward.

Another point in regard to this particular one. Were these departmental people who posed for these photographs?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In some cases. I think the one to which the hon. member’s question referred is a member of the staff of The Department of Lands and Forests. There was one—he was a well-known guide and I think a resort operator—Mr. Richardson. But there was no fee paid for the models if that is what the member is asking.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That was what I was getting at.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Walter Kenyon of the Royal Ontario Museum.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, I wonder, I really question whether this is money well spent. You have a picture of a Lands and Forests officer—supposedly the picture is of Arnold Olsen, whoever he is, wearing a Lands and Forests outfit—and then the people are told to write Arnold Olsen, care of The Department of Tourism and Information. He certainly gets around.

Hon. Mr. Auld: He does not necessarily have to—

Mr. T. P. Reid: I should hope not.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) Just the dog and cat bit.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I was quite interested at the committee meeting on Tuesday on tourism. The big problem there, for most of that day, was that the tourist industry could not get enough money, or borrow enough money, to carry on.

We are now promoting tourism on a year-round basis. I wonder if the Minister could

tell us what percentage of the tourist industry in Ontario is actually equipped now to handle the tourist business on a year-round basis?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I really could not answer that question, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is referring to the accommodation end of the tourist industry I presume. I am not sure that we would have an accurate breakdown because some of the accommodation might well be used in the winter time but it is in such a location that it could not be. For instance, I am thinking of some of the hunting camps and so on.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, should not this be under the Tourist Industry Development Services?

Mr. Chairman: Well, the Chairman felt that perhaps it was, but at the same time the hon. member for Hamilton Centre was discussing the promotion of this, so if the hon. Minister wishes to discuss it under promotion he may do so.

Mr. Davison: Just on this point, we are spending a lot of money now on promotion telling the people in the United States where they should come. Does the department not know the areas where they can go during any part of the year and how many people can be accommodated in a certain area? Surely you must know this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In a way, Mr. Chairman, I think I could answer. But as the hon. member’s question, as I understood it, was, “How many accommodation units are there in the province that could handle winter business?” I cannot answer that question.

But, we are, as I have mentioned before, promoting on a year-round basis and I think with some success. One of the problems, of course, is that although those resort areas, or those accommodation units can be winterized with little or no expenditure, the operators have not attempted to do so until they saw the business coming. This is sort of which came first, the chicken or the egg?

We are attempting, and I think as I say with some success, to get more people travelling in the winter time. So far I have heard no complaints that there was not sufficient accommodation for them. It may not have been exactly what they wanted, but I have heard no complaints, and I do not think that we have had any that people came to an area which we had suggested and found that they could not be accommodated.

Mr. Davison: I would agree with you, but the problem is in the tourist industry, if we are really going to bring tourists into Ontario, we are going to have to get more money in there to get them to rebuild in a lot of cases. But how are they going to do it if they are only going to be open two or three months?

Mr. Chairman: That comes, I think, under Tourist Industry Development Services rather than promotion.

The hon. member for Kent under Promotion Services.

Mr. Spence: Would campers' fees be under this section?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Under Lands and Forests.

Mr. Spence: Yes, but that is one of the things that hurts the tourist industry in this province, if I am correct. The fees in the province of Ontario are a lot higher than in other provinces and some of the states, a lot of the states.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further under promotions?

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Through you to the Minister, last year, under promotion, I believe the department had a \$75,000 item, the cost of wining and dining and toasting American editors and newspaper writers, TV, radio people, and so on. I do not see this \$75,000 item in these estimates this year and I wonder if the Minister, in his wisdom, Mr. Chairman, has decided to drop that or whether it is still in, and if so, has it been increased or reduced from \$75,000?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, that would be in the maintenance part of vote 2102.

Mr. T. P. Reid: How did we get into maintenance?

Hon. Mr. Auld: You have to be in the right place at the right time.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Shall I bring my own photographer?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That amount has been reduced by \$10,000. It is now \$65,000, and if you bring your own photographer you may have to pay for his meal.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, how does the Minister continue to justify this expenditure, albeit he has reduced it? What tangible benefits does the tourist industry in Ontario derive from these trips? Are they increasing?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say the tangible benefits which Ontario receives are in the stories written by the travel writers who come and whom we take around the province either in groups or individually. I suppose one could lump it in the term good public relations.

We are in a very competitive field.

As a matter of fact, if hon. members would like to find a calling—and if they are good at it—which they would enjoy, and where they would be received royally around the world, they should get into the travel writing business.

To me, as I say, if you are good at it, there would be nothing better than making your living going out and hunting and fishing and then writing about it, particularly if you are being escorted around.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, how many stories, or how many affidavits, do you have? What can you put your finger on to prove that they are going back and are writing stories that are of benefit to this industry?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not have the figures in front of me but I think it would be very difficult, again, to specifically state if Mr. A. were here how many stories he wrote as a result of that visit and how many he wrote, or did not write, if he was not here. We have generally distributed in the areas those stories that emanated from visits of travel writers, outdoor writers and so on. I can try and get the information for you but it would be rather speculative. I can only say that we are quite convinced that, along with many other jurisdictions, this is a worthwhile bit of promotion.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay was trying to get the floor on promotion.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Getting back to promotion, I see there were grants made to various regional associations—

Mr. Chairman: That comes under the tourist industry development branch, not promotion.

Mr. Stokes: What about these? Is this promotion?

Mr. Chairman: I believe those were discussed under promotion, yes.

Mr. Stokes: I noticed the "Great Ontario Adventure Vacation" is supposed to give potential visitors a panoramic view of what

to expect when they reach our fair province. As I look over it—a very sophisticated publication that emanates from northern Ontario—there is only one picture. If I did not know the place first hand I would not even be aware of that. As a matter of fact I cannot even find it right now, that is how unobtrusive it is. Here it is, here. Is that a picture of Ouimet Canyon?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that even with my glasses off, I cannot see it.

Mr. Stokes: That is the point I am trying to make.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the photographs in that, as we call it, the major lure book are not titled. They are not specific to a part of the province. The purpose of it is to give an overall picture of the province and not attempt, by any means, to have a picture of every part of the province. If we attempted to do that we would have a publication of about six inches thick, and extremely costly. The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management says two feet thick.

The purpose is to give an overall impression of the province. I think if the hon. member will look into the back part of that he will note that if a card is torn out and sent in to us indicating what region of the province a prospective visitor is interested in, we will then give more definitive information. I think that there are many photographs in there which could have been taken at any one of several parts of the province, and that was one of the reasons for selecting some of them.

Mr. Stokes: Just to pursue this further, I imagine if someone did fill out this card—

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is a picture of Ouimet Canyon, I am informed.

Mr. Stokes: —This little tear-off that you referred to—I imagine you would send them “Ontario, Wilderness Ways of the Voyageurs”. I imagine that is the book you would send them if they were interested in going to northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Either that or “The Land of the Polar Bear Express”, depending on which part of northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: I am talking specifically about northwestern Ontario. I notice you have got “Sailing at the Lakehead”. How many people would be involved in “Sailing at the Lakehead”? They would not take a sloop out with them. What percentage would you orient this

kind of advertising to? Or “Trotting Races Are Popular.” Now where would you go—to Greenwood? Where would you go for trotting races in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think Manitoulin Island.

Mr. Stokes: The point I am trying to make is, are you really interested, in this department, in promoting tourism in northern Ontario? Particularly northwestern Ontario? There is nothing in these booklets, these publications, that demonstrates to me that you are really interested in promoting tourism in northern Ontario. For example, last year when I was this Party's critic for your department, I asked you specifically if you would get out any publication that would show the people what the potential was, and just what was available to the tourist in northern Ontario.

I specifically asked you about the publication you put out that would be of interest to rock hounds. And I think I read a couple of letters into the records regarding rock hounds in the area, particularly up along Highway 11. I asked if you would not take the recommendations into consideration, and make the half million North American rock hounds who are definitely interested in this aware of just what the potential is in northern Ontario.

I happen to know there are a couple of unique deposits in Northern Ontario. I think this is the only place they can be found in the world. Yet, in trying to get this promoted, it seems to fall on deaf ears with The Department of Tourism and The Department of Mines. I was wondering if you are really attempting—in a serious way—to tell the people, to tell the potential tourist, just what is available in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that the department has taken our entire programme to every part of this province, both the advertising and the promotional programme. We have had comments from all the tourist councils and chambers of commerce. Certainly those meetings which I have attended—and I have attended many of them—and reports from those meetings which I have not attended, indicate that the people in the tourist industry feel we have a very balanced programme, and that the kind of material we are producing is the kind they want.

In fact, we have been working with various regions and helping them with their marketing programmes, using the same basic ap-

proaches as we have used in our own marketing programmes, and the same basic approach as we have used in our own literature.

We attempt to give—and the people in the industry feel we are giving—a balanced picture of an area. In northern Ontario, of course, not only is it covered in three publications depending on how one defines northern Ontario—the one to which the hon. member refers, plus Polar Bear Express and Champlain Country. But it is carried in the specific book on fishing, the specific book on hunting, and also in the other—the advertisements and so on.

We are still using the rock hound publication—to which the hon. member referred last year. It will probably be some time later this year or next before we have a new edition of it. It was written for us by the foremost geologist in the province. I am afraid I am not an expert in geology.

I have accepted the remarks of the hon. member and we are going to look into that. But as I say, the industry seems to feel that the publications we have put together are good and are all-encompassing as far as any single publication of reasonable size and colour can be.

Mr. Chairman: On promotion, the hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up on these particular remarks the Minister has made that the industry itself is in agreement with the type of promotion that has been made to date. Possibly this is what they tell the Minister at the many meetings he attends. But as is often the case, once the hon. Minister or senior officials leave, a different story may come out to other interested parties.

I would like to refer this back to the remarks of my hon. friend from Rainy River, who brought up the question of the Karsh photographs and the type of advertising. I would also like to relate this back to the public accounts, whereby the James Lovick Company received \$1 million for advertising during that particular fiscal year—out of the \$2,256,000 maintenance appropriation. Is the James Lovick Company still the principal or sole recipient of funds for the promotions of the province as such?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The James Lovick Company continues to be our agency.

Mr. Paterson: Exclusive agency on all matters relating to the province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: All our advertising programmes.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. Might I ask what appropriation in that maintenance fund is for them this year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: \$1,875,000. The current year it is \$1,720,000. This coming year we are requesting \$1,875,000, as I think I indicated in my introductory remarks.

Mr. Singer: They do not need any other clients except you.

Mr. Paterson: No. That is for sure.

The reason I raise this—and I believe it has been raised in years gone by—is that personally I feel that possibly the departments should look at other advertising agencies that they bring in in a package deal for, say, a five-year programme.

Put this out for bids and possibly we will get a better or different type of perspective than what is being put out. I think my friend from Rainy River expressed more than one person's opinion in relation to the advertising of our province.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to pursue the matter that the member for Windsor-Walkerville mentioned about the tourist information centres and, of course, Windsor is the largest port of entry into Canada. I represent Fort Erie, which is the second largest port of entry into Canada. Some six million vehicles travel this bridge every year—with more than five million of them automobiles.

The question I think I raised last year was: When is the Minister, or the department planning on building a new tourist information centre at Fort Erie? I know in the past members of his staff have been in this area, talking on different occasions, and telling us that they are going to give it consideration that we will have a new tourist centre information booth at that particular point.

Now the revenue that is collected at the Peace Bridge, which shared with the Peace Bridge Authority, the Buffalo Port Authority, and the Canadian Government, is some \$400,000. This is split on a 50/50 basis—\$200,000 of it goes to the federal Department of Revenue.

Now I would like to bring this to the attention of the Minister. There is \$200,000 going to Ottawa. Why I do not know, but

some of this money should be kept and spent in this area, perhaps to build this new centre which is needed.

This amount of money continually goes to Ottawa, year after year. Some years it is much higher than \$200,000. But surely I think that with your contacts you should be able to get some of this money here, and build us a decent information centre. There are some points that I would like to bring to your attention also, if this new building is to be built.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Do you think I might have more success in getting funds from Ottawa than my colleague, the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton)?

Mr. Haggerty: We would. It is your department, is it not?

Mr. T. P. Reid: You are the promotion man.

Mr. Haggerty: Promotion is right, this is what we are dealing with.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Promoting money out of Ottawa these days would be a real mark of success.

Mr. Haggerty: Let us leave this for a minute. The Americans who come to Canada are tourists, spending millions of dollars a year in this province. Now, what is lacking in this area is a bank where they can exchange their money. There must be some building that is open for say, six months of the year—from May perhaps up until October—for their convenience, where they can exchange their money, instead of traveling all over the province of Ontario.

I know of many cases where people have had to travel to St. Catharines to a tourist booth on wheels, a mobile unit, and to other places.

I think this is where we need a new tourist establishment, in this area where the people can find out where to travel in Ontario—to see Ontario as it is. And I wish that you, Mr. Minister, would, with the Treasurer, go to Ottawa and see if you cannot get some of this money. I think we deserve it in this area.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I might just mention, Mr. Chairman, that—as I think I mentioned last year—we would like to have new facilities in Fort Erie. The Department of Highways is working on plans for a change in the road configuration there and has assured us that it is going to reserve space in its configuration so that we will have a good location.

One of our problems in the past has been when the department embarked on the programme of having information centres at border entry points, it just was not possible to get a location which was convenient for tourists or where there was adequate parking. There were a lot of other problems.

We hope that, whatever changes are made at Fort Erie, we will be in on them and that there will be funds at that time to put in a new centre. But I would have to be frank with the hon. member and tell him that in terms of priorities at the present time, our first priority is the Pigeon River bridge leading to the Lakehead, where we have had a trailer for some time and which I think the hon. member for Rainy River and the hon. member for Port Arthur are aware of—and remind me of on many occasions, along with the daily representations of the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) and the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman).

At Hawkesbury, we have a building which has not fallen down yet, but is not too far from it. And it would appear that Public Works will have funds for two locations for us in the coming year. So those are our priorities at the moment.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I thought Hawkesbury and Pigeon River were in the programme some four years ago. Does the Minister mean to tell me he has not got them built yet?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I want to remind the hon. member that the situation at Pigeon River is that it has taken us until, I think, three weeks ago, to acquire the property from the federal government on which to locate a permanent centre, although we have had good co-operation in that they have allowed us to put our trailer on their property until such time as we resolve this permanent site.

The problem at Hawkesbury has been jointly provincial-federal, federal public works are building a wharf.

Mr. Haggerty: The matter of the property at the Peace Bridge entrance; I am sure the property is there, right at the entrance to the Peace Bridge, right alongside the Queen Elizabeth Way.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We may have highways come along two years from now and change the traffic pattern and we will find we are in the wrong place.

Mr. Haggerty: Well, have you not another provincial building there, not too far from there? I think the Ontario provincial police

are within this same area. There is land available in that area. There is no reason why a building could not be built in that area.

Mr. Chairman: Under promotion, the hon. member for Wellington South wanted the floor.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I spoke to the Minister yesterday about receiving a letter from the owner of the hotel in Fergus, and this man, of course, was concerned in this letter he had written to the Minister—with a copy to me—about the fact he has belonged to the association promoting tourist accommodation. He said he has made three payments, but is not yet registered. This man, along with one other gentleman, provide excellent accommodation in the town of Fergus. I would like the Minister to undertake to see that this man is registered and the necessary steps taken to help him promote his hotel in that area.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member said, he mentioned this to me before. Unfortunately, the letter of which the member has a copy, the original has not yet reached me, because I checked again this morning. However, the publication to which the letter writer refers is, I believe, "Where to Stay" which is in the process of being updated. If he is not in the edition which he has seen, he will be in the edition which is coming out hopefully in the near future.

Mr. Worton: It is mentioned in the letter, Mr. Chairman, that like my friend, the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), he is in a dry area and this presents quite a bit of difficulty in his promoting his business.

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

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just one remark or question here. In the public accounts there is purchase of photographic supplies, motion pictures and equipment, totalling some \$87,000. I believe this is an item also this year. I would like to know if it is an item under these estimates, and what exactly it is for.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the budget for the current year is \$109,000, the request before the committee at the moment is for \$129,000. This is made up as follows: Film production, \$60,000; replacement prints, that is, prints for the 27 films that we presently have in our library, which, of course, wear

out and which are distributed for us by the National Film Board, who are on a 50/50 basis with us, \$15,000; the department library replacement prints, \$10,000, which is a new item this year. We had no funds in last year for this.

Commercial distribution, \$5,000, the same as last year; \$10,000 for telecasts, which we are doing again jointly with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. These are the fillers which I mentioned in my remarks yesterday. \$4,000, which is a new item this year, for versioning in foreign films, that is putting other language sound tracks on our present films, all of which are English; and prints from outside agencies. These are travel films which other agencies produce and we buy prints of. And then equipment and supplies, which is the equipment for our own photographers, \$20,000.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Just one other matter, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister: The Minister and his officials indicated at the NOTO meeting held in Kenora that they were prepared to open a permanent office of The Department of Tourism and Information in Fort Frances. As you know, we have 250,000 tourists coming across the border there every year and they spread out into the rest of northwestern Ontario from the border crossing at International Falls, Fort Frances.

Could the Minister advise me at this time if there are any plans for a permanent structure at Fort Frances with a permanent employee probably, I would imagine, Elmer Stone or Peter Hughes, from the Kenora office being placed in Fort Frances?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that as the hon. member knows, all our development officers are at our headquarters at the moment in Kenora where our district office is. We have been considering for some time the pros and cons of putting one of the field staff in the Fort Frances headquarters. It is still under active consideration and I cannot tell the hon. member this afternoon whether we will be doing it next month or some time from now.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I can appreciate that. I just gathered from the remarks made in Kenora that as soon as the new bridge was built, hopefully across the Rainy River at International Falls, Fort Frances, that the department would build a new tourism building there and staff it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is true. And when that day comes we would attempt to have

the building include office space as well as tourist information space, so we could then have a man stationed there.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the Minister say the bridge is the hold-up?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps I could put it the other way. We probably will not be building a new building until we know where the bridge is going to be.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton Centre has been trying to get the floor.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, I was interested yesterday afternoon in the Minister telling us that they were now starting to do a promotion job among travel agencies. I was quite interested in a book that came to my door last weekend, in fact most of the people in Hamilton got it. It is put out by Lucas and King and is called "Vacation Guide for 1969."

It has pictures and shows you places to go in nearly every place in the world but Ontario. Right across Canada. You can start at the east coast and go to the west coast, but there is not a word about Ontario in there.

I looked at a magazine put out by a travel agency in Ontario and what I am interested in; are there travel agencies in Quebec or in the western provinces that put out this type of a book that tells the people to come to Ontario? I was just wondering how you missed out in not getting into a book of this type?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should first say that travel agents earn their living from a percentage of the travel ticket which they sell and the accommodation which they may book at the other end. On transportation, I think their percentage on domestic flights is 5 per cent and on foreign flights is 7.5 per cent and sometimes 10 per cent. Not all travel agents, in fact there is only one in Toronto who specializes in Ontario tours. They look for long trips because the fare will be higher.

I can only say that we have taken the first step in discussing with travel agents the difference between selling one \$1,000 ticket and making \$50 commission, and selling 50 \$100 tickets so that they would make a larger return and, in fact, try to get into the bulk business rather than the individual business, if I am making myself clear.

There is another question, too, with travel agents and resort operators in this province. Not all resort operators are prepared to give a travel agent commission for booking their accommodation, particularly in July and August because in the last few years they have not required it. They are getting enough business without the assistance of a travel agent. Without going into too much detail on what is mainly an administrative matter, I suppose, or a promotional matter here, I can say in fact I suggested to ASTA on Tuesday night, I think it was, that they start working with the resort operators in what they might call their slack season on a percentage basis.

I think through this kind of co-operation we can generate more winter, spring and fall business. I would suspect that travel agents on the west coast would be selling trips to Ontario because it is far enough. By the same token, I do not think that a travel agent in Vancouver is selling a lot of travel in British Columbia.

Mr. Davison: That is fine, Mr. Chairman, but what I was interested in was: are any of the other provinces doing this same thing where they are using Ontario? That was what interested me. You are talking about the travel agency on the basis of promoting year-round vacations in Ontario. I was quite interested in a book somebody sent me from British Columbia and it is called "Beautiful British Columbia." It is put out four times a year so that in each publication they show what is going on for that season. I have looked through the publications here in Ontario and I have never seen anything that even comes close to this.

The interesting and nice thing about it is that it is something that people can buy in British Columbia and send to people in other parts of Ontario, in Canada or the world. Quite frankly, I have only spent a few days in British Columbia but after receiving this book for about two years now, I am certainly going to go back to British Columbia and do a bit of traveling there. I have discovered an awful lot of nice places to go and when they show you a picture, you are told exactly what it is and they explain all about it. It is quite interesting. Apart from that, they also send you a little calendar that you hang on your wall. It is a scenic calendar and this is also presented by the government of British Columbia when you subscribe to this book for \$2 for one year.

This book is put out by the Minister of Travel and Industry in British Columbia. Would it not be possible for The Depart-

ment of Tourism—I know it is expensive—to have a set-up like this whereby you could get this into homes in a lot of places in North America where they are not getting the type of tourism information that is coming out now? I think this is a good thing and I would hope that this department would take a really serious look at doing something like this.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the hon. member for Hamilton Centre, it is an excellent publication and I have read it myself. We have looked and are looking again at this kind of a promotion which is not self-supporting; it is a subscription piece and it does pay for a good deal of its cost. The lure-book, to which reference is made a little earlier, is in a somewhat similar vein. From the comments that we received from people in the industry and our competitors in the industry, it is an excellent piece—the kind of thing that when somebody receives it, they can keep it on the coffee table as a reference, rather than throw it away. The only thing I would say about the B.C. proposal, as applied to here, is that you have to look at these things in terms of priority and marketing. B.C.'s tourist industry is a little differently based from ours. A great many of their tourists are of a higher income level and come from a greater distance than, say, some percentage of ours.

Thus far, it has been our judgment that the amount of money involved in doing a piece like "Beautiful B.C."—which, I say, is excellently done—will produce more return for us in another media, for instance, television or regular magazine promotion or joint promotions with regional tourist councils or tourist organizations. But as funds become available—which is the old phrase, I suppose—or as we constantly re-assess our programme, it may well be that we might be into something like it. There is no doubt about it, it has great value and in that case is extremely well done.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in looking over the annual report of the Minister, we find that as a result of the studies, 18 per cent of the Ontario visitors have incomes over \$29,000; one other figure is that the average individual coming in from the United States, has a household income of \$10,000 and up to \$15,000. We are catering, Mr. Minister, to people who have a fairly high income.

How about selling the province to people within the province, those who would have an income much lower than that? Why don't

we talk about using a series of trailers such as was used by the Canadian government during Expo year, which travelled the length and breadth of Canada with various exhibits concerning our country? Could you not, Mr. Minister, copy that idea? Have you thought of that? Is it not feasible or is it practical to be able to use a series of trailers travelling throughout Ontario and attempt to sell Ontario to residents within the province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, it would be a very costly way, I think; very much more costly method than the present method we use, which is Canadian magazines. I am not sure that it would be as effective because, just off the top of my head, I cannot conceive what one would put in a trailer that would be interesting enough to get people to come through the trailer as compared to opening a magazine which you get in your home—

Mr. B. Newman: The same thing that was put in the Expo trailers.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —But I do not think that the purpose of the Expo trailers was to promote travel across Canada. I think the purpose of the Expo trailers was educational—

Mr. B. Newman: It was promoting Canada. It was to promote something—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It was reminding Canadians of their heritage and of the many great people and events which had gone to make up that heritage. I do not really think, Mr. Chairman, that kind of approach could solve tourism in Ontario more effectively than the mass media. As I say, the great problem is reaching the prospect. You have to have some way of catching his attention, perhaps with a mobile trailer with a photograph of Ouimet Canyon in it, or of the grain elevators at the Lakehead, or the Hudson Bay post at Moose Factory, or the nuclear plant at Pickering. I am not sure that the people would go to a trailer to see those, whereas they now will see an ad and write in to us and get information about it.

Mr. B. Newman: Could you not, Mr. Minister, have exactly the same thing that you show on TV—these one-minute trailers on television—right in a mobile trailer?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Could I ask the hon. member, if he had a choice, would he rather look at it at home with a beer, or go down the street and look at it in a trailer?

Mr. B. Newman: I have yet to see one of your one minute TV trailers.

An hon. member: It is not on TV there.

Mr. B. Newman: So apparently it is not hitting my area. My area is a very important area. We are in the centre of a population that might run into say 35 to 40 million within an eight-hour travelling distance of the city of Windsor.

May I ask you, Mr. Minister, if you are using the schools at all in an attempt to sell Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is a difficult question to answer. Formally no. We have, as I mentioned in my introductory remarks, been conducting seminars in some high schools having to do with the employment possibilities in the tourism industry. However, we have not been running, under our auspices, any programmes in the school about travel in Ontario. I think in social studies and other courses, at least that is what they are called now—when I was at school, it was history and geography—I think that the young people in the schools are learning about their province.

Mr. B. Newman: May I, first of all, respectfully suggest to the Minister that we undertake some studies or a pilot project in some given area in the province where they would send in tourist consultants with motion pictures and so forth in an attempt to show the highlights of the province of Ontario? This would encourage the students to have their parents visit Ontario first before they go south of the border.

May I ask of the Minister if the department has considered publishing in US newspapers, weekend tours of the area, within say a hundred driving miles of centres like Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, Windsor, Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie in an attempt to attract the tourist or of promoting a three day visit first as a lure to come in? I feel that once we get them in, they will come back.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We do not do that, Mr. Chairman, but this is the kind of project which can be undertaken, and very effectively carried by regional tourist councils.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the regional tourist councils do not have enough money to do all of this.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Neither do we.

Mr. B. Newman: You could put some of your funds in that. I notice in the Detroit papers that Shell advertise weekend tours—I should not say weekend tours—one-day trips into Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well we can think about it.

Mr. B. Newman: Maybe you could consult with some of the big oil interests and have them undertake a similar project in American papers so that our American friends could come and visit us.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We have discussed with the oil companies the, "heritage highway programme", which they have undertaken in the States. Thus far the oil companies have not been anxious to work together about this because they are concerned about the Combines legislation.

In connection with schools, I should have pointed out to the hon. member that there are film programmes. There are films which our department has produced about various parts of the province and various aspects of recreation such as hunting and fishing and just touring history. Sailing is most recent one, but they are all distributed and shown in the schools.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, the film alone, without someone making comment after the film in an attempt to sell, is not effective enough. It is the sales talk, which follows the film, that is, by far, more effective than simply watching a motion picture film in an auditorium.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, this is a \$3,052,000 item that we are discussing under the very broad caption of Promotion Services. Maintenance, for that matter, covers \$2,256,000 of it, and this entire item, Promotion Services is the largest item for the whole tourism business.

I would like something clarified here. We have heard the Minister twist that word "maintenance" into dozens of connotations here this afternoon. There are so many things jammed in under "maintenance" it is not funny. We hear an awful lot of scuttlebutt going around, that the government uses this department to promote the government, and I of course, do not believe a word of that. However, I feel that now is the time to set the record straight. I wonder if the Minister would state whether these funds, \$3,052,000, are being used to promote anything other than tourism?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The answer to that is "no", Mr. Chairman. The hon. member would recall that under the government system of accounting, as far as major divisions are concerned, there are only three—salaries or travel expense, and everything else is maintenance.

I am delighted and prepared, and we have been working for some time to have all the information here. If there are any questions that the hon. member has about the items that go to make up the maintenance section or any of these votes, I would be delighted to give it to him. I can understand that when you see that kind of figure, it makes you wonder. But I have given the breakdown in a number of these votes, and I would be delighted to give it any time any hon. member wants the details.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted the hon. Minister to kill that bad rumour once and for all. Thank you.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister how much is going to be spent in promoting tourism at the CNE this year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I hate to tell the hon. member this, but the CNE exhibit—all the departments in the CNE—come under The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Chairman: The St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

Mr. Paterson: I visited there with the select committee a couple of years ago, and noticed there was a great amount of summer employment in that area. I wonder if the Minister could inform us how many students will be hired this year and whether this will be an increased number as opposed to last year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Approximately 300, Mr. Chairman. The largest groups will be the Fort Henry guard which I think is in the order of 85, all boys, or male university students. There are, I think, 30 girls at Old Fort Henry, approximately the same number at Upper Canada Village; no, more at Upper Canada Village and in the parks. It is a little hard to be correct down to the last one because the names that we have do not indicate ages in all cases. In some of the parks where there may be students working, taking tickets, with beach safety supervisors, they might be adults. But in total it is about 300.

Mr. Chairman: The St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the discussions I had made mention that we lose approximately \$1 million a year on the St. Lawrence Parks Commission. Now I look under, not the public accounts but the annual report, and I find that the estimated revenue from the St. Lawrence Parks Commission is \$1,402,000. When I look at the estimates, I

see we are budgeting for \$2,600,000. Will the Minister explain where the \$1,200,000 is going to come from then? Is that a loss?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is speaking about the total expenditure of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission as opposed to the total estimated revenue. Perhaps we should go back a little in history.

The St. Lawrence Parks Commission was set up as a result of an agreement between the government of Ontario and the government of Canada to provide park space and open space along the St. Lawrence River. It was to replace, in many cases, those areas which were being flooded or destroyed because of the seaway and the power authority. I do not think that the commission was ever planned to be totally self-supporting.

A great deal of the commission's land is what the commission refers to as non-revenue land. The commission acquired, at a cost of something over \$1 million, from Ontario Hydro, who shared its acquisition costs with New York State, New York State Power Authority, and also the seaway authority, about 35 miles of shore front from just east of Morrisburg to Cornwall.

Now, some of that is developed into parks and camping areas and so on and revenue is received from the use that the public makes of that. But, a great deal of it is non-revenue producing land or a game sanctuary in one case, and there is no revenue that pulls from that. In addition, I would point out that the total expenditure includes a good deal of capital expenditure as well as operating expense.

The capital expenditure each year has become less and in fact is, I suppose, you might say that there would not be any further capital expenditure. There has been more capital expenditure in recent years than perhaps envisaged ten years ago because of the necessity to expand the camping areas but they are revenue producing areas.

Mr. B. Newman: I thank the Minister for the history lesson but when I look into the books, into the two books, the estimates and the Minister's Report, I do not find the type of a picture which he expresses. I find that the estimated revenue is \$1,402,000 for the whole St. Lawrence Parks Commission. I look in the estimates and I find that the capital cost for construction and development is only going to be \$250,000, yet the total budget is \$2,693,000 for the St. Lawrence Parks Commission. We are losing

approximately \$1 million a year in that operation.

Two million people visit the parks over the course of a year and we are subsidizing visitors to the St. Lawrence Parks Commission to the extent of 50 cents per visitor. This is a nice thing, Mr. Minister, why not come along and set up that same type of a project in other parts of Ontario? If you are going to subsidize one part of Ontario, why not subsidize another part?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Why not have another St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. B. Newman: This is why I ask you to put up some type of tourist attraction in the Windsor-Essex county area, because we would not mind that \$1 million a year subsidy in our area either.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to bring to the attention of the House, the fact that the Fairfield family of Lennox and Addington county have been very generous through the years. A few years ago, Fairfield Place was left to the St. Lawrence Parks Commission and it is a very historic house, constructed before the year 1800. Many tourists visit this house and see its furnishings and admire the fine state in which it is kept. It really is of historical interest and it is the type of thing that, even if it does not produce much revenue, it does have a lot of visitors. I still think it is worthwhile to the people of Ontario to own and have it as something of very great historical value. Now, more recently, Mrs. Mabel Fairfield Gutzeit, of the village of Bath, passed away, and she, of course, was a Fairfield before her marriage. Now she, in turn, has left her historical house, which likewise was constructed prior to 1800, along with the contents and a great collection of paintings.

Certainly we have reason to appreciate Mrs. Gutzeit's generous gift and we are interested, of course, in the future of this latest Fairchild house and the paintings. We understand that the paintings have been brought to Toronto for evaluation, but we would hope, and we think it is probably in terms of the legacy as she would want it that way, that those paintings be on display in the former house that she occupied, during the summer months at least.

Now I can understand that it probably would be impractical to leave them there in

the winter time due to possible theft or fire, but it seems to me that they do belong to eastern Ontario. I would hope there is no intention of taking them elsewhere or that there is no intention of not having them on display in the Fairfield house in Bath during the summer months when tourists may see and admire them.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Chairman, just in connection with that, I would like to concur in the remarks of the member for Prince Edward-Lennox. I have written to the chairman of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission in this connection suggesting that in the winter time they could have these pictures stored, or have them on display at the Agnes Etherington Art Centre which is connected with Queen's University in Kingston. I am sure that if representations were made to the directors of the centre they would be more than happy to keep them and show them in their centre in Kingston.

I think this is most important. These pictures have been in eastern Ontario for many, many years.

It would be a shame to have them come to Toronto and lay in some dusty cupboard rather than have them back in eastern Ontario and shown there. As the member for Prince Edward County indicates, they could be in the original house during the summer and then taken to some suitable place like the Agnes Etherington Art Centre at Queen's University for storage and display in the winter time. I would very heartily recommend that this action be taken.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would reassure my hon. friends that the chairman of the commission has mentioned this to me, and I believe that this is what the commission will plan to do. I agree with them that this would be the logical place to keep this art and make it available to the public, and it seems only fair that it stay in the area from whence it was given to the province.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Minister has given that assurance and we will look forward to seeing them down in eastern Ontario very shortly, we hope.

I trust I am in order when, on looking at the attendance figures of the various parks, I am wondering if there has been any analysis made as to why the attendance in some of the parks has increased substantially, while the attendance at some of the other parks has decreased; whether there has been an

analysis as to what makes the attendance go up in certain areas and why has the attendance fallen in other areas? I am wondering if the Minister has any comments in that connection?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, there has not been to my knowledge any survey commissioned in this connection, but actually the commission is always interested in attendance trends. I know in the past that in some cases we have found attendance has dropped because of road repairs being made in some area; because of work going on in the park itself, entrance roads, and this kind of thing. If the hon. member has any specific question perhaps I might be able to get the answer for him if I do not have it here.

Mr. Apps: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I am particularly concerned about are the two parks west of Kingston between Kingston and Adolphustown, and those are the parks at Adolphustown and Fairfield, both of which have shown a very substantial decline in attendance.

I see Upper Canada Village has gone up quite a bit; Ivy Lea has stayed about the same; Morrison and Nairn have increased; Farran has increased; and Charlottenberg has increased.

I think it would be a good idea to sit down and examine these parks, compare them, and find out what may be attracting visitors in one area, in one park, and see if the other parks have similar facilities and just try and determine, with the experience of the parks that are improving their attendance, how the other parks can also be improved so their attendance would be increased in the years to come.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I will pass that along to the commission and we will see what we can find out and convey it to the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Huronia Historical Park. Tourist Industry Development Services.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I think it was last year the Minister announced a study of the possibilities for tourist development in the Lower Grand. He shared the responsibility of this with the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, and while there was some considerable publicity at the time about the potential of the Lower Grand as an expanding tourist centre, there has been little or nothing said about it since.

At the time the Minister felt that the gov-

ernment of Canada might do something rather than the government of Ontario. But this is certainly a matter of continuing concern to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) and myself, because so many people are coming out from Hamilton and the growing communities in that area. I would expect some kind of a programme, whether a joint one with the government of Canada or otherwise, would be set in motion to meet the needs of this area of the province.

I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs has finally realized that the provincial responsibility in planning in Haldimand-Norfolk is of paramount importance when we see the new industrial development down there, but certainly recreation and tourism is going to be associated with it as well. I wonder if the Minister had any second thoughts about that area of development?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the report to which the hon. leader of the Opposition refers was produced with the budget of my department. As I recall it, it was produced originally at the request of the Niagara Iroquois tourist council, who asked that it be done.

The hon. leader of the Opposition is correct in that there were a number of suggestions or recommendations in the report which might relate to either federal responsibility as it has been in the past, having to do with waterways and so on, or the conservation authority, which is provincial, municipal and in some cases, federal. This report was circulated in the area.

I am afraid I cannot tell the hon. leader of the Opposition just what is happening to those various agencies at the moment, although I can tell him that we hope to continue jointly with the federal Department of Transport, the study that involves representatives of a number of federal and provincial departments on the inland waterways in the province.

If you will recall, we did a study of this kind jointly with the federal government two years ago, and it was hoped that this could be continued jointly. I think it is now going to be continued jointly, and no doubt this might have a bearing.

Mr. Nixon: Might I pursue this a bit? It is our experience, I suppose, sitting on this side of the House, that whenever a Minister tells us that his responsibility is shared, this is an indication that little or nothing is going to be done. I would suggest to the Minister that this is a project he might very well take

hold of himself in his department and move it towards some kind of action and with some completion goal associated with it.

The Grand River has suffered from gross pollution for a long, long time. There are those who feel it is improving. I am among those who think the situation is improving. We are spending a lot of money in sewage disposal and other efforts to improve it.

But this could be an excellent centre for tourism, and it actually would fit into the idea that the Minister mentioned a moment ago under another vote—of heritage highway. He has heard me on this subject before because in close proximity is the Six Nations Indian reservation, the most populated one in Canada. The highway that runs through it and beside it might very well be a part of a heritage highway that would be within easy access to Buffalo and the citizens of New York state.

It is loaded with history and interest, and if it had added to it an area of water recreation, such as the Grand River could provide, then it would be a very attractive centre indeed.

I think the projected cost associated with the report last year was \$10 million, which is something that we would have to consider very carefully under present circumstances. But it appears to me that if the Minister is going to spearhead an approach in this connection, he will wait a long time if he waits for his colleague in Energy and Resources Management to move. He might be prepared to say we would wait a long time if we waited for our colleagues in Ottawa to move.

The point is that this does come under the Minister's jurisdiction, and I would urge him to examine it very carefully with the possibility of having some community involvement in the area, just to see how keen the local people would be to participate; how keen the local tourist association and Niagara-Iroquois association would be to follow community efforts in this connection; and try to see if he could not persuade the projects of the government and the Treasury board to put this high up on the list of priorities, because I think it is important.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, last night in a few brief comments, I made the remark that this department was deficient in two areas, and someone behind me said the first one was the Minister. I would not want to go so far as to say that. But looking at the estimates of this department, we find that there is only approximately \$8 million that is spent directly on tourism.

The rest is St. Lawrence Parks, Huronia Historic Park, which surely should be under Lands and Forests. We have the institute of science, and Centennial centre of science and technology, which should be under The Department of Education. This leaves the Minister with very little responsibility.

We also learned, and those of us who are in northwestern Ontario and were involved in the northwestern Ontario tourist industry study, are aware that in this study on page 72 was outlined the fact that 12 different departments are involved in the tourist business. Actually, there should be one more, as we learned at the committee meeting yesterday. Added to that list should be The Department of the Provincial Secretary, under whose aegis comes the liquor control board affairs of this province.

Surely these laws are more detrimental to the tourist industry in Ontario than any other single factor. However, the fact there are 13 other departments of government that directly infringe upon the tourist industry in Ontario, has frayed the responsibility of this particular department, and has left little authority in this department to have any kind of impact upon tourism in Ontario.

That is bad enough in itself. But the real deficiency in this department comes in the fact that the Minister has not provided any kind of development fund for the tourist industry. The Minister goes out glad-handing around the province of Ontario, the rest of Canada, all through the States, and yet there is no provision in his department to ensure that facilities are available for the tourists when they arrive in Canada.

The tourist industry is an industry that requires long-term capital assets, long-term capital investment in plant, in accommodation and rooms, and the financing for them is not available at the present time. Banks are loath to make these kinds of loans.

The Industrial Development Bank acknowledges that it is not a development bank. The Ontario Development Corporation is not overly interested in these kinds of loans, these small business administrations loan up to only \$25,000.

Now, the NOTO association asked the Minister to set up a fund of some \$3 million to provide loans. The gentleman was talking in the \$100,000 class, but I think a more reasonable figure would be for loans in the \$25,000 to \$50,000 class so that tourist operators could expand their facilities and provide the accommodations that are necessary.

Now, for the Minister to go out holus-bolus across the country and across the United States and invite people to come to Ontario and, at the same time, not be able to assure them of accommodation once they arrive here, I will call a Machiavellian fraud. It is certainly very poor advertising on his part.

I would ask the Minister at this point whether he or his department is prepared at this time to recommend to his Cabinet colleagues on the Treasury benches that such a fund be set up? The NOTO association did not ask for a handout or an interest-free loan. They asked for a fund of some \$3 million at a reasonable rate of interest—around eight per cent. Is the Minister prepared at this time to recommend such a fund to his colleagues?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the hon. member that we are discussing at the present time, and have been for several weeks, with the Minister of Trade and Development and the Ontario Department Corporation, an expansion of their programme. They make no bones about it. They are not primarily at the present time in their terms of reference, involved in loans to the tourist industry, except for those types of facilities which will tend to fill up existing accommodation in an area.

It is a good programme and has been very effective in those places where it have been applied. I cannot tell the hon. member what decision will finally be arrived at by the government. I do not have to remind the hon. members that funds are not flowing freely. On the other hand, I think we would all agree that the industry is a dollar earner for the province, and I am hopeful that there will be some expansion of the present programme.

I would agree with the hon. member that the industry do not want hand-outs or grants; they want relatively long-term financing at current rates of interest, not exorbitant current rates for third mortgage but the first mortgage type rates, of 8 or 8.25 per cent. I am hopeful that we will make progress in this area. Although I think that not only does the provincial government have a responsibility and an interest here, so does the federal government because in terms of tax revenue they stand to benefit substantially from improved conditions in the tourist industry, just as this province does. In fact, they stand to benefit to a greater extent.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Would you be prepared to give up the jurisdiction in this area?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Indeed. I would say that all provinces would be prepared to have the federal government take over tourist promotion, providing that the provinces were convinced that the federal authority would do it effectively for that province.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The Minister is surely aware that his problem is the number one priority with all the tourist groups in Ontario? It was recommended, I believe, by the tourist industry committee of the Ontario Economic Council as far back as 1965. The Minister will recall at the NOTO meeting at Kenora last fall, where he was present as well as myself—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was up there again.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes. In the briefs that were presented to him by various elements in the tourist business in northwestern Ontario and northern Ontario, the number one priority was such a fund. Surely, the Minister is aware that this is a returnable sort of thing. If you loan, these tourist operators money, you are going to get it back. It is not a sort of an open-ended welfare programme where the money is spent, or even a \$0.5 million free loan. The province is going to get the money back. I would urge careful consideration.

I would like to go on to something else—the matter of licencing. Your department is responsible for the licencing of tourist camps and tent camps, is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, of tourist accommodation other than that which is in conjunction with facilities licenced by the Liquor Licence Board. But we have several types of licence. There is the outfitter's licence which I think you are referring to compared to, say, a hotel or a motel.

Mr. T. P. Reid: These outfits cannot operate without such a licence from your department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is right. Anybody who has two or more cottages or units. And we classify tourist establishments in ten categories, starting with cabin establishments and working down to tourist outfitter establishments. There are outpost establishments, for instance, which are—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Are Americans allowed to have these licences?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, at a higher licence fee.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What is that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is \$60 as compared to \$20.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is ridiculous, is it not, that an American can come in and use our natural resources, set up a base camp, a tent camp, in the Ontario wilderness for \$60, have his people come in, fly them in most cases, from the American side; have them buy a fishing licence for \$8.50. This is the only revenue that accrues to the province of Ontario and the residents of Ontario. This is all the money the province gets out of it. The American operator goes back to the American side with all the money that he has made out of Canadian resources, without having to pay any taxes or any fees except the very nominal one of \$60 for a tent camp. Meanwhile, he is exploiting and exhausting our fishing and hunting supplies in the province of Ontario.

I would urge upon you, sir, to give this your very serious consideration. You, in effect, are promoting the American tourist in competition with the Ontario resident who has to pay these taxes, who has to give better service to the people coming in, and who has to pay all the other licence fees that your department and Lands and Forests, and so on, impose upon him.

How can you sit there and say you are promoting Ontario tourism and allow this sort of situation to continue?

I would like to know if you are going to change this regulation and either: 1. No American outfitters are allowed to operate a tent camp in Ontario, or: 2. Make the licence fee so restrictive that at least Ontario will make some money out of this in some way.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I should clarify this a little. There are a number of the extremely good resort operators, particularly in north-western Ontario, who are United States citizens and who have a substantial capital investment with their headquarters operations as well as their outpost camps. They purchase their supplies in the province; they pay Crown fees for outpost areas, and they act just like Canadian operators. There are many good ones and I think the hon. member knows some.

Mr. T. P. Reid: We are talking about the ones that operate from the American side of the border.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have no sympathy for the ones to which he refers either. He is talking about the people who actually, in

many cases, do not even have an outpost licence with us because they fly in as private individuals. These are the people about whom we have had discussions with Ottawa for four years that I can think of. I will not rehash all the complexities. The hon. member and the other northern members, I think, are aware of this. At the present time—as I said the other day, without the use of the Royal Canadian Air Force—if that is what it is still called and if, in fact, we still have any aircraft in it to police this kind of thing—we have not yet found the answer.

This matter was brought up at the north-western Ontario associated chambers of commerce commission to the Cabinet a week ago. The Minister of Lands and Forests mentioned at that time that they are working on a plan which they think may be able to control this. What, in fact, is happening is that people are flying in, fishing, and flying out, and making no contribution to the local economy or to the province other than the purchase of a fishing licence.

There has been, as yet, no way to control this because in the first place you cannot prove that they are outfitters.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would ask you this, sir. Are there any outfitters operating from the American side of the border—and I am thinking particularly of Ely, Minnesota, in that area—that you are aware of who are able to get these licences for outpost camps on the Canadian side?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I cannot give the hon. member specific information, but my staff indicate to me that there may be—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Will you act to stop this particular practice?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We will look into this aspect of it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Are you also responsible for the licencing of houseboats, commercial houseboats?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Only if they were rented as a cottage and somebody had more than two of them. Houseboats, I may say, are a very grey area.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Do you licence some, in effect? If I have five or six houseboats and I am operating a commercial operation renting them to American parties coming into Canada to fish? Are you responsible for licencing?

Mr. Singer: Only if they are not grey.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Only if they would be anchored in one place, permanently at one time, and rented as a resort. Otherwise it is like a rental boat or cruiser, which we do not licence.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under development service? I thought the hon. member for Port Arthur had been up before? The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: On this same point of licencing, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend mentioned the licencing of trailer camps. I believe that the department does licence these facilities when there is accommodation for six or eight trailers in a lot. I wondered, does this licence supersede or go beyond the jurisdiction of local municipality bylaws in relation to such activities, or do the local bylaws supersede?

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I understand the question correctly, anybody who operates a trailer camp, as defined in our regulations, is required to have our licence. But we do not licence those places which are sort of permanent residence areas, where somebody leases a lot to a fellow with a house trailer who moves it in, takes the wheels off, and put it up to the utilities.

Mr. Paterson: The reason I bring this up, Mr. Chairman, is that a number of municipalities, especially in my own area, have bylaws that prohibit people from living in a trailer within the boundaries of that municipality for, say, a one-year period. It must be moved out over-night and can be moved back in. There is some thought that if they were licenced by the department this would give them a little stronger hold in this regard. I think underlying this whole situation is a certain stigma that has been placed upon the owners or the people that live in these mobile homes.

I wonder if it is not the prerogative—if not the duty—of the Minister of this department to try and enhance the position of these people; possibly get more constructive information out to the municipalities so they

will not be afraid of this type of development and in many cases probably encourage it, because of our extreme housing shortage and the difficulties of these people requiring sites that are of a more permanent nature.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister have a comment?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I did not realize the hon. member wanted a comment. I think perhaps we are talking about different things. I would agree with the hon. member that some municipalities, because of their bylaws preventing trailers, have made it impossible for the transient tourist to find accommodation in their area. This is a problem. On the other hand, I know that many municipalities have not wanted trailer sites for a number of reasons and one of them has been the problem of educating the children who come with the mobile homes.

If there is any specific area where we can be of assistance in pointing out to the municipality the pro's and con's of having accommodation available for transient trailers, we would be delighted to do so.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under development?

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, in my own municipality we have people from other jurisdictions who move their mobile homes or their trailers into the campsite, and who commute back and forth, say, to points in Michigan, during the summer months. They would prefer to leave these accommodation facilities at that campsite because of the friendships that are developed and the facilities are there.

The municipal bylaws basically prohibited this. I know some municipalities wink at this, but it is something I think the department should look closer at and maybe along with the hon. Minister of Trade and Development pursue something that will enhance this type of accommodation.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 20, 1969

Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld, concluded	2529
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2563

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1969

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION (Concluded)

On vote 2102:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2102, development service, tourist industry. The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, just before the supper recess this evening, my colleague, the hon. member for Rainy River, through his remarks, indicated just how conscientious the people in north-western Ontario are about tourist development and the fact that they are examining their situation and trying to come up with ideas of their own. I am sure this committee would want to encourage that.

And this brings me to another affidavit, another indication of just how we are trying to help ourselves. A former alderman in Fort William by the name of Steve Luckinuk has produced a report which he entitles "The Design for Development of the Superior Woods Portion of Ontario." I think it is certainly worthy of the consideration of this committee and I would be very anxious to find out whether the Minister has read it, and what his comments would be.

I should point out to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that this report has had one main recommendation and that is for a crash programme of controlled cottage development as a prime economic goal for the Superior Woods area over the next ten years. The proposal has been very thoroughly studied by Mr. Luckinuk.

First of all, it suggests that we call that entire area above Lake Superior—that would include the districts of Patricia, Kenora, Rainy River and Thunder Bay—Superior Woods. And then that we undertake a programme of developing or constructing cottages—setting land aside and constructing cottages around 50 lakes that would seem to be the best lakes at the moment for this type of development. And he points out in his

report that this would be only one per cent of all the lakes up there.

I am sure the hon. members who were on the northern tour last year will recall, through the courtesy of The Department of Lands and Forests, flying over miles and miles of lake after lake after lake. They looked so lonely down there, just waiting for someone to come in and do something with them, and I am sure this is what this gentleman, Mr. Luckinuk, had in mind.

I was speaking to Mr. Luckinuk on the phone this morning, Mr. Chairman, and I feel that the theory upon which he bases his proposal is an extremely good one. The gentleman, like myself, seems to feel there is just not enough being done in this department along the practical point of view—what he would call a completely new approach.

So, with the permission of the committee, Mr. Chairman, I would like you to hear how Mr. Luckinuk voiced his argument to me this morning:

As the author of "The Design for Development of the Superior Woods Portion of Ontario" in northwestern Ontario, I just would like to repeat that, insofar as I can determine—

Mr. Chairman: To the best of my knowledge, the use of a tape recorder in the proceedings of the committee, or the House, is not permitted.

Mr. Knight: Well, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, would this not be considered an audio aid? The hon. member for Rainy River—

Mr. Chairman: I do not know what it might be considered, but it has not been used—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Knight: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to argue the point. It seems to me that whatever we can do to substantiate our argument—to make it easier for the hon. members to understand our point, especially to present an affidavit that backs up what we are trying to say, should be acceptable in committee.

This is a very short statement—this is not a speech—in which this gentleman, who is the author of this report, who has put hours and hours of work into it, is heard with his main idea. After all, what am I bringing it up for, Mr. Chairman, if not to convince this committee, especially this Minister and this department, that this is a good idea?

The hon. member for Rainy River raised a huge photo and he had his visual aid, which he used in the House today to put a point across to the Minister. The hon. member for Thunder Bay had several booklets which he raised. And now I come in here as a broadcaster with some knowledge of the audio aid and I feel that this is something that is available to anyone else, I am sure.

Mr. Chairman: The use of such equipment has not been permitted in this House. I would rule that it may not be used at this time.

Mr. Knight: Well, Mr. Chairman, in that case I would like to just summarize what Mr. Luckinuk said in his proposal in order to complete my argument, and I am very disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that the House will not accept this kind of an aid. I think it is another indication of just how antiquated our rules are here, as the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) has stated. By the way, courtesy of CHUM radio.

In the opinion of the writer of the report, Mr. Luckinuk, the efforts of the various government bodies have been misdirected. I would like you to think that over; it is very important, Mr. Chairman.

In the opinion of the writer, Mr. Luckinuk, the efforts of the various government bodies have been misdirected. The money spent on tourism in the area should be reallocated, with a switch of a high proportion of these moneys from inviting sightseers to the area, to developing a vast seasonal dwelling area.

And this is Mr. Luckinuk's main point. Why just have them for a couple of days—and I believe the large percentage only stay in Ontario for one or two days—when you could perhaps have them for two weeks, three weeks, four weeks, when you place them in cottages? And, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to call this report to the attention of the hon. Minister and ask whether he has seen the report and whether he is prepared to give it complete consideration.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, I got a copy of the report this afternoon about twenty minutes to five, so I must admit that I have

not read it. I am just glancing through it at the moment.

From what the hon. member says it sounds as though it is directed towards other departments than this one, inasmuch as he was talking about cottage development, which is a good thing. It is the basis of a great deal of the tourist industry in this province, as the hon. member knows.

I have flown over, and in fact paddled across, some few of those lakes in the area which he mentioned.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Not all 100,000 of them.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not all 250,000 of them, no. But I hope to before I die, because it is magnificent.

And all I can say is that the—

Mr. B. Newman: You will have to start now if you are going to.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I started quite a few years ago in Algonquin Park, but—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): You have come a long way.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, I have been through the park anyway. All I can say about this "Design for the Development for the Superior Woods Tourist Region of Ontario" is that, naturally, we will look at it with a great deal of interest.

I presume, although I do not know, if it has been circulated to other departments who might have more direct involvement in some of the suggestions.

The member for Fort William mentioned this yesterday at the standing committee, and unfortunately I guess my copy took a little longer getting to me than his did to him. We are always interested in any suggestions that come—and we get quite a few good ones—and we will take a look at it.

Mr. Knight: I wonder, as the hon. Minister has not had a chance to see the report, whether he would like to hear this comment from Mr. Luckinuk?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would be delighted at about nine o'clock tomorrow in the office, Mr. Chairman. Which might solve your problem.

Just while I am on my feet, if I might indulge the committee. Earlier the hon. member for Port Arthur was asking about the \$75,000 for so-called entertainment and what we were getting out of it. I brought a

few bits of material from the last year which I thought he might like to have a look at.

I do not know how one could establish what the commercial value of all this material is in things like *Sports Afield*, and *Outdoor Life*, *Outdoors*, *Sports Afield* again, and again. *Leisure Living*, the *Detroit Free Press*, *Mohawk Airlines' Gateway*, which is a volume in the aircraft, the Sunday edition of the *Buffalo Courier Express*, the *Cincinnati Enquirer*. I will not go through all the newspaper clippings—the *Detroit Free Press*—a whole host of them. But if the hon. member would like to take a look at them, I would be delighted to send them over to him for perhaps two, or three, weekend sessions.

I would also point out that of that \$75,000, a portion involved this year is a provincial dinner for the Canadian Tourist Association, which in 1969 will be meeting in Ontario, and which is hosted traditionally at one function by the host province.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, may I say thank you to the hon. Minister. I am still reading some of the material he sent me a year and a half ago, and I would certainly be glad to have a look at this.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the development of the tourist industry in the province, how does Algonquin Park fit into this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, it is a great attraction in the province.

Mr. Stokes: How do you intend to use it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Personally I hope to take my children there again next year, and enjoy it.

Mr. Stokes: Have you been there? I have not been there, but I would like to know from the Minister if his department has made any recommendations to The Department of Lands and Forests on what the priorities of this government should be—what the government should do by way of multiple use in the park, or whether it sees it more for its recreational value, than for its commercial value?

Has the Minister and his department made any recommendations or given any thoughts on the subject at all?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only suggestion that I recall making was a facetious one. I said that perhaps with the amount of use being made of the park, we might have to resod the portages during the summer.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Surely that is not an adequate reply from the Minister to the member for Thunder Bay? Does the Minister, for example, know who the members of the advisory committee are: the committee which is advising his colleague, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle)?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I no doubt can find out their names. But seriously, we are not involved in the question of the long-term plan for Algonquin Park, any more than The Department of Mines, or The Department of Highways would be. My own interest, and the interest of our department, is to make it available to as many people as possible for recreation.

Now that does not mean that we necessarily feel that it should be restricted in this area. I think the hon. member would agree that our interest is to make it available to as many people as possible for whatever recreational uses they might desire.

I am one who used to canoe trip through the park in the 30's when it was used by far fewer than it is now. That is why I mentioned facetiously about sodding the portages.

As I recall, the last time I went through the park was before the war, in 1939, when I think there were 125 canoe trip parties, other than those from the boys' and girls' camps, through the area. But the last time I was in the park, I was told that there was something in the area of 9,000 or 10,000 canoe trip parties.

There has been a great change in use of the park, because of the vast numbers of people who go there because it is so close to this metropolitan area. That is the only comment I would have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, may I pursue this, if we can get the Minister to be serious? He has the delightful capacity for supercilious and facetious remarks, but perhaps he can act as a Minister for a moment.

To say that his department is not interested, any more than Mines, or Highways, is to ignore the whole function of his department.

Mines, according to the policy of this government, should not be in Algonquin Park at all, so surely you have more interest than Mines? Highways is going to be there only for certain road construction, and that is limited, presumably, to other than roads to resources. This department should be intensely involved in Algonquin Park, and the reason for it I put in these terms.

Some of the representation and the flood of material that we have had with regard to Algonquin Park argues that there is about \$5 million in wages from the exploitation of the forest resources there. This is very important—a vital necessity in terms of the livelihood of some 1,000 people in the communities on the fringes of the parks.

But there are some people who argue that there are now \$6 million a year being spent in the park by tourists, and another \$6 million a year spent by those same tourists elsewhere in the province on the way to the park. Their contention is that if the park were developed fully for recreational purposes—for tourist purposes—that that \$12 million total, involving \$6 million in the park, could be doubled or trebled.

In other words, you could find work on a purely recreational basis to provide the employment that is now available in the exploitation of the woods resources. If one were to come to the conclusion that the woods resources are near the end of their tether, perhaps we are going to have to place the emphasis on the recreational end.

In short, this Minister, as the Minister promoting tourism and recreation, particularly for residents of this province, should be intensely involved, not like the Minister of Mines who is not involved at all.

This is why we are asking him: what are your views, what are the departments' views, in the context of your developing still further the second largest industry of this province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, as a member of the government, I think that the hon. member would understand the views I might have in terms of formulating new policy regarding Algonquin Park I would express to my colleagues in Cabinet, or in the parks integration board. I do not think until such time as a new policy is developed—if in fact a new one is—it would be proper for me to express my views in this forum.

As a private member I might, but as a member of the government, we work out our policy having to do with all the conflicting interests—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): We are not like the federal government.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, you have no policy.

Mr. MacDonald: I would say to the Minister he at least is now talking logically and sensibly. A few moments ago you said you

had no more involvement than Mines and it has none at all.

You have some views and presumably you are pressing them and sometime we may get a policy from the government; is that what you are saying?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say that if there is a change in the policy it will be expressed by the Minister of Lands and Forests, under whose jurisdiction Algonquin Park comes. If there is no change in the policy then there would be no announcement.

It would seem apparent that there may be because the Minister has put forward a proposal for interested parties to discuss.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me put my question specifically to the Minister. Has the Minister investigated and is he in a position to give to this House, facts—which will not have any relationship for the moment to a policy decision of the government later—facts with regard to the tourist potential of Algonquin Park?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I could give any facts, because we have done no specific study in relation to Algonquin Park in our research branch.

I have personal opinions; I have the views of the department, in terms of its tourist attraction potential, which I express in the proper form.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is saying right now puts a lot of doubt in my mind that this department does anything.

If they are not looking at what goes on in Algonquin Park, are they looking at what is going on in all of the other provincial parks? Are they looking at what is going on in all of the towns in this country that are trying to attract tourists, and do you know what is in those towns? Do you know what the tourist attractions are, and are you working to co-ordinate the efforts of all of these groups that are involved?

What you are saying now is that there really is no co-ordination amongst the departments, other than what you say is underneath, or between, the Cabinet members. You have admitted that you really do not have any say in what goes on, you put forth your ideas. Where do you come in, as the Minister of—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Where do you come in in your party?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Obviously ahead of you in yours.

Mr. Stokes: We are more interested in when you are going out.

Mr. Jackson: When we get to the Minister of irresponsibility we will get to his department.

There is a grave doubt in my mind that the \$12 million that your department is spending is well spent, after what you have said in the last few minutes. You do not know what is going on in Algonquin Park, which is a major tourist attraction in Ontario. You admit you do not really know what is going on.

Can you tell us what is going on in the other provincial parks; what you are doing to make them tourist attractions? Or are you just sitting back and letting The Department of Lands and Forests do what they want and then saying, "Well, they are there. I don't know what is in them, but you are welcome to come and see them?"

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is reading a few things into what I have said. He has been reaching a little.

Mr. MacDonald: For a while you were saying nothing and we had to read everything into your statements.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would remind the hon. members of the committee that last year we announced that we were doing a study in conjunction with, or in co-operation with, a number of other departments for a tourist survey of this entire province. It was based to some extent on the experience we had in the Kenora study, with which I think all hon. members are familiar.

I frankly admit, and I think at the time we announced the study I said, that we did not know all the tourist attractions in the province. We do not know specifically what the accommodation situation is in some parts of the province for certain seasons, which is something we were discussing earlier this afternoon.

I cannot honestly give a factual answer to the question the member for York South asked me a moment ago, and I said so. I am aware, of course—and my department is aware, of course—of the great attraction of Algonquin Park and, in fact, of all the provincial parks. The St. Lawrence parks commission, for instance—we know the increase in attendance each year, the camping habits

of people, but I cannot specifically say what the answers would be factually to the questions which the member for York South posed.

I can assure the hon. member that we are very interested in the parks programme of the province. It is a great tourist attraction, not only for our own people, the urban people who are moving out around the province. We want them to travel around the province, not only to enjoy themselves, but to learn a little more about life in the north, for instance, as opposed to life here in Metropolitan Toronto. And we encourage this.

Parks are a great way for many people to take those first steps and to travel around a bit. But I could not factually answer the question of the member for York South.

Mr. Jackson: I have just one question to add to this. Is there a committee within the Minister's caucus which sits on parks and is the Minister a member of that committee?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is the Ontario parks integration board and I am vice-chairman of it.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might pursue this. Here we have a park that is the largest in Ontario—one of the largest in Canada—and the Minister of Tourism and Information should be more concerned and more interested than any other member of that party, or the Treasury benches, for that matter.

We have had intense dialogue going on between the various interests in the park, whether they be recreational or whether they be commercial. I do not think the Minister can deny that he is fully aware of that.

If he is not prepared to get up and make a statement with regard to what his department's concerns are for the use of the park, could he not, as an individual, get up and say what his own individual thoughts are?

Now, if he is going to be playing politics with it, I think he has some responsibility to this House to get up and assure its members that the best use possible is going to be made of the park and its facilities. He should assure the people of the province that the best use possible will be made of the park.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, that is a very simple thing to do. I can assure the member, on behalf of the government, that the best possible use will be made of the park.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, we have wondered for a long time about the real need

for this department. Presumably the Minister has something to do with parks, and presumably he and his officials from time to time sit down and make plans. Now, how can you plan—this is what this discussion has been about for the last 15 minutes—how can you plan about Algonquin Park when the government has not declared what its policy is?

Is it going to continue to be a park solely for recreation purposes, or is it going to have a huge lumbering operation—an ever-increasing lumber operation? And when the vice-chairman of the parks committee brings his estimates before the House, surely that is the time when the members of the House, the members of the public, the people of Ontario, are entitled to know what planning this department is doing, insofar as the future use of Algonquin Park is concerned?

It is not enough to say that “my colleague will answer in due course.” You are the vice-chairman; you are a member of the Cabinet; you are here with your estimates, and we are entitled to get from you some type of explanation.

What are the plans that your department has for the use of Algonquin Park for the next twelve-month period? You are asking us for a lot of money so that you can carry on your department. Part of the carrying on of your department is the use that is going to be made of this park. What use are you going to make of it?

That is the answer, Mr. Chairman, that we are entitled to, and if the passing of these estimates means anything, then we are entitled to a fair and a frank answer from this Minister at this time.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, bless his heart, knows far better than what he has said.

There is not one dollar, nor has there ever been, in the estimates of this department for Algonquin Park. The Minister responsible is the Minister of Lands and Forests; he is chairman of the parks integration board, and he is responsible for Algonquin Park.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on this same question, as it came through to me from the Minister.

The Minister of Tourism and Information, in charge of the responsibility for the recreational facilities available for tourists within the province of Ontario, has said that his position, so far as the review for the plan for Algonquin Park is concerned, is no different than that of the Minister of Correctional Services, or the Provincial Secretary.

As I understood what he said, it is that in due course, when his colleague the Minister of Lands and Forests produces the plan, after all the discussions that will take place and the whole matter is reviewed, then he, as a member of the Cabinet, along with the other members of the Cabinet, will express his views on the policy.

What my colleague from Thunder Bay is saying — what the member for Timiskaming is saying—what my leader is saying, is that you, as Minister of Tourism and Information, have a very special interest in Algonquin Park. That if you do not interest yourself, along with the Minister of Lands and Forests, then we will find that the recreational aspects of Algonquin Park are going to be seriously downgraded. They are seriously downgraded in the provisional plan which your colleague, the Minister of Lands and Forests, has put forward.

Of all the Ministers, the one who has a special interest, equal to the interest that the Minister of Lands and Forests has, is yourself. And I think that you must assert within your own Cabinet the proposition that you must be intimately involved with the Minister of Lands and Forests. You say that you were familiar with the park; I have some degree of familiarity with the park, as I am sure many members have, but if you look at the map, which your colleague the Minister of Lands and Forests has stuck in the back of the provisional master plan, you will find a miniscule portion of Algonquin Park set aside for so-called wilderness.

Now, I know the argument that it is not a wilderness, in the traditional sense of the term, because it has been logged over many years. But that is not the kind of wilderness which is available in Algonquin Park in its present state. You will find, for example, that as my colleague from Thunder Bay said in the question to the Minister the other day, if you read that report, the provisional management study, in a cursory way you get the impression that the timber licences are all going to be cancelled at the end of May, 1979. In substitution for them there is going to be volume-cut arrangements.

But when you actually read the text of it you find that there are 1,700,000-odd acres where that will not apply in the park. And the only place that the timber licences are going to be cancelled and this new method developed, hazy as it is, is in about 400,000 acres of the park. You are going to find that the Minister of Lands and Forests has suggested that the roads will come under his

department—and the kind of roads and the quality of the roads.

In other words, the Minister of Lands and Forests, responsible for the overall management of the park, is, in fact, without consultation with you, deciding upon the recreational use of Algonquin Park, and the quality of recreation and the variety of recreation which will be available within the park—the whole gamut of what attractions there will be in the park. As you say, in 1939 there were very few people, but by the early 1950's and the early 1960's, a tremendous number of people came from this urban area and from outside the province, and if you do not interest yourself in it, the time will come when the Minister of Lands and Forests presents his master plan to the Cabinet and it will be just too late for you to become involved in the recreational aspects of it.

I assert, I think quite properly, your interest in that park because the policy of that park is being subjected to an overall review. That cannot be said about the St. Lawrence parks commission or the other parks which are in the hands of the Minister of Lands and Forests. This is likely to be the major token park in which basic decisions are made about the recreational facilities and the balance between recreational facilities and other uses for the park.

I simply assert what my colleagues have been saying, what we have been trying to say here, that you have a very special interest and that it is just not sufficient for you in this circumstance to consider yourself just one among many members of the Cabinet who do not have that kind of special interest.

I think you are going to have to take that special interest, because the Minister of Lands and Forests' advisory committee, with two exceptions, does not have anyone oriented towards a recreational aspect or a leisure aspect of the use of Algonquin Park. He is getting advice from the wrong people. He is getting lots of advice, but there is nobody who can effectively counteract with the recreational demands and needs of Algonquin Park and pose that in counterbalance to what the Minister of Lands and Forests is constantly hearing.

The groups who are pressing the other side of the coin are being ridiculed, the so-called "wild-lands people". Everybody is trying to put them off to one side as some kind of nuts who are interested in preservation of wilderness, as the rich people who come from Bay Street and do not have any-

thing else to do in the summer except go and sit in the solitudes of Algonquin Park. But there are many people in this province who do not have a voice in the recreational policies.

For example, the 500,000 people who used the camp facilities last summer, do they have any organized voice to bring their views to bear on the government? No, of course they do not. The only person who can do it is the Minister of Tourism and Information, and I think he has got to get up and get interested and get involved, at this point in time in what is going to happen to Algonquin Park, because it is going to establish a very real pattern for other areas. Because it happens to be one of the major parks which is close to the urban area, the demands on that park are going to require all the skill and ability that this Minister can bring in order to counteract the tremendous pressure that the Minister of Lands and Forests is under from those who have a historic vested interest in that park.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, is the Minister advertising the beauties and attractions of Algonquin Park in any of his material over the next year? Does it appear in any of his literature, in any of his brochures, in any of his film material? Is it included in talks on the glories of the province of Ontario and the value of coming here and spending the tourist dollar?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, but it is not in a specific publication devoted entirely to Algonquin Park, but it is included with many of the other attractions of our province.

Mr. Lewis: If it figures in your material then how is the park being conveyed to the public, to those whom you wish to entice? How is it being conveyed? Is it being conveyed as a wilderness area? Is it being conveyed as an area whose recreational facilities are gradually being undermined by this government? Is it being conveyed as an area where lumbering in certain parts takes precedence over all other forms of human activity? How are you conveying it in the next year and how do you intend to convey it? What has the policy been?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, we do not, as we obviously cannot, go into the detail of the various attractions in all the provincial parks in our general literature. The facilities available in Algonquin Park are indicated in

the camping or parks booklet that we produce, which indicates what facilities there are there.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the point simply is that the facilities are changing by virtue of the master plan—the facilities which have their attractions now may be completely set aside if the forces agitating at the door of the Minister of Lands and Forests win out. What we are witnessing here tonight is not some simple blandishment about “Algonquin Park not being part of my estimates”. What we are witnessing tonight, Mr. Chairman, is a political decision on the part of the Tory government to progressively degrade the value of Algonquin Park as a resource in the province of Ontario. That is really what is implied by the Minister’s refusal to get involved in this.

It obviously has to be because if the Minister is the vice-chairman of the advisory committee, if the Minister views it as a major tourist attraction, and if the Minister cannot therefore substantiate—or indicate, let alone substantiate—what is involved for his government in the preservation of the park, then one can only assume, that all that is implicit in the master plan will come to pass. And much of what is implicit in that plan—when it rates the park as a valuable recreational resource—means ultimately that this Minister and The Department of Tourism and Information will not have the park as a natural resource to advertise one year, two years, three years hence. Either it is, as my colleague pointed out, a matter of a Cabinet policy decision, which has already been made—and I suspect that is simply what it is. I was going to put an alternative, but I do not think there is an alternative. I think that the refusal of the Minister to engage in a discussion on the plans for the park indicates that the die is cast. This is a political decision of the worst kind for recreational facilities in the province of Ontario, and one with serious deleterious effects in terms of the prospects for long-run tourism.

If the Minister does not get up to fight for his department—indeed, he has to fight for it in the face of many Cabinet intrusions from other colleagues—then he has acquiesced on this issue, and the policy is revealed—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pure rhetoric.

Mr. Lewis: It is not.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2102?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister thinks it is pure rhetoric, let me recall

to the House that some eight or nine years ago we had a select committee in this Legislature, headed by Kelso Roberts, in which we were looking at government re-organization. One of the problems we grappled with, and never solved, was what in heaven’s name should be done with parks.

We have a parks integration board which, presumably, has had an integrating effect in terms of policy. But parks are in a half a dozen different departments, and I must say I am having increasing doubts about the wisdom of parks being left in Lands and Forests, for the simple reason that if it is left in Lands and Forests—I do not say this is necessarily criticism of the Minister—invariably the influences in The Department of Lands and Forests are in the forest industry. They subordinate the importance of parks, which exist, not for forestry, but for recreation.

Now let me be specific and show you where I think you have got things twisted rather badly. It is illustrated by the fact that the Minister of Lands and Forests is chairman, and the Minister of Tourism and Information is vice-chairman of the parks integration board. If you read the purpose of Algonquin Park—the objective in the provisional plan that is being presented—it is stated, in clear and unequivocal terms, that the purpose of Algonquin Park is primarily a recreational purpose. To the extent that there is any multiple use, it is permitted only if it does not detract and encroach seriously upon the prime purpose of recreation.

Let us face it, Mr. Chairman. If you leave this whole issue in the hands of the Minister of Lands and Forests that prime purpose is going to be encroached upon. If the Minister of Tourism and Information is not in there fighting—fighting on behalf of his department and what his department is attempting to do for tourism and recreation in this province—then that issue, that important basic purpose, is going to get lost. Indeed, there is some evidence that it is getting lost. So I come back to a point that I made earlier, and I reiterate it only because I want to put it as a very firm request to the Minister.

Evidence has been given to us that the amount of income that accrues to the communities, to the area, as a result of visitors to Algonquin Park is in the range of \$6 million. That, interestingly enough, is just a bit more than the wages that are attributed to those who are involved in the forest industry, either directly in the park, or in the mills in the towns around it.

In other words, if you have some picture—and this is what I suggest to the Minister he should get—if we have some picture regarding the potential for recreational development, for tourist attraction in Algonquin Park, you may find that the \$6 million is \$12, \$15, \$18, \$25 or \$30 million. That potential might far outstrip the relatively small amount of money—\$5 million—which is going to those who are involved in a desperate marginal existence in the forest industry in Algonquin Park and around its fringes.

It may be wise—and I put this to you as a possibility—that the forest industry is about exhausted in Algonquin Park, but you do not need to leave the people without employment. They can be fitted into an expanded tourist industry with an even greater income than they now have at the present time.

To what extent that is possible depends on this Minister doing his homework. His department must do the research work. You have got to be, not the tail on the dog—you have got to be the dog, so to speak, as far as Algonquin Park is concerned; because it is primarily a recreational facility. To the extent that the forest industry is in there, it is only an incidental that should not encroach upon its prime purpose.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to carry this a little bit further.

On Wednesday, or on Tuesday, I raised the point of what was going on in our committee on natural resources and tourism. This was one of my points. Today we sat in that committee for three and one-half hours. We mulled over the whole problem of fish and why we do not have fish in Ontario. The Minister gave us some good answers. It was not at all his department—with without fish we do not have tourists.

Muskoka right at the moment has a big problem. They have tourist resorts with no fish in the lakes for them to fish. When we get in there the Minister of Lands and Forests is fielding questions on pollution that should have been fielded by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

An hon. member: Impossible.

Mr. Jackson: Fielding questions that should have been fielded by the Minister of Tourism on why they do not have facilities in certain areas.

I cannot understand it. If we are going to have tourism in this province, we cannot have it just by the Minister sitting back and saying: "What happens here, I will accept and

then try to get tourists in there." He has to have a first-hand knowledge of what is there. He also has to have first-hand experience of what is there, and he also has to have a hand in putting it there.

Until that happens, the \$12 million that is spent in this department is, I would say, badly spent—very badly spent.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, my colleague raises one of the major points in this whole discussion.

The major stumbling block to the tourist industry in this province is undoubtedly the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. His inability to see the great problem that the pollution that he is allowing to continue in this province creates for the tourist industry, is perhaps the greatest problem that you face at this time.

What I want to ask you is this: what have you done in the last year to bring to this relic's attention the great need for an all-out assault on water pollution in this province, in order that we can have a decent fishing attraction, swimming attraction, so that the beaches will be fit to be used, so that we can sell the greatest natural resource that we have in the tourist industry? What have you done recently in this way?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Ask him where the pollution is—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting debate, and one, of course, of concern to me, as Minister of Tourism and Information. But I am afraid that we are straying far from the purpose of these estimates.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I understand our system, the purpose of this debate is to deal with the estimates—

An hon. member: You are way off base.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am very interested to hear the comments.

I think it is obvious to any member of this House who knows our system that the Ministers of various departments express their views about various policies, from all the points of view, from various aspects. I am not properly in a position to discuss the policies of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, or The Department of Lands and Forests, or The Department of Highways.

I discuss these from the point of view of the interests of my department in Cabinet and in the various committees, just as my colleagues do, on matters which we bring forward. As I say, I do not think that we are wasting our time here, but I think that the comments that have been made are properly comments for, in some cases, the estimates of the departments directly involved. Or in other cases, the original purpose, as I understand it, of the Budget debate as opposed to the estimates.

It seems to me in the interests of doing the business of this House that if we could confine ourselves to the items which are involved in my estimates, we would accomplish the objects the hon. members wish to accomplish more effectively.

In the case of water pollution, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is here with his staff and his figures. If it is a matter of fish and wildlife, when the Minister of Lands and Forests is here.

I do not think that any hon. member opposite expects me to say what I think The Department of Lands and Forests policy should be in Algonquin Park, until such time as any new policy is announced by the responsible Minister. I would be a little upset if the Minister of Lands and Forests announced that he were changing the advertising programme in The Department of Tourism and Information.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I do not accept what the Minister says as being true.

We were discussing the tourist industry development services and before we decide to vote \$761,000 we want to know what you are doing to improve the conditions in Ontario and what you are doing to sell them.

Now it is quite obvious that if you permit your colleagues to allow the tourist attractions of Ontario to deteriorate, as is presently happening, then of course your function will become redundant.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is your idea and yours alone.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Oh no, it is not. Everybody in this province knows the truth of that.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Keep talking like that because you will never get yourselves into this position.

Mr. Deans: The whole purpose of this exercise surely is to determine whether or not you are doing a good job.

Mr. Stokes: You just keep wallowing in your activated sludge.

Mr. Deans: Now what we want to know is this. Quite obviously, the attractions are deteriorating. We want to know what you are doing to try to shore them up and I, personally, want to know what has been done by The Department of Tourism to bring to the attention of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, the deteriorating condition of the water resources of this province as they affect tourism.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might take a moment of the committee's time to point out the responsibilities of the tourist industry development branch.

They are basically twofold. One is to license accommodation, to ensure that certain standards are attained in that accommodation, and the other is counselling, management advice, this sort of thing, in the accommodation field. That is the purpose of the development branch which is the heart of vote 2102 that we are now dealing with.

Mr. Chairman: Research services—the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, would the Minister like to be rescued from Algonquin Park for a moment?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, I would like to visit there again. However, carry on.

Mr. Deans: The park will not be worth going to if you allow them to continue as they are doing.

Mr. Burr: Before the Minister decides to dissolve his Ministry according to the suggestions we have heard, I wish he would listen to a few words that I would like to say in support of the hon. member, my friend from Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) regarding the establishment of one of these tourist attractions on Peche Island, which we pronounce as "Peach Island" in Windsor.

I will be very brief. This island has something over 100 acres above water and another 200 or 300 acres below water, which could be filled-in in a fairly easy manner—but the important thing is that this island has the best beach, I think, in the whole of Essex county. Yet until last summer it was inaccessible to almost everybody in the county, or in the province for that matter, but the water there at the head of the Detroit River is, I am told, the best swimming water available in the whole area, perhaps between Lake Huron and the St. Lawrence River.

This is one important consideration which I would like the Minister to consider in talking over this matter with his friend the Minister of Lands and Forests, who has a sympathetic ear. There are wooded trails—I have a visual aid here, these are popular today—for those who want to walk through what resembles a forest; there are lagoons for boating; there are some open places for other recreation; and it would provide a late afternoon retreat for the hard pressed, sweltering citizens of the city of Windsor and Essex County and their friends who are visiting with them. It would prove a good tourist attraction.

The people of our area are afraid that this is going to become a Coney Island and they do not want any kind of American Coney Island or Canadian Coney Island—they want a place to which they can go that is noise free, pollution free, auto free and has an excellent, safe swimming place. I would ask the Minister to think about this whenever he wants to get away from the great problem he has in that other area from which I hope I have rescued him for a little while.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions of the Minister regarding the development of the tourist industry in the Bruce Peninsula, and particularly around the Tobermory area. I believe the Minister has been in receipt of a brief which has been presented regarding the preservation of underwater wrecks in the Tobermory area suggesting that their preservation as a recreational, historical and tourist attraction is most vital to the province.

Now there has developed in this area, in the last few years, a great influx of tourists which has been brought about, not by anything this department has done, but because of the fact that there exists in Tobermory something which is not available in any other place in Canada, and that is the concentration of underwater wrecks in clear water.

Only in the Caribbean Sea can this situation be duplicated with the result that on weekends there are now as many as 500 divers congregating in the town of Tobermory, and with them their families and wives which swells the tourist industry a great deal in that area.

These people are coming not only from Ontario but also a great many from the underwater clubs of Detroit, Michigan; from

Toledo, Ohio; from Pennsylvania, and also from New York state. We have a potential here for developing a new tourist attraction, but it is going to take a great deal of co-operation from various departments of government to preserve these wrecks and I would just like to read a few sentences from this brief which was presented to the Minister. It says:

It is now a well known fact by serious divers of the Ontario Underwater Council, officials and many of the members, and also by amateur archeologists and indigenous people of the Tobermory region that the shipwrecks of the Bruce, and particularly Tobermory, are being exploited by the weekend sports divers.

Now, I know there are a lot of complicating factors resolving the jurisdiction of these wrecks in the Tobermory area, but it is going to take a great deal of co-operation from many departments, both provincial and federal governments, to preserve these wrecks and to prevent them from being carried off out of the area—and the resource completely depleted.

There are 5,000 divers in Ontario, many coming in from the States, and this resource is going to be rapidly depleted unless something is done about it very quickly. The tourist development in the area is rightly a responsibility of this department, so I would think, myself, that it is the responsibility of The Tourism and Information Department of the province of Ontario to take the initiative to establish whatever is necessary to preserve these wrecks, to develop the tourist industry in the area, to develop marine museums in the area, and to prevent the taking away of all the artifacts and sections of the wrecks.

Now, would the Minister answer and tell me if anything is being done in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would say that this, properly, would be a matter for The Department of Public Records and Archives, because, in fact, even though it was commented earlier that there was no relationship between the two departments, this is one of a number of fields where there is.

We have an Act which allows the Minister to designate an archeological site which, in fact, this is.

In 1965, I think it was, we started what has been a long discussion with the federal authorities about these underwater archeological sites which, in my view, is what they are. But there is a great legal difficulty,

as I think the hon. member knows, because any wreck, and ship that sinks and which is not removed by the owner, is dealt with by the receiver of wrecks, and there is a good question as to just who owns it or whether you can in fact prevent people from going down and taking bits of it away.

The situation is that we have set aside a very modest sum and attempted to get archeologists who are divers to look into some of these areas. The area which the hon. member mentioned is one with many wrecks, and there are others, around Manitoulin Island and on the north channel, and down certain parts of the St. Lawrence, and in fact, I suppose, in other places too.

Our difficulty is really twofold, one is to find a sufficient number of competent people who are divers to deal with this situation, the other is to have sufficient funds to employ them to survey these areas, and perhaps to bring up those things which are important and once they bring them up, to treat them properly.

If the hon. member has looked into this, he will know that it is difficult to haul things out of the water that have been under the water for many years. Unless you treat them in a special way, they virtually disintegrate. And thus far, we have not been able to resolve this jurisdictional problem. We are well aware and quite concerned about what is happening in the area to which the hon. member refers and of some other areas, but so far I can only tell this committee that we have not found a practical and effective solution.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, just one or two other points. I was given to understand that it could be argued that the province does have jurisdiction for three miles offshore in the Great Lakes area. I do not know if this is correct or not.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Under The Canada Shipping Act, the wreck is owned by the Crown, in right of Canada. I cannot give the hon. member all the details but if a ship sinks the owner is expected to get it out of the way—if it is in the way of navigation—and if he does not, the Crown can do it and charge him and try to collect. If in fact it stays there, it is owned by the Crown, in right of Canada.

Apparently the receiver of wrecks—I think there is only one in Ontario, excuse me, there are two in Ontario—just apparently do not have the staff to police this kind of thing so we have a great vacuum. We do not have

the staff, the trained personnel, or the funds to make an arrangement with the federal authority whereby we might collect all these things and bring them up.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, the establishment of an underwater museum so that nothing could be brought up, I think has possibilities. When these things are brought in, they are brought in through the town of Tobermory. Now, surely there must be some way whereby some provincial area of authority could tell the boat owners who are being hired to take these divers out there—you would have to have an educational programme—of the tourists coming in.

The way it is now, the receiver of wrecks in Parry Sound simply says, "We have to bluff our way into telling people: 'You are not supposed to take that stuff out of the water'," and this is not good enough.

I think this department should do this in the interests of tourism. Here is a tourist industry which has sprung up there, just by itself, and we should be promoting that tourism and getting it developed into something really big for that area. Believe me, the Bruce peninsula needs development as a tourist area; it is coming along very well, but I would think it would be well worth the effort and expense of this department to co-ordinate the efforts of both other departments of this government and the federal government to look into this very, very thoroughly.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, through you, sir, how many of the 27 recommendations prepared in the northwestern Ontario tourist study last year have been carried out so far and how many will be carried out in the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that question. A number of the recommendations were directed to the area in general, some were directed to various departments of government. There have been two meetings in the area sponsored by this department in connection with the report.

The first one was when the report was presented, I think last July, and at that time I stated to those present that this was a report prepared by our department in co-operation with the federal government under an ARDA grant; that the report did not state what the government was going to do, but that it made a number of recommendations and suggestions, some of which applied to tourist councils, some to municipalities, some to other governments.

We had a subsequent meeting in November at which time various interested groups in the areas came back with their comments on the brief, and in some cases opposed certain sections of the brief. At that meeting we indicated that we would produce copies of all these briefs and circulate them to all those who had attended and that further meetings could be carried out.

The first recommendation of that report, which was probably—since it was the first—one of the most important, was that a committee be set up to co-ordinate many of these things.

I think I pointed out at the time the consultants were preparing the brief that the then Department of Economics and Development, now the economics branch of The Department of Treasury and Economics, was also working on the design for development programme, and in the interim had set up a committee which seemed somewhat similar to the committee suggested by this report. I pointed out that perhaps the implementation of those parts of the report which would be the responsibility of government, provincial, municipal or federal might well be dealt with by that committee. That is where the matter stands at the moment.

Mr. Shulman: Am I to understand, Mr. Minister, that nothing has been done at this point as a result of that report? Is that a fair statement?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, if that is your interpretation of what I said, that could be—

Mr. Shulman: At great length, as I understand it. Well there are a number of recommendations here which certainly would fall within your department's authority and I certainly find it rather disturbing that someone in your department authorized the funds to prepare this report, and then it just seems to have been washed away, as everything does in this department.

We see here they have suggested, in addition to the suggestion you mentioned, to establish a northwestern regional tourist development committee with terms of reference to co-ordinate all departmental activities. We do not care much who does it, but you have a good suggestion, and apparently it has foundered somewhere in the department. You should get on the ball and get this done. The second thing here, is to set up priorities for developing the various areas within an opportunity region, and then survey each in detail and prepare a comprehensive plan.

Surely that comes in your department, does it not?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I did not hear that last part, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: The second suggestion—to set up priorities to develop the various areas within an opportunity region and then survey each in detail and prepare comprehensive plans. Would this come under your department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: That is very interesting. Where does the Minister think it should come?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Presumably in terms of the report, which I may say I did not write, in the terms of reference in whatever committee is co-ordinating the multitude of agencies who are involved.

Mr. Shulman: Surely that should be your department, should it not? You are responsible for tourism.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not think that this department, that I should set up priorities for development in an area where so many agencies are involved. I think that the area itself should set its own priorities.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps the Minister did not understand the recommendations. Perhaps I had better read it again. It was not that the area should be developed, it was to set up priorities for developing the various areas. Now, obviously, each area is going to think they should develop first.

Someone is supposed to set up the priorities. They are suggesting that some level of government do this. Now if it is not The Department of Tourism, what department is it? Highways, or Provincial Secretary?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I recall the report, Mr. Chairman, it was not a department, but it would be whatever coordinating committee that was set up. I think there were 18 geographic areas set out in the report to decide the priorities of development in those areas. But the kinds of development might be—they were many. In some cases it was highways, and in some cases, as I recall, cottage areas, and in some cases attractions, a whole host of things.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask the Minister how much he paid for this report?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think the cost was \$25,000, which as I say, was an ARDA project.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to ask the Minister whether, in his promotion in the United States and other provinces, he promoted the province as a province or did he promote separate areas of the province, in a regional way?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am not sure that I can answer the question definitively, in the terms it was asked. We promote the province as a province. The only area that we promote separately, if I can put it that way, is northern Ontario in the Karsh programme. In terms of our U.S. and other provinces of Canada programme, we promote the province as a province.

Mr. Shulman: I wonder, has the Minister read this report? May I read one of the suggestions in the report? Do not promote an entire province. Special regional campaigns are advisable and should be aimed at specific markets. Has the Minister seen this report?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: Do you agree with this report?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I agree with many things in the report, in some cases. Personally, I question some of the recommendations but the purpose was to produce a report for the area. Many aspects are involved other than tourist promotion which is the responsibility of this department.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his annual report has taken a little credit here. I quote:

The northwestern Ontario tourist industry study prepared during 1968 is the most comprehensive report on this part of Ontario to date, offering 27 recommendations for development of the tourist industry in the area of study.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabour this, I just want to point out that the things he takes credit for, he forgets and does not carry. This report is a waste of money—you have not done a darn thing about it.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, three or four years ago, when I took a more active part in this tourist industry debate, I posed a question on the development branch in relation to, I believe, the Michigan programme called the "Har-

bours of Refuge," and this was in relation to the yachting traffic that possibly could come to our shoreline.

In that programme, I believe the purchaser of gasoline in the state of Michigan, say, did not get a rebate on the gasoline but the amount of those funds that were rebated, say, in the province of Ontario, were designated in Michigan to create these harbours of refuge along their coastline every 20 or 30 miles.

And since the province has seen fit to take this gasoline rebate from the boat owners, and I might say there are many thousands of small outboard motor boat owners in our province who are paying these funds that were originally designated for highway travel use, I wonder has this department and the Minister, who sits on the Treasury Board, made representation to acquire any of these funds to assist in the creation of harbours of refuge along our coastline? Or, in the future, will he attempt to develop such a policy for the encouragement of the yacht or boating traffic in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I hate to keep saying this but there are no funds in these estimates for this kind of programme. I would doubt that if such a programme is developed that it would be under the jurisdiction of my department. Perhaps I should mention my own personal interest as a boat owner, and one who is going to lose about \$160 a year in gasoline tax refunds.

But we have been interested, and we have had discussions with other departments about facilities for boaters, both with Lands and Forests which has a programme that it initiated some time ago in a limited way of boat launching ramps and trailer parking facilities in the provincial parks, and with The Department of Transport, on the possibility of establishing harbours in certain of the areas, I think particularly, Lake Superior, and part of Lake Huron and the north channel of Georgian Bay, where these facilities are lacking and where, to encourage boat tourism, they will be required.

The hon. member knows the federal government has a programme where they will meet 50/50 with an individual or a government, the cost of dredging and harbours of refuge, but I am afraid that I cannot tell the hon. member of any programme which is being developed at the present time. I can only say that it is being discussed and, of course, we are interested in terms of development of tourism, but I would doubt that we would be the operative department.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman: if I may ask the Minister under this vote, grants to regional associations. Who decides the region? Who decides what area is going to be a certain region? Is that set out by your department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member repeat his question, I did not catch it?

Mr. B. Newman: How do you decide a certain region is going to be Algoma regional tourist area? Who decides that this is going to be? Does your department tell the Algoma people that this is going to be a certain region?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, this programme was set up in, I think, 1961, and so I cannot, at first hand knowledge, explain to the hon. member how the original 32 regions were established, but I understand that it was as a result of discussions between officials of the department and various area groups, chambers of commerce, local tourist associations, cottage owners' associations, and so on.

In the past two years, we have, as a result of discussions with the tourist councils, agreed to the alteration of certain boundaries and, in fact, the division of certain of the tourist council areas which were very large—just too large geographically to be effective—producing three additional councils within the north and the northwest.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, are these regions limited to a \$5,000 grant?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is a matching grant of up to \$5,000.

Mr. B. Newman: Now, a region, the Minister mentions, could be too large geographically. Likewise, it could be fairly small geographically but it would have an area that is adjacent to a centre of very heavy population. And when I look at the Essex-Kent regional tourist council, they get a grant of approximately \$5,000.

I think the Essex area really could use the \$5,000 in itself in promotion just across the border, and the Kent county grant could have a separate \$5,000 grant. I think the Essex-Kent county regional tourist council should really be broken up into two. They could do a far more effective job if they were two units, and they would have twice the amount of money.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I was somewhat dismayed at the reluctance of the Minister to react to the question put to him by the member for High Park when he asked whether he was in favour of the recommendations of the study done on tourism in northwestern Ontario. I would like to refer briefly to a news release in the Port Arthur *News Chronicle* that covered the report that day and it said:

Mr. Auld told a public meeting that, "the main recommendation is not one which we can deal with automatically in view of the regional development apparatus which is being established by the government overall. Yet it suggests a logical approach and I am asking our research director to put this recommendation before the government senior advisory committee on regional development for their appraisal and consideration," he said. The Minister said his initial reaction to the 111-page report containing 27 recommendations and the reactions of others in the government have been decidedly favourable. "I believe this report is destined to become an extremely valuable document in the future development of the tourist industry in northwestern Ontario," he said.

Mr. Lewis: The Department of Public Archives is what he meant.

Mr. Stokes: I wonder has the Minister made that recommendation to the advisory committee on regional development and what has their reaction been to it some nine months later?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As a matter of fact, I have the speech that I gave that night in front of me because I thought somebody might ask me about this tonight.

An hon. member: Is it worth repeating?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Yes, read it again, we want to hear it again ourselves, it is so good.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, it is 13 pages, it might take a little too long. But it was a pretty good speech.

Mr. Lewis: I have heard it was a dud.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, I could send the hon. member a copy. He can read it as bedtime reading and I am sure he would be delighted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He reads *Playboy*.

Mr. Lewis: I gave that up.

An hon. member: It would put him to sleep.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The answer to the question of the hon. member is that it has been referred to the committee on regional development. And I would just quote:

What we now have in hand seemed in fact to go somewhat beyond this, that was to evaluate in broad terms the areas' potentiality in growth in the tourism and recreation centre and to identify in terms of programmes and a limited number of potential projects means whereby the government of Ontario could encourage and stimulate this growth.

I say, "what we now have in hand", quoting from that speech, seems to go somewhat beyond this. The report provides not only a plan for government action but a guideline for stimulus to the tourist industry by all of its own participants, those who are engaged in and benefit from tourism, whether they are private individuals, organizations or municipalities.

Mr. Stokes: But has the advisory committee appraised and considered it and if so, what has been their recommendation or reaction to it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: To my knowledge, they have not produced any recommendations but I presume they are studying it.

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

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to the amount listed here for "grants to regional associations", \$160,000, out of a total of \$7,550,500 for tourism in this province.

Mr. Stokes: Thirty thousand dollars in northern Ontario.

Mr. Knight: It is astounding and shocking, Mr. Chairman, that this is all that goes to these local councils, because the local tourist councils are the key to real tourist development in this province and the more money that this department can channel through these local associations the better it is going to be. I cannot believe that only \$160,000—Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister how much or how he determines priorities, how much goes where, who gets the most and who gets the least, and why do they get it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, all the councils can receive the same amount, that is, a maximum of \$5,000.

Mr. Knight: What is it for?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will not take the time of the House to read the amounts that have been received. Actually, the total is \$160,000. In 1967-68 of that total potential of \$160,000, \$157,212.02 was actually granted. There are no priorities. Each council is designated and receives up to \$5,000 on a matching basis. They can spend that money for any kind of promotional purpose they wish, whether it be advertising, printed material or tourist attraction. The only proviso is that they must not spend more than \$500 for administration.

Mr. Knight: Suppose, Mr. Chairman, that a local or regional council has an idea, they have a scheme in order to attract tourists, it could be a marina or some kind of a garden or park development. Can they not solicit funds from this department toward the cost of such a project in order to attract tourists?

Hon. Mr. Auld: They could use that \$5,000 for that purpose.

Mr. Knight: This is all they would be able to get out of this entire budget of \$12,500,000 or whatever it is now?

Mr. Lewis: How much would the member give them?

Mr. Knight: How much would I give them?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Knight: I would give them far more. All of this money that is going into theatres, archives and history, or the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology, in the name of tourism, just does not make sense to me; this is not real tourism. I think it is the local councils that can really promote or really cause the tourist industry to increase in this province.

I just wonder, while we are talking about a regional council, whether the Minister is aware that the Lakehead chamber of commerce does not really know how it is going to be able to go on taking care of tourist matters in the Lakehead area. Even now, it is very seriously considering passing it back to the municipalities, it has even been made aware of the economic problem that they have encountered, in as far as tourism is concerned, at the Lakehead.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If they are unable to raise funds locally to promote tourism, then it would appear to me that there cannot be the kind of interest in tourism locally that we would like to see. But I do not think the hon. member would expect the province to subsidize every community in this province for tourist promotion. The province's responsibility in this field, as I see it—and I think hon. members would agree—is to promote the province as a whole and to encourage, as we have done by setting up regional tourist councils, areas to get together, to pool their funds and their time and their energy, to do a better job for an area. I think it is axiomatic in this field that two plus two equal six, if I can put it that way. If you can get a group working together to pool their funds, they can do a better job and they can do the job in the area.

Mr. Lewis: That is not axiomatic—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, I learned this from my son, he is doing new math. But, seriously, the purpose of setting up the tourist councils was to get areas to combine their efforts so that they could do a better job combined than they were doing in a fragmented way. By the same token, we have been asked to, and we have been, assisting several tourist council areas to produce a marketing plan. From the early results of the first one which was in eastern Ontario, it would appear that this is a better way—just as the Canadian government travel bureau promotes Canada as a whole. We do not expect them to do more promotion for Ontario than they do for British Columbia.

Mr. Knight: Do you feel that grants to these local councils and the work that you do in theatres, through this department, is on the same priority? You are putting almost the same amount into theatres, whatever you are doing in theatres, as you are into local regional council tourism.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, to answer the hon. member's question. The theatres branch is self-supporting and in fact, I think makes a small profit because of a fee for both for licensing the theatres and for reviewing films. So I do not think the analogy is a correct one in that case.

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

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue the remarks of the member for Wentworth, just for a moment, in reference

particularly to the tourist industry around Lake Erie. There is a very good tourist industry around that area, particularly around the Nanticoke area where there are, I believe, some five provincial parks within a fairly close area.

A project is afoot in Nanticoke which is going to nicely destroy your tourist industry in that area. We have raised this matter, of course, with the responsible Minister but as every member of this House knows, the Minister responsible for that particular problem, of water pollution, does not have the mental acumen to understand it. So, I am raising it now with this Minister, Mr. Chairman, because you—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is unparliamentary.

Mr. Shulman: —because, when this new hydro project is completed in Nanticoke—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Auld: —we are discussing, in this estimate, the estimates of the development branch of the department which, I have explained, have to do with licensing of accommodation and counselling of tourist operators. I do not think the hon. member is discussing anything germane to this estimate.

Mr. Shulman: I am discussing counselling of tourist operators. There are a number of tourist operators in that region and the tourist facilities that are available involve fishing, swimming and the various activities available through your provincial parks. Now this is going to be completely destroyed within the next three or four years unless you, as the responsible Minister, intervene with our Prime Minister to see that something is done in this field.

I realize you cannot do anything with the Minister that is responsible, and we are asking you to intervene with the Prime Minister because otherwise this very important area is going to lose its tourism. You will have no fishing because you are pouring superheated water into Lake Erie; you are going to have a growth of algae; you will not be able to swim.

Downwind from the plant will be all the provincial parks where the sulphur dioxide will be pouring down. The whole industry in that area is going to be destroyed unless you, as the responsible Minister, take some action.

Mr. Lewis: Well, what is the Minister going to do, Mr. Chairman? What is the Minister's answer to the problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ask the member for High Park to resign.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am very happy to discuss my estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2102?

Mr. Lewis: Do you see it as a threat to the tourist resort in the area, or do you see it as something about which you just shrug your shoulders? How do you feel about a development of this kind?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He thinks that the member for High Park should resign.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, like any other member of this House, obviously I am concerned about water and air pollution. It seems to me, though, that we are discussing the estimates of my department and there is nothing in these estimates having to do with either water or air pollution or provincial parks.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, we are simply trying to preserve your estimates, and you as a Minister, and you are gradually dismantling the entire department. Tourism as an industry in the province is being undermined by the Minister of Lands and Forests and the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Now you have to jack up the mental acumen, as well, of Cabinet Ministers. You have got to—the Minister of Trade and Development is gradually intruding on your preserve.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): When you first came into this House—

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact—

Mr. Chairman: Can we get back to the tourist industry development services, vote 2102?

Mr. Lewis: The Minister indicated that counselling and management of the tourist operators and in the area of tourism was part of his department. I fail to see the distinction he makes between counselling and management around the growth of the tourist industry, and the point the member for High Park makes, that a particular area of the province around Lake Erie is going to be destroyed as a tourist resort within the next three or four years because of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member sees the difference all right.

Mr. Lewis:—what the Minister of Energy and Resources Management is failing to do. Now surely, Mr. Chairman, that affects the development counselling and management of the tourist industry? Surely that is a legitimate question? I am just asking the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Out of order.

Mr. Lewis:—I am just asking the Minister, as he is being asked, what does he intend to do about this apparent intrusion on his tourist attractions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Intensify the counselling.

Mr. Lewis: Everyone is asking.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister have any further comments in that respect?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The only final comment I have, Mr. Chairman, is really the same one that I gave when we were discussing Algonquin Park. Policy having to do with water and air pollution emanates from either The Department of Health or the Ontario Water Resources Commission which presently reports to this Legislature through the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. If I have comments on behalf of my department, I make them to him. The government policy is made known in due course.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2102? Development services?

The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, there is \$450,000 in this item for salaries and I just wondered if the hon. Minister, in keeping with the suggestion of the Premier a few days ago, has plans to engage more student help during the summer in the development of the tourist industry? I would like to know whether he has any programme to get students involved, because it is pretty obvious that summer and students pretty well go together.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I mentioned this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that in the department there are some 300 students involved in summer work. In the tourist industry development branch this summer, there is one student involved. Last year, I think we had two, but this branch does not lend itself to students because in terms of inspection and counselling, we require trained people. It is not

the kind of work where you can put a young student, who comes from university, into for three months—and have him be effective. When we are doing surveys and so on, as we have done in the research branch in the past, we have use for a few students.

Mr. Knight: There is one more thing, Mr. Chairman. I just wonder whether the Minister is preparing a programme in conjunction with The Department of Education for the better training of tourist operators? Whether there is any, shall I say, progress, in this field, any improvement in the proper training of our tourist operators and our tourist counsellors?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am happy to tell the hon. member that now with the community colleges, there are persons in various aspects of hotel, restaurant and resort administration in I think nine of them. Some have relatively few options, a number have very many and this is a great improvement. The University of Guelph is starting, this year, a degree course in hotel and restaurant administration, I think it is called. Up until about a year and a half or two years ago, there was only one course in Ontario, at Ryerson, in hotel business administration. But we feel, and the industry feels, that this is a great step forward.

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

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back on the regional associations and the \$160,000 that is being appropriated for that. As I recall, back at the inception of this programme in the early 60's, there were approximately 32 regional councils set aside with the qualifying grant of \$5,000. I somewhat agree with the style of mathematics of the hon. Minister, as we in Essex county feel that the two plus two, with our wedding of the county of Kent, has added up to three and we, in fact, have been less effective than we were prior to that time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We always spoke very nicely about you.

Mr. Paterson: We like the people of Kent county and we have tried to assist them but it is quite burdensome.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Wonderful people.

Mr. Paterson: But anyway, what I would like to get at is that during this period of eight or nine years that these councils have been functioning, there has been, to my

knowledge, no real growth in the activities of them compared to, say, the regional development councils of our friendly Minister of Trade and Development. With the event of regional government looming on the horizon, the other types of designations of areas, I just wonder if the Minister honestly, in his own opinion, feels that the great bulk of these regional tourist councils have fulfilled the original objectives that were set out in the underlying terms of reference; or whether many, or some, have fallen by the wayside; and if, in fact, we can see the death knell of these regional tourist councils looming on the horizons?

Certainly the restrictive nature of a \$5,000 total grant available, regardless of the amount of money and area effort put into projects to generate things, and the restrictive amount of \$500 limit on administration, is a very serious limitation. I think it has really throttled the development of these associations and, personally, from what I have seen—and as the Minister knows, I was involved directly in this type of work in the early 60's—it would now appear to me that the regional development associations may have to become the arm that is going to fortify the tourist industry by reason of these associations.

Would the Minister like to comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact I have been preaching for, I think, three years the gospel of the regional tourist councils joining together in the regional development areas to do the tourist promotion, so that the regional development associations would get out of that aspect, into smokestack industry promotion, while the tourist councils might become, say, the tourist committee of the development association, and to some extent that is now happening in the eastern Ontario development area.

Mr. Paterson: Would this \$5,000 be available in some of—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is still available and that really, in a sense, is the carrot to try to make this come about because in some areas there has been a real duplication of efforts as between the tourist promotion activities of the development council and the various tourist councils.

I think we are making some progress in this and I think that in the long run it might even bring Essex and Kent together.

Mr. Paterson: Then I would think that two plus two might equal six in our particular case.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on development services? The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what plans his department has for the Bruce trail along the Niagara escarpment, if any?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The only thing that I can say, again, Mr. Chairman, is that we have no plans to develop it as such because we have no funds in the budget for it. We do mention it in our literature; or in effect promote it. I think that the question as far as developing physically the trail itself is concerned should be addressed to the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Chairman: The development services, vote 2102. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I notice no item in the estimates to cover membership in and grants to travel organizations. Now it may be in there, but does it come under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It would be in maintenance.

Mr. Stokes: I am referring to your financial report of 1967-1968, where there was an expenditure of \$10,700 in membership in and grants to travel organizations. I was wondering how \$2,000 to the Mississippi parkway commission would be spent?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The total amount in grants to and memberships in travel organizations is \$17,000. In the Mississippi river parkway commission, which is Ontario and Manitoba in Canada and all the states down the Mississippi, from Minnesota south to Louisiana, there are two funds. One is for promotion, the other is for administration, and what they call lobbying.

Manitoba and ourselves felt that we should not properly be contributing to a fund which lobbies the U.S. federal government.

Mr. Lewis: There is no lobbying in this government?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, just representation.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We do not think that provinces in Canada should be involved in lobbying the government of the United States,

which is the point I was making. So that that \$2,000 is used for promotion brochures and advertising for the Mississippi river parkway, which is a road so designated by signs on it. It runs through all the states of the midwest, from the Gulf of Mexico to the border at Fort Frances.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2102; developments?

Mr. Stokes: Just let me pursue this.

Does the Minister not see the Canadian side of the Mississippi parkway—I understand the member for Kenora is a member of that. I was wondering to what extent he is involved in the Mississippi parkway authority. Does he report to the Minister for this \$2,000, or is this something apart from his membership in that association?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The Mississippi river parkway commission—

Mr. Chairman: Does this really come under development?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Actually we have passed it, but—

Mr. Chairman: It should really have been brought up under promotions.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I may take just a moment. I am glad to tell the hon. member we receive the financial report through the Canadian delegation, or the Canadian membership, which consists of, I think, ten people from northwestern Ontario. We receive the audited financial report of the Mississippi river parkway commission.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on development?

Vote 2102 agreed to.

On vote 2103:

Mr. Chairman: Archives and history. The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: I might ask of the Minister—I have not had occasion to be in the Sigmund Samuel building this year, but is the archives branch is still located on that property? Are the facilities adequate in those premises to do a proper job, or are you making representation to get in one of the new provincial buildings?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We are extremely crowded in the archives building and we have made a report, or a request, to The Department of Public Works for additional space.

Just how this is going to be accomplished I am not sure, but we are extremely crowded, because there has been a great increase in the use of the archives facilities. Not only that, there is an increasing amount of material to be stored there and made available, and, of course, we have the Canadiana collection there as well.

Mr. Paterson: Might I follow up on this?

If your archives branch moves out, would this added space be available to the Sigmund Samuel, or related type artifacts, for a display—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am not sure that I can answer this definitely because I am not sure just what, if any, provisions there are about the use of the building for the Canadiana collection.

It has been suggested that the collection should properly be moved to the Royal Ontario Museum, because actually it is owned by the ROM, as I understand it, and simply displayed at the archives.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this year was the 150th anniversary of George Brown. The people of this province are most interested in what he achieved. The Department of Education gave away a series of books as history prizes—his biography written by professor Careless. Considerable attention was paid to the ceremony by the government of this province.

We have in the city of Toronto, as the Minister well knows, his home on Beverley street. Now I wonder if the Minister is going to devote some of the money he has under this vote 2103 to preserving that home, because this is just about his last chance.

There is no point in going into a great long history, but George Brown is one of the genuine fathers of Confederation who lived in the capital city of this province. He lived on Beverley street, here in Toronto, and the home is about to disappear unless someone does something to preserve it.

I wonder if the Minister has any plans at all to do something to preserve George Brown's home.

Mr. Lewis: Politics, perhaps.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Actually, I think I mentioned this in the House last year.

The house on Beverley street is not, according to my information, likely to disappear. It is presently owned by the corporation of Metropolitan Toronto and leased to the school for retarded children, I believe.

It is a little complicated in that the original structure has had an addition put on it, some years ago.

We have been, perhaps slowly but steadily, trying to establish a value for this property. So that hopefully—and again, I am not sure that this is what will happen eventually—what we hope to do is to acquire title to the property, so that it will not be destroyed.

We have had it inspected and it has not been radically changed physically. So at some point, when this school finds other premises, we might be able to preserve that part of the original property, or that part of the property which is original.

I have had discussions with Metro Chairman Allen about this; Public Works has searched the title—I am not sure that they have completed that. There are apparently some complexities there, and the archivist has had his expert on buildings inspect the property.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The building was obtained through the services of the Minister for Correctional Services.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could not take some positive steps, with the agreement of Metropolitan Toronto, to put something on the title at this stage so that there can be no doubt. Things have a way of being forgotten on occasion, and this occasion, the 150th anniversary, would be the most appropriate time, without any great expenditure of money. If, with the consent of Metropolitan Toronto, you put out a notice of expropriation and in due course figured out how much money you were going to pay them, I do not think it would cost any money but at least it would preserve the property and indicate the intention of the government of Ontario with regard to it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will look into that. I want to be very careful in view of some of the press comments today of provincial-metropolitan relations. I want to make sure, and make very clear that both of us know exactly what we are doing.

Mr. Singer: I am not suggesting for a moment that we launch a "Bay of Piglets" out of Queen's Park.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South was on his feet.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Downsview has, I believe, brought up the area of the heritage foundation, under this vote. In public accounts there was a grant made of some \$500,000 to initiate that programme. Is this the correct area to discuss this particular matter?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would think so.

Mr. Paterson: There are one or two things I would like to ask in this regard. First, I believe there is going to be public subscription of funds to add to this \$500,000 source of funds for the initiation of this programme. I would like to ask how successful this has been, how successful you have been in acquiring artifacts or buildings, what projects you have under way, and to whom interested persons should write—to the Minister, or to the chairman of that board, or to the secretary of the archives board, or the heritage foundation—could the Minister give me some information there?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The report of the foundation will be available shortly, which will have the details. I think it is, as far as a public subscription is concerned—the foundation has not, as yet, undertaken that kind of a campaign. I believe that some donations, or—

Mr. Paterson: Have you approached large industries or concerns that are interested in this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I honestly cannot answer that question definitively. I believe there have been some discussions with individuals. There have been certain donations. The one that I think of immediately is the Field House in Niagara on the Lake, where an arrangement is in the process of being worked out with the Ontario College of Pharmacy. There have been quite a number of donations offered. In fact, you might say that they have a surfeit of riches in their first—they have not had really a full year of operation. But by the very nature of these things, they seem to take a long time to come to fruition, and the solicitor seems to take a long time to work out the deeds of gift, and so on. So that, as of tonight I cannot tell you of the long list of things that have been completed. I can only say that there are a number of things in the works and I have been asked on some occasions not to make them public until such time as they are completed. I hope that is satisfactory.

Mr. Paterson: I shall be pleased to wait for the annual report. Is the department not

putting any more money into this Heritage Foundation, during the current estimates?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are no additional funds for this year, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2103. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I am a little disturbed, under this particular vote—and this applies also directly to the encouragement of tourism—to see buildings which should be part of our national heritage literally being allowed to fall into rack and ruin.

The member from Downsview has mentioned one building which may disappear. I would like to mention a perhaps far more important building, which is the Rockwood Academy in Rockwood. The Minister has not heard of this? The Minister has put a plaque up there. The Minister has a delightful habit of putting plaques up all over the province: "here was", and the thing can fall into rack and ruin. But it is all right, we can look at a plaque. It would be nice if, instead of putting the plaques up, we could preserve the buildings.

Rockwood Academy is one of the very few schools dating back to that time—it dates back to 1850—which was set up for the teaching of the conservatives of the time. As a matter of fact, among the former pupils, I understand, were Adam Beck and the fourth premier of Ontario, Mr. A. S. Hardy. It is a shame to see what has happened to this building. In fact it has deteriorated so badly that eight years ago it finally was sold, with all the land around it, for \$8,000. It could have been bought for that sum by the province.

A dedicated man, a Mr. Joseph Drenters, bought the building and he, as an individual, has done what he could to preserve it and prevent it from falling into further deterioration. But one individual cannot be responsible for buildings of this importance. I would like to suggest to the Minister, through you, sir, that money should be voted through the Heritage Foundation, or any other way, to buy buildings of this nature, because we have so very few of them.

As you travel across the rest of North America, particularly across the United States, you see so many buildings of this type which are preserved by the federal government because they realize their importance to future generations, to tourists, and to the people of their own state.

This particular building, the Rockwood Academy, would fit so very well into that particular area. It happens to be a rarity, the only one of its type that I have seen, and I have travelled about this province quite a bit, calling at the Minister of Correctional Services' various institutions. This particular academy, I believe, is unique; and I would like to suggest to the Minister that steps be taken in the very near future to make certain that this building is preserved.

I understand that the area immediately across from it has now been purchased for use as a housing development, and there is encroachment coming in on all sides. Unless the Minister takes some steps we may wake up next year to find that the building has been torn down, and we have a lovely new housing development there. So I would like to ask the Minister, would he make some effort in this particular area?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I would tell the hon. member that I will bring this to the attention of the heritage foundation, although I think they are aware of it. The hon. member may be aware that we have, starting I think three years ago, undertaken, with the co-operation and assistance of one of the members of the archeological and historic sites advisory board, who is also a professor of architecture at the university, to do an inventory of the pre-Confederation buildings throughout the province. One of them, of course, is this structure and we now have, of all those which were standing at that time, photographs, drawings and sketches of them so that if they have disappeared, it will be possible to replace them.

It is just not possible at the moment to acquire every building which perhaps he would like—and certainly I would like—to see acquired and preserved. But I think through the heritage foundation we are going to be able to set some priorities and I will certainly bring this one to their attention again.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, is it not possible in some legal way to put some sort of a lien on the deeds so that before such a building is sold or torn down, the government would have first option on purchasing it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is no legislation presently to accomplish this.

Mr. Shulman: Could the Minister consider bringing in such legislation? It would appear to me that, as part of our national heritage,

we should take immediate urgent steps. Perhaps the money is not available now but at least take this precaution so the buildings do not get torn down before we get the money to buy them.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This has been discussed. Actually I think it started off from a situation that arose in Kingston and then again in Niagara-on-the-Lake. This is something that we have discussed and will be discussing again with The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2103? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how the determination was made that the Ontario Heritage Foundation will pay \$50,000 for the Field House. I am not questioning it, I am just curious as to how much the vendors of the house paid for it, what the condition of it was, who makes the assessment as to value? It is my understanding that \$50,000 was paid to Judge Robert Cudney and Miss Rita Cudney for that property. I would like to know by what method the valuation was reached.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the property was assessed by an appraiser and I believe it was approximately \$48,000 we paid for it. But it had been assessed by a qualified appraiser.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, at Niagara on McFarland Point there is one of your plaques which refers to the De Puisay house which, of course, is no longer there. This house originally stood about one mile south of Huron and so on and so forth. It was purchased in 1779 by Lieutenant-General Joseph Genevieve De Puisay, Count De Puisay, 1775-1827, the leader of Royalist resistance in France 1792 to 1794. He commanded its forces during the expedition in 1795, and in 1798 he led a party of immigrants who settled in Upper Canada. The plaque goes on: "One of the oldest remaining houses in the province, it is a good example of construction popular during Upper Canada's early years".

My understanding of the background of it is that that house was donated to the Niagara parks commission in 1965. A ceremony was held at which the then chairman of the Niagara parks commission officiated at the unveiling of this plaque in July, 1966 and then,

I understand, in March, 1968, the house was sold for \$4,000 odd by the Niagara parks commission and removed from the site.

Mr. Singer: That is because they did not like the former chairman of the parks commission.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am just curious as to whether or not your Ministry knew what was taking place. Had any participation or discussion with the Niagara parks commission taken place before this house property was sold? Where it is now, what continuing interest, if any, do you have in what is apparently, obviously, a part of the heritage of the province, and under what circumstances was it sold to the extent that you have any knowledge of it, other than knowledge which perhaps only the Niagara parks commission has?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do know something about this because in the original instance the house was owned by a canner in the area; I cannot think of his name. It came to our attention because the owner who wanted to see it removed had offered it, I believe, to a local fire department as a place for training. The fire department was approached by a number of people in the area who were concerned about this.

We approached the Niagara parks commission which undertook, in effect, to give it a home, to build a foundation on which it could be placed. So it was moved from its original location onto the parks commission property, I think next to the McFarlane house, and kept there.

It was not restored. The parks commission did not have any plan to restore it, furnish it or anything like that. They were giving it a home. A prospective owner came along who was interested in acquiring it, restoring it and using it, and the parks commission, I think, properly sold it to this owner who in turn has moved it to its present location.

He has been in touch with the Heritage Foundation which is, in fact, discussing with him, or perhaps negotiating with him, some sort of an arrangement whereby it will remain on his passing or his wanting to dispose of it. I am also informed that the restoration he is doing is being done with competent, professional assistance so that, in fact, when he has completed it and it living in it, the building will be in far better condition than it was when its peregrination started.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2103 carried?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the same point. I am not an expert in the field but my understanding is that, in fact, the renovations which are taking place will result in substantial structural alterations to the property; that the house will not be restored into anything resembling its original condition; and that, in that sense, it will not be available as it was originally constructed and, therefore, would apparently not be available as part of the heritage.

But what I cannot understand is, did your Ministry have any knowledge about this sale that was made by the Niagara parks commission? Were you consulted about it? Did you consent and agree to it? Are you now concerned in any way about the renovations or the work which is being done on that property, or did it, as is so often the case, fall between the Niagara parks commission on the one hand, and this Ministry on the other?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We were aware of it, Mr. Chairman, and while it was not necessary for us to do so, we did agree with the parks commission's plans. In connection with the original condition, perhaps we are playing with words unknowingly, or unwittingly. My understanding is, and I think this was confirmed because it seems to me that we have a report made on the structure before the Niagara Parks commission accepted it, that at the time it was about to be destroyed, it had been substantially altered structurally from the way it was originally built by De Puisay.

My understanding is, and I stand to be corrected on this, that the present owner is attempting to restore it to the way it was originally built, rather than the outline or the structure that he purchased.

Mr. J. Renwick: My information is otherwise, but I cannot conduct a useful discussion about it to any further extent. Would the Minister tell me, using the Field House as an example, what are the terms of the arrangements for the Field House? In other words, do the vendors of that property have some right to remain in residence there or to live there? Is it then opened to inspection by the public or is it an outright purchase and you have a superintendent or caretaker looking after the property for the foundation? Just what exactly is the arrangement under which these properties are acquired so far as the vendors are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Regarding the Field House, I cannot give the hon. member the exact details, but it is owned by the foundation. It is rented to a tenant who, as part of the lease, agrees to have it open to the general public so many days a year, and I am afraid I cannot tell the hon. member just how many days or what days. But it is the type of thing that is done, for instance, by the National Trust.

Mr. J. Renwick: Is it likely that, in the Minister's annual report, he is likely to give the particulars, the exact particulars of these transactions? In other words, assuming for the moment that Judge Cudney and his sister are the ones to whom the Field House has been rented, is it rented at a nominal rent or is it rented at an economic rent, in addition to the \$48,000 which was paid? You paid the \$48,000 for it, but are they paying a nominal rent or an economic rent for the use of that property?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid that I do not have the details in front of me. I am informed it was from Judge Cudney that the foundation purchased the building, they are not the present tenants. The present tenants are paying a rent. It certainly is not a nominal rent and I am afraid I do not have the details of the amount per month, but it is not a dollar a year or anything like that. I can get that information for the hon. member if he would like it, before we have the annual report. If he is prepared to wait for the annual report, I am sure that it will be in that document.

Mr. J. Renwick: As long as the full details are in the annual report, I am quite prepared to wait on. I was concerned that the annual report may not contain that kind of detail. For example, I think where there is an accounting being made in an annual report, again using the Field House as an example, one should know what the price that was paid for the house by the vendors was, when they originally acquired it, what money was expended on it, so far as your evaluator took that into account, and how you arrived at the price of \$48,000; then the existing arrangements under which the tenants occupy that house and the rent which they pay for it. I think this information is essential if there is to be any public accounting of the use of the funds available to the Ontario Heritage Foundation.

I would like to just come back momentarily to the De Puisay House. Why would it be that if the Ontario Heritage Foundation is

interested in that house, it would be sold for \$4,000-odd to the Chipman family and now the Ontario Heritage Foundation is beginning to become interested in it? Why was not the Ontario Heritage Foundation prepared to buy that house at the relatively nominal amount of money involved and in turn, if the Chipmans have a special interest in that property, to lease it to them under the same arrangement that apparently the Field house is rented?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, as I recall it, the foundation was not functioning at the time the De Puisay house was sold, but had it been, I doubt in their priority that they would have had the funds to acquire it, move it, and then restore it. I have heard the figure and I am afraid I cannot remember as to what is involved in the restoration, but I know it is a very substantial amount of money because I believe there was an approach made to the foundation to, in effect lend the money and acquire a life interest or something of this nature, in the house. However, the foundation was not in sufficient funds or had other higher priorities for their funds to be involved with the De Puisay house at that time. With admittedly limited funds they have had to be very cautious in just how they expend them. I know that the chairman of the foundation, Mr. Wade, has had discussions with, I believe, Mr. Chipman. I think they are still hopeful of working out some arrangement which will insure that the house will not be destroyed in the future. But for the immediate future, it would appear that what we wanted primarily to be accomplished, has been accomplished, that is, the preservation of the house and then its restoration.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, is it the intention to move the plaque, which the department raised on that property, to the new location of the house?

Well, then, am I correct that the Ontario Heritage Foundation uses only the interest portion of the \$500,000 which is available to it?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, in October, 1968—I do not know the exact date of the inception of the foundation, but it is not very long ago—but, what rate of interest on \$500,000 produced the \$48,000 that was paid for the Field house?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, the \$50,000 was placed in their current account so that in

fact it was the interest on \$450,000. I think the rate of interest is—well, whatever the current government rate is at the moment, roughly six per cent.

Mr. J. Renwick: My problem is simply one of mathematics. I do not know how you get up to \$48,000, that is the point.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, it is because of that \$50,000—in effect, current funds—that they started off with.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask of the Minister under this vote if he is considering setting up some type of village similar to Greenfield Village, as they have in the city of Detroit? There are a lot of these historic buildings that may not be able to be restored on the site but could be restored in some central location just as the Ford interests have done in Greenfield Village. They have taken scientific buildings and buildings of historic interest and concentrated them in one area and as a result have developed a tremendous tourist attraction.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do we have to have everything as good as the United States?

Mr. B. Newman: Would the Minister consider such a thing?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I mentioned this afternoon that we hoped to do other projects, once we get our current projects completed.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister, then, under the fourth item in grants, if there is a grant being provided for the Walker Museum in the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is not municipally owned, is it?

Mr. B. Newman: I would think it is. It may not be, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, because I do not have a list of all those museums in front of me, that if it is owned by the municipality it would qualify for a grant of up to \$1,000.

Mr. B. Newman: But they would have to apply for it. Would that be it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: They would apply and they apply before June—

Mr. B. Newman: Well, I will check that then, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Before we ask the Minister to erect any Greenfield Villages on this side of the Canadian-U.S. border, I want to ask him, as other members have, to consider one further salvage operation and that is the one of the Sir James Baby house, in the west end of Windsor. I wrote to Mr. W. H. Cranston last April about this structure, but unfortunately the chairman of the Ontario Archeological and Historic Sites board, was ill at the time. I did not have an opportunity to have any further discussion with him about the province's ability to participate in the preservation of this structure.

I would like to read part of my letter to Mr. Cranston to the Minister, Mr. Chairman:

A member of the Algonquin Club, which is an international historical organization with an interest in the history of the Detroit River and the St. Clair frontier region—

and I just want to interject, Mr. Chairman, that we are still very much a frontier region in Essex county along the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers. To bring back into our discussion the remarks by my colleague, the member for Sandwich-Riverside, we are still trying to retain lands on the Ontario side of the waterway that have fallen into the hands of modern-day American financial enterprises who are, as you know, developing Pêche Island—attempting to develop Pêche Island—whose efforts so far have proved ostensibly unsuccessful. The members of this House, of the Windsor area, have been endeavouring to engage the attention of the Minister of Lands and Forests and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in an effort to re-acquire that property for the use and development of and by Ontario and Windsor residents particularly.

To continue with the letter about the Baby House, Mr. Chairman:

The Algonquin Club recently passed a resolution supporting an application to the Ontario Municipal Board to enforce a Windsor zoning by-law against the location of a crushed stone operation in the vicinity of the Bobbie House.

The Club noted that the Baby House was one of the most historically important houses in Ontario and the whole border region. Furthermore, the Club stated that it's widely recognized for its architectural significance. Every effort should be made to preserve it for future generations of Canadians and Americans to enjoy. It would be a tragedy to lose it.

The Ontario Municipal Board ruling, however, left the crushed stone operation in the same location, that is, directly opposite the Baby House. Residents in the neighbourhood were concerned about the large volume of dust drifting over their properties including the Baby House. In addition to the damage which was then apparently occurring to the building there was also the failure of any group in the area to undertake the development of the house as a point of historical interest.

The house is owned privately and is being well taken care of by the present owners. However, the public's awareness of the interest of the Baby House is extremely limited and I feel that much more could be done both in respect to the house's preservation and its development as a point of historical interest than is now the case.

If you have any suggestions as to the manner in which steps could be undertaken to promote both these matters, I would be very pleased to have advice.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the house still remains in private hands and is in a rather out-of-the-way location in Windsor, as far as attracting any number of visitors to it. There is that usual plaque standing outside the house recalling, for visitors who come to look at the exterior—and very, very briefly—what its significance was and is now.

I want to suggest to the Minister that as he has undertaken consideration of the acquisition of the former George Brown home in Toronto through the heritage foundation, perhaps he could devise a means, through the foundation, to ensure the preservation of these structures of historical interest in this province. If outright acquisition is impossible at this point, because of lack of funds, then I suggest he enter into some kind of arrangement with the present owners whereby at least sufficient maintenance could be undertaken to ensure the buildings are kept from harm—the kind of pollution that has affected the Baby House in Windsor. To provide for, perhaps, restoration of the house in part or in full to its original appearance.

I think that either of these suggestions might well be undertaken in the instance of the Baby House and some of the other structures of historical interest that have been discussed this evening. Certainly, if there is any new effort to be undertaken in the Windsor area by this section of the department, I think it should be in respect

to this very important historical structure in Windsor.

Mr. Lewis: I live in an old house in Newmarket.

Vote 2103 agreed to.

On vote 2104:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2104? The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Knight: It seems to me that there is a \$63,000 cutback in the amount appropriated to this particular section from last year. I wonder if the Minister could tell the committee where that amount went to.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Is the hon. member speaking on 2104?

Mr. Knight: Well, archives and history. Is it not down \$63,000 from the —

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2103 has been passed. We are on vote 2104.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did you make a ruling?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I ruled that vote 2103 has obviously been passed and we are on vote 2104.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Actually, the hon. member may recall that last year there was a substantial sum—\$48,000, for the contract for the people who started up the government records management service. That contract was completed and that item no longer appears.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2104? The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: May I ask of the hon. Minister if he has had numerous write-ins, specifically from the United Church Women, complaining about the moral standards of the movies shown in our province? No doubt the Minister will recall the question I had before the orders of the day concerning this matter.

I realize this topic is something very hard to judge. We all think on our own individual planes. And who sets moral standards and what are the criteria?

I realize it is very difficult, but it does seem from the Minister's reply to my question that only three movies were banned in the province, 20 some odd were clipped and the other sections were designated into adult or family entertainment.

Does the Minister have any comment and have there been write-ins from other groups other than this one particular church group?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the only group which wrote in as a group was from the Windsor area, although I have had more letters this year—and I think the chairman of the board has had more letters this year—than previous years.

By the same token, I think that the board has been a little more severe in certain fields—perhaps not more severe, but has had more work to do, because of more films which required attention in the past year than in the past. The board's standard and judgment is, I think, as it has been.

I think the board, by and large, is in tune with public taste, but as the hon. member has said, and it has been said in this House many times, it is very difficult to satisfy everybody.

There are all kinds of considerations involved. In fact, I well remember the evening in this House some years ago when two members from the official Opposition got up, one after the other. The first one was severely critical of the fact that we were doing any censorship and the other one was severely critical of what was being let by.

I think I remarked that night that while we were not satisfying everybody, we were apparently not satisfying either extreme, so we must be somewhere in the middle and perhaps somewhat as close to being as right as you can be in this field.

I think that the concern—and I mentioned this in my estimates speech last year—that the board—

Mr. Nixon: I do not recall that. What year was that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can tell you who one of the members was. It was the late member for Nipissing, Leo Troy.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, yes, he used to bring in comic books.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is right. He was very concerned, I think, about a trailer, rather than an actual film.

As I said last year, the board was asked to have more removed—to have adult classifications rather, than restricted, and I think the pattern is the same this year.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2104? The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have received at least a half a dozen letters from women's organizations in my own community concerning this topic and I suggested to all of them that they write to the hon. Minister expressing their views.

Would the Minister care to read a copy of a letter that he sent to the people in the Windsor area concerning this topic, so that we could know what the Minister's views are specifically on this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I did not bring a copy with me, Mr. Chairman, but I think basically what I said was that I was interested in their writing to us, that the board had taken cognizance of some of the changes and had requested more deletions and had classified more films as restricted, and I think—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Were you for or against sex?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I ended up by pointing out that the best way to deal with this kind of situation is for the people not to go to the film.

Mr. B. Newman: How are they going to find out that they need to object?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, I suppose you could send one from the group and get her to report back.

An hon. member: Oh, there is no fun in that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister if he is considering any changes in the members of the censorship board?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not at the present time.

Mr. B. Newman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister who it is that enforces the signs that occasionally are put up outside theatres to the effect that the films are restricted to persons 18 years or over, or are for adults only? Who enforces this; what is the meaning of this sign? Is it really enforced?

If youngsters are allowed in the theatre, can the police go in and charge the theatre owner? Has it ever happened?

Hon. Mr. Auld: If a film is restricted, the theatre owner is required to have a restricted

sign up outside. The theatres branch has a staff of inspectors who cover a number of activities, one of which is to see that the proper sign is outside. Others have to do with safety and licensing of projectionists, and so on.

Mr. Knight: What happens if a theatre manager does not have a sign, or has it but still allows youngsters, say, 11 or 12 years old, into the movie? Is there anything done to the theatre manager?

Hon. Mr. Auld: He could be prosecuted.

Mr. Knight: Can the Minister tell the committee, Mr. Chairman, when the last time was that a theatre—

Hon. Mr. Auld: The fine on conviction is between \$50 and \$500.

Mr. Knight: I see. Have any theatres been fined in this manner recently?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am informed not.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2104? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Would the Minister give us the names of the movies which were banned, and of those which were censored?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was hoping somebody would ask me that question.

An hon. member: You just happen to have a list.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, I just happen to have a list. The three that were not accepted in any form were three epics called, "The Gruesome Twosome", "The Girl, the Body and the Pill" and "She Devils on Wheels".

The *Star* commented editorially:

Whatever may be said about the principle of censorship in general, Ontario's strong censorship can hardly be considered a threat to liberty of expression in the province.

The report, submitted to the Legislature by James Auld, Tourism and Information Minister, shows that the censors reviewed 463 feature films in 1968. Of these, they ordered deletions in only 22 and have refused approval of only three. The three rejected films, incidentally, were, "The Gruesome Twosome", "The Girl, the Body and the Pill", and "She Devils on Wheels".

We doubt, somehow, if banning them left any great gap in Ontario's cultural life.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member wanted a list of those films from which there were deletions and it is always a great temptation to put these together in double bills. However, I will leave this opportunity for the hon. members tonight.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Who gets to keep the clippings?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can start off with, "Wild is my Love" and "Adventura al Motel", but we will start the American ones—"Revolution", "Wild in the Streets", "Savage Seven", "Wild is my Love", and "Angels from Hell".

The British—and these first two are a good pair—"Here We Go Round the Mulberry Bush" and "Just Like a Woman", and the third one is "Primitive London".

The foreign ones—that is non-British or U.S.—"Anzio", "Adventura al Motel", "Birds in Peru", and "Games Men Play"—which might have some sort of a context, too, I suppose—"Serpent", "Playgirls", "Women of Pleasure", "Three Day Pass", "Carmen Baby", "Brute and the Beast", "She Beast", "Sergeant"—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Watch your punctuation there.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and "E Intouno a Lui Fu Morte", and the one Canadian one was "High".

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2104? The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, ostensibly these films are censored to prevent corruption of people of the province of Ontario, could you indicate if this had any effect on the censorship board?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I must say it never occurred to me, Mr. Chairman, to ask the members of the board about that but they seem to survive.

Vote 2104 agreed to.

On vote 2105:

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, on vote 2105. I am wondering if this programme includes the provision of technical advice and assistance to the government departments in the field of records management—the operation of a records centre and the distribution of news releases to radio and television stations. Could you tell me the nature of those news

releases? Where do they emanate from and to what extent are these services made available to the legislative members?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is primarily the radio and television service which has been operating for some years and which was a matter of great debate before the hon. member was first elected, I think. I can give him, perhaps, the totals.

It includes a report from Queen's Park which is done weekly, or was done weekly until last July, distributed to 62 radio stations plus Broadcast News, which is a CP radio affiliate. There were 19 of those weekly reports sent out in spot news, which is either a member of the Legislature making a report which is sent to a station, or a station calling in there asking for a comment or a report from some member. There were 188 of those.

Mr. Stokes: Could you give me a breakdown of the 188? Who requested them and when?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can give the hon. member a sample. We could take January of this year:

January 2—the hon. Darcy McKeough press conference on the tax reduction allowance. January 2—the Prime Minister on the late hon. Ivan Rand's death. January 6—The Department of Agriculture and Food, a press conference on the farm income report. January 13—the leader of the Opposition press conference. January 14—the member for Sarnia, press conference on tax rebate. January 16—the Minister of Education, press conference on the length of the school year. January 22—special to CHIC, the Minister of Municipal Affairs on Peel-Halton regional government. January 23—the leader of the Opposition on a special. January 27—the Ontario Law Reform Commission, press conference. January 27—the Minister of Education, press conference on the Franco-Ontarian report. January 29—the member's report, the member for Ontario South. January 29—the Minister of Trade and Development, press conference. January 29—the leader of the Opposition, press conference. January 30—the leader of the Opposition, a special on pollution. January 31—the Minister of Trade and Development, press conference on high rise condominiums.

February 3—the Prime Minister, press conference re party and federal and provincial conferences. February 4—the member for Kenora, spot news. February 7—the member for Kenora and the member for Fort William

on the member's report. February 11—the member for Hastings South, I guess it is, for the member's report. February 11—the Minister of Tourism and Information, spot news re the Centennial Centre of Science and Technology. February 12—the Minister of Education on the passing of the late Neil Olde. February 13—the member for York South, press conference. February 13—the Minister of Mines, spot news. February 13—the Minister of Transport, regarding the expiration of licence plates. February 13—another member's report, for the member for Ontario South, the member for Kenora and the member for Fort William. February 12—the member's report for the member for Oxford. February 17—the leader of the Opposition, press conference. February 17—spot news regarding the member for Kenora and Indian and Eskimo resolution, and also about expiration of licence plates. February 18—spot news, the member for Grey-Bruce and the member for Welland South, and so on.

Mr. Stokes: How does somebody get a piece of the action?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Just go down and see the people down there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who is running this show?

An hon. member: It mentions your name, you were not listening.

Mr. Singer: How about party officials?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In the case of a party official, the physical facilities are used down there at the request of the press gallery here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the media wants to see you.

Mr. Singer: Why do you not help him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am.

Mr. Singer: He needs you.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, as the Minister of Correctional Services says, if the media in this building want to interview somebody who is in this building and has some reason to be here, the facilities are available. I believe that this has been used by all parties in that connection.

Mr. Singer: How many times has it been used for the purpose of interviewing the president of the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The same as for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Singer: We do not need your help either.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I could not say. All I can tell him is that, in terms of press conferences, there have been 43 on behalf of the government or government supporters, 19 on behalf of the Liberal Party, nine on behalf of the New Democratic Party and what is referred to here, as other groups—eight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We sure are leaning over backwards.

Vote 2105 agreed to.

On vote 2106:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, some questions on the Centennial Centre:

Can the Minister assure us that the construction is now completed and the work that is going on there is simply of a nature of finishing and preparing the exhibits? That is the first question.

The second is, the request under this vote over \$3.5 million should be approximately what it would take to run the Centennial Centre on a continuing basis. However, I wonder if the Minister would comment on just what we might be expecting in the way of costs to operate the centre once it is in full use by the public and particularly, the students of the province.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that the buildings are all completed. My information which, of course, is to an extent second hand from The Department of Public Works is that building "A", which is the main entrance building on Don Mills Road, and which we are presently occupying, is virtually complete although there are some things to complete. In fact, I noticed up there the other day a few electrical outlets that are not finished. There are minor things that still have to be completed. The same holds true with what we refer to as building "C", the building down on the valley floor, the centre building, building "B", where the main administrative functions will be in the auditoria and the three first theme halls, Space, the World and the Molecule. We are told we will have beneficial occupancy some time in April—April 15.

Now, as far as the exhibits are concerned, we are progressing on schedule with the exhibits. It is very difficult to give a mean-

ingful set of figures because one exhibit may take up 50 square feet and another one, like the Hydro one, might take up 5,000 square feet.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might simplify my question. Can the Minister assure us that on opening day in September or October of this year, that the museum will be completed and be occupied with exhibits? It is obvious that the exhibits are going to be changing over the life of the museum and we hope it will be more than a century, but will it be completed at that time and is it not going to be opened until it is fully completed and in full service?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. As the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, I suppose it would never be completed in the sense that there will always be change going on. But we expect roughly 540 exhibits will be completed at that time. It could be that there will be only 520, yet there might be 555. The hon. members will realize that we are constructing some of these totally ourselves. Some we are fabricating from some portions that we make ourselves in our own shops and some components which we are purchasing. And in other cases, quite a substantial number, the entire exhibit is being built outside. We have schedule deliveries on all these items but from past experience I hesitate to say that everything will be delivered on schedule. But I am quite confident and I know the board is because this was considered at great length, before the opening date was settled, that we will have the exhibits complete and the building completed when the opening takes place.

Mr. Nixon: And it will be correct to say that this department is going to continue administering the museum as a working enterprise and that it will not be administered by The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is the present plan, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder then, if the Minister could tell us what the completed cost would be? There have been a number of figures bandied about and the Minister tends to react sometimes rather violently when the Opposition makes an estimate. But since it is at least within range of full completion and full use, I would like to know what we have invested in the Centennial project?

Mr. Singer: Centennial, loosely meaning 1969.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was just checking because I would like to be accurate for the leader of the Opposition. I cannot give him—

Mr. Nixon: It is an obvious question and one that you are going to have to live with for quite a while.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Including the estimates presently before the House, the expenditures through my department, to the end—

Mr. Nixon: Well, do not give us this three-Minister division. How much money have you invested in the project?

Hon. Mr. Auld: At the end of the forthcoming fiscal year, which would be 1970, the expenditures through The Department of Tourism and Information will be approximately \$10 million which includes artifacts, exhibits and administrative costs since the inception of the project.

The figure which the Minister of Public Works has given for the building itself, the contract price, is \$21,700,000. I am afraid I cannot give the leader of the Opposition what that final figure will be, whether it will be above or below that, there have been certain deletions from the contract, to my knowledge, and certain additions. What other costs have been involved, I cannot say—and, of course, as I recall his comments last year, I think it was, that \$21,700,000 was a gross figure, I think there was some \$900,000 of federal sales tax rebate plus the \$2½ million federal grant—

Mr. Singer: What about the land costs?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There was no land cost. As the hon. member will recall, we lease for a dollar a year from Metro parks or Metro conservation authority for part of it and Metro—

Mr. Singer: Considering the fact that you are seizing the waterfront, they might change their minds about this.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Apart from Metro parks and apart from Metro conservation authority.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there is one further piece of information I was interested in. The Minister of Public Works indicated that there was a continuing contract with the architect to upgrade the idea of the use of the building. And as I understand it, it was a contract that would go on for a number of years. Is the Minister the authority to which this contract will be expressed in the

next few years? He knows nothing about that at all?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I could not have been in the House when this was discussed. I do not recall anything about this; I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. Nixon: I do not have the quote from the Minister's colleague with me but when we were investigating the architect's cost either last year or the year before, he indicated that there was a flat seven per cent fee and this was augmented with funds to allow the architect to travel about the world before he began. There was also a contingency in the contract which would be, the Minister said, to the advantage of Ontario and that Mr. Moriyama, I believe his name is, would be available on a continuing basis, at a set fee, to assist the government in keeping the museum up to date as far as an educational institution was concerned.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I have no knowledge of that. It certainly is not as far as my department is concerned.

Mr. Nixon: And is not in this estimate?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, these items under vote 2106 are new ones and I was trying my best to follow the Minister in his total estimate of cost—what did he say?—\$21.7 million plus \$10.1 million, is that right?—\$21.7 million from public works and \$10.1 million from this department up to the end of this year, this fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Approximately \$10 million, I will get the exact figure here some place.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member waiting or just meditating?

Mr. Singer: Waiting.

Mr. Trotter: Waiting for the facts he does not have.

Mr. J. Renwick: Artifacts.

Mr. Trotter: The artifacts.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will give the figures. Up to March 31, 1966: \$1,032,250. For fiscal 1966-67, \$1,307,000; 1967-68, \$2,078,000; 1968-69 estimate, the current year, \$2,526,000—and I might just say as of the up-to-date figure for last month, we are about \$80,000 below that estimate for the year.

These estimates are \$3,608,000, giving a total of \$10,551,250, although I should point

out that included in this year's estimates are operating expenses for a portion of the year, but there is no estimate of revenue which will, of course, have a tendency to offset a portion of it.

Mr. Singer: I am a little puzzled by these figures, Mr. Chairman, because last year, with some considerable difficulty, we got the \$30 million which would have excluded whatever overages there are on the contract in the meantime. I suppose the Minister is going to indicate that if there are any, these would be only within the knowledge of the Minister of Public Works, but the figure we had last year certainly would not include this \$3,608,000 that the Minister has in his estimates this year? Did he project that forward?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think one of the figures that has been indicated before has been the contribution by industry to the project. The figure of \$30 million that was bandied about a bit two years ago included an estimated \$2 million for contributions from industry. At the present time, up to the present, contributions from industry are in the order of approximately \$900,000, nearly a million dollars. Now, there will be other contributions that we expect in this fiscal year, so that I would be able to give the hon. member, perhaps at this time next year, the total amount of money in the project, including donations less federal grants, sales tax and all these things, but I am afraid I cannot give it to him at the moment.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right. Has it gone up over the \$30 million that we were talking about last year? Has it materially increased since then?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, because there would be approximately \$864,000 in these estimates for operating expenses which we expect will be offset by revenue—perhaps a little more than offset, perhaps a little less. But that figure was not included in the \$30 million.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2106 carried?

Mr. Singer: No, I am a fair way from being through yet. Is it fair to assume then that your Budget figures do not show any offsetting figure for revenue at all?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Singer: They do not? So that in addition to anything else that the Treasurer predicted when he gave his Budget speech, you

anticipating another million dollars surplus on top of the Budget that your department has shown under this heading?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As far as I know, the Treasurer did not anticipate revenue from the Centennial centre, but I would want to check that with him.

Mr. Singer: All right. Now, item 1 under vote 2106, salaries in the amount of \$2,065,000. It seems like an awful lot. What is that \$2 million for?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That would cover the current complement of 167 staff, scientists, installation people and so on, plus the estimated amount for the security staff and the additional curators, guides, and so on. The difference in salaries this year, this forthcoming fiscal year, and the current year, is approximately \$864,000.

Mr. Singer: What was that figure?

Hon. Mr. Auld: \$864,000. That is made up of two aspects, the civil service increases that were granted last year in the revision, plus the additional staff which will be required when we start operating, some of whom will be hired after April 1, and some of whom will be hired in July, August or September.

Mr. Singer: When the centre is in regular operation, if we can call it that, if we are going to arrive at that stage, what will be the full complement of staff?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It should be approximately what it is at the present time, plus short-term or casuals. Now, there are certain decisions regarding, for instance, security services where we have bodies there, but they are now shown on the complement—if I can put it that way, because we purchase the service. In the same sense, some of the cleaning may well be done by contract, rather than by our own staff.

Mr. Singer: Is Mr. Moriyama's salary being included in this amount?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. One other thing I might just mention, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to mislead the hon. member. In addition, at the present time, we are budgeting for ten teachers who will be involved in the educational aspect of school groups who come in. Now it is not yet determined whether, in the long run, those teachers will be on the centre's staff or whether they will be on The Department of Education staff and rotate.

Mr. Singer: Have you had any discussions with OISE about this, or with the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We have had no discussions with OISE, but with The Department of Education we have.

Mr. Singer: What salary is Mr. O'Dea going to get?

Hon. Mr. Auld: His salary will continue—his contract of \$22,000, with no fringe benefits.

An hon. member: Did he not quit?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. O'Dea has moved from being director general to being senior scientific advisor. He is remaining under contract for, we hope, another year and his duties now are to continue liaison with scientific museums and also, particularly, to follow up a number of the contracts for the exhibits which are being built in Europe and elsewhere.

I think there are some 25-37 which need to be followed up to make sure that we have them here in time for the opening.

Mr. Singer: How many persons—

Hon. Mr. Auld: He is also, as I say, senior scientific advisor and continuing to advise the centre on the scientific aspect of some of these exhibits.

Mr. Singer: Is there another director general who was hired to take over the job of Mr. O'Dea?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid the hon. member did not read the press release or the paper. There was an—

Mr. Singer: I cannot keep up with all the press releases.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The new director general who became director general on February 15, is Mr. Douglas Omand, who is sitting here in front of me.

Mr. Singer: And what is the salary being paid?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That has not been established by the civil service commission.

Mr. Singer: I see, so he is working for nothing?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I doubt it and I think he has confidence that when his salary is established there will be payment of any retroactive difference.

Mr. Singer: How many people of the 167 are being paid salaries over \$20,000 a year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Two—well, there would be a total of three.

Mr. Singer: Who are they?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The chairman of the board, Mr. Crean, the director general and the senior scientific advisor.

Mr. Singer: How much is Mr. Crean being paid?

Hon. Mr. Auld: \$23,000.

Mr. Nixon: Just one question in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am sorry, \$22,000.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. O'Dea is on full salary in his new capacity as senior scientific advisor; has he not returned to the United Kingdom?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, he is right here. He is returning to the United Kingdom, I believe at the end of this month, to make his headquarters there.

Mr. Nixon: To take up another occupation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Pardon?

Mr. Nixon: To take up another occupation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, no. He is under exclusive contract to the centre but he is going to be travelling, following up on the production of these exhibits, liaising with museums and also returning here, I think for two weeks, the last week of one month and first week of the next month, to work in his capacity at the centre.

Mr. Nixon: What does he do for the third week out of each month then?

Hon. Mr. Auld: He would be following up on the production of these exhibits of which there are quite a quantity. I have not the figure here but I think I gave it to the hon. member who asked me the question in the House.

Mr. Nixon: What would be the estimate of his travelling expenses in addition to his salary?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It will be considerably less since he will be based in England rather than here, and as I mentioned—

Mr. Nixon: But he will be flying back here once a month to consult—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Once every two months.

Mr. Nixon: Six times a year, you do not fool around.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask one brief question in connection with the Centre on Science and Technology.

Last year during the estimates of this department, there was a news release saying that, according to Mr. Pigott, of Pigott Construction, there could be litigation as a result of delays and that extra expenses and claims have already been submitted in the amount of \$419,000. And there could be litigation in the amount of another \$500,000. I was wondering if any of that came to pass, and if so, are there any amounts in these estimates to cover such contingencies?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, there are no funds in these estimates having anything to do with the Pigott contract because Pigott is employed by The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2106? The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister about the way in which the centre is financed? Is Pigott the chief, the prime contractor and have they a contract for building the whole complex at so much money or is it the cost-plus arrangement? How is it done?

Mr. Chairman: This comes under Department of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes; the hon. member should ask the Minister of Public Works. All I can tell him is that it is my understanding

that Pigott is the prime contractor and that he has a fixed price contract.

Vote 2106 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will carry on with the estimates and then, of course, there is the private members' hour at 12.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): No Budget debate?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I understand no one is ready. Do you have any objections? All right.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): It appears, Mr. Speaker, that there has been too short a notice for some of the members and it may be better if we proceeded with the estimates.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 21, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Friday, March 21, 1969

Farm products marketing board, statement by Mr. Stewart	2567
Town of Trenton, statement by Mr. McKeough	2568
Community development officer, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. T. Reid	2568
Nursing home care, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Brown	2568
Spoiled food in lunches, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Martel	2569
Soil study, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Martel	2569
Artificial kidney units, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Burr	2570
Day nursery units, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mrs. M. Renwick	2570
Casual gifts, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mrs. M. Renwick	2570
Lumber prices, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Worton	2571
Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Welch	2572
On notice of motion No. 21, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Winkler, Mr. Young, Mr. Ben, Mr. Kerr ..	2582
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2593
Erratum	2593

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1969

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning we are very pleased to have with us in the west gallery a group of new Canadians from Czechoslovakia, and also the 16th Company of Girl Guides from St. Catharines; and in the east gallery we have, or will have, the 6th Stamford Park Girl Guides from Niagara Falls.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE FISH AND GAME ACT, 1961-1962

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fish and Game Act, 1961-1962.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any notice of the introduction of this bill and I do not think it can be introduced—

Mr. Speaker: Without the unanimous consent of the House!

Mr. Singer: That is right!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview is quite right. If the Clerk will check and see if notice has been given of this.

Clerk of the House: I have no notice.

Mr. Speaker: No notice. This bill may only be introduced upon the unanimous consent of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that this unanimous consent be given?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Yes!

Mr. Singer: No!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That will "larn" you!

Mr. Brown: It sure will.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We will remember this co-operative experience.

Mr. Singer: Yes we will. We have been getting a lot of it this year.

Mr. Speaker: We have had similar events from both sides of the House and both of the Opposition parties; and I would hope that the members would follow the rules and save these moments of embarrassment for some members.

Before the orders of the day, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development has a statement to make with respect to a question yesterday.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) yesterday on question 947, a typographical error was made and the statement in answer to (1) should read: "Metropolitan Toronto Bylaws 2990 and 1551, as a matter of strict law, do not apply to the Crown and its agents."

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food has a statement.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in announcing to this Legislature that Mr. Donald Plaxton, a well known St. Catharines district fruit grower, has been appointed to the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board and will assume his new duties as a member of that board on March 24, 1969.

Mr. Plaxton comes to the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board with a wide range of experience in the production and marketing of farm products, particularly fruit and vegetables. He has been a member of the Ontario Tender Fruit Growers Marketing Board since 1963, and in 1968 was named chairman of that board. He is a past president of the Niagara Peninsula Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, and at the present time is also serving as member of the growers' committee of the Ontario Fresh Fruit Growers' Marketing Board.

Mr. Plaxton is a valued member of this community and he continues to operate a very business-like fruit farm operation in partnership with his son Kenneth. He will bring valuable experience in the fruit and vegetable

industry to the board and he will, I am sure, complement the great wealth of experience provided by the other two producer members, Mr. Ed Hutton, of Guelph, and Mr. Ray Lougheed, of Barrie.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would explain on this announcement, if, as, or when there is a general farm organization in Ontario, will this negate the government appointments like this?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Speaker, it certainly will not, because these are members of the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board.

Mr. Sargent: Appointed by whom?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Ontario Farm Product Marketing Board is appointed by the government; it is the government board that works with the locally elected commodity boards throughout the province.

Mr. Sargent: This is the government's appointment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes, this is our appointment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has a statement.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a statement regarding the town of Trenton.

I have today directed a provincial municipal audit, under section 17 of The Department of Municipal Affairs Act, into certain of the affairs of the town of Trenton. Specifically the audit will enquire into the alleged bonusing of industry in the years 1967-68, which was raised in this House by the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman).

This audit is to be conducted by Mr. John A. G. MacDonald, solicitor, and Mr. John L. Gartley, senior accounting advisor, both of The Department of Municipal Affairs. This audit will commence immediately.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough East has a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services from the other day.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, whereas the Manitoulin Island area is one of the areas of heavy concentration of Indian people in Ontario, when is the Minister going to appoint a community development officer to serve this area?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, it is our policy, in accordance with the terms of the Indian development agreement with the federal government, that our community development officers serve only those reserves which formally requested service through their chief and council. The one reserve in the Manitoulin area which has made this request—the West Bay reserve—is being served by our community development officer who works out of Sault Ste. Marie.

I am informed that all reserves in the area are aware that this service is available upon request. I might add that six of the reserves in that area have their own welfare administrators under The General Welfare Assistance Act. All these administrators have taken advantage of our Indian band welfare administration courses offered by our training and staff development branches.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, do I understand then that the reserve on Manitoulin Island has not requested such an officer directly from the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are, as I have indicated, a number of reserves and one reserve has made the request. It is being serviced.

The others are aware of the availability of this service but have not as yet requested it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine has a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Brown: A question of the Minister of Health.

Did the department have a study prepared concerning the *per diem* rate for nursing home care?

What were the outstanding features of the report that persuaded the Minister that \$9.50 per day was an adequate rate for nursing home care?

Is the Minister aware that a copy of this report has been refused a member of the House?

Will the Minister table this study for the benefit of the member of the House?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the hon. member's question is yes.

The second part: On the basis of an analysis of nursing home costs it was ascer-

tained that a rate of \$9.50 *per diem* was adequate to meet current expenditures, depreciation and provide for an appropriate return on investment. In addition, it took into account additional expenditures related to the increase in the minimum wage.

I think there is a certain degree of misunderstanding in respect of our setting a rate for nursing home care, Mr. Speaker. We do not presume to dictate to the nursing home industry what they shall charge, we simply state that \$9.50 *per diem*, in our judgment, is the rate that will be paid by any department of government which subsidizes, either in full or in part, the maintenance of patients in nursing homes.

The answer to the third part of the question, Mr. Speaker: I am aware that a member was refused the report and I do not intend to table the report. This was simply another departmental study asked for to assist us in carrying out the functions of our departmental responsibilities.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Why the secrecy?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No secrecy about it at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member would like to ask a supplementary question? The Minister will hear it?

Mr. Brown: Could the Minister share with the members of the House at this time the salient aspects of this study that led to a conclusion that \$9.50 was adequate? I would like to hear a breakdown, in other words.

What are the cost components that led to \$9.50 a day being a rational figure?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I just included that in the answer to the second part of the hon. member's question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East has a series of questions.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): To the Minister of Health:

Has the investigation by the Sudbury and district health unit been completed regarding the spoiled food being packed by Crawley and McCracken into the lunches of Falconbridge employees?

If so, will the Minister table the findings, or supply me with a copy of same?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that this study is completed but I would point out to the hon. member there

is no requirement that the district health unit submit a report to The Department of Health.

The district health unit is an independently operated body. It is responsible for its own actions as long as they are carried out in keeping with the administration of The Public Health Act.

However, I have asked the medical officer of health if he will let me have a copy, which I shall make available to the hon. member.

Mr. Martel: A question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food:

Was a soil study done by Professor Hoffman for The Department of Agriculture and Food? If so, is it true that soil maps have been in the printing stage for two years? And, why?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the soil survey of the Sudbury district was undertaken late in 1966 as a part of the continuing programme of the federal ARDA commitment to develop a Canada land inventory or, in other words, a map of all land in Canada from the standpoint of agricultural capability.

In the case of the Sudbury district, the work of compiling this report was assigned to Professor D. Hoffman, the associate professor of soil sciences at the Ontario Agricultural College of the University of Guelph. The survey has necessitated a very great deal of work in a multitude of soil samples which has to be taken from the various parts of the district and when these are completed and placed on the map, the map is then sent to federal ARDA at Ottawa. We hope that by mid-summer of this year, sufficient soil samples will have been taken and identified so that the various areas can be described and then sent to the federal ARDA branch to check it all out.

If everything is in accordance, then it is sent for printing. We would hope that by a year from this coming summer we will have that report in final detail, printed as a colour map, so that by looking at it, the various types of soil are defined by the colours that are used to describe them—the same as all other maps where soil surveys have been taken.

But I would point out to the hon. member that one of the reasons why this has taken what might appear to be a longer time than necessary is because there had not been this very detailed survey of soil samples and testing done in the Sudbury area before.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park. I would point out that one of the questions submitted in the name of the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside is actually that of the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Correctional Services, in four parts: Was there a sit-down strike at Burwash on February 4?

How many persons were involved?

What was the reason?

What disciplinary action was taken?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have not had sufficient notice of this question to get the information from the institution. Therefore, I shall take it as notice.

Mr. Shulman: Do they not tell the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, we have all sorts of these things. We have a lot of unwilling guests.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside does have a question of his own.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A question of the Minister of Health: How many hospitals in Ontario have artificial kidney units?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Fourteen.

Mr. Burr: How many home artificial kidney units are in use in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: To the best of my knowledge, one.

Mr. Burr: Only one?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Burr: Can the Minister assure the House now that all persons involved in the operation of these units have been altered to the dangers of the use of fluoridated water in the kidney unit?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I answered this question for the hon. member a few days ago.

Mr. Burr: But not satisfactorily.

An hon. member: What else is new?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has questions?

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): A question of the Minister of Social and Family Services: Since the proclamation of The Day Nurseries Act, August 10, 1967, how many licences for day nursery facilities have been

issued and how does this compare with expansion prior to the proclamation of the new Act?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, licences for day nurseries are in effect for a calendar year and the following figures show the number of day nurseries in operation over a five-year period as at December 31 of each year: 1964-348; 1965-356; 1966-391; 1967-441; 1968-484.

The effects of the recent amendments can perhaps be more clearly seen in the following figures, which show the number of day nurseries receiving public funds for the same five-year period as of December 31 of each year: 1964-33; 1965-42; 1966-46; 1967-45; 1968-100.

Mrs. M. Renwick: A further question of the Minister for Social and Family Services.

Would the Minister tell the House whether one gift of \$60 to a family of four on family benefits during the Christmas period constitutes a casual gift of small nature under section 10, (2t) of the regulations under The Family Benefits Act?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members of this House are aware, in the light of an earlier question that I answered, each case is considered on an individual basis. It is, therefore, not possible for me to provide an answer with respect to a specific gift without knowledge of the donor, the relationship of the donor to the recipient, and the circumstances of the recipient at the time of the gift.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question? Would he give me some light as to why whichever particular donor it was who gave the money would make any difference?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think it would be a very relevant factor, in relation to establishing whether a gift is a gift in the term as it is understood both by the man on the street and by the interpretation of the technical term of a gift.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a further supplementary question? I would like to ask if the Minister would give me an example of what would not be a legitimate donor of this kind?

Mr. MacDonald: That was a fair enough supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: For example, if somebody were to hand over some money in

accordance with some general provision extended to a great number of people in accordance with some legislative provision.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept another supplementary question?

Mr. MacDonald: That is one we should keep on the record.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, does he mean like the tax rebate?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It would be a matter of interpretation whether a legislative refund in terms of a tax rebate were a tax rebate or a gift. My understanding is that the Minister of Municipal Affairs was giving tax rebates and not gifts.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is damned casual, anyway!

Mrs. M. Renwick: This will be my last supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would accept it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This has now become a debate, I may suggest—

Mr. MacDonald: I now know the difference between a Scrooge and a nit-picking Scrooge.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Look behind!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has declined to accept further supplementary questions.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a question from the other day.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) asked a question with reference to lumber prices, the increase on construction contracts for Ontario Housing Corporation and our discussions with the lumber dealers this week to ascertain what had been the reason for a 30 per cent increase. We are told, of course, that in British Columbia, logging conditions had been down, which had reduced the amount of lumber available. I would also think, without checking into it, that an added factor such as wage increases and transportation costs would also have an effect on the

increase in lumber prices in this part of the country.

Insofar as the Ontario Housing Corporation is concerned on question two, we have not entered into any new contracts recently, due to the fact that a considerable number of developments have been awaiting federal approval for several months. As most of us know and as the hon. member will appreciate, prices of most building materials are increasing, therefore the delay in receiving federal approval will not only have the effect of retarding OHC's efforts to meet the housing needs of this province, but will mean a substantial increase in capital costs. I think we have spelled this out for the Minister in Ottawa as carefully and as clearly as we can and I hope that this coming week some action will be taken to let us get along with the programme.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a matter of urgent importance to the people of my riding. I received a telegram from the mayor and council at Timmins and from the Timmins-Porcupine Development Commission and I would like to direct it to the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch). It concerns the processing facilities of the Texas Gulf Sulphur Company with respect to the Kidd Creek Mine Development. The telegram reads:

THE PEOPLE OF THE PORCUPINE REQUIRE YOUR IMMEDIATE ACTION IN THEIR BATTLE FOR SURVIVAL. WITHIN A SHORT TIME TEXAS GULF SULPHUR—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would realize that this is not the place for such a statement. It is a matter of urgency to his people, true, but this is a matter I think he could take up directly with the Minister and get results. I would so advise him and I would rule him out of order.

Mr. Ferrier: It is a matter of such importance to our area, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I quite agree, but it is not a matter of public importance to the province as a whole.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is of great importance to the people of this province.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, surely the whole question of the location of the processing facilities of Texas Gulf mines is a matter of importance, not just to the area of Cochrane South, but for the whole of the

province of Ontario. The member for Cochrane South received this telegram just before coming into the House. He had no opportunity to consult with you about it. The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is not in his place, the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) is not in his place, and the member for Cochrane South felt that he had to raise that question at this point in the House proceedings because of its urgency and because of its public importance to the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: I realize the problem that the hon. member has, but as I was about to point out to him when he had the opportunity of making further remarks, matters of urgent public importance are raised by certain procedure in the rules of this House which we have tried to follow. The hon. member, of course, did not follow that procedure and the hon. member for Riverdale has indicated why, because the message only came in.

Under the circumstances, of course, then I would suggest that the hon. member might very well wish to arrange to meet with the appropriate Ministers, or at least with the House leader, and deal with the matter. But so far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, the hon. member is out of order and that would complete this matter unless there is something else to be said that would be in order.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 71st order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to submit, for the consideration of the members of the committee, the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

In doing so, I come to the conclusion that perhaps we have an opportunity to discuss our very diversified programme and departmental activities as we consider each of the votes which are before us as part of these estimates. Therefore, I do not intend to make any general remarks by way of introduction.

Before I sit down, however, I would like to take this opportunity on the tabling of the estimates of the department, to pay

tribute to my Deputy Minister, Mr. Jack Yoerger, and through Mr. Yoerger, to all the members of the departmental staff, the supervisors and staff members who all work together as a great team to make my job such an enjoyable one as the Minister of this particular department.

I am very proud to head this department of government because of the people I work with in the department and particularly, for the programme of contact with the people of the province in the various activities of the department. So, perhaps as we go through these estimates we will have an opportunity through the exchange to discuss the details of our department.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has sort of taken me by surprise. I expected a statement from him but it is a pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to rise again to lead off the estimates of the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship (Mr. Welch) on behalf of my party.

When one studies the activities of this department one finds that it is made up of mainly the companies branch and other minor administrative functions given to it by statute. Also, the Minister has the job of administering The Department of Citizenship. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Provincial Secretary is concentrating most of his resources on the teaching of English as a second language. This is a very laudable thing. It is absolutely vital that immigrants receive instruction in the English language, along with their children. I attended a conference some weeks ago for teachers of English as a second language and some of the projects I saw were excellent.

However, I feel the Minister should now turn his thoughts, in a much more definite fashion than hitherto, to the problem of bridging the cultural gap between the immigrant generations. I am myself a member of the first Canadian born generation of my line, and so I know about this cultural clash at first hand.

The mores of Canada are still very different from those of the countries from which immigrants come. Even in Europe, traditions persist which have no counterpart here. We are inclined to think that, because we can now switch the satellite into our TV networks, and see the Pope on his balcony, DeGaulle receiving Jean-Guy Cardinal or Tokyo students rioting, that somehow we have achieved the global village. Well, we have not, not

yet, except perhaps in the international fraternity of the young, as so well caught by Moses Znamer on Sunday, March 16, in his documentary on Yugoslavia. There we saw how even immigration from the countryside to the spanking new city of Belgrade had created exactly the gap I am talking about—a gap of light years in attitudes and experiences. If this can happen after a journey of only one hundred miles, the one-way trip across the ocean can be traumatic indeed for the older generation, even today.

Nowadays, we are getting a much greater variety of immigrants. The people of Spain and Portugal, who never came before, are arriving in Ontario in ever rising numbers. From the Far East we see a rise in numbers too, and perhaps the participation of Ontario in Expo 70 will increase this flow even more.

Is this a self-correcting state, I wonder? In the long run, this could be so. Certainly, there is no second-generation problem to speak of. But so long as the immigrant flow continues—and I am not suggesting that it should be cut off—then there will always be a first generation problem of some consequence, I feel, unless and until we all turn into carbon copies of each other on a global scale, which is the last thing we want.

At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I, as a first generation Canadian of Italian background, would like to say something about this battle—and I do call it a battle—taking place between the two founding nations of this country and I am referring to the English and the French battle in connection with biculturalism and bilingualism.

We Canadians of a background other than French and English take exception to the fact that this battle between these two great people might destroy our country. This is uppermost in the mind of all Canadians who are not of these great groups.

This is a great country and this is a great province but for God's sake let us not destroy it over such picayune problems. You know, you cannot impose culture, you simply cannot impose it. You cannot impose language. The problem is, and I repeat it, do not let this little fight between two-thirds of our nation destroy this nation.

We are born and exist in the greatest nation in this world and I take extreme exception to the fact that this seems to be happening right now. You know in Canada nobody is forced to speak any language today. In Canada it does not matter whether you speak Italian or whether you speak Polish, or whether you speak Ukrainian, you can go into

any court of law and receive justice and I know this from personal experience. Nobody has told me in this great country that I cannot speak Italian, no one, and I speak it fluently; my father also spoke it. Nobody told my father that he had to accept this culture or that culture. My father came from a culture, one of the greatest cultures history has ever known, he was proud of it, but nobody could have told my father that you have to speak French or you have to speak English.

We do not care what language we speak in this country. We only care that we come from Canada. We are proud to be born here and my father once told me, "Every time you wake up in the morning thank God that you were born in Canada." I wanted to make this point, Mr. Chairman, because I am getting sick and tired of watching these two great races fight each other, the result of which may be to the detriment of our country, to the detriment of our province.

In considering, Mr. Chairman, our great nation, we must consider all the people that make up this great nation. In my riding I have 57 different racial groups. I have Italians, Poles, Ukrainians, Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos. I think my riding is a perfect example of people working together, not so much caring where you come from, except that you are here and working to make this nation the great nation that it is and the great nation that it should be. We are lucky in this country that we do not have the concept of the melting pot, and that this concept has never taken hold here. Instead we have the concept of the mosaic.

Have you ever seen a mosaic? Each little part makes up the whole; each contributes to the whole with its colour and its piece fit in to make a beautiful, beautiful picture for a beautiful piece of wall. This is the whole concept I want to bring to your attention today, Mr. Chairman, that it is this that will make Canada great, not the fact that we speak one language or another language, but the fact that all these people are working together to create a great and viable nation. There is no other nation in this world, there is no other province in this world, that has the opportunity we have. No nation. They look at us and they say, "There is a nation that is great but some day will be greater."

The concept is that the people must retain the best elements of their traditions and cultures, even as they try to keep their homeland language alive and to pass it on. There is a difficulty. The problem lies within the first generation—and when I refer to the

first generation I refer to the generation that is born here—springs from a family that has a culture deep in the roots of some other country and therein lies that gap that causes problems in our country. Not every Canadian-born child of immigrant parents is equally keen to learn the language of his parents. He has to be convinced, in the face of all the modern distractions of the new world, that the older values, too, have merit. This is not easy. It calls for educational assistance in itself, and it is a very subtle thing to put over to the young.

This is not something that can simply be met by a lavish public relations effort. It is a very selective approach that is needed, and perhaps the stress must vary from group to group. It certainly involves the presence of the Minister himself at many more festivals and functions than he has hitherto seen fit to attend. It is certainly no more than the truth to observe that the Opposition is far more diligent in this regard than is the government. If functions are to continue to have real meaning in a transplanted milieu, then they must be supported, not so much by money as by the very real and continuing presence of the provincial government, as personified by the physical presence of the Minister and his colleagues at occasions of remembrance and festivity.

The absence of the Minister from such functions may be interpreted as the stamp of approval on a policy of assimilation. The melting-pot philosophy can be the product of apathy, just as much as the conscious policy of our neighbours to the south. There are these two ways of achieving assimilation, and I would suggest that, while the Minister is taking no active steps to kill these cultures, he is indeed permitting them to wither on the vine. Get out, I say, and attend more functions.

Further along this line of thought, the Minister must actively encourage full participation in Canadian life by immigrants, and this fulfillment demands, in the culmination of a five-year acclimatization, the gaining of citizenship. I do not think that the Minister is doing enough to bring non-English speaking immigrants along this road. His presence should be felt in subtle fashion all the way. His presence should be there all the time. Too often, after the first flush of welcome, there follows a period of isolation and loneliness, a sense of the government not caring. An immigrant comes here, he is welcome, then he is thrown out into the world and nothing really happens. This must be

changed. We need a climate of interest throughout, right up to the proud day when the immigrant claims his citizenship certificate and takes his place on an equal basis with everyone else in this lively nation.

It seems to me that too much energy has been diverted to promotional ends that are not people-centred. The Minister is asked to promote this and that, to be the shill for each and every enterprise that the government dreams up, and, in this preoccupation with the puff-piece, he tends to lose sight of the real purpose for the existence of his office, which, surely, if it is anything at all, is a people-centred institution. I want to follow up the success of last year's one-day conference on the teaching of English as a second language with a very relevant observation, and that is: What steps is the Minister taking to use the airwaves, and the facilities of the educational television branch at Bayview Avenue, for language-training purposes? It is clear that the direct budget under this heading is very small, and the ETV branch itself is pre-occupied with the French language, the public accounts committee was told, to the point where 20 per cent of its production effort is going in that direction, to meet the needs of only 10 per cent of the school population.

However, the ETV branch is doing very little in concrete terms for the other great segment of our population—the people of the mosaic of cultures other than English and French—and it is quite clear that, with the budget shown in the estimates now before us, if all of it were devoted to educational television, it would not pay for 30 half-hour programmes, let alone the network time to air them on the CBC and its affiliates. I think that the Minister has to get together with the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), and point out that vote 1703 contains only \$649,000 in total for language training, whereas vote 502 on page 48 has over \$7.5 million earmarked for ETV, of which the immigrants are getting nothing specific as yet by way of programming of English as a second language. I am told that Mr. Don Crowdis of the ETV branch has been talking with Mr. Carson and Mr. Columbo of the Minister's office about this and that a sum has tentatively been set aside for this purpose, but that nothing has been finalized as I speak. I hope you will tell them to get on with it.

Since it looks as though there will be many hurdles to jump before the federal Bill C-179—An Act to Establish the Canadian Edu-

cational Broadcasting Agency—gets through Parliament and is transformed into electronic real-estate, I should like the Provincial Secretary to look, in co-operation with ETV and with the Metropolitan Educational Television Association, at the possibility of using the existing and licensed cable television networks in urban areas to disseminate the teaching aids already in existence, together with what Messrs. Crowdis, Carson and Columbo may come up with, to all the immigrant homes that are now hooked up to cable television.

This is not going to be a Cadillac service, I know, but it will be a beginning. Only a few days ago, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission gave the green light to the cable television operators, and the Secretary of State's office is now in the process of working out guidelines for the original programming that will emanate from the studios of the cable companies. These people are hungry for inexpensive and prestigious programming, and now is the ideal opportunity for the Provincial Secretary to move right in and pre-empt one of the two available channels and show his audio-visual material which was so much in evidence at that seminar. We could use those films, slides and audiotapes over and over and over, perhaps as often as a dozen times a day. I can assure you that immigrants will watch it, if the material is already proven through classroom use, as is apparently the case.

I have heard a comment over here that it was a showcase. It may have been a showcase. It may have been a public relations gimmick but what I saw there was good and excellent. The only complaint I have is that they are not using it. They should use it. They should get it out on to TV. I went to a seminar and they were talking about producing these concepts on TV and how they would meld them in with books to be sent out to the immigrants. You know, we can talk until we are blue in the face. Unless we put it into action we may as well throw away these seminars.

Now, when we consider the immigrant, from whatever country he has come, he has to earn a living. The man usually comes by himself and brings over his wife and his family later. The immigrant must work in order to exist here. He must work hard, and they do work hard; they are good hard-working people, the backbone of our nation. But they have difficulty attending some of these schools that we have set up. I think the drop-out rate in some cases is enormous. If he knew that he could sit down at 9.30 at night and look at a programme, combine it

with a book and learn the English language, I am convinced that he would do it. This would help him to integrate into the Canadian mosaic.

I have a specific proposal on this aspect, and that is to use channel 6 on the cable TV which carries CHF1-FM sound only, for immigrant English language use in the mornings; and channel 9 which carries CKEY-AM sound only, for immigrant language use in the afternoons and evenings—of course CBLT comes in on channel 5 on cable and CFTO comes in on channel 8.

The cable operators, sir, whose consciences have been somewhat pricked by the knowledge that their licences are contingent upon public service, will breathe more easily, and at the same time the immigrant community will be served. It ought to be possible to negotiate a fairly sharp deal on this, that would involve little or no further expenditure to the public purse. I do not see this growing into another \$7.5 million empire, as ETV has become in three short years, but I do see the great chance of a businesslike venture here, and a deal in the public interest with a group of operators who are pretty vulnerable at the moment. I suggest you seek the seconding of Mr. Crowdis from ETV for the purpose of getting this thing under way.

Of course, the Bell Telephone Company will have to be brought into this. They have a contract with the cable operators which forbids them to broadcast educational programming. Rogers Cable TV is one company that is going right ahead and piping WNED-TV Buffalo's educational channel 17 in anyway, translating it to channel 10 on the regular dial. Channel 17 is not on the air all day, and, if the cable companies feel that their subscribers will scream if deprived of Jim Fleming's news or CKEY's music, then it ought to be possible to work something out on cable channel 10. And the Bell Telephone Company is just going to have to be shown that this restriction forbidding cable companies to carry educational programming is beyond their right as a common carrier. I do not think this will need to be done at this level and we should make that clear to them.

They should not dictate what goes over the air on their lines; they have a duty to the public and they should be able to be required to follow that duty. Who are they to forbid educational programming on the TV that goes over their lines? I think this is a disgraceful thing and something should be done about it right away.

So now is the time for the Provincial Secretary to act, and take advantage of this situation which will not last for many more weeks before something else moves in to fill the vacuum as soon as the federal guidelines are laid down. I need not, of course, further maintain the position that education—in which I include second-language instruction by television—is a provincial responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, in line with our general policy of keeping our opening remarks as short as is possible, consistent with the exposition of our viewpoint on matters of concern, I intend to terminate this lead-off speech, and to treat certain more detailed matters as they come up vote by vote. By way of warning, however, I should advise the Provincial Secretary that we shall expect a fairly full accounting for the deterioration of the postal service following the move of the main office to another building in this complex. I am told that the Opposition office is expected to have all its daily mail in by four, even though the secretarial staff works until five, and, of course, the House goes on until six, not allowing for evening sittings. It does seem completely absurd that we should be expected to tailor our work day around these most unrealistic hours. We shall want, not just a few words by way of explanation, but a fairly full answer. Since this may need some preparation, I thought it might be courteous to alert the Minister now, so that he may put his staff to work on it in the interim. Thank you.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate you on your elevation today?

I should like, as lead-off speaker in the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship for the first time, to compliment the Minister on his ability or his good fortune in having been able to assemble such a competent staff.

I should like also to express my appreciation for the many courtesies that have been extended to me by members of the staff and by the Minister (Mr. Welch) himself. And I should like especially to congratulate the Minister and his staff for the arrangements that they made for the conference held on Saturday, February 22, at the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute for the teachers of English as a second language. At this conference, there were at least 17 different panel discussions on various aspects of teaching English as a second language, or TESL, as it is known for short, ranging from the motivating of adult learners to the effective use of field

trips. The potential role of television in teaching English as a second language was discussed at considerable length in one of these panels. As the Minister was not present at this particular discussion, his impression must necessarily be second hand. And I should like to pass on to him my impression of the discussion and that was this: There was very little enthusiasm for spending money on TV in the hope of teaching English effectively as a second language.

One of the objections was the passivity of the listening learner, an objection which I mentioned on December 17 which I was discussing the value of ETV, educational television, in Ontario's whole school system. There are many forms of instruction where movies, film strips and video tapes are of great use, but in teaching a new language, television has a bottom-rung rating.

A lesson in language is not like a lesson in science or mathematics; it cannot be compared with a lesson in chemistry or algebra or botany or zoology. In all these there is a precise answer to be worked out, there is a fact or a series of facts to be discovered.

But language is a method of exchanging ideas. Questions and answers, statements and comments, commands and either an acquiescence or refusal. These constitute the great framework on which all language is built. Without this immediate interplay, the immediate response between the teacher and the learner, without this dialogue, language is of very little use and it serves little purpose.

In an arithmetic lesson, five times five always has the same answer, 25. Every time you ask it, that is always the right answer; it is always the standard answer. Some people might like to teach arithmetic by television, certainly I would not. In a language lesson there is no standard answer, no correct answer, for the question, "What do you think about so-and-so?"; "What do you think about such-and-such?" And there is no correct or standard answer for "Where are you going?"; "What are you doing?".

When there is no teacher present, language is very difficult to learn. Educational television in schools has the merit at least of having a teacher who may possibly be able to exploit and develop the material presented. But after a television lesson in English as a second language, there would be nothing; there would be no follow-up; there would be silence under normal or average circumstances.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Minister and his staff on the

methods they are using at present in teaching English as a second language, but I wish to suggest that any improvements they may be able to make are not likely to be found in the area of television.

Knowing how tight a budget the Minister is operating on this year, my personal advice—and I stress this is my personal advice—is this: Any additional resources of time or talent or money that he is able to find should be directed to the expansion of the present courses, many of which are carried out by volunteer community workers, and along the present lines.

One of the most interesting parts of the programme at this conference on February 22, Mr. Chairman, was a short film which showed a typical instruction class in which a teacher introduced a new grammatical construction, based on the expression, "I wish I were".

Now, in practising or drilling this construction, the teacher used such examples as "I wish I had a good job" and in developing the drill practice the teacher used the example, "I wish I had a new car." "I wish I were rich." "I wish I had her telephone number". Now, these last examples—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): And you wish you were a Liberal.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): The member has to be kidding.

Mr. Sargent: The only place to go is up.

Mr. Burr: These last examples drew considerable criticism in later panel discussions, partly on the ground that almost every one of these new Canadians in the circle, in the class, had been offended or made to feel uncomfortable in one way or another, and partly on the ground that they were being brainwashed with the attitudes of what is loosely known as the American way of life or what could be called the "acquisitive society" or the "materialistic society."

These interesting reactions on the part of the teachers of English as a second language point up one problem—and I should like the Minister to make some comments on this when he is replying. The problem is, to what extent does teaching English as a second language involve the teaching of Canadian culture or North American culture? I should like the Minister to give that some thought when he replies.

There are also a few comments I should like to make on the government's hospitality

fund, which it is the Provincial Secretary's misfortune to have to administer. I say his misfortune because I am sure—he is smiling so my colleague says it gives him great pleasure—I was being charitable.

I say his misfortune because I am sure that if the choice were his he would establish better priorities. For example, this government's hospitality fund paid out over \$11,000 for the president of Italy and when the conference for the teachers of English as a second language was held, back in February, each teacher who came paid a registration fee of \$5. Many of these teachers travelled long distances at considerable expense to attend this conference and when they arrived, they paid a \$5 registration fee which covered a luncheon and a coffee break.

Yet the visit of the President of Italy cost the Ontario taxpayers \$11,378. Presumably, most of this was spent on a banquet or banquets to which were invited hundreds of people who could well have afforded to pay \$5 for the honour of dining with the president of a foreign country. We would not charge \$5 to the President of Italy, but would charge \$5 to MPPs who were invited, or to Cabinet Ministers who might be able to round up \$5 if they scrounged a bit. Mr. Chairman, I mention the President of Italy merely because of the extravagant cost, over \$11,000. The visit of the President of Austria cost us \$8,766.50.

An hon. member: How about Princess Alexandra?

Mr. Burr: Oh, I am coming to her. I am not suggesting that the conference for teachers of English as a second language should have had no registration fee. I am merely pointing out the incongruity of the situation. One group of dedicated people comes to Toronto on a serious mission and pays for the privilege \$5 each in addition to all their travelling expenses. In the other situation a visiting head of state arrives and a large group of affluent citizens, including perhaps the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman)—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Am I regarded as affluent?

Mr. Burr: I believe you are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not mind a comparison with some of the hon. members opposite.

Mr. Burr: This group is given hospitality at the expense of the taxpayers of Ontario, who include the first group. Why can government hospitality not be kept within reasonable grounds? Only \$358 was spent on King Constantine of Greece, only \$320 was spent on the Vice-President of Taiwan. Only \$610 was spent on Queen Juliana of the Netherlands. These are reasonable amounts. Why did the hospitality for Princess Alexandra's visit cost us \$29,000?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Oh, these white Anglo-Saxon Protestants over there—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Your expenditures are in terms of the importance of these dignitaries according to your likes, are they? Look at the hierarchy of power here; really something!

Mr. Burr: This raises another rather delicate point, Mr. Chairman. When President De Gaulle visited Quebec a couple of years ago there was a great controversy about a Canadian province having diplomatic relations with an outside country. If our Provincial Secretary or the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) had put his foot down and told Ottawa that Ontario did not wish to be involved with the heads of state of foreign countries, he could have saved this government of Ontario thousands of dollars. In fact over \$75,000 was spent in extending hospitality to visiting heads of state as recorded on page Q7 of the 1968 Public Accounts.

Mr. Sargent: This all goes to Ports of Call.

Mr. Burr: Why do you not own that, Eddie?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, he only owns dry hotels.

Mr. Burr: The budget for the government hospitality fund for 1968, as approved by this Legislature, was \$40,000. Yet the Minister spent almost twice this amount on visiting heads of state alone. Surely the entertainment of visiting heads of foreign states is a federal responsibility and any provincial participation should be on an appropriately modest level.

Back in December the Premier reported to the Legislature that Ontario had sent \$20,000 worth on food to help the starving millions in Biafra. We now find in the public accounts that far more than that—\$29,000—actually was spent on hospitality involving one visiting dignitary. Governments must have priorities but they should be justifiable priorities. When the people of Ontario read

that over \$207,000 was spent from the Ontario government hospitality fund I hope they will read too that this Legislature authorized only \$40,000 and that the rest came from the Treasury Board over which we, in the Opposition at least, have no control.

On February 23, 1967, during the estimates of the Provincial Secretary, the Minister enunciated some of the principles followed in distributing the government hospitality fund and the clearest guidelines seem to be these, four in number: First, the fact that the guests were coming from outside the province; second, the fact that the organization had not benefited in the previous year; third, the reasonableness or extent of the request; fourth, budget limitations.

I suggest that those are good guidelines, but I find that in the 1967-68 there were eight organizations who were given hospitality despite the fact they had received hospitality in the previous year, 1966-67. Three of these were so relatively inexpensive as to escape criticism—namely, Colombo Plan seminars, the Silver Cross Women of Canada convention, and the International Rescue and First Aid Association. Two others—the Ontario Public Service Quarter Century Club, Toronto Branch, and student exchange luncheons—perhaps could qualify on the basis of need, although that is not one of the Minister's guidelines.

The reason for the provincial lawn bowling tournament's success in passing the Minister's qualifying test eludes me at the moment, but perhaps this was an oversight, as perhaps were the two other repeaters. The Central Canada Broadcasters Association was accorded hospitality in both years, perhaps because a few of its members came from outside the province and thus helped the organization to qualify for the hospitality fund under what might be called the Minister's extra-provincial proviso or the extra-territorial eligibility test.

The only organization, however, which anyone knowing the Minister's guidelines would be positive could not qualify in 1967-68, but did, was the Toronto Men's Press Club By-line Ball. It failed the Minister's first requirement because this organization did not come visiting from outside the province; in fact it did not even have province-wide membership and it did not come visiting even from outside Toronto. It failed the second test because it had been admitted in the previous year. The extent of the request turned out to be over \$4,100 in 1966-67 and \$4,600 in 1967-68. When

compared to the \$50 hospitality extended to the International Rescue and First Aid convention in 1966-67, which dropped to \$39 in 1967-68, and such items as \$150 for a whole high school band being entertained, the Toronto Men's Press Club request may seem somewhat unreasonable.

Mr. Lawlor: A very questionable item; some sort of a bribery involved.

Mr. Burr: Especially for two years in a row. Thus it failed to pass the Minister's number three test.

Mr. Lawlor: I notice to the extent that he uses the press—all kinds of ethnic press and what-not—subsidization, backdoor; there are four or five cases here—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Four or five cases of what?

Mr. Burr: The Minister's fourth and final test, that of budget limitations, approved by the members of this Legislature, should have stopped this request because it exceeds ten per cent of the total year's budget for the government's hospitality estimate. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, this illustrates merely the power of the Toronto press. Perhaps it shows that the Minister forgot his guidelines. Perhaps it shows that the Minister did not know what was going on in his department—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): More likely!

Mr. Burr: —and, perhaps, and I think this may be nearer the truth, perhaps some greater power interceded.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Is there a greater power?

Mr. Burr: In the Cabinet, yes. And perhaps it is another illustration of what the government—

Mr. Stokes: Questionable right now!

Mr. Burr: —considers top priority.

Mr. Stokes: Divine intervention!

Mr. Burr: Perhaps it will not happen again this year—perhaps.

My other question for the Minister, on which I would like him to comment, is this: In the Minister's estimates for the coming year, can we be assured that the Minister will follow the excellent guidelines he set down two years ago and will he resist pressures—from whatever direction—that would cause him to depart from these guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, may I just take a brief opportunity to comment on the remarks made by the hon. members for Dovercourt (Mr. De Monte) and Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr). May I, at the outset, quite sincerely say how much I have appreciated their comments and the constructive approach to much of our programme. Referring particularly to the hon. member for Dovercourt, I just wanted to make one or two comments in addition to those.

He talked in terms of the government presence at various functions sponsored by our various ethnic groups and I think this is a legitimate point. I hope that he will agree with me at least that this Minister is not the only Minister who can assure physically the government presence at these functions. Many of our members, in fact many of the members of this Legislature, do, in the exercising of their riding responsibilities, attend many of these functions. My Cabinet colleagues are doing this all the time as well, to mention the Minister of Correctional Services and the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko).

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Practically every week end.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not argue this point with the hon. member, sir. I agree with him that we cannot overdo or rather over-emphasize this evidence of goodwill and our legitimate interest. For instance, this morning in our gallery above you, we have some 40 or 50 students from the adult learning centre here in Toronto, made up completely of Czechoslovakian refugees.

I met them this morning as did the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) and they have been taken on a tour to identify them with the operation of government. The Speaker spoke with them this morning as well and we are doing this all the time without, perhaps, the attendant publicity which goes with other types of functions.

I could not agree more, we must never let up on this tangible evidence of our interest in them and our concern for them. I say this as well—that we work very closely with The Department of the Secretary of State in Ottawa. I have some responsibility in this field and have a wonderful relationship with the citizenship people from Ottawa. They have some outstanding men in the service that have worked with our people.

You certainly have to have a great dedication to this work to give the time which both our citizenship people and, I believe, the

federal people do in this. They would be the first to agree that there is always room for improvement and if only there were more time and more people available, this welcoming and evidence of good neighbourliness, keeping in mind the strangeness that these people must experience coming to a new country, would grow.

I would hope that in the constructive and helpful tone of the remarks of the member for Dovercourt, we might continue in this work.

I turn just briefly to the comments of the member for Sandwich-Riverside and, on behalf of the staff of the department, I thank him for his kind references to them and to their dedication. Two specific questions were raised in the course of his remarks and we might comment on the others as we go through.

He asked me to comment first, if I remember correctly—and he will help me if I overlook any of his questions, I hope—the relationship of the teaching of English to Canadian culture. I am not, as he would well know, an expert, and I appreciate his assessment of our teaching programme because he is in pedagogy and is a teacher of great reputation from his area—in fact, our new assistant director of citizenship of our department is a former pupil of his from the Windsor high school system.

An hon. member: Oh, you have a socialist?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Of course, in the civil service, we look for the best man regardless of his political background. You know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And sometimes they can even be NDPers!

Hon. Mr. Welch: However, may I as a lay person, simply indicate that I suppose any introduction to Canadian culture, is good whatever that might be—and I would be very interested in having an exchange sometime on what we mean today by Canadian culture, particularly in view of the very well founded comments of the hon. member when he was making reference to the Americanism that crept into those repetitive questions in the learning situation and in the sample film which we both saw at that time.

All three of us were at the same conference, we could not have seen the same group, naturally, with all the numbers there were, but whatever that Canadian culture might be I suppose it is incidental to the teaching process. Perhaps, I speak now as a lay person, that in using the situations and material

for this approach, they would identify these questions with perhaps something which is exclusively Canadian and helpful in the integration process.

So the first concern is teaching English to the students and in the implementation of whatever the method might be, and the auxiliary material, I would assume that by implication this moves in. You will also recall at that same conference, Mr. Chairman, the movie "Here We Go Round", and there will be some comments on that in some parts. But I think there was some evidence of a recognition that in the teaching programme itself, there is more than just English being taught, as incidental as it might be. There was some introduction to those things into which we hope there will be some integration as well.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister explain then why this could not be in The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Welch: If the hon. member would permit, Mr. Chairman, when we get to vote 1703, that would be a very legitimate question to raise at that time. I would like to have an exchange on that as it comes up because I think it is a very worthwhile question.

May I just quickly go to the hospitality matter. We shall be into that vote shortly and I would be less than frank if I did not share with you the fact that there are certain difficulties in living within rigid guidelines, notwithstanding their enunciation in the *Hansard*, to which you make reference.

Most of the concern in the early part of the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside's comment in connection with the hospitality fund had specific reference to Centennial year. Now I make no apology personally, or on behalf of this government, for this government being a good host to heads of state during our Centennial year.

Mr. Sargent: Not that good.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Over \$200,000.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is a value judgment with respect to these matters, as the hon. members know, in consultation with the Centennial commissioner. In the general arrangements between Ottawa and the provinces, it is my understanding—I stand to be corrected—that when heads of state were invited to come and join with us in our 100th birthday celebrations, they came to the capital of this country.

I think it included a visit to Expo at Montreal and they could then choose, as I understand it, two other provinces in their official visit and Ontario was a very popular choice.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Naturally.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think we should be guided by this.

Mr. Trotter: With a bun-feed like that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, I hasten to remind the hon. member that his opinion is just as valid as anyone else's as to whether or not these amounts are excessive, but let me point out that there they were, in our Centennial celebrations, and we acted in our capacity as host for the dignitaries.

The other point that I want to make in connection with this is that we attempt to live within our guidelines, we attempt to live within the budgets. We have attempted in these estimates to set out a more realistic approach to our funds, keeping in mind that, as in our personal situations, we sometimes find someone visiting with us somewhat unexpectedly and therefore we have to look after them as they arrive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Depending on whether it is a girl friend or a mother-in-law, for example?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not know what further explanations I could make; it may be, as we get into the particular votes, we could have an exchange on these items. I conclude as I started by thanking both hon. members for the constructive and helpful way in which they discussed these estimates, by way of introduction.

On vote 1701:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1701, general expenditure; the hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: While we are on this question of the hospitality fund, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks. I can remember at one time in the estimates that the hospitality fund was \$40,000 a year, and I used to complain about it. Now it is up to \$90,000. I can well understand that during what we call Centennial year, as a result of Expo, you were going to have higher expenses. I never dreamed they would go over \$200,000, which to me seems to be an utterly ridiculous figure. I do not know what kind of guidelines the government has,

but they certainly are not narrow and strict enough.

For example, there is one item—and this may relate to what you mention as your guidelines—for dinner for the Governor General costing over \$12,000. That was probably as much money as that man earned, sir, when he was a member of this Legislature. In those days the salaries were lower, and it is probably as much as he earned. When we think of guidelines I ask you to remember how I used to belabour the hon. Minister of Family and Social Services, who used to have your position as the Provincial Secretary, for being too loose with the hospitality fund. In 1967, the so-called Centennial year, we turned down a request of the Big Brother movement for \$18,000 and yet we can spend \$12,000 on one dinner for the Governor General.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trotter: Now, surely, that man does not expect it, and after all, you all know him well, he's one of your fellows, just pat him on the back and shake his hand and save the government \$12,000. It is just not necessary to spend the money in this way. I realize that large companies and large firms have their PR departments and they have to have goodwill, but even this government two years ago was spending approximately \$6 million—and this includes your estimate—on advertising and in PR work. It is higher than that now. I think it is utterly ridiculous that government, and particularly this government, spends that kind of money. This estimate is symptomatic of the attitude that the government has; it just does not seem to care. It is throwing out money right, left and centre, and I think it is time you quit the high-class bun-feasts. I think Princess Alexandra's dinner cost far more than—

Mr. Sargent: How much did it cost?

Mr. Trotter: Over \$29,000. Two dinners in that one year, for the Governor General and Princess Alexandra, amounted to about \$49,000, and this is just stupid. If this is the type of guidelines that you are using, heaven knows where this estimate is going to end.

Two years ago, you asked this House for \$40,000 and the Treasury Board orders increased it to well over \$200,000. Now when I see a Treasury Board order go through for a hospitality fund, I wonder if it could be in the year ahead we are planning. If

there are going to be more Treasury Board orders, it is just completely contrary to common sense and in my view it is an outrage on the people of this province the way you are spending money on hospitality.

Hon. Mr. Welch: May I comment on this. I think I should adjourn for purposes of the private members, but I would just make this comment: As you know, the \$40,000 figure was put in somewhat as an arbitrary figure in previous years, for which explanation has been given. They kept it at \$40,000 until 1968.

Mr. Trotter: Two dinners were over that. Two dinners were over the entire estimate. Crazy!

Hon. Mr. Welch: Last year when we requested the \$65,000, we had conducted a study and attempted to put a more realistic figure into the estimates and live within it. This year, we have attempted to do the same thing, keeping in mind the increase in the cost of this type of function.

This might be a good point, Mr. Chairman, to introduce a motion that the committee rise and report, and pick up our estimates at this point when they are next being considered.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises, would the Minister tell us if he proposes, immediately following the completion of his estimates, to deal with the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario and the Liquor Control Board of Ontario, as has been the tradition and custom in the past?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think what we will do, Mr. Chairman, is that we will put both reports on the order paper and debate them as separate orders, the same as we did last year and the year before.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Private member's notice of motion No. 21 by Mr. Trotter:

RESOLUTION: That Ontario should introduce a mandatory system of automobile insurance based on the principle of compensation without fault, that would reduce the case load on our courts and ensure prompt and fair payment for the injured, in line with the recommendations of the select committee on automobile insurance.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), resolution No. 21 standing in my name which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, in a final report of the select committee on automobile insurance, which was presented to this House in 1963, the unanimous recommendation of that committee as made to this Legislature was that Ontario should introduce a mandatory system of automobile insurance based on the principle of compensation without fault. Some may wonder what they mean by compensation without fault. It is based very similarly on the principle of workmen's compensation. If a workman is injured at work he receives his compensation whether or not he was negligent or at fault.

Despite the fact that the committee recommended a mandatory system of automobile insurance six years ago, today we have only managed to introduce a half-baked voluntary system as of January 1, 1969. As of the first of this year many of the insurance companies, not only in Ontario but literally across Canada, have introduced policies where an individual is covered for medical insurance, for death benefits, medical payments, and things of that sort. The payments are very small, and I will deal with that as I go on, Mr. Speaker, but I did want to interject here that the insurance companies are on a voluntary basis probably feeling that the pressure is on them—have made some halting steps forward. We, by means of our legislation, have helped in making this mincing step forward.

Mr. Speaker, even very conservative elements in our society such as the benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada and the All Canada Insurance Federation, have believed that the traditional fault liability system sometimes falls short of providing justice to those involved in, or affected by, automobile accidents.

Mr. Speaker, if these two groups of people think there is something wrong with our fault liability system there must be something very wrong because they—literally the lawyers and insurance companies—are the two groups who stand to benefit most from the present system as it is today. But I feel that even the most conservative elements having to deal with this subject are concerned. They may be concerned in some respects for the public and there is no question that some of them are, because there have been members of the bar, like the present Mr. Justice Edsell Haynes, who is very outstanding in this field, and who has made a surprising number of good recommendations. In fact he has recommended more than the government is willing to accept.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I accuse the benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada of being very conservative, I want to say in all fairness that there are some who see the light, and there are some who want change, and I think there are some who want change even among insurance companies because they know that the present system has become so difficult and so unfair to those involved with automobile accidents that government is going to have to move in on them, not in a half baked way but in a complete way. I say simply this: that the old system has been on trial for a long time and is not passing the test and that is the test of servicing the public of the province of Ontario.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which we deal with auto accident cases belongs to horse-and-buggy days. We should abandon the existing tort system and favour the compulsory no-fault system of automobile insurance issued by private carriers under the control of a government board.

The select committee of 1963 thought so and even in November, 1968, a commission, headed by Mr. Justice R. A. B. Wootton, in British Columbia, said the very same thing. In other words this serious condition has become chronic, and despite the fact that in British Columbia they have an excellent record—as records go—in settling cases, I think over 73 per cent of the accidents in British Columbia are settled within approximately six months, which is an amazing record and better than ours. And even with that record they are concerned because they know that the very serious accidents, the ones where the situation amounts to a catastrophe for the individual, are not being solved. So I say that as up to date of November, 1968, Mr. Speaker, distinguished citizens of this country,

particularly in British Columbia, are urging what I am urging on this House this morning.

Those of us, Mr. Speaker, who are lawyers, may feel a twinge of pain when we do away with the trial of judge or judge and jury because the lawyers' pocketbooks will also be hurt. There is no question about that, but, Mr. Speaker, the laws exist for the benefit of society as a whole and not for lawyers and not for insurance companies. The report of Professor Allen Linden, of Osgoode Hall—a report, incidentally, that was financed by this government—said this:

The compensation paid to people who suffered injuries in automobile accidents showed that 37 per cent of those injured received compensation from automobile insurance. Twenty-three per cent received compensation from sources such as the Ontario Hospital Insurance Commission, or PSI or OMSIP—

In other words the insurance companies were off the hook—

—and 40 per cent of those injured, received nothing.

In other words they had to take care of their own injuries.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, why should these so-called "other sources" like PSI that paid for 23 per cent of the claims, be responsible for it when the primary responsibility for automobile accidents is with automobile insurance and automobile insurance companies?

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that I as a lawyer probably have ingrained into me the importance of the common law and the liberty that is given to us as individuals. We could not exist as a government today in this province unless we had English common law, but when the system becomes outworn it should be changed, and one of the things wrong with our legal system today is what we call the tort system in regard to automobile accidents. To those who are not familiar with the expression it is this—that if a person is injured in an automobile accident, he sues. It is a tort action, there is the plaintiff and the defendant, and the court decides what the result of the case should be, who is at fault and how much should be awarded. Some of the cases are heard by a judge and many of the distinguished jurists in this province, like former Chief Justice McRuer, have complained often and very fiercely of the fact that such cases should not be before our

courts, that our courts are being crammed with cases affecting scraped fenders and broken bumpers.

Because of our court system taking so long, many people just abandon their claim—here in the city of Toronto it takes approximately two years to get a case before the Supreme Court and the larger a city gets it seems to become more complex and more involved. For example, in the city of Chicago, it takes 70 months to get an automobile case before one of their courts and in Philadelphia it takes 51 months. I use these two American examples—I know there are differences in our law and as to the cost—because the thing that I do emphasize is that as a city becomes more urbanized and larger, this does affect the delay before our courts so that we simply need to have a new system. Often the success of a case depends upon the tricks of the legal trade. I can remember how one lawyer, a number of years ago, won a case simply because it involved an elderly lady, a pedestrian who was struck by a car. He knew she had trouble and had medical help with her feet and he kept questioning her on that very fact and was able to emphasize that as she walked she tended to look down toward her feet. Hammering away on this point, he was able to have the case dismissed, simply on the grounds that she was never looking where she was going, she was always looking at the feet that needed care. Well, he was a smart lawyer and he won his case but is it fair to the individual who has suffered injury? Is it fair to society? My answer is, no, and such cases should simply be taken out of our law courts.

The old tricks of the legal trade are no longer good enough and it is time that we changed the system. It costs money. To get \$1 in compensation, it costs \$1.60 in premiums. It is one of the most inefficient systems we could possibly have. Distinguished men like the late Professor Cecil A. Wright—and again I point out that these men were not socialists, they were not men away out on the fringe of ideas, they were very practical and able men—and the former Chief Justice McRuer, have emphasized time and again that we need a change. Our select committee, with a unanimous report of all the parties of this House, recommended a change, and yet we still really do very, very little.

It is true we now have what is called a voluntary system as of the first of this year, but the voluntary system is not going to

affect the tort, you are still going to have tortuous court procedures which I feel simply are not necessary.

The fact that you have a voluntary system means that a person still need not be insured, that under our present motor vehicles accident claims fund, there are going to be many people who are left uncovered.

The insurance companies may say that such an increase or extension of insurance benefits is going to cost more, that they are losing money. Well, if the insurance companies give the bleeding heart routine, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House of this, that when they say they are losing money, they do not include in their statements to you, the ratio of loss over automobile accidents as to the interest they make on premiums paid in advance—they do not include the interest they make on their very extensive investments.

So that even if their actuarial rate seems to show that their profit is being reduced, regarding the actuarial rate insofar as automobile accidents are concerned, I want to remind and emphasize that they do not tell you again about the money they make on premiums paid in advance and on the money they make on the investments they already have.

The insurance companies in my view have stood in the way of progress more than any other group in our society, insofar as bringing changes in automobile insurance, and in a good many other aspects as well, Mr. Speaker, that I will not go into at this time.

But today our superintendent of insurance has very little control over the insurance companies. The insurance companies have what they call a green book with the rates of insurance. I do not know of any occasion when the superintendent of insurance has ever objected to any of the rates. It is amazing that they can never find anything wrong with what the insurance companies say in their green book.

And today if an insurance company just simply does not like the colour of your eyes, they can virtually make it impractical for anybody to drive a car in the province of Ontario. And if anyone is going to be denied the privilege of driving a car in this province, it should be denied by a government board, not by a private group of companies that are the most powerful lobby, not only in this province of Ontario but throughout Canada.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why does the member keep them in the picture then?

Mr. Trotter: I feel, in conclusion, so that I can give some of the other speakers an opportunity to speak on this matter, that we in this province should introduce a mandatory system of insurance that is government-operated.

They ask me why I keep the insurance companies in the field at all? I can say, at this stage in our economy and in our history, that I can see no practical aspect of wiping out insurance companies at this point and I do not intend to. I think that the private sector in our economy has a very important part to play but I feel that it must be a co-operative effort.

I do not deny that in the history of this country, insurance companies have made a contribution, but the difficulty is they have become far too powerful and they are holding back progress in too many fields and more particularly, in automobile insurance.

It is time that we in this House accepted the recommendations of the select committee of this Legislature made six years ago and amend our law and see it that our laws serve the public and not any particular group.

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

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I do not mind who has the floor; I may as well follow the list and that is what my list says, too. However, on reading the terms of the resolution, I think that one would be inclined to agree with it on the first observation, also in reading the terms of the report of the select committee in 1963.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are other considerations and I for one, as a layman—certainly this imposing list of lawyers here will have more to say from their technical point of view than I will—but I simply want to say briefly that the application of compensation without fault in the industry for coverage is a very good one.

And I believe it follows that after the introduction, on January 1, 1969, by the government of Ontario in that all licensed drivers now, as I understand it, who make application for insurance cannot be rejected by a company which somehow refutes to some degree the gentleman who introduced the motion, at least that is what he had to say in this regard. This is so.

Now, compensation without fault overcomes the disparity, to some degree, of a person who is the guest driver or guest passenger in a car and it gives him the opportunity of receiving quickly some financial assistance. It seems to me that in the public at large these days, everyone wants some sort of financial assistance immediately following an accident, and this seems to cover that particular area without having all cases subject to tort law, as the member has well spoken in that regard.

I am not—because I am not a lawyer—particularly concerned whether the tort system be eliminated or not—maybe it is a good thing, I will have to take his advice in that regard—but I do believe in the application of compensation without fault as a result of what has been done in regard to the coverage.

I believe it was our own present Minister in the government who personally recommended the rights of the individual and particularly, as I said, the guest passenger. This aspect was well received by both the public and the insurance industry. Naturally, I think it follows that the industry is going to sell more insurance but they have not got the right today to reject anyone who is properly licensed within the terms of government requirements.

Whether compensation without fault at this time should be compulsory or mandatory, would be somewhat premature, I believe, and I hope to be able to prove that. I am inclined to suggest that we should see what the acceptance of the present plan, as projected, is.

For instance, I believe any compulsory or mandatory application at this or any other time would have the effect of increasing, to a substantial degree, the proliferation of irresponsibility on the highways and I think that this has been proven. There is, I think, in this jurisdiction, and in many other jurisdictions, particularly some of the American jurisdictions, evidence and enough jurisprudence available today to indicate that the compulsory aspect is not particularly a good one—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is there any other jurisdiction that has shown this?

Mr. Winkler: There is sufficient evidence in the application of this particular aspect of insurance to prove this. Now I am—

Mr. Singer: Not at all.

Mr. Winkler: Yes, there is.

Mr. Singer: Not at all.

Mr. Winkler: As I understand—

Mr. Singer: The member is talking about an entirely different thing.

Mr. Winkler: I am not. The member can make his speech if he wishes.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Winkler: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the insurance companies are in agreement with this particular coverage, compensation without fault.

Mr. Singer: Certainly they are.

Mr. Winkler: And they are also in agreement with the use of the unsatisfied judgment fund and certainly, if one is used, I think the other should apply. Now why—

Mr. Singer: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. Winkler: —now why the gentleman over there introduced the motion—yes, Mr. Speaker, will you deal with that man?

Mr. Singer: Am I bothering the hon. member? I am sorry.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, the insurance companies, as I said, are in agreement with the application of this coverage, and I do not think that follows in direct agreement with what the introduction of the resolution—the introducer had to say. But if, in fact, the situation were compulsory or mandatory then I think, of course, the use of the fund is also a very necessary one.

Mr. Singer: Has anybody suggested doing away with the fund?

Mr. Winkler: No, but in this instance I am saying—Mr. Speaker, that gentleman is just throwing me off balance here and I think we will have to let him make his own speech.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Winkler: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that today in the province of Ontario, anyone who has standard coverage as of January 1, 1969, also has compensation without fault at this particular time and he will have this without cost to himself until the renewal of his premium arises at whatever time in 1969. Then he will have the option of determining for himself whether he wants to carry

this addition to his insurance premium or not. And inasmuch as I understand the broad coverage of this application, it will cost the driver \$7 per annum. I suppose one will say immediately, "That is to begin with", but I asked them what would it cost if the government of Ontario made it compulsory or mandatory. It would change in a tremendous hurry, I believe.

Mr. Singer: It would cost \$7 per driver; that is exactly what it would cost.

Mr. Winkler: However, under this scheme he has the right to accept or to reject, and I believe that as the other aspects of insurance have been accepted by the public, the public should have the right to accept or reject. I am informed that that cost is universal not only in the province of Ontario but also across the entire country.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by putting it this way. I do not believe the government can force compulsion of the inclusion of compensation without fault. They can recommend and I think they should recommend the inclusion in general coverage of standard policies. Then I just ask the House once again, Mr. Speaker, to bear in mind that that rate of the increase of accidents would be more than I believe these people presently anticipate.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in general I would support the resolution this morning except that it does not, of course, go far enough. We believe we should have a system of automobile insurance without regard to fault. Claims should be met in that regard. But if this kind of insurance is to be effective and to work adequately we must also have a public system of insurance. How the mover of this resolution can berate the insurance companies as he did, to point out the kind of thing they are doing to the motorist public and the public of Ontario, and then to accept them as the carriers to continue this, I do not understand. I doubt if he does, because some of his own friends in Saskatchewan have had a look at this and have seen how it works, and have changed their minds completely and are going to continue the public plan in that province. I will come to that a little later on.

Certainly I would say this morning that it is only consistent brainwashing by the insurance trusts—presenting them on a par with home and motherhood—that has prevented the people of Ontario from rising in their wrath against the way they are being fleeced

and bamboozled by the automobile insurance companies in this province. They are bamboozled in the first place by tremendous costs. In order to drive we have to have insurance today. That is a must; even though we do not have the compulsory feature, it is there and people cannot drive without it. We just do not dare do it. The cost in this province of the kind of insurance we have, is 2.5 times as high in administration as the publicly operated insurance plan in Saskatchewan with a Liberal Premier. Last year in Ontario, 41.5 cents of every premium dollar went for administration costs, leaving only 58.5 cents to meet claims. The Saskatchewan plan has operated on an average cost of 16 cents per premium dollar since its inception in 1946 and last year or rather the last year for which we have reports, that is 1966, I have them here—the cost was 11.6 cents. In that province it leaves 84 cents to be paid out in benefits. Contrast that with the 58.5 cents in the private insurance plans we have in the province of Ontario.

The second way we are being bamboozled is that when we buy insurance we just do not get what we think we are paying for, that is, adequate protection. The mover of the resolution this morning quoted the Linden report. That has been quoted time after time in this House; a survey which demonstrates without doubt that the people buying insurance just do not receive the coverage which they think they are getting and for which they pay.

After an accident we may wake up to find out we are not protected at all or very inadequately. The more serious the accident the less likelihood there is of proper coverage. The more serious the accident, of course, the greater the need. The greater is the chance too in serious accidents of long delays in settlements—and we heard something of that this morning. Court cases take time and if there is any doubt of who is to blame, it has to be established before the settlement.

This again, is the argument for compensation without fault. Another way in which we are being bamboozled and fleeced by the insurance trust is that after the accident, we often discover we have been paying into a loan fund, not insurance. If the company pays out money on our behalf it immediately raises the rates to get it back. That is a loan fund, that is not an insurance policy, and many of us have had sad experience in this field. Not only do the companies get

back the amount they have paid out on our behalf but they get more than is paid out very often.

I will say that in catastrophic accidents this does not occur. It would take just too long to get this amount back. But in the ordinary variety of accidents that occur on our highways, the company pays the money, then it assesses the insured in order to get it back. It is a loan fund not insurance. Then again, after the accident, or even a traffic violation, the insurance company sets itself up as judge and jury, Mr. Speaker, and adds a fine of its own to what the court has already assessed. They punish the offender further by upping the premiums. Sentences meted out by regular courts can be appealed and we can also appeal the sentence handed out by our own Department of Transport, which through its point system, may rule us off the highway. We can appeal that. But there is no appeal whatsoever from the dictates of the insurance trust. How we, as civilized human beings, can put up with that I cannot quite understand, particularly where we say, as the former speaker did, that we should still leave the control, this kind of control, in the hands of these people.

Even worse, the insurance industry takes our premium money in advance and then invests it and siphons off the interest earned. If this interest were ploughed back, as it should be, rates could be lower. By skimming off this part of the income the companies can often show a book loss and demand increased rates.

It is impossible from our reports from the superintendent of insurance and others, to establish how much is skimmed off this way, but I have here the report of the Saskatchewan public company and it tells us that during the period that the public service has been in operation there, since 1946, \$5.2 million have been returned to the fund in interest earned. That is almost five per cent of the total amount. And let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that this is a publicly operated insurance at cost, there is no padding, a cost which returns a very large amount into the payment of claims.

Now, with the kind of insurance we have, the private insurance, in this province, we can well see that the part that should be returned and is now skimmed off in investment interest could well amount to twice that five per cent—it may be ten per cent, it may be 15 per cent, we have no way of knowing at this point.

Ralph Nader in his book, "Unsafe At Any Speed", says this about the American insurance:

Since the ceiling rates can be raised as the level of premiums rises, the monetary incentive to reduce the causes of death and injuries in automobile accidents by advocating safer vehicles is reduced.

Moreover he says:

The profits of the casualty industry now come much more from investment income than from earned premiums. Between 1959 and 1963, for example, the casualty industry had an underwriting profit of \$1.38 billion and a net investment income of \$4.01 billion. The higher the volume of prepaid insurance premiums, the more funds are available to produce investment income.

This investment income should be ploughed back into the main stream to help in setting rates.

The public insurance which I have mentioned can overcome these effects of the private companies and bring lower costs. It is bought at cost with the licence, or possibly with an added couple of cents on each gallon of gas bought. This eliminates, of course, the sales cost, advertising and profit.

It pays without regard to fault, saving court costs and eliminating much of the delays to establish blame. It ploughs interest in investment back into the fund thus raising total incomes and lowering rates.

I have here a statement from the *Wall Street Journal* of November, 1967, where it says this:

A close look at Saskatchewan's experience is particularly pertinent now because of mounting dissatisfaction with the way automobile casualty and liability insurance works in the USA. Auto insurance in the United States, its critics say, is too costly, and liability benefits are too uncertain.

Courts are clogged with lawsuits seeking to pin the blame for accidents on one driver or another.

The injured person who cannot afford a lawyer often receives no liability payments at all.

The Saskatchewan plan has been operating for 21 years. It was established in 1946 when Saskatchewan elected the only socialist state of provincial government ever to take office in North America. The socialists promptly set up the government-operated insurance system. Though the socialists were replaced in 1964 by a re-

gime of the middle of the road Liberal Party that promised to return auto insurance entirely to private companies, the provincial insurance system has been maintained and there appears to be little likelihood of a major change.

"Government auto insurance has given us a lot of headaches," said Liberal Party Premier Ross Thatcher. "I would have to admit, however, the plan is working".

Now we have the statement from Mr. Thatcher in the *Star* of January 29, 1969:

Premier Thatcher bluntly declared his government had decided against any change in the system of universal compulsory auto insurance administered by the government agency. The government has decided on one agency—

And these are pertinent words:

—agency with a monopoly over auto insurance is able to provide motorists with the cheapest possible auto insurance.

This is Liberal Premier Ross Thatcher, who has had experience with the only publicly owned auto insurance plan in North America. Mr. Thatcher has decided against all the promises he made that he was going to get rid of. He made those promises right through the province, before the last election.

He now finds that the people will not stand for its removal because it is working and working to the advantage of the people. So that crowning proof of the success of a public plan is that Ross Thatcher, who promised to scuttle it, now has uttered these words and he says that it again provides the motorist with the cheapest possible auto insurance, and he is going to keep it.

Even ultra free-enterpriser Thatcher has seen the light, and sooner or later his party and the Tories and the people of Ontario will see the light as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I guess my time has expired and perhaps I had better leave it at that, but I think we have to recognize that a plan such as that mentioned in the resolution can only work, and work effectively, if it is a public plan administered through a government agency.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in rising to support the resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Parkdale. I think it is long overdue that this resolution was given some serious consideration by this government.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal that the hon. member for Parkdale advocates, compensa-

tion without fault, is not a new concept. It has been in effect in Canada here, or in Ontario, in the guise of The Workmen's Compensation Act for well over half a century, and if one considers that Bismarck introduced a system similar to this over 125 years ago, one can only wonder just how reactionary this particular government is. Not only that, but the system of compensation without fault has been discussed and written about for at least the last 30 some odd years.

In 1932, Columbia University undertook a study which was subsequently called the Columbia scheme and under this scheme it would have been a state operated compensation scheme similar to the workmen's compensation board, that is compensating persons injured in automobile accidents without consideration of fault.

In 1955, Professor Ehrenzweig at the University of California law school put forward a plan which was subsequently called by his name, the Ehrenzweig scheme, which called for voluntary accident insurance by private members. Under his scheme there would be periodic payments rather than a lump sum settlement.

In 1958, Professor Leon Green, of the University of Texas law school, sketched a scheme for compulsory insurance by private insurance subject to regulations by the state. The amount that would have been paid would have been fixed by the courts subject to a limit set by the state and there would have been no compensation for pain and suffering.

Subsequently, in 1965, there was a proposal of the California State Bar Association. Under this scheme, all payments would have been made regardless of fault and would have been deducted from the common law recovery which would still have been permitted. In addition, liability insurance for limits of \$25,000 and \$50,000 would have been compulsory.

Two professors — Professors Blum and Kalven—of the University of Chicago published a study in 1965. They believed that the suggestion for eliminating many of the awards for pain and suffering and removing most cases from the courts, would only produce a saving of about 15 per cent which would be quite insufficient for compensation without fault to be provided by insurers without extra charge.

Then Professor Keaton from Harvard, and Professor O'Connell from the University of Illinois wrote a book which is almost a bible on this subject now—"Basic Protection for

the Traffic Victim"—and it was published in 1965.

They called for compulsory insurance by private insurers to pay all the out-of-pocket expenses and loss of income of those injured in traffic accidents up to \$10,000 per person, \$100,000 per accident. There was no coverage for property damage.

Then a scheme came into being which was introduced by a nation-wide mutual insurance company in 1959; they called it their family compensation coverage. They thought that the other insurance companies would pick it up but fortunately they did not, so it sort of went by the board.

The hon. member for Yorkview was speaking of the Saskatchewan automotive accident insurance scheme. He failed to point out that in 1965 or 1966 their deficit was \$991,773. The amount of compensation paid was extremely limited. The maximum was \$10,000 for one death and they paid sums like \$100 for loss of a child up to six years of age, increasing by \$100 amounts per year until for persons 15, 16 or 17 years of age when the payment was \$1,000.

Not everybody was or is insured under that scheme. For instance the coverage does not apply—and this is the 1967 guidebook—to residents of another province or country while riding in Saskatchewan, in or on vehicles not registered with the Saskatchewan highway traffic board, out of town people or to persons entitled to workmen's compensation benefits arising from accidents. Principal sum is payable, however, in the event of loss or death.

Mr. Young: They can still sue, as here!

Mr. Ben: There they go. They can still sue. They say: "Well, we are trying to avoid this suing".

Coverage does not apply to federal government employees while operating vehicles owned by that government, to holders of international driving permits while operating a motor vehicle, to persons using or operating motor vehicles under the influence of drugs or intoxicants except for death benefits, drivers without unexpired Saskatchewan licences are not eligible for personal injury benefits, to any owner-occupant of a motor vehicle not registered under The Vehicles Act for the current year provided the vehicle is one that should be registered, to the driver or owner-occupant of a motor vehicle to which is attached an unlicensed trailer if licence of the trailer is required, except for

death benefits. And there are three other types that are excluded.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Other than that, they are insured.

Mr. Ben: Yes, other than that. They get very little, the thing is operating under a deficit but that is the way it is going. As far as the Liberal government carrying it on is concerned, they have no choice. I think it was estimated it would take about \$5 billion to undo the con job that the CCF did on the people in that small province, telling them to believe they were living in paradise. And he says they have to look after the interest of the people to keep them healthy, wealthy and wise, rather than try to undo the harm that the CCF caused. So they put their money to good use in Saskatchewan.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why does the member not face up to reality?

Mr. Ben: Then, of course, there is the famous report of the select committee of this province—you know, the first place that LSD was introduced in this country was in Saskatchewan by the CCF government and they still have not been able to face up to reality, they are still in that hazy dream.

The select committee, Mr. Speaker, had on it such distinguished gentlemen as the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), who was the chairman; and a Minister of the Crown—the member for Lanark (Mr. Gomme), who at that time was not a Minister but who is now a Minister of the Crown, charged with the responsibility for highways—and the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), a Minister of the Crown. This select committee with those three illustrious gentlemen on it—plus others, of course, because being a select committee, the preponderance of members belonged to the government side—they advocated a certain scheme and it is amazing that it was rejected.

The Linden report, which was already mentioned by some previous speakers, pointed out the very sad state of affairs in this province. Professor Allen M. Linden, in his study, compared tort and non-tort recoveries and noted that of those attempting recovery through tort law, 57.1 per cent went without compensation, 28.8 per cent recovered all their losses and 14.1 per cent recovered in part.

Under non-tort recoveries, i.e. hospital insurance, workmen's compensation, life insurance, etc., 17.6 per cent received full

compensation and 30 per cent received more than half their losses. Under combined recovery from tort law and social welfare, 54 per cent received full compensation; and in only 2.4 per cent of the cases was the unrecovered loss in excess of \$2,000. Considering these statistics it is well to recall that unless the injury or death was at least partly due to the fault of some other person there could have been no grounds for a tort recovery. And Professor Linden advocated the implementation of the scheme advocated by the select committee on automobile insurance, a select committee of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one has to wonder why this thing has not been implemented. Well, there are a number of arguments advanced against this and I would like—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has one minute of his time left, perhaps he could draw to a conclusion in that period.

Mr. Ben: It is very difficult to wind up in such a short time, Mr. Speaker, but one of the reasons given is that it is immoral and the hon. Minister had this to say in 1966:

In effect the mandatory provision for compensation, regardless of fault, applied to motor vehicle accidents would mean that the government had selected one type of personal calamity for special consideration. A person who caused a motor vehicle accident or his family would be eligible for compensation but the same would not necessarily be true if a person were involved in another type of accident or if it should be his misfortune to be stricken by permanent or crippling disease. The discrimination would be illogical and unjust.

Mr. Singer: What Minister said that?

Mr. Ben: This hon. Minister, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett).

Mr. Singer: Oh, that Minister.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I say phooey and the Liberal Party says phooey, because we believe in compensating victims of all misfortunes and if the principle of workmen's compensation is right then this particular principle would be right. There is one big gap in this province, Mr. Speaker, between those who are injured in workmen's compensation and those who have the right to receive unemployment insurance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is well over his time. Will he please bring his remarks to a conclusion?

Mr. Ben: All right, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that this will be the first step forward and we are striving for the day, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal Party gets into this government, and introduces a scheme of compensation for victims of accidents—period.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members know, this same resolution was debated last year in the Legislature. Since that time we have seen that the insurance industry has, with the prodding of this government, extended its coverage in a very effective manner by providing coverage for injuries to occupants of motor vehicles—and, you might say, based on the principle of compensation without fault. I am advised, Mr. Speaker, by representatives of the insurance industry that although it is early to tell exactly how successful the voluntary system is, approximately 80 per cent of those people covered with automobile insurance have definitely indicated that they wish to have this extra coverage and have consented to it being included in their automobile policies. When one realizes for how short a time the industry has in fact made an effort to promote and sell this coverage—

Mr. Singer: They have given it to everybody for the first year for nothing, so there is no problem yet.

Mr. Kerr: Well no, only until their existing policy expires.

Mr. Singer: Yes, when they renew—

Mr. Kerr: However, when one realizes for how short a time the industry has in fact made an effort to promote this coverage, I think hon. members will agree that probably by the end of this year everyone with automobile insurance will include such coverage in their policy. So far, under this voluntary system the extra premium is nominal. However, the claims to date, I would think, would probably be very few.

In re-reading the hon. member's resolution and also the recommendations of the select committee of 1963, I do not think the committee was advocating or recommending the abolition of the tort system or tort law in accident compensation. The committee did recommend certain death benefits, dismemberment, loss of sight benefits, medical payments, and so on. However, I hope I am right in that, as the committee did not go into the whole principle of tort and compensation without fault, they were not advocating its abolition and saying that their recommendations were the last word by any means.

Some of the arguments for this principle, and I think it was referred to in this debate, refer to the Keeton-O'Connell plan in the USA, sometimes without realizing the different situation that exists between our two countries. The tort system in the USA is increasingly condemned there. There is a contingent fee prevailing almost everywhere which results in legal costs of litigated claims being anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent of the total recovery. I doubt whether the comparable average percentage of legal costs in this jurisdiction is as high as 12 per cent. Prolonged delay in obtaining a judicial result after trial is not a major problem in Ontario and only possibly in Toronto is it a minor problem. An Ontario claimant can bring his case to trial within six to nine months from the commencement of proceedings, and trials within three or four months in most parts of this province are not unusual. The criticism of delay may be valid, but the proposed remedy, that is, a drastic change in the tort law, is not responsive to the problem.

In my opinion there are probably three principal reasons for delay. First, during the last few years, delays have been occasioned, particularly in Toronto, by the substantial increase in criminal cases which take precedence for trial over civil cases. These criminal cases at times literally clog our courts. Is this a reason for changing the substantive criminal law?

The second reason is the lack of sufficient judges available to try these cases. In Ontario in the past few years there has been an increase in all forms of court business which is commensurate with the population increase. Delay is developed due to our failure to provide the facilities and personnel needed to keep pace with this growth. Another reason for delay is that a small percentage of lawyers, both for the plaintiffs and defence, are dilatory, disorganized and inefficient in moving their clients' auto claims forward to final disposition. This is a defect which surely can be corrected and the bar as a whole must redouble its efforts to find ways to increase the speed and efficiency of dealing with automobile tort cases. There are occasions when competent plaintiff's counsel have valid reason for delaying the final disposition of the plaintiff's claim in personal injury cases of a severe nature. It is frequently difficult to obtain, until considerable time has elapsed, a final medical prognosis sufficient to enable the counsel to assess the value of the general damages of the plaintiff.

In most cases plaintiffs are rarely financially destitute or prejudiced by the delay. A great majority are supported by some form of sick benefit plan provided by their employers whereby they recover a portion if not all of their income. Hospital and medical expenses are almost invariably paid by some other agency. Moreover the insurance industry itself, in an effort to overcome any criticism for the delay in payment to the needy victim, has developed a plan supported by the majority of insurance companies in Ontario where in cases of clear liability, advance payments are made on behalf of the defendant to the claimant to cover his loss of income, medical and other expenses as they are incurred. The claimant is then free to proceed to trial when his injury has "matured". The offer of general damages made by the defendant's insurers appears inadequate.

Now back to the situation in the States: Statistics indicate that delay in the courts in the American metropolitan areas, such as Chicago as mentioned by the hon. member, averages 31 months, and is said to be as much as six years in Cooke county, Illinois.

Again, those people who refer to the Keeton-O'Connell plan sometimes neglect to point out the sad state of tort law in the USA and how in fact, legislatures in the various states have not really kept up with us here in this country. Certainly some reform is drastically needed in most areas in our neighbouring country. For example in the USA, if two cars collide, and one driver is ten per cent at fault while the other driver is 90 per cent at fault, even if the ten-per-cent-at-fault driver is seriously injured, he has no right of action against the other driver. In Canada under our contributory negligence rule, he does have such a right of action, and he is entitled to receive damages in proportion to the degree of fault of the other party.

Another example may be if two cars collide—I do not have time to give this other example, Mr. Speaker. However, I could go on to mention the contingency fee, the legal fee, that is charged in the US by lawyers. This, of course, is considered not proper conduct in Ontario and this would be reflected I would think in our claims and in our insurance rates.

I just want to say that, having read Professor Linden's latest report where he advocates a form of peaceful co-existence, this seems to be, at least at this time, a reasonable solution to our problem here. In his suggestion there would, in fact, be limited accident benefits such as recommended by

the select committee, and at the same time our basic laws as to negligence tort would still be in effect and there would be—

Mr. Speaker: I would draw to the hon. member's attention that the private member's hour has now expired.

Mr. Kerr: I would just say in winding up then, Mr. Speaker, that I do support the basic recommendations of the select committee. I do not think they have advocated the complete abolition of the tort law in this province. I think that, as I suggested, they both can exist and if claims are kept to a certain minimum, then by the use of our present tort system and our negligence Act, people who would have what we call extra claims, pain and suffering, could also enjoy the benefits of our common law.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker if I may rise on a point of order—perhaps it is a matter of privilege—and bring to your attention one thing. Owing to the inability of the members of this House to adhere to the rules, we as the third party are constantly not able to have a second speaker. Unless the motion happens to arise from this particular section of the House, we speak third. And when members do not adhere to the rules, out of necessity it eliminates the opportunity to speak a second time for this section of the House.

On the last three Fridays I have been slated to speak second for this party and on the last three Fridays I have been unable to, owing to the inability of the members to adhere to the rules. I would ask you, sir, if you would attempt to keep them within the time limits.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, on this same point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would allow the Speaker to speak to the point of order as raised by this hon. member first.

I am well aware of the situation and I am also well aware of the fact that private members' hour is usually five minutes late in starting, which is the fault, shall I say, of all the members because the members today were sitting in the committee of the whole House, which, as you all know, is all of the members here. That, of course, does cause a difficulty. I would also point out that usually—and it has happened today again—the member for the third party who speaks first very wisely probably believes what is going to happen, and usually is allowed, and I

allowed it again today, to go on over his time because I knew this would happen. It was impossible to put the number of speakers in.

I believe that the point raised by the hon. member is a fair point, a good point. It does not always happen to that party; it has happened to the other two parties too. All I can suggest is that some arrangement be made by the Whips whereby either we have a fewer number of speakers so that they can be assured of speaking, or that the time for each member to speak is cut down, because it is almost impossible on the 20 minutes and 10-10-10 minute deal to get in the speakers who always wish to speak three to a side. It is practically impossible because we never start on time and we always have the members wishing to go just a little bit over, no matter how much Mr. Speaker urges them to cease and desist.

So perhaps—yes, there are some Whips here—perhaps the Whips would discuss it among themselves and see what they can do before Monday's private members' hour comes.

Now, the hon. member for Humber has a point.

Mr. Ben: Yes, I was just going to point out that I agree something should be done, but I would also point out that the lead-off speaker started late but he finished 20 minutes after. The hon. member for Grey South finished at 27½ minutes after, the hon. member who then spoke for the NDP, the member for Yorkview, spoke for 15 minutes, and I restricted my remarks to 10 minutes. This happened last week also. The Speaker gave a reason for it and I accepted it, but I do resent that the pot should get up and imply that all the other pans are black. The reason is well taken but I do note where the fault lies.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if I may make just one final point on this: As I understand the rule at present, it is 20 minutes—

Mr. Speaker: It is not a rule. It is an agreement among the party Whips.

Mr. Deans: The agreement—I apologize—the agreement is 20 minutes for the first speaker, ten minutes for each of the second two speakers, and five minutes for the final speakers; and that, sir, as I understand it, would take 55 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: The member's understanding is not the same as Mr. Speaker's so we will have to leave that with the Whips to sort out by Monday or some later date.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, when we resume Monday we will consider legislation, and then if time permits, turn to the estimates.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): I wonder if we could have a further list of estimates than we have now?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member would like to know the name of the department which will follow the hon. Minister's.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Social and Family Services will follow the Provincial Secretary, then The Department of Mines and The Department of Transport. I will have to get you the rest. I will have the list on Monday, but these are the next three after these current estimates. As you know, the Treasurer's estimates are not completed and we may resume them to get them cleaned up as well.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder what we can anticipate under the heading of legislation, Bills 73 and 74 on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am not prepared to discuss any particular bills, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I presume the private members' hour will also be on Monday.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: I would urge the Whips to try to sort out our problem by Monday at 5.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.10 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM (March 18, 1969)

Page	Column	Line	Correction
2435	1	13	Change to read: member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton)

No. 71



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 24, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



Price per session, \$5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 24, 1969

Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, first reading	2597
Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	2597
Land Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	2597
Lakefront land, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	2605
Government planning, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Shulman	2609
Harbour City development, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Nixon	2606
"Farm and Country", questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald	2607
Texas Gulf smelter, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Ferrier	2607
Sales tax on production machinery, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Braithwaite	2608
Ontario Hydro management, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	2609
Weston Credit Jewellers advertisement, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Stokes	2609
Robert F. McCarthy, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Makarchuk	2609
Federal-provincial sharing programme, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Shulman	2610
Great West Life Insurance Company, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Shulman	2610
Suicides in psychiatric hospitals, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman	2612
Niagara escarpment report, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. MacDonald	2612
E. E. Stewart, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid	2613
Union Carbide, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Haggerty	2613
Mrs. Fiona Nelson, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	2614
Easter recess of Legislature, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Lawlor	2614
Mr. Sheldon Boutillier, question to Mr. Bales, Mrs. M. Renwick	2614
Sitdown strike at Burwash, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman	2615
Shelter allowance, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mrs. M. Renwick	2616
Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Welch, continued	2617
Public Health Act, bill to amend, on second reading, Mr. Deans, Mrs. Pritchard, Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Gisborn	2624
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2632

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon our guests are in the west gallery and they are students from Sultan Public School, in Sultan.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT CLAIMS ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill to amend The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act.

The first amendment will facilitate proceedings in certain circumstances enabling the Minister to act on behalf of a deceased person. This amendment is to the benefit of those who are victims of collisions.

The second amendment will increase the limit for payments from the fund from \$35,000 to \$50,000. Further, if more than one uninsured vehicle is at fault in a single collision, the limit will apply to each of these vehicles.

The increase to \$50,000 recognizes the general rise in evaluation of claims since the \$35,000 was set in 1962. It is in keeping with our policy of maintaining the position of the accident claims fund as a thoroughly effective method of providing compensation for the innocent victims of collisions that are caused by an uninsured vehicle. To be consistent with our plans for this increase in the limit of the fund, I asked the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs to consider a corresponding amendment in The Insurance Act. That amendment was introduced last week, providing for an increase to

\$50,000 in the minimum public liability coverage in automobile insurance policies.

Thus the amendment I am introducing in The Accident Claims Act, combined with the change in The Insurance Act, increases the provision of compensation for the victims of any collision regardless of the insurance status of the vehicle at fault.

THE REGISTRY ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Doing away with the registry now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There are some 20 amendments, Mr. Speaker. We are bringing the procedures of our Act up to date generally.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That Act will never be up to date.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We keep moving forward.

Mr. Singer: Anything startling?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member would not expect me to warn him, would he?

THE LAND TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Some of these amendments are complementary to the changes in The Registry Act amendments and assist in bringing the procedures in the two methods of land registration together.

Mr. Speaker: This morning, I would inform the members, the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) consulted me with a view to moving the adjournment of the House today, to discuss as a matter of urgent public

importance, the fear of the people in his electoral district that the proposed smelter of Texas Gulf Sulphur Company, processing the ore from the Kidd Creek mine, may be located elsewhere than in the Timmins area.

While I am very sympathetic to this proposal and agree that it is of public importance to the area in question and perhaps to all of Ontario, I was reluctantly compelled to rule it out of order, as not complying with the existing rule and precedents.

One of the established requirements for such a motion is that the matter to be debated must be a specific matter of recent occurrence. The member for Cochrane South and the member of Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), who advised him, agreed that there had been no recent occurrence which would meet this requirement.

Now, I have pointed out to the hon. members that, of course, the rules of the House are always subject to the unanimous determination of the members of the House as to what is to be done. But I have ruled that the proposed motion to adjourn the House to discuss this matter is out of order.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask this question: In view of the fact that you concede this is a matter of public importance—so that this is just another instance when the rules seem to frustrate rather than facilitate the conduct of the business of the House—I wonder if we could get the unanimous consent of the House—perhaps the Minister might be willing to concur in it—so that this admitted matter of public importance could be debated?

Mr. Speaker: Of course, I think that is quite proper, and the proper way to deal with the Speaker's ruling rather than what we have sometimes done.

The hon. Prime Minister wishes to speak.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this matter is under very close, intensive negotiation at the moment. I do not think anything would be served by a debate. I can make these comments to the people of that area, however. We have been very interested in this whole matter from the beginning and I can assure the House that it is receiving attention.

As recently as this morning it was negotiated, and I hope that we will be able to make some announcement in the not-too-distant future. But I cannot see that any purpose would be served by such a debate at this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I might make a comment, on a point of order. I was very interested in hearing the presentation that had been put to you by the hon. member for Cochrane South, but surely if our rules in this regard are going to be meaningful, he should have had an opportunity to put his reasons to you and to the House before you gave your reason for not permitting the adjournment. I think this is one example of the fact that the rules do not, in fact, accommodate the obvious requirements if we are going to respond to the needs of the community. Now, as far as giving consent for this particular debate is concerned, I would be delighted to give the consent of the group which I have the honour to lead.

I feel that the leader of the government has, in fact, entered into the debate to some extent already by assuring the citizens of the province that he and his government are up to date and on top of the problem. I do not find that satisfactory, and I think it would be a useful exercise if more information were to be made available.

If the Prime Minister thinks it would jeopardize the delicate negotiations, that is another matter. But I do not believe he has made that point.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House give unanimous consent for a debate on this matter.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, we will not consent to that. I think my position is very clear. We have been discussing this matter over a continuous period of time and I wonder myself at the propriety of this motion. Either the subject for debate fits the rules or it does not. I do not see how it can be introduced by unanimous consent, other than by taking the position that this House can do anything at once, in any respect, if we had unanimous consent.

Mr. Nixon: Well, certainly if you are not prepared to consent it is not unanimous.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the basic theory of Parliament.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Because you have no rules.

Mr. Speaker: The matter appears to me to rest at this particular point, properly and in accordance with the rules. The hon. member for Cochrane South discussed the matter with Mr. Speaker this morning, and for the reasons which Mr. Speaker has given to the House

it was thought that this was not within the rules, and Mr. Speaker so ruled. The leader of the New Democratic Party has appealed for unanimous consent of the House. I believe a motion would be out of order but he has made that appeal. The unanimous consent is not forthcoming and therefore, as Mr. Speaker must abide by the rules, the rules say that the matter, of course, would be closed.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I am forced into a situation that I did not want to be in. We have no alternative, in view of the archaic nature of our rules, which do not permit either the introduction of the motion in the first instance—so that you deal with it behind the scenes, though I would give you full credit and thanks for bringing it out into the open—or an opportunity for a motion to be made, as is the case in most other Parliaments, and then the Speaker can rule after the motion is made.

In short, on at least two grounds the rules are so archaic that, I repeat, they frustrate rather than facilitate the normal, ordinary, sensible conduct of the business of the province. I am, therefore, left with no alternative but to appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The appeal of a Speaker's ruling is without debate; and therefore the appeal by the member for York South will now be put to the House.

The vote is on the Speaker's ruling that the proposed motion to adjourn the House for debate on a matter of urgent public importance, proposed to be made by the hon. member for the electoral district of Cochrane South, is out of order.

The Speaker's ruling was sustained on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Brown
Bales	Davison
Belanger	Deans
Ben	Ferrier
Bernier	Gisborn
Boyer	Jackson
Braithwaite	Lawlor
Breithaupt	Lewis
Brunelle	MacDonald
Connell	Makarchuk
Davis	Peacock
De Monté	Pilkey
Dunlop	Pitman
Edighoffer	Renwick
Evans	(Riverdale)
Farquhar	Renwick (Mrs.)
Gaunt	(Scarborough Centre)

AYES	NAYS
Gomme	Shulman
Good	Stokes
Grossman	Young—18.
Guindon	
Haggerty	
Haskett	
Henderson	
Hodgson	
(Victoria-Haliburton)	
Jessiman	
Johnston	
(Parry Sound)	
Kennedy	
Knight	
Lawrence	
(Carleton East)	
Lawrence	
(St. George)	
MacNaughton	
Meen	
McNeil	
Newman	
(Ontario South)	
Nixon	
Pritchard (Mrs.)	
Randall	
Reid	
(Rainy River)	
Reid	
(Scarborough East)	
Reilly	
Reuter	
Robarts	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Ruston	
Simonett	
Singer	
Smith	
(Simcoe East)	
Smith	
(Hamilton Mountain)	
Snow	
Sopha	
Spence	
Welch	
White	
Winkler	
Wishart	
Worton—59.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 59, the "nays" 18.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the ruling upheld.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South was on his feet before the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): My point of order is this, Mr. Speaker, that it is my conviction that the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) has moved his estimates down in the order of consideration so that he will not have to come to grips with this Texas Gulf smelter problem—

Mr. Speaker: The member has not stated any point of order, he is stating a conviction. Now will he state his point of order.

The hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, with great respect I want to question the propriety of your making your decision on the request for the adjournment in this House. Perhaps you might enlighten me and other members who would ask for further information in this regard. Having gone through this procedure myself, I have brought to the attention of your Honour, outside the House as is required, my feeling on another occasion that perhaps an adjournment would have been in order and it was your decision then not to proceed.

I think it is often forgotten that another aspect of the archaic approach that we take in this particular matter is that if in fact you had permitted such a debate it would have been ruled out of order on all occasions in this session when we might have had some more information pertaining to this important subject, which would put us in a position to discuss on a more intelligent basis the decision that apparently is about to be taken by Texas Gulf. So I would like your views on that, sir, and the whole procedure that is before us.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, he and one of his members had the same problem during the last session. As I recall it it was dealt with at that time in a manner similar to this time.

First of all the hon. leader of the Opposition is quite correct that the rules do specify that if this matter is dealt with by a debate on an adjournment to discuss the matter of urgent public importance then it cannot be debated further at the same session. That, of course, is always a problem for any member or any party wishing to discuss a matter that is of public and urgent and of great importance to the member or to his constituents or the people of Ontario.

That point is well taken and is one which

often decides the course of the matters. Now with respect to the manner of dealing with it, I may say that I have followed the precedent which I set last year which, according to what information I could gather, was the manner of dealing with it. I certainly would have no objection to an hon. member making such a motion in the House because it would immediately be ruled out of order. The Speaker's decision is not debatable and therefore, there would be no debate.

One of the reasons that it has been handled in the manner in which it has been to give the member concerned, and his party caucus, the opportunity of deciding just what they wish to do about it. Sometimes the decision falls on one side of the line, as last year, and sometimes on another side of the line, as this year.

I cannot say that I disagree with the statements made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and at various times by the Prime Minister, and today certainly by the member for York South that our rules do need something done to them.

The other problem that Mr. Speaker faces—as the hon. leader of the Opposition will know and, as a matter of fact, made note of today in one of the remarks that he made—is that unless the rules, archaic or otherwise, are endeavoured to be followed, we do not have any rules. The answer, of course, is to have a revision of the rules and then try to stick to those.

Should we have this matter come up again, since it apparently is the feeling of the House, I have no objection whatsoever to dealing with it, should I be in the chair, as the hon. leader has suggested and as the member for York South discussed with the Speaker beforehand. Whether he approves or not, the Speaker can give his approval. The member can make his motion, but that again would be the end of the debate until the Speaker's ruling were dealt with.

Those briefly are the considerations and they were fully discussed, I know, last year with the hon. leader of the Opposition and his party representatives. This morning they were discussed with the hon. member for Cochrane South and with the member for Riverdale. I have not had the opportunity of discussing it with anyone other than the Clerk of the House because I felt that this was a ruling which followed the ruling made last year and apparently was the proper way to deal with it.

I am convinced that the House would prefer some different way, at least to the left

of Mr. Speaker, and I can see that it would do no harm. So the next time there is an occurrence like this, I shall consider very seriously whether it should have Mr. Speaker's approval to be at least moved in the House or not, rather than following the precedent which I have set, that I followed today.

I trust that will meet the observations of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order; two points really.

The first one is that I do not know who is responsible for initiating a revision of the rules of this House but I suggest that it should have happened a long, long time ago.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if the rules of this House stand and are to be lived up to, I suggest you do not have the right to do as you have just indicated you are going to do, namely review the precedents and come in, a week or two from now, and decide whether or not there would be the right to introduce the motion. I think this is wrong. It underlines the whole archaic nature of our rules.

If the rules of the House are going to be revised, let them be revised, and do not let them be reinterpreted by you when the pressure gets irresistible at some point or another. I think this is a wholly invidious situation for all of us, and particularly for yourself.

I repeat, I do not think you have the right to come in, two weeks from now, and reinterpret the precedents of this House and do it differently. I suggest, if nobody else has the initiative, you have the initiative, Mr. Speaker, for moving immediately, to establish an appropriate body for the revision of the rules of this House. We have talked about it for years. The time for action is long since past.

The second point I wanted to make, by way of a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I for one—and I do not pretend to speak even for the rest of my group, let alone for the rest of the House, at the moment—I for one am not going to be threatened with the proposition that if you bring in a motion to deal with a matter of urgent public importance, that then it is off the order paper for the rest of the year, because that rule has never been lived up to in this House.

Every time we have a motion that comes in on a private bill, or a private resolution, and we deal with it in this House, presumably never again in the Legislature can that be raised, even by a member of the government. An hon. member reminds me that there is no vote on a private member's bill or resolu-

tion. Well, I suppose that is the catch, there is no vote and so you have got us over the barrel.

Let me put my case on something that is wholly on sound ground. The amendments that we consider to the Throne Speech are kitchen sink amendments, they include everything. The Liberals lead off and we have no alternative but to add to it, so the kitchen sink is very overcrowded. In fact, most of the business of the House is out of order from that point forward, that is, when the vote of the Throne Speech has been taken, because these matters have already been voted on in the amendment to the Throne Speech. So, I refuse, Mr. Speaker, to be intimidated with the threat that if we bring in a motion of urgent public importance that item can never be discussed again. You would be enforcing a rule which we honour in the breach all the rest of the time in our conduct of the business of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me back to my first point, that the rules of the House should be studied and revised. I suggest, if nobody else is willing to take the initiative, that it rest with yourself, sir.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There are few subjects that are of more importance to the way in which we do our business in this House.

Mr. Speaker: If you would give me the floor, for a moment, I would like the hon. member for York South to explain to Mr. Speaker, whether the threat and the intimidation that he is talking about is being imputed to Mr. Speaker. The speech which the hon. member has just made is one which I, as Mr. Speaker, will not accept if there is any such imputation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if you are taking it personally, I withdraw the comment in terms of you personally. But I am a little puzzled as to why you have become very sensitive, on prompting from the Clerk of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will read what the Clerk of the House sent me: "This is all out of order, debating a ruling already upheld. He is speaking now of an entirely different rule."

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I am pointing out that the hon. member should make plain that he is not imputing threats and intimidations to Mr. Speaker. All Mr. Speaker did was explain to

the hon. member from his party what the rules were, as he understood them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, it was the hon. leader of the Opposition who rose and raised this matter. I have become a little puzzled at the sensitiveness of this matter and the time when you get angry, sir. And if one person can get angry, two people can get angry in this House. I have said, sir, that every time this matter has been raised with you and your predecessors we are faced with the threat that if this motion is brought in, never in the rest of that session can we debate the same matter. I ask you, sir, why it is that you enforce the rules in this specific instance, which denies the Opposition the right to bring in a matter of urgent public importance, when we breach that rule throughout the whole of the session, regularly, every session, after the Throne Debate has been voted on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made himself plain now, by saying that it is the present Mr. Speaker and his predecessors. I accept his comments, and they are quite, as far as I am concerned, proper, although according to the Clerk of the House, out of order. The hon. member for Sudbury had a point of order.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that few subjects are of more importance than a discussion of the way in which we conduct our business in this House, indeed the efforts to make what goes on in this place relevant to the life of the province in general. Now, it is a mistake to think, sir, that in the nation's capital they do not do some things that are of very superior quality. I want to remind you that the House of Commons in Ottawa has recently, in a very progressive way, updated the rules that apply to that House.

In addition, sir, for a long time they have had a book of Canadian precedents, to which they have adhered, whereas we in this House—and I suppose it is an outgrowth of the nineteenth-century provincialist attitude that led us to look across the sea to the mother of Parliaments at Westminster. Now, sir, this discussion today is very germane because tonight I shall take the opportunity to look at that rule again. I always thought the rule was, that a member seeking to move to adjourn the House and discuss a matter of urgent public importance, had the opportunity in the House to state his reasons briefly, and to draw attention to the circumstances that led him to make that request.

Mr. MacDonald: There were a lot of efforts to achieve this down through the years.

Mr. Sopha: We were put in the position today, by the method adopted in that group, of not having the faintest idea of what the rumours were or what the background was. In fact we had no information at all on what motivated the member from Cochrane South, and accordingly we had no alternative, in acting responsibly, but to support you in your ruling. And we will stand by that decision today, and that is the way I assume the leader of this group—well, I will leave that, I will leave that because I am not seeking to quarrel.

Mr. Lewis: Well done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I want to make this additional point. If I spent some time this evening, I would refresh my memory about a speech I made two or three years ago—I think it was two years ago—advocating the initiation of a rule updating process and I recall at that time—and I think it is not unfair to say to the leader of the government—that if I looked at his speech, made immediately after mine, I would see where he said that the rules were just fine and that everything was hunky-dory and we could go on and live with them.

Well, I say to you sir, in relation to this point of order, it has been demonstrated that we cannot live much longer in this type of environment and some initiative has to be seized. So, may I, in furtherance of what the hon. member for York South has said—because I am so intensely concerned about this—may I ask you, sir, whether tomorrow you will give us guidance, having reflected about it overnight, as to whether one of us, or a number of us, in the official Opposition, perhaps in both parties, might put some form of resolution on the order paper, or take some other initiative, that would give you the power to initiate a revision of the rules? At the same time I suggest, because of the success of the Ottawa exercise, that it be done by the members of this House themselves.

I do recall, speaking historically—and I have studied this matter, that a number of years ago, I guess it would be maybe 12 or 15 years ago, there was a parliamentary committee that looked into the rules, under the chairmanship of a former speaker of the House. And the only place that report can be found, I assure you, is in the journals of the House, a copy of which is behind the throne. It was never published in any other form. It gathers dust and it is completely

forgotten. But I want to urge upon you some initiative, at a very early date, whereby we might seize this thing and I hope this impels the leader of the government to make some observations about it today.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I would be delighted to, Mr. Speaker. I have quite a list of amendments I would like to propose to the rules of this House, and I would be happy to meet with the leaders of the two other parties at any time. I have been working on these for some considerable time; I have mentioned them upon occasions to both the leaders of the other parties. We have amended the rules—

Mr. MacDonald: The initiative rests with the government.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have amended the rules periodically through the years since I have been here. I do not think a single session has gone by when we have not had some alteration or amendment to the rules. I would, however, be quite prepared and happy to play my part in putting forth what I think the amendments should be. I will arrange, with Mr. Speaker, to convene a meeting of the two other leaders, and myself, and perhaps they will then be ready to make their suggestions as well.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a point of order, until such time as the rules are revised, I wish to point out that it is quite essential that we follow all the rules, because we cannot break them sometimes and not at other times. Some three weeks ago, a member of this party made a motion within the rules of the House that a question be put and at that time the rules of the House were ignored. Today, where the cap fits somewhat differently, the rules of the House are followed strictly. Now, until such time as the rules are revised, the ruling must be applied evenly.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that was raised originally, without reference to this other matter that has been brought in. I must say, in response to the offer from the Premier to convene a meeting of the party leaders that the rules might be adjusted, that while I am quite prepared to take part in that discussion, I feel that the rules, if they are changed, should be changed as a result of a committee of this House, not necessarily just the party leaders. He surely is in agreement with that view and would take the initiative to set up such a committee, whether it is a select committee or some other vehicle, whereby we can review what we are doing.

Now, I would also like to disassociate myself from some of the comments that have been made from my left, because certainly it is within the powers of Mr. Speaker to set precedents himself. When certain occasions come up where it is necessary in his view to interpret the rules in a certain way, then he does so, and he is either sustained by the House or overruled by the House and the precedents of Mr. Speaker are kept in a list in our book of rules and we are supposed to go by them.

So surely the objection that has been raised by the leader of the New Democratic Party that Mr. Speaker does not have this in his armoury as far as controlling the House is concerned, is simply unacceptable. But I would hope that, when we come to review the rules of the House—and it is obvious, we must do it very soon—that it be a committee of the House involving Mr. Speaker or one of Mr. Speaker's predecessors, if that might be better.

We should do it that way and not by some meeting just of the three leaders to decide, or try to decide, among themselves what the course of events should be.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, may I say that some three or four years ago the former hon. member for Woodbine, Ken Bryden, requested the establishment of a committee to do precisely this. We have drifted for four or five years.

I would agree on this small point with the leader of the Opposition—I am not interested in sitting down with the Prime Minister other than to hand in proposals for a change and get them to a committee. It is a little ludicrous to suggest that the three leaders, busy as we are, are going to come together with proposals and rescue the ones that the Prime Minister has allowed to accumulate dust—and then suddenly introduce them.

It has to be handed to a committee for study. And I do not know that there is really any need for the leaders of the parties to meet to initiate the whole process. If it requires a committee, let the Prime Minister introduce a motion to establish a committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one final comment on the observations of the leader of the Opposition. We have had interpretations in this House by the Speaker, so that we have a series of precedents which are contradictory.

Mr. Nixon: What makes the hon. member think it will be the last word?

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Because he is the only one who says anything.

Mr. MacDonald:—and it is like the Bible. You can get a precedent to support anything you want. Therefore, another ruling by a Speaker in the sequence that you presumably have to live up to—or at least observe because it is in the book—is just a backdoor method for changing the rules of the House.

When we have a set of rules that are generally acceptable, I would agree that the Speaker's re-interpretation upon receiving approval of the House, is a fair procedure. But not in the chaos that we have at the moment. This is just a further addition to the chaos and creates a further contradiction in the precedence the House tries to live by.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to add a footnote to the addendum of the parenthesis of what has gone before. Not being a member of the elect, sir, of the House triumvirate which has been alluded to, I would like to suggest—as the member for York South has indicated that all of us in this House, as private members of the House, would wish to participate in the alteration of the rules rather than having them somewhat gratuitously handed to us, and that it is now appropriate to appoint that committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this has been talked about for all the ten years that I have been here. Now, it is very interesting to hear the—

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member a point of order?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the same point of order that the other gentlemen spoke to and I am just as entitled as they are to speak to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue. This has been talked about for as many years as I have been in the House and nobody does anything about it. It is always a good thing to do but it is never being done.

In fact, a year ago the hon. members who are members of the third party voted against a resolution put by my leader to set up just such a committee. It is there, it is in *Hansard*, and that is what they did.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Oh, come on!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): What a revolting development!

Mr. Lewis: That was his "John Robarts is a nice man" resolution.

Mr. Singer: Now then, in addition, Mr. Speaker, before we started on the estimates the hon. Prime Minister indicated that there was going to be some resolution brought forward about how we might deal with the estimates. Notwithstanding that good intention, we are dealing with the estimates in the same old time-wasting, time-consuming repetitious way.

Now, the House really is controlled—and there is no doubt — by the leader of the government as long as he has as many votes as he has.

The only way we are going to get a change of rules is not from you, sir, with great respect, it is only if the Prime Minister wants it. And the fact that we are labouring under these ancient, archaic, unfair rules is the fault of the Prime Minister. The only way we are going to get them changed is if the Prime Minister does something.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview has just talked about wasting the time of this House. If that party and the government had accepted the responsibility today, we would be debating Texas Gulf rather than the rules of this House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. members have precipitated a debate where a debate is not allowable, but after listening to the views of the members, I felt it was desirable that everyone who wished to speak on this at this time should do so. I would say that no one would be happier than the Speaker for the time being with a set of rules which everyone would agree with.

I, as the Speaker, at the present time feel that is an impossibility, and not to be expected from human nature. I would also like to advise the hon. members that there have been overtures and meetings when this matter has been brought up. And it has not been entirely forgotten by either the leaders of the Opposition parties, or by the Prime Minister.

I would also like to assure the House that I feel the proper way now to deal with this is a combination of what has been said on both sides of the House. The hon. members will remember that Mr. Speaker is responsive to the House—but to a majority of the members of the House. And so far, the great

majority of the members of this House have not made their voices heard.

So my view is that we should follow—and I will endeavour to do so — the suggestion made by the Prime Minister to have a meeting of the three leaders. Then, if they agree a committee is the proper solution, the necessary action would have to be taken by someone other than Mr. Speaker.

But it seems to me that the Prime Minister's suggestion is a way to get the matter moving, particularly in view of the fact that it has been set out—which is quite correct—that the running of the House is up to the leader of the government members, the Prime Minister. If it is then agreeable with the members of the House as a body, I would propose to proceed with the matter in this manner. And at least something will be started.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister.

Part of this was asked last Thursday—the third question—when the questions pertaining to Ontario's legal right to the land on the lakefront was being answered by the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall).

So I would ask the Premier: What is the basis of Ontario claims to all lakefront land west of Toronto Island airport? And will the Premier appoint an impartial commission to assess this claim in view of the Metro council chairman's strong opposition, or does he intend to have it settled by judicial decision?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it will require an impartial commission. It is difficult for me to give you the legal basis upon which these claims have been made. Obviously there is some doubt as to who has title to the land and frankly, until this is settled, it is very difficult to do anything with the land in question. It has to be settled one way or the other. We have to establish a title.

I do not anticipate any great difficulty in settling the matter. There are certain bills that have been passed to deal with it and the lawyers really are looking at it at the present time. I would not want to attach to this whole thing more significance than it really rates. May I put it that way? Because certainly it is not the intention of this government to hold up whatever development may take place along the waterfront because of ancient flaws in titles.

But in order to correct them, you have got to find out what they are, and I am quite

certain that once we get them spread out and have a look at what the flaws in the titles are, we will be able to work it out on a satisfactory basis. But I do not think it will take an impartial commission. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. Nixon: It may lead to court action?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It might, but I even have some doubts about that. I really think we have to see what the total picture is before we can say how we are going to attack it. It is not a question of a land grab on the part of the government. We are not trying to take anything away from anybody else.

There are agreements in the past which no doubt we will honour, but it is just a little difficult to decide what the situation is—as any lawyer in this House will tell you—until we have hammered out what the legal position is. Then, if we have to give a quit claim deed to somebody to legalize what has happened in the past, we are prepared to do so. But that is the kind of thing we have got to ascertain.

Mr. Nixon: Well, might I ask a supplementary question? If the Premier was not sure of their position, why did the government move so definitely without getting it settled?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think we are quite settled in what we are doing now.

There are two things here. One is the actual fill that is taking place. I do not think there is any doubt about that. There are some questions about previous properties that have been dealt with over a long period of years. That is where the doubt is. But with any land that is created as a result of present filling operations, I do not think there is any doubt in anyone's mind that that belongs to the province.

Mr. Nixon: I will tell the Premier the doubt that is in my mind was raised by the statement of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development when he said the land was incorrectly deeded to the city of Toronto some 50 years ago. Now I do not know how the Premier can explain, or how he can expect the Metropolitan council to nod and say, "Oh yes, that was incorrect," without some basis of fact in argument?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think the hon. Minister was speaking on the basis of advice given him by his own lawyers, but that is not applicable to the land we are talking about—that we are filling.

Mr. Singer: The Premier means he spoke out of turn?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not mean he spoke out of turn at all. I do not think he spoke out of turn at all.

Mr. Singer: That is all right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I really do not think he spoke out of turn at all.

Mr. Singer: Even the *Telegram* called him arrogant.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh well, all right, all right—sticks and stones.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): It has called the hon. member that many times.

Mr. Singer: The whole bunch of them collectively.

Mr. Lewis: That must terrify them when the *Telegram* moves in on them.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Nixon: This question is to the Premier and it dates from last Thursday.

What action will the Premier take to bring an end to what has been referred to in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of March 20, as an "outstanding lack of co-ordination and co-operation among various government departments" associated with regional government planning?

Would the Premier agree that these matters should have been co-ordinated and directed from his office so that inter-departmental conflicts would not now be holding up progress in these related fields?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for High Park who has a similar question also from last Thursday would place it at this time and the Prime Minister could answer both—question 958.

Mr. Shulman: What was the number of the question?

Mr. Speaker: Question 958.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. For the Prime Minister:

1. Is today's *Globe and Mail* correct in stating that there is "an outstanding lack of co-operation" between the Departments of Municipal Affairs and Treasury?

2. If so, what steps does the Prime Minister intend to take to improve this situation?

3. In the Prime Minister's opinion, would the replacement of one or both of the responsible Ministers solve this problem?

4. In the Prime Minister's opinion, which of the two Ministers would it be preferable to replace?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I do not agree with the story in the *Globe and Mail*, all the rest of the questions are irrelevant.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer's estimates will be before us perhaps later in the day or tomorrow and we can ask him his views. I do not think that he would have any doubt as to what the changes would be.

I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister comment on the report in Saturday's *Toronto Star* saying that "a senior provincial government official" indicated that Ontario's main purpose in staking claim to 52,000 acres of waterfront land and lake bed is to influence development of Metro's proposed Harbour City?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, just to show you how things get out of context, that was 52,000 acres when I got it today and I just moved the decimal point back one.

The province has not made a specific claim for 5,200 acres along the Metro Toronto waterfront. What I stated today, and what I stated last week to the Metro executive, was to point out that the province has one of the major interests in the central waterfront area, including the proposed harbour city development.

In our view, many of the grants made by the federal government in this area are questionable—they still are and Ottawa is looking at it—as the water lots in this area are primarily provincial. We believe that in the interest of all concerned, the actual ownership of the lands involved should be decided upon. It has never been our intention—and I restated this this morning to the Metro executive—to take over parklands that are being used as parklands.

If the province has a major land interest in the harbour city development, I am sure that the Legislature would expect me to carefully consider all of the province's interests in this vital development, and this is the course that I have followed on the government's behalf.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I think the government is over its head.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask further. The Minister, as I understood it, said that many of the grants are questionable and Ottawa is looking at them. Has the government of Ontario asked Ottawa to review their decision to grant the title to this land?

Mr. Singer: What does the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) say on all this? It should be his department.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister has his own lawyers.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Our people have discussed the grants previously given by the federal government, which are called quit claim deeds. Now I am not a lawyer, but your friend on your right there can point out that a quit claim deed is where the federal government—

Mr. Singer: Even the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) shudders.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —the federal government has given every right that it has, but it says if anybody comes back and objects then you must be prepared to fight it on the other fellow's grounds.

What we have suggested here is if we are going to build on Harbour City, and some of that land is a quit claim deed, I am sure that Harbour City themselves, or the harbour commission, would like to know if they have the right to build on that land. This is what we are trying to clear for the harbour commission, and also for Metro, in these discussions of the claims that we have listed for them.

I might say to the House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker—I think it is reported in the press at noon, I have not seen it—that we had a very good meeting this morning. All matters with reference to the waterfront at the Exhibition were settled, and we will expect to be dumping fill in there, starting on Wednesday morning.

Mr. Nixon: Did you say that Ottawa was looking at it, or not, and if so, how are they getting involved in this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Ottawa is looking at the claims that they granted 50 years ago—yes, they are looking at them.

Mr. Singer: We have 23 departments and 23 legal opinions.

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

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Prime Minister but he has vanished, so I will have to withhold it again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: The word is quik—q-u-i-k—not quit.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: A question to the Minister of Health—and a slight typographical error has crept into this, I note, Mr. Minister:

Have employees of The Department of Health been asked to sign an affidavit that they have not and/or will not, give any information to *Farm and Country* concerning the government's pesticides advisory committee?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. What did the hon. member say the typographical error was?

Mr. MacDonald: "Have not" and "will not".

Mr. Speaker: Instead of "did not".

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, no employees of The Department of Health have been asked to sign an affidavit that they have not—and I have "did not"—but I will alter that to say that they will not be asked to sign an affidavit that they will not give any information to *Farm and Country* concerning the government's pesticides advisory committee.

However, I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a rule in my department that releases to the press are authorized by myself.

Mr. MacDonald: Just so that we are not playing games, may I ask the Minister whether or not this matter has been discussed with the employees—affidavit or any other procedure apart? Have the employees been canvassed as to whether or not any one of them may have been the so-called source, or leak, with regard to the story that was carried in *Farm and Country* on the pesticides committee.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker, they have not and I do not intend that they will be.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the Minister of Mines.

During consideration of the estimates last year, the Minister stated that the government was putting pressure on Texas Gulf to build their copper smelter in Timmins, even

though there was a copper smelter as close as Noranda, but that the location of a zinc smelter might be anywhere in the province of Ontario. In view of the fact that ore shipped from the Kidd Creek mine has turned out to be primarily zinc, has the government re-considered its position and insisted that the zinc smelter should be in the Timmins area?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South has a similar question addressed to the same Minister. Perhaps he would place it now.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; question of the Minister of Mines.

During his estimates last year, the Minister informed the House that Texas Gulf was engaged in two feasibility studies concerning the location of their zinc and copper smelters and, in late November, the Minister, in reply to my question, informed the House that the company could not meet the deadline. Will the Minister now inform the House of the present status of those feasibility studies and the latest developments concerning the location of the two smelters?

Second question: in view of the growing uncertainty about the smelter location announcements, is the government prepared to introduce legislation to guarantee that a maximum degree of processing of our natural resources will take place within the province, preferably at the location of the ore body?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question asked by the leader of the NDP and the last part of the question asked by the hon. member for Cochrane South, I would say to you that if there is any change in government policy required, it will be announced in this House in due course.

In respect of the two feasibility studies: My information from the company is that the feasibility study respecting the copper smelter has not yet been completed. They have not yet received it. In relation to the feasibility study regarding the location of their zinc smelter, they have completed it and they are carrying on very intensive negotiations at the moment with the government respecting the location.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Etobicoke.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer of Ontario. Many small firms, in planning their manufacturing needs for the years 1969

and 1970, ordered equipment late in 1968 or early in 1969, before the new tax was suggested. Due to the time required to manufacture certain equipment, delivery, in many cases, will not be made until after April 1, 1969.

Often such equipment is sent FOB point of manufacture. Such equipment becomes the property of the purchaser the moment the transport pulls away from the equipment manufacturer's plant somewhere in the U.S.A. In the light of the foregoing, would the Minister advise:

1. Whether equipment invoiced and shipped before the end of March, but not received in Ontario until after April 1, will be taxable under the new five per cent sales tax on production machinery?

2. Will any special consideration be given to cases where equipment belonging to the purchaser is shipped in March but does not arrive at the purchaser's plant until after April 1, 1969?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I am going to quote from "Circular 69-1 Vendor Information Service", published by the retail sales tax branch under date of March 24, which is today and which will be in the mail to all vendors today. I think the sections of the bulletin that I will read and which I will make available to the hon. member will provide the answers to the questions:

Delayed delivery: Goods may be considered as tax exempt under each of the following conditions:

(a) The goods were shipped FOB supply point or point of origin and were in the hands of a common carrier at the purchaser's risk before April 1, 1969.

(b) The goods have been sold to the purchaser, can be physically identified as belonging to him and are held at the purchaser's risk prior to April 1, 1969.

(c) The goods are in bond or in transit and are owned by the purchaser prior to April 1, 1969.

Now with respect to contracts for production machinery, contracts entered into prior to April 1, 1969, involving production machinery and not completed as of that date are subject to the "delivery date" rule. This means all machinery and equipment delivered on or after April 1, 1969, under such contracts, is subject to tax.

I will make a copy of this circular available to the hon. member, for his information.

Mr. Braithwaite: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is that circular to be sent to American manufacturers as well?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would rather think that it would be sent to all vendors in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Will the Minister investigate a report that discriminatory action taken by Ontario Hydro management against the members of Local 18 of the United Carpenters Union at Nanticoke has resulted in the loss of wages for the employees and threatens the success of the project?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the action reported to have been taken by the Ontario Hydro management was not discriminatory. It was taken within the terms of the current applicable labour agreement and is not expected to influence the success of the Nanticoke project.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Deans: Is the Minister aware that the action that was taken by Ontario Hydro management against the carpenters was directed against the carpenters only, and that this action was not taken against the other trades and therefore it was, in effect, a discriminatory action?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I was not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

When will the Minister reply to my letter of January 15, 1969, drawing to his attention the exceedingly small print used by Weston Credit Jewellers in an advertisement calling for carrying charges of 38.5 per cent and in case of default, additional interest of ten per cent plus collection costs?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, an answer to the hon. member's letter has

been mailed. It was delayed, awaiting confirmation that the company accepted the direction from the Consumer Protection Bureau and changed the format of their advertisement to give greater prominence to the section disclosing interest charges on time sales.

Default charges are standard practice on all contracts of this nature. Purchasers are expected to meet the provisions of the contract and penalties are imposed when they fail to do so.

Mr. Stokes: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Does the Minister not think that 38.5 per cent is an outrageous rate? And what was the result of his representations to the sales agency?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It sounds like a good deal of money, but I simply say that the rates of interest in such transactions are controlled by the federal government.

Mr. Stokes: Pardon me, as a supplementary, the Minister said that the matter had been taken up with the sales agency; what was their reaction to it?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is right. On the basis of making the disclosure of the facts more prominent.

Mr. Stokes: Did they give that commitment that they would make them more prominent?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, we have not received that back from the company mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Attorney General.

Does the Minister consider as just, a 90-day sentence handed out to Robert F. McCarthy by Judge Michael Cloney on March 20 at Toronto Provincial Court for non-payment of a \$1.80 breakfast eaten at the Royal York Hotel?

Second question, does the Minister intend to intervene in this matter?

And the third question, will Mr. McCarthy have to serve the full sentence?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I made inquiries into this matter and my officials advise me that on November 29, 1968, Mr.

Robert F. McCarthy, an American citizen, visited the coffee shop at the Royal York Hotel, ordered a meal and then did not pay for it. Mr. McCarthy was charged under section 307, subsection 2 of the Criminal Code which deals with obtaining food by fraud.

The gentleman appeared in court and was given a suspended sentence. On January 10, 1969, he was deported to the United States. On March 14 of this year, in the same hotel around 7.30 a.m. Mr. Robert F. McCarthy ordered breakfast and again did not pay for the meal.

Mr. McCarthy was charged under the same section of the Criminal Code and on March 21, 1969, he was convicted and sentenced to 90 days.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He still will not be charged for his meals.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to intervene in this matter. I believe the suspended sentence in the first case, and the deportation, speaks for itself.

As to serving the full sentence, there is a matter of good conduct remission which is 13 days off a sentence, and of course the gentleman can make application also to the National Parole Board. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I have further evidence of this man's criminal conduct in the United States. I will not read it to the House.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? I can understand the court may have records and so on, but it seems to me—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member will place his question.

Mr. Makarchuk: Very well, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that other people have managed to abscond with about a million and a half and get a similar—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is not asking a supplementary question, he is making a statement.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, will the Minister pro-rate this particular term, perhaps, or sentence?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The member wants to know whether he got two eggs or one.

Mr. Lewis: He has served his sentence by eating at the Royal York.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a question of the Prime Minister, which

perhaps he would place. It is a question from March 21, No. 967.

Mr. Shulman: I have a number of questions of the Prime Minister. May I put the question to the Prime Minister, who is in his seat now?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, would you ask that and then go on with the rest of your questions?

Mr. Shulman: What steps is the province taking to collect the \$41 million owed to Ontario by the federal government for health aids under the federal-provincial sharing programme and in part dating back to 1957 for mental hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that this money is owing. We have taken many steps over the years, so far to no avail. But I will itemize the steps that have been taken and that we are taking and will provide the hon. member with an answer.

Mr. Shulman: May I suggest a good lawyer?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, it would not work. Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Provincial Treasurer from last week:

Why has his department refused to make the requested payroll deductions in the case of Mrs. Pearl Campbell, who is employed by The Ontario Department of Education, as outlined in a letter written by Mr. J. G. Demeza, superintendent, Ontario school for the deaf?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I saw this question for the first time today. I enquired about it and I find that the research to provide the answer for the hon. member is still proceeding. I hope to be able to answer the question within a day or so.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Speaker; in five parts:

1. Why did the Ontario Securities Commission delist the stock of the Great West Life Insurance Company from the Toronto Stock Exchange after the Toronto Stock Exchange had refused to do so?

2. Was the purpose of this de-listing to assist the management of Great West Life to prevent Great West Saddlery and the Bronfman family from gaining control of Great West Life?

3. Was the Minister aware of this action before it was taken?

4. If the Minister was not aware of this action, what disciplinary action does the Minister intend to take at the Ontario Securities Commission to prevent a recurrence?

5. If the Minister was aware of this action, was he at that time aware of the significance of what was being done?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, I am informed that on Friday, January 31, the commission — in light of the facts and circumstances which then existed—exercised its discretion in the public interest pursuant to the provisions of section 141(b) of The Securities Act, 1966, as amended, to suspend the trading of the shares of the Great West Life Assurance Company from January 31 until Tuesday, February 4, 1969, inclusive.

The answer to part two of the question is no. The events leading to the suspension are a matter of public record. Rumours of the proposed takeover bid by the Great West Saddlery Company Limited had resulted in the suspension of trading in the shares of both Great West Life and Great West Saddlery by the Toronto Stock Exchange for a period prior to January 31. Great West Saddlery made an announcement concerning the terms of the proposed takeover before the trading was reinstated.

The president of Great West Life, having certain plans and facts which he felt unable to release before they were presented to the Great West Life shareholders at the meeting to be held on February 4, requested that trading in those shares be suspended until the meeting was held and the facts announced.

The proposed takeover bid from Great West Saddlery, while announced, had not been made. The commission acceded to the Great West Life request just as it had done for Great West Saddlery the previous July 8.

The commission, in publishing its timely disclosure policy in its weekly summary of September 27 of 1968, stated in part:

It is essential that all investors be placed on an equal footing insofar as knowledge of the material facts regarding the company which has securities in the hands of the public.

Therefore, immediate disclosure of all material and significant information through news media is encouraged. Unfavourable facts must be disclosed as promptly, fully and plainly, as favourable facts.

And that was the content of the policy declared in that weekly summary I referred to.

With reference to part three of the question, the answer is no. The answer to part four of the question, none. And the answer to part five is that it is not applicable.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept two supplementary questions?

Would the Minister explain why, instead of delisting the stock, he did not instead order that the information be given out by Great West Life? And secondly, would the Minister explain to me how the actions taken by his department could be in the public interest when in effect they were merely to sustain the management of this company?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Would the member repeat the first part of the question?

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister explain why he did not demand disclosure of the facts which he suggested the president of Great West Life did not wish to release, rather than delisting the stock?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This was a decision taken by the commission itself without reference to me. They made a decision in the light of all the circumstances and it was their judgment that that was the proper course to follow.

As far as ordering the company to make the disclosure, I think at the time—and these would be my comments—that the time factor in making the disclosure public would have taken much longer and would not have been effective with respect to the time available and intervening before the annual meeting was to be held.

In addition to that, the company itself had requested that this action be taken. I might say that the Manitoba Securities Commission, where the company has its head office and where a large number of shareholders are domiciled, took similar action to that of the Ontario commission.

Now, the second part of the member's question has to do with—

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister explain how this action was in the public interest, rather than the interest of the president of Great West Life?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not think that this had to do with any proposition that was directed to Great West Saddlery at all. My understanding of the explanations which have

since been given to me was that it had to do with the disclosure aspect having to do with certain increases in dividends, or certain other situations which were going to be disclosed at the annual meeting of the Great West Life Company itself on the occasion of the annual meeting, and the most effective way of stopping any action in these weeks was to suspend the trading. The proper time for the announcement of any change in dividend policy was to be at the annual meeting.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a further supplementary?

As I understood the Minister to just say that the action taken had nothing to do with Great West Saddlery, is the Minister saying then that if a company is going to increase its dividends, it is better to delist the stock rather than force the announcement of the increase in dividends?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes, and the proper place for that statement to be made, in the course of the business of this company, was at the annual meeting.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General.

Was Mr. Stanley Dubreuil taken from his home in Windsor on August 16, 1968, by four Windsor policemen who were under the impression that he was mentally ill?

Was Mr. Dubreuil sent to the St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital by the Windsor police?

Was Mr. Dubreuil released by the St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital with the explanation that an error had been made?

Why and how did this incident occur?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and have an answer very shortly.

Mr. Shulman: Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health, in six parts.

Did a patient, Donald W. Hall, commit suicide in the Penetang Psychiatric Hospital on January 31, 1969?

Did this suicide occur after commencing Hall on a new drug?

Was the patient kept under close supervision after being put on a new medication—if not, why not?

How many suicides have occurred in Ontario Psychiatric Hospitals since January 1, 1969?

Are these suicides occurring because of inadequate supervision due to lack of staff?

What action does the Minister propose to take to prevent further occurrences of this nature?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes.

What the hon. member means by a new drug is quite beyond me. He was on medication and he was under close supervision at the time when he was on medication.

Four suicides have occurred. Three are still under investigation but no incident has been reported as due to lack of supervision because of inadequate staff.

The department has a routine in all of these cases. Every tragedy of this kind is reported to me immediately and a committee of investigation is immediately set up before the coroner becomes involved at all.

A full report is expected from every hospital and the coroner's report comes to us. We seek to follow all of the reasonable recommendations and some of them, I might admit, sir, are not reasonable. But every effort is made to prevent such tragic circumstances.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will hear it.

Mr. Shulman: If four suicides have occurred since January 1, 1969, would the Minister not agree that this number could be cut down by more complete supervision?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not. We are continually aware of the fact that the more freedom we give patients in the treatment of mental disorder, the more calculated risks we have to take. One of those calculated risks is the possibility that the patient will finally succeed in taking his own life. We do everything humanly possible, short of restraining or constricting the treatment, to prevent these tragic circumstances, but they do occur and they will occur, in spite of everything we do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South might wish to place his question from March 21.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

When will the report on the Niagara escarpment be made public?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is presently being examined by the various departments interested and when that examination is complete, it will go to a committee of

Cabinet. I cannot tell you just when that will be but when we have finished our examination of it, we will decide what we are going to do.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I may just make this comment.

I have had enquiries from at least two municipalities with regard to this, because it is holding up all of their planning. I would hope that the Prime Minister would move as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question outstanding from March 12, of the Minister of University Affairs.

In view of the story in the March 12 issue of the *Globe and Mail* regarding the comments of Mr. E. E. Stewart, Deputy Minister of University Affairs: Why does the Minister allow a civil servant in his department to make major policy statements at public meetings concerning the policies of the Minister's department before the Minister states his policies in the Ontario Legislature?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister was invited to—I think it was called a teach-in—by the faculty association of the University of Toronto, to discuss with them, along with others, the government policy and the committee on university affairs' recommendation in respect of university finance. There were a number of questions asked, with a certain amount of give and take.

As I read the press reports, which I assume are the same source of information as that of the member for Scarborough East, I fail to recognize any major policy statements that should have been made by the Minister. In fact, perhaps the member for Scarborough East and I, one of these days, Mr. Speaker, should get together and determine what constitutes policy.

I do not think there is anything in what the Deputy Minister said, as I read it, that constitutes any change or any major government policy. There may have been some explanation of the procedures, the rationale, but this surely is the responsibility of anyone who is involved in the governmental process.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Is it the policy of The Department of University Affairs that professors at university be

paid for only eight months if the teaching year continues only in the fall and winter semester, as Mr. Stewart stated at that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member perhaps is taking one portion of what was said.

The policy of the department really is very simply this. The department reacts to, as does the government, the recommendations of the committee on university affairs, which makes these determinations based on the formula.

I understand that the chairman of the committee on university affairs will be appearing before the committee on education tomorrow at 11 o'clock when the member for Scarborough East will have ample opportunity to get into the details of the formula and how these are determined, as far as the individual institutions are concerned.

Mr. T. Reid: Can I ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether this committee is an advisory committee and if so, whom it advises?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, surely the member for Scarborough East has not been here as a member for some period of time without recognizing that the committee of university affairs is an advisory committee to the government?

Mr. T. Reid: That makes it clear then why the Minister has a Deputy Minister.

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

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): A question of the Minister of Health.

In view of the \$10 million new plant expansion announced by Union Carbide for Welland on March 5, 1969, what is the department requiring the company to do to control pollution in this sophisticated plant expansion, which will produce graphite electrodes?

What is the department doing to control existing air pollution at the present Union Carbide factory?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, section 7 of The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967, requires that Union Carbide and all companies submit an application for a certificate of approval covering the plant expansion, as announced in this case on March 5, 1969.

To secure this certificate of approval the air pollution emissions from the plant will

have to meet the standards set in table 1 of Ontario Regulation 449-67 under the Act.

The second part of the hon. member's question: The existing Union Carbide plant at Welland has been surveyed under section 8 of The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967. This report will be completed shortly and the requirements will then be made upon the company, which will have to abide by them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Education arises as a result of the actions of the Toronto board of education late last week.

Will the Minister indicate if Mrs. Fiona Nelson will receive a board of reference, as requested by Mrs. Nelson and her federation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I communicated with both Mrs. Nelson and the Toronto board to ascertain if the requirements of The Schools Administration Act had been followed. As soon as we have the replies to these communications I will be in a position to inform the House whether a board of reference can be granted.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would comment on whether—if a board of reference is found not to be appropriate—whether the Minister would accept a tribunal, as suggested by the federation over the past week, as a means of bringing some justice into this situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think really it would be relatively unwise to explore alternatives to a decision that may or may not work out in appropriate fashion. I would prefer to answer that when I make the determination whether legally a board of reference can in fact be granted.

Mr. Pitman: Might I ask a further supplementary?

I wonder if the Minister would indicate how long it will take to get a decision of this nature? I am sure the Minister will realize how important time is to a teacher at this time of the year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, under The Schools Administration Act, as I recall it, I believe there are 30 days from the receipt of the application before the determination has to be made. In other words, I think it has to be made within 30 days. I think Mrs. Nelson's application was received in the department on March 5.

So quite obviously time is considered in the procedures and it would indicate to the hon. member there are not too many days to go before the information has to be there and a decision made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore has a question from last week of the Prime Minister.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has the Prime Minister given consideration to coinciding the Easter recess of this Legislature with that of the schools, so that the members, particularly the out-of-town ones, have an opportunity to be with their children during that period?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, yes, this was considered. As the timing of events in this House worked out, it seemed we had resumed for too short a period after Christmas.

In other words, our deciding to take a break from Easter related more to the length of time that this House has been sitting than to the fact that the children are out of school at that particular time. The matter is elastic, it can be adjusted to suit the members. I felt that this was really what the members wanted.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am with my children a good deal. Has the Prime Minister considered giving me a rest?

An hon. member: What about the hon. member's children?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a question.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): I have an outstanding question, Mr. Speaker; should we deal with that? The question of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that would be fine.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Outstanding from March 21. What is the hold-up in the claim of Sheldon Boutillier, claim number C-7433163, for settlement with the Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario, before Mr. Boutillier leaves Ontario for Prince Edward Island?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question: Arrangements have been made for Mr. Boutillier to be examined at the board's offices for disability assessment and this will take place prior to his proposed leaving for Prince Edward Island.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Minister. A question of the Minister of Trade and Development—a series of questions, Mr. Speaker.

What was the overriding factor in the Minister's decision in December last to make the residential tax rebate a benefit to all Ontario Housing Corporation's tenants, instead of the Minister's original intention that he would make the rebates only to those paying an economic rent?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister suggests that all the questions be placed and then they will be answered.

Mrs. M. Renwick: How does the Minister arrive at economic rent, and market rent?

How many Ontario Housing Corporation tenants pay an economic rent, and how many pay a market rent?

What was the total amount of rents received by the Ontario Housing Corporation in 1968, and for how many units?

What is the total amount to be allowed in rent deduction, in lieu of residential tax rebate, to Ontario Housing Corporation tenants and to how many tenants?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will take this question as notice and have these questions researched for the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have to leave and I have the answer to a question the hon. member for High Park asked on Friday. I wonder if I could be permitted to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: With the permission of the hon. member.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On Friday last, the hon. member for High Park asked a four-part question, number 971, Mr. Speaker. Was there a sit-down strike at Burwash on February 4? How many persons were involved? What was the reason? What disciplinary action was taken?

The answer to the first part of the question is: yes, there was a sit-down strike. The answer to the second part as to how many were involved is: 39 initially. After a brief meeting with the deputy superintendent, ten of the original inmates decided to go back to work, reducing the figure to 29. Later during the day, one additional inmate refused to work.

For the third part of the question, the reasons given by the inmates for their refusal

to work were as follows: one man complained of the insufficiency of concerts staged for the inmates' benefit by visiting entertainers; one man complained about the quality of the preparation of the food; one man complained of delay in being moved from his dormitory to the visiting room when he had a visit.

A few inmates complained about the quality of medical and dental treatment. Some complained about the delay in implementing the federal government's stated intention to equalize the rates of remission between the provincial and federal systems. They had read that this would take effect when the federal omnibus bill was passed and were demanding immediate action.

Another complaint was that the Ontario Parole Board, on a recent visit to the institution, refused to grant parole in the majority of cases reviewed at that time, and did not provide reasons for their decisions. This is the normal practice of the board, the reasons for which I gave in detail to the House last week.

The answer to the fourth part of the question is that the following disciplinary action was taken: each inmate involved in the refusal to work; forfeited good conduct remission and was placed in indefinite confinement on a special diet for a period not to exceed ten days.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question? Were any prisoners transferred to district jails because of this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, there were 13 transferred to jails.

Mr. Shulman: Then why did the Minister not mention that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because the hon. member did not ask that question. The hon. member asked the question, what disciplinary action was taken. As has been pointed out in the past, this is not disciplinary action. This is not punishment for having taken part in the action. Prisoners are removed to other institutions because they are the disturbers, the agitators who are the most likely to attempt to create further trouble. They have not been transferred for what might be termed disciplinary purposes.

Mr. Shulman: Would they have been transferred otherwise?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No; but, Mr. Speaker, this could be a very deceiving question and

one designed to bring on an answer which is not true.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us not make the answers more deceiving.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member had asked, on a previous occasion, whether transfer to jails was for punishment purposes. At that time I answered no, and I explained exactly what I have explained today. The ones who have created the disturbance are removed to jails if it is felt they will continue to be the agitators and perhaps create further disturbance. But this is not as part of their punishment. The punishment is precisely what the others have been meted out. In other words, loss of good conduct, remission, special diet, and so on.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister if any prisoners are still in solitary as a result of this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot answer that.

Mr. Shulman: Well, would he find out for me? Did the Minister say yes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In fact, I do not recall saying that. Do you mean whether they are in confinement?

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I cannot give you that answer. I do not have it. I will get it for you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre will please continue.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to relinquish the floor to the Minister of Correctional Services, but I had not finished speaking to you with regard to the questions to the Minister of Trade and Development. I would like to ask the Minister if he would accept a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Since it is notice, I cannot accept a supplementary, on this basis.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister points out correctly that until he has brought in an answer to the questions asked, a supplementary question would appear to be fruitless. So there will be no supplementary.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, is it wrong for me to have a question on the answer the Minister gave?

Mr. Speaker: Well, might I ask the hon. member to tell me what question and what answer she is referring to at the moment?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, when I asked questions one to six, the Minister replied he would be doing research. I would like to ask what research the Minister needs to do to answer question one?

Mr. Speaker: Well, that question would be out of order. When the Minister has made his research and given his answer, then the hon. member will be entitled to ask him a supplementary question—whether it would be answered or not—as to the type of research. There will be no supplementary questions, then, in connection with this question. As the Minister has pointed out, there has been no answer.

Mrs. M. Renwick: How many tenants of the Ontario Housing Corporation have not yet received their residential tax rebate? When did the first rent reductions in lieu of municipal tax rebate to Ontario Housing Corporation's tenants become effective? And by what date will they be completed?

Why were tax rebates for Ontario Housing Corporation tenants paid as late as March 1969, when all other landlords in Ontario were required by law to do this by the end of 1968? How many general welfare or family benefit recipients are tenants of the Ontario Housing Corporation?

In the Minister's letter to Ontario Housing Corporation tenants, in which he called the rebate a benefit he was pleased to bestow upon all Ontario Housing Corporation tenants to enjoy this benefit immediately, was there any mention that the same benefit from the Minister's department would be recalled at a later date by another Minister of the Crown, namely the Minister of Social and Family Services, if the recipient received any type of welfare benefit?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will take all this as notice, Mr. Speaker, and get the information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has questions now of the Minister of Social and Family Services?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. How many persons on either general welfare assistance, or family benefits pay more money for rent than they receive in shelter allowance, and what is the total amount of money involved?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the details of our case load are constantly changing in a number of ways. Rents vary from time to time and leases are being negotiated. People

move from one location to another, often with variation in the amount of rents. There is much movement on and off the case load—that is, new applicants becoming eligible and other recipients no longer eligible. In view of the constantly-changing nature of the case load, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to provide the information requested.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Another question of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

1. Are welfare administrators in Metro Toronto encouraged or allowed to seek the co-operation of the Ontario Housing Corporation in their attempts to house welfare recipients? Or do they rely solely on the Metro welfare housing department on George Street, which I understand, supplies only those landlords who will take welfare recipients as tenants at welfare rates for shelter?

2. What is the policy with regard to welfare administrators trying to cope with emergency housing cases such as evictions? Are they allowed or encouraged to work with the Ontario Housing Corporation on these cases, or are the administrators to rely on the one family hostel in Toronto on Dundas Street, where husbands are not allowed to stay with their families?

3. Why are husbands not allowed to stay with their families at this family hostel on Dundas Street?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, since all three parts of the question refer to matters affecting the Metro Toronto department of welfare, it would require consultation with members of that department. I would be pleased to obtain this information and answer the question at some later date.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 71st order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY
AND CITIZENSHIP
(Continued)

On vote 1701.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701—page 126. Carried?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Wait until the Minister's advisors find their places—he is helpless without them.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1701 agreed to?

On vote 1702: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): On vote 1701, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I thought it had been carried. However, if the hon. member was up, carry on.

Mr. De Monte: I was up. Mr. Chairman, I notice that, the vote is up \$51,500. Could the Minister tell me in what areas the increase took place?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): I think the end result is that the salary increases account for \$43,000 of this and the government hospitality vote is up \$25,000. We also have two decreases in memorial wreaths and in the maintenance vote.

Mr. De Monte: I notice your memorial wreaths item went down by \$2,000 but how many memorial wreaths do you hand out for \$10,500? Do you have the figure?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Approximately 600.

Mr. De Monte: 600! I notice in an item from last year's accounts, Mr. Chairman, of \$29,018.65 and it says United Kingdom, Princess Alexandra—what was that amount spent for in detail?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Is that in order, Mr. Chairman? He is asking a question in connection with the public accounts. Would that not be the public accounts committee? He should not be asking that question in this vote.

Mr. Chairman: I think that this is quite correct, that we had discussed the matter of the debating of public accounts previously. I think it is quite in order for the hon. member to direct a question to the Minister as to whether or not the same item is in this year's vote, so that he can relate the previous year's public accounts to this year's vote.

Mr. De Monte: I know that this item is not in this year's vote, Mr. Chairman. I am wondering, are you going to—

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): You cannot ask what it is; the NDP made that clear last time on the vote.

Mr. De Monte: Well do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is not going to answer that question?

Mr. Chairman: I was not certain that the hon. member had directed a direct question to the hon. Minister. Is the hon. Minister—

Mr. De Monte: Perhaps the hon. Minister then would tell me if there is a similar item in this year's budget, or estimates—surely I can ask—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, just because something is in the public accounts, does not rule out its discussion when the Minister is before the House, because the public accounts committee has a limited number of members. It is the only opportunity that the other members of the House get to question actions in the past, and we have always, in the past, been able to refer to public accounts and to get an explanation for expenditures when the committee estimates come before the House.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, before you answer that question, just so there will not be any misunderstanding; in the absence of the hon. member we did have this matter out during the discussion of one of my colleague's estimates. I was simply going along with the ruling that was made at that time and supported by your group in the House.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, I am sorry—it was not—I take that back.

Mr. Ben: It was not even put to a vote.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I take it back.

Mr. Ben: All right. It was not even put to a vote. What the other party said was that we cannot go to the public accounts, but our position was that we can ask questions. The Chairman rephrased the question so that it did not make sense but he rephrased it so that the question was, "Can you debate the public accounts?"

Our point was, "Can we ask a question," and that is not debating. But then the NDP said, "Well, you cannot question the government so—"

Mr. Lewis: I wonder that the princess ever visited us at all!

Mr. Chairman: Well the Chairman had ruled last week that, to come to the committee of supply which is debating this year's estimates, we can make reference to previous public accounts by way of questions such as "is the same item in here for this year's estimates, or has it increased or decreased."

The hon. Minister has remarked that this particular item is not in. We are debating this year's estimates. Now, to come to this com-

mittee to debate the public accounts, as such, without relating them to this year's estimates, in the opinion of the Chairman, is not the reason for this committee. We are here to debate the estimates. Reference may be made to the previous public accounts, but not to take the public accounts and debate the previous accounts in their entirety, or in part thereof, without relating them to this year's estimates.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, do you not distinguish between a question and a debate? If I ask you your name are you suggesting I am debating?

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, surely I have a right to find out in connection with these estimates what was spent last year in the amount of \$29,018.65. Surely I should be able to find out why that money was being spent and for what, in relating it to these estimates.

I notice that these estimates now, for hospitality, are up to \$90,000. The 1967-68 estimates were \$200,000 and change. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what \$29,018.65 was spent for in that particular account.

Mr. Ben: We should put it to a vote, the government only has eight members in the House.

Mr. Singer: Continuing on this point of order, Mr. Chairman, surely if the public accounts revealed some great scandal and it had been ascertained at the public accounts committee; are you suggesting that when the appropriate Minister brings his estimates before the House that we cannot criticize him for that information that is revealed in the statement of public accounts, which incidentally, Mr. Chairman, is tabled before us at just about the same time as the estimates are brought before us?

Now, the public accounts committee has what—eight or nine members on it—it does not deal with every department every year. Whether it deals with the Provincial Secretary or not I do not know, but it would seem to me that you are cutting off the legitimate opportunity for criticism that we have at this time on the estimates when the appropriate Minister is before the House. I do not know what happened in the discussion on another day—apparently I was not here when it took place, but if that ruling was made, with the greatest respect, sir, I think it was wrong. You are limiting our ability to debate and our ability to call the Minister to answer for

his past actions. The fact that it may, or may not, be dealt with by another committee of which only eight or nine of us are members, is no answer at all.

Mr. Chairman: Well, if the Chairman may just comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Downsview. The Chairman has no desire or intention of restricting debate in connection with these estimates in any way, shape or form. However, on the occasion previously mentioned, the hon. member came in and, without any reference whatsoever to this year's estimates, the questions put were "Now, what is this figure in the public accounts for a certain period consisting of?" There was no reference whatsoever to this year's estimates.

The Chairman maintains that in dealing with the estimates under general expenditure, vote 1701, the hon. member may refer to the matter of government hospitality funds for example, which is \$90,000, relate it back to the public accounts of a prior period, and in that manner bring in discussion on the previous public accounts. But, to debate the public accounts as such is not, in the opinion of the Chair, the proper place in this committee of supply.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, where is the proper place?

Mr. Chairman: We have a committee on public accounts.

Mr. Singer: But that is no answer. Surely all members of the House—this is one of our sacred rights—all members of the House are entitled to find out when the appropriate Minister is before the House, what money was spent for. This is the only opportunity we have in the whole session.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has no intention whatsoever of permitting any long, drawn-out debate in connection with whether or not we can permit debate on the public accounts, whether they should be restricted or not. I put it up to the hon. member if he feels that is a fair and proper place in this committee, proceed.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, if I may, on just one point: The example that you gave us was that we should ask first, is there a similar amount in this year's estimate?

Mr. Chairman: I suggested that would be a proper question.

Mr. Ben: Surely a logical sequence of events would be to ask, for what purpose

did you require \$51,000 as shown in the public accounts for the last fiscal period? If that answer is given, the next logical question is, are you making the same expenditure in this year's estimates? It would be rather stupid to ask if you have the same amount in this year's estimates without even knowing—

Mr. Chairman: I do not wish the hon. member in any way to appear stupid, so he may ask any question he wishes.

Mr. De Monte: Well again, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, through you, what was the \$29,018.65 spent for? Itemize it, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I cannot give it itemized, but I will be glad to obtain it. The total amount to which the member makes reference was what was spent during Centennial year as the entertainment and functions for Princess Alexandra, as part of a series of special guests we had in this province during our Centennial year. The actual breakdown of that figure which the member quotes, I will have to get for him, but that was the total.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, continuing on with this government hospitality fund for a few minutes when you talk about spending this considerable sum, first of all you obviously make no provision for it in advance of the case. I mean it is three or four or five times greater than anything you did make provision for. Surely you realized the Centennial year was on its way—it only happens once in 100 years.

And if you look in the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information we just completed, there is in excess of \$900,000—going on to a million dollars—for entertainment and other forms of expenses under his estimates. We turn over to your estimates and run into another \$200,000 when you voted \$40,000 to start with.

My main objection to it is, at least in part, the way it falls. It looks to me that there is a greater tendency now—and I would like some explanation from the Minister—to allocate moneys under these things to the press, to the journalists. Now, the reasons for my objections are obvious on the face of them. I would not want to see—and I am sure the hon. Minister would not see—the press subverted under a hospitality fund.

But on four occasions in the year of the public accounts which we are discussing—I might relate it to the present year and I trust it does not happen and is not in your

present budgeting arrangements, despite the fact you have increased it to \$90,000—you gave out money to the Canadian ethnic press association in excess of \$2,000, the Canadian weekly newspapers association for \$1,600; then again, what was mentioned, the Toronto Men's Press Club By-Line Ball, \$4,500; and again the Ontario Weekly Newspaper Association, close to \$1,000.

This is the first time that it appeared to public knowledge. In occasions in the past the press have been mentioned, but just once, as I recall. But here it seems to be getting to proliferate, and I want to scotch it, if humanly possible, and get some assurances. I cannot imagine why the press would need sums of money to start with, and there are a number of other items here. I cannot imagine why they would need your assistance at all either.

But just staying on that one point, I wonder if the Minister would have any comment to make.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I think when this matter comes before us annually, the very important point that we keep in mind is that we do not apply a means test in the disposition of these funds. I am sure that one could take a look at the applicants from time to time who write to the department in connection with their convention or seminars and come to the conclusion that there is not any one of them that could not afford to have it themselves, if that were the only test, namely, a means test.

Surely the hospitality fund is what it says, it is an opportunity for the government of Ontario to extend hospitality to those who come to this province to have their meetings or their functions. Now, if this is the case, the name of the organization or the function of the group, really is not relevant, and it just so happens that, in the movement around Canada the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association meet in Toronto this year and next in Regina.

I want to underline that the main rationale behind the disposition of these funds is that the province would in fact be the host to these groups coming from outside the province in most cases to have their functions here, and to be accorded, as I say, the hospitality of the province.

As to the other point, as you will recall last year when we discussed these estimates, we were attempting to introduce some factor with respect to these estimates that would be somewhat realistic to what had been expended on hospitality in the past. I know

the member's point is well made, that for Centennial year we made no special provisions with respect to the hospitality fund.

The visits of heads of state and these special visitors for Centennial year were co-ordinated through the Centennial commission by the heads of state planners here and the expenses for this were charged to the hospitality fund. We had no idea how many of these special visitors would elect to come here as opposed to the other visits, as I explained last Friday morning.

So, I think if he were to take the heads of state visits out of that sum to which the member made reference—in excess of \$200,000—and remove them from the consideration, he would see that there is some relationship between the sums voted for hospitality under normal circumstances compared to the special circumstances of 1967.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I do not see the rationale. I cannot for the life of me see what rule of thumb or what divination is used in choosing. The Minister says that we extend hospitality to those coming from outside the province, but surely that is not the case with respect to the Ontario Weekly Newspaper Association or to the By-Line Ball of the Toronto Men's Press Club, and this same reservation runs all the way through.

The Minister says they have plenty of "filthy lucre" of their own with which to have this entertainment. He said the means test was not the test that was utilized here, it was not a question of whether they had the moneys or not really, it was a question of the open-handedness of this province with respect to visitors. But I would daresay if you went through this, a good third or more would not be visitors at all from outside the province. They are people within the province, not only within the province but well equipped financially to look after their own entertainment. And if such is the case then the fund is presently being abused and continues to be abused.

You look back over the years . . . in 1966-67 you voted \$40,000 and you spent \$57,000. Back in 1961 was the last year in which you stayed anywhere close to the \$40,000. You had \$43,800 that year. Last year you voted the \$40,000 and you got to \$207,000. Then you voted \$65,000 to come into this year and now you are jumping it again.

But this is subject to great abuse and you know what is in the back of our minds. We are terribly concerned that the government does not use taxpayers fund—that is, the money out of all our pockets—to play games

and to fructify its friends or to win friends, in any event, through this particular device. It seems to me that up to a point, particularly where the nub twitches, that is with the press, that you are turning into that area.

I would like just to come back on 50 per cent of the cases, the four cases here, your argument does not sustain itself. How do you account for the other two?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that although we talk about this by-line ball, it is my understanding that this is the Canadian Newspaper Association's annual event whereby they make the presentation of their awards. Now to refer to it as the Toronto By-Line Ball is not really to represent to the House the correct name of the sponsoring group which is, I understand, the Canadian Newspaper Association or some such name.

All I can say to the member is that he is just entitled to an opinion like anyone else and I can assure him—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): You cannot justify it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, that is not the case at all. If you want to have the last word, to have it on record, then leave it there if it makes you feel better. I only tell you we try our best to live within the guidelines we have already laid down and, within our budget, to extend the hospitality of the province.

I can assure you there is no attempt other than to deal with each application on its own merits concerning the people who are in the association or organization which is having the meeting.

Mr. Peacock: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear to the Minister that I do want to challenge him to justify the increase in this expenditure, if not the whole expenditure. When we have just had a Budget in which grants to our health fields have been cut back and in which one programme after another has been deferred, or postponed, how can we bring this estimate in here with an additional \$25,000 spending on such falderal as this? I suggest he has no justification at all for continuing—never mind increasing—the expenditure under this vote.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well that is a very reasonable question and I might say the first time it has been asked. I will be very happy to attempt to answer it.

It is my understanding, on the basis of increased costs, that in order to do the same

amount of entertaining and to accomplish what we did last year, we will require these additional funds.

One keeps in mind that, after consulting with the various places where these functions will be held—and we have no control over that, because these conventions are held in different parts of the province—it was decided that increased costs necessitated us asking for this additional amount of money to do about the same amount of work as the preceding fiscal year. That is a very reasonable question.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one more question? I am not so familiar as the Minister with the philosophy of hospitality, but I wonder if he could indicate to me, in view of the ignorance I suffer from in this field, just what the philosophy is behind government assistance to the holding of such events as the By-line Ball? Is this to further the quality of journalism in this province? What is the purpose of the grant to the By-line Ball?

Hon. Mr. Welch: We do not identify ourselves with the function as such. I have never attended the function, so I really do not know that much about it except that it is a function sponsored by the Canadian Newspaper Association.

Journalists from across this country assemble here to make presentations to those of their members who have distinguished themselves in certain aspects of this Association's activities. The province adopts this as an opportunity to welcome these people from across Canada who meet here for this purpose.

So, the whole philosophy behind it is one of hospitality. And it is the same for any of these people who ask for our assistance or who advise us that they are meeting in our province. As you perhaps know, a special menu is provided and, in some cases, the government of Ontario welcomes the delegates and affords them hospitality in different forms, depending on the nature of the meeting.

Mr. Peacock: Could I ask a question in a somewhat different area, Mr. Chairman, before we leave this vote?

Could the Minister tell us in what manner the \$5,000 under the statutory vote to Ministers Without Portfolio will be spent?

Hon. Mr. Welch: You are referring to the statutory item under vote 1701? That is their salary, \$2,500 each.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701? The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this vote, might I ask of the Minister; is this where we might discuss the scrolls that are presented to couples who are celebrating 50th anniversaries?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I hate to let this vote go by without saying something in this regard because, from first-hand knowledge, I think all members of this House are aware of the wonderful feeling that it brings to couples which are presented with these particular scrolls.

I am sure it is something we would like to see continued. Our federal counterparts are somewhat jealous of the method in which the province recognizes these couples who have succeeded in being very worthy citizens of our province.

Approximately how many of these scrolls are given out in a year? What is the budgetary estimate for this year?

Hon. Mr. Welch: In round figures, I think about 3,500 scrolls for various reasons, depending on birthdays and anniversaries. As you know, we budget for that number.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask, have these been purchased from one source over the years? Are the frames put out for tender from time to time? And approximately what is the cost of the 3,500 scrolls?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Slightly under \$4 per scroll is the cost. We have had an arrangement for some years with respect to their production, so that we do not have to carry a large inventory and get them only as we require them.

We are giving some thought to the design of the scroll and will perhaps be discussing this with members shortly as to whether or not the time has come when we might sort of change the format of these, to make them just a little different. But we have not yet progressed to the point where I have—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What are you going to put on the top? "The province of opportunity greets you"?

Mr. Paterson: Might I follow up on this? I take it from the Minister's remarks that these have been purchased from one source over a period of time and a satisfactory—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Not necessarily. I am glad you asked that, because I did not cover that point in my answer. We have changed suppliers from time to time because we have had some trouble in the past with the frames and so we have been shopping around as far as this is concerned.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. Therefore, if a person had the largest manufacturer of these frames in his own particular riding, it might be worthwhile if that manufacturer submitted a bid to the department if they were interested in this.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If anyone has any designs at all—certainly the department would be interested.

Mr. Paterson: Have your officials looked into the matter of using plastic frames? I notice the change of frames for sale in department stores.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, very much so. We are concerned about it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Talking on memorial wreaths for a moment, I notice that the amount of money has been reduced on this item from previous years. I am not suggesting that it should be more just right at this time, but I would like to put a flea in the Minister's ear on the subject.

You know when we go out with the service clubs on Remembrance Day, there are numerous other wreaths. Our wreaths have been fine up to now, but I have just got the feeling that it should be watched very closely. I mean the YMCAs, the church groups and the others who put forth these wreaths are tending to outdistance us in what we are presenting.

In other words, the prestige of the government of Ontario is, to some extent, at stake in this matter. In this year of retrenchment, it would not be time to suggest we should have more ample or more glorious wreaths. But perhaps in the years to come, the wreaths presented by other organizations less well heeled than ourselves, will outdistance us.

I would not want our wreaths to be dowdy, or for us to be in any way backward about being in attendance and actually placing them on the cenotaphs simply because of their appearance. But there is a bit of that, I feel, at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask a comparable question in the same area?

Does the reduction of the appropriation mean that you are going to give fewer wreaths, or less expensive wreaths?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am glad this question was raised. Last year when we were voting the estimate, we were a little unsure what the ultimate costs might be in moving to a new size. I think the reduction comes now from more of a refinement of actual costs. If you recall, we used a different wreath last November for the first time. It was slightly larger than the wreath we used in previous years.

We made an arrangement with the poppy fund people of the Canadian Legion to develop the new wreath, so there is no reduction in the number of wreaths. It is just a more accurate estimate of the costs of this new wreath.

I appreciate the comments of the member for Lakeshore. I have had these points mentioned to be before and I think it is something we should keep under close scrutiny.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701; the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): On vote 1701, Mr. Chairman: would the hon. Minister in line with the statement on the Budget made by the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), advise us what was the amount his department requested to have approved by the Treasury Board for the whole of the department and by what amount was it cut back by the Treasury Board and which programmes of the Minister's department were curtailed, as this is specifically, as I recall, one of the departments where the curtailment of activity took place.

Could the Minister specify on each of those three items?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Would the hon. member be prepared to leave that with me? We will be back to these estimates, so I can give you those particulars.

There have been some inter-departmental changes which are reflected in these estimates, and if the member would allow me to get that information in more detail, I will see that he has it before these estimates are completed.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes. I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister fully understands the questions which I raised covering the whole

of this department for the \$7,187,000 to be voted?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Right.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, in going through the hospitality fund, one cannot help wondering how you arrive at the amounts of money that are spent on the various visiting dignitaries. I note big variances from one dignitary to the next. I am curious to know if you do not have a set programme, or pattern, of entertainment that you follow—regardless of where this person may come from—under normal conditions.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If the hon. member is making reference to our special visitors during Centennial year, I am really unable to give any general guidelines; it depended on the time of day they arrived and the types of functions which were, in fact, planned for them.

I might say the actual planning for the heads of state was conducted by the co-ordinator of heads of states visits, in co-operation with the Centennial commission, and so there is quite a variation on the type of functions. I really have no further explanation for that, other than the fact that they varied according to the length of time they were to be with us, the things they wanted to see and the type of functions. In some cases we co-operated with some of the ethnic groups in the community, of course, who were particularly interested in their visit as well.

Mr. Deans: I just wanted to be sure there was no discrimination involved. I look at Princess Alexandra with \$29,000 spent, while some poor soul from the Republic of China gets \$320 spent on him. I am just curious as to how you decide these things.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Discrimination would be the last factor that would enter our departmental activities.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701. The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, who figures out the guest lists when there is an invitation, for instance, to Premier Guiseppe Saragat's banquet? Who set up that guest list?

Hon. Mr. Welch: If we are going back now to discuss the visits of heads of states, the co-ordinator of the heads-of-state visits for Ontario, who is the secretary of the Cabinet,

would work in consultation with the consular corps, the ethnic community represented by the dignitary, and so on.

It has to be very flexible depending on the guests and the length of time or duration of their visit.

Mr. De Monte: I ask you this question then, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick: May I just intervene on a point of order? The Chairman will recall the discussion which took place, and the concern of members, about the private members' hour. As it is 5 o'clock, it might be well if we adhered to the time for the private members, to avoid—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member's remarks are well placed.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The house resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth) moves second reading of Bill 42, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Mr. Speaker, once each half hour in this country a child takes poison. Because of this, I feel it is necessary for us in this House today to take a serious look at whether or not we can take action to somehow or other relieve these children, who have no way of taking care of themselves, from the hazards and dangers involved.

One of the most common poisons taken by children is the common headache tablet. It is the leading cause of poisoning to all Canadian children and it causes a quarter of the child deaths from all forms of poisoning in this country. I might point out that the great majority of the deaths happen to children in the two and three year category—two- and three-year-olds.

I realize that practically all of the poisonings—whether they result in death, or whether

they result in the infamous stomach pumping operation that takes place in many of the hospitals every day—arrives from the negligence of adults. But I do not think that we should allow this in any way to preclude us from taking whatever action we can.

I recognize that the food and drug directorate of the national health department has taken some action to reduce the dangers and has brought about regulations that will necessitate drug manufacturers to label packages with special warnings of danger of overdose and of improper usage, as they relate to children. Unfortunately, the majority of the children who are the victims of poisoning are under the age to read. They are much below the five years of age level and, of course, any comments that are written on a label on a bottle really makes little sense to them.

Up until recently it was very, very difficult to devise some method whereby we could safeguard the children. But, of late, what have been called child-proof containers have come on the market. Having viewed some of them, I believe that if we were to take the necessary action in this province and make it mandatory for the manufacturers of drugs to use these containers, we would be able to drastically cut down on the number of child deaths and, indeed, on the number of child poisonings in the province.

I want to refer to a newspaper article; it says: "New Container is Found Safer for Medicines." I want to make it clear at this point that I do not intend to beat the drum for any particular manufacturer, so I will avoid as much as possible mention of this particular container that I have in mind, because I know that there are others on the market. And I am quite happy to accept any one at all made by anyone, provided it meets with the criteria of safety. It says:

The use, in two test areas, of a new push-and-turn type of plastic container for medicines has reduced by more than 80 per cent the number of children accidentally poisoned from eating medicines or toxic household products.

In a report to the American Academy of Pediatrics, a research team in the Fort Lewis and McChord areas of Tacoma, Washington, found that small children who tried to force open these containers to get jelly beans or pennies deliberately placed inside them could not do so.

Similar containers were used for prescription tablets and capsules dispensed in

Essex County, Ontario, during two periods last year and this year.

This was 1967 and 1968.

Approximately a million containers were used in the Ontario test. There were reports of 21 instances in which children ate the contents and were poisoned. In three of these the child did manage to get the cap off. In the other 18 instances, the container tops were found to be improperly locked by the parents.

At Madigan General Hospital in Tacoma, it was found that in the areas where the new containers were used the cases dropped from 45 in 1967 to six up to October 31, 1968.

There was a 97 per cent decrease in poisoning rates when the post exchanges at Fort Lewis and McChord Air Base attached one of the new containers to each bottle of orange-flavoured children's headache pills.

They go on to explain how the pliable plastic caps on these containers work. But this is of very little importance, because at least we have devised a way whereby we can safeguard children from themselves and this is of vital importance.

In my research into this area I came across an article and I want to put it on the record. I think it very clearly states what I would like to say about the use of this particular type of container, and it does it perhaps even much better than I could have done had I done it myself.

So I would like to read from an article in *Steel Shots* magazine, of the city of Hamilton. It is put out by Local 1005 of the Steelworkers of America. It is written by one, Pat Murtfeldt, and he is talking about family safety, and I quote:

It lurks in medicine chests, under kitchen sinks, in laundry room cabinets. It cleans, it deodorizes, it cures. And it kills. Five hundred children died from swallowing it last year. And the year before, and the year before that.

They were innocent victims—exploring, testing, judging the newness of their environment. Then they were stricken without warning. More than once a day in the United States, the stage is set:

And as I point out, once every half hour in Canada.

Mother reaches for her headache pills—the pretty red ones—and swallows a couple while her two-year-old son looks on.

Twenty minutes later a little boy is rushed to a nearby hospital to get his stomach pumped while his anxious parents wait and wait.

In another home, another city, two youngsters are playing doctor. One feigns sickness while the other climbs onto the bathroom vanity, grasps a bottle of "candy" pills, and feeds a handful to his patient. The fantasy ends, and so does the child's life. Scenes just like these are enacted each day in homes that hardly expect them.

And I might say at this juncture—going away from this particular document—that this happened in my own home not too long ago, where we believed that one of our children had eaten car sickness pills, and caused a great deal of anxiety. So I am speaking from personal concern as well as from concern for the other children in this province.

Sometime the curtain comes down quickly, never to be raised again; more often the drama continues for agonizing hours as the victim fights for life. The suspense is overwhelming and the ending too often pitifully sad.

Nearly one-quarter of all deaths from poisoning last year occurred among children under five years of age. Pre-schoolers have endless curiosity. They imitate mother. They judge new objects by putting them into their mouths.

Estimates show that each year about 500,000 of these children swallow poisons but survive. Ingestion of household products, such as turpentine and lye and soaps, accounts for a large number, but more than that, even, is the terrible threat of an accidental medication overdose.

And it is about this that I want to deal.

The toddler's life is endangered when he explores the medicine chest before his parents get up in the morning, when he swallows a handful of vitamin pills from a bottle left open on the kitchen table, when he chews several of the pretty tablets that his mother has called "candy".

Despite warnings from doctors, druggists and drug manufacturers, home poisoning accidents have continued to increase each year, most of the victims being two to three years old.

Birth control pills have become an increasingly dangerous threat in many homes. In fact, a 1966 study of the St. Louis Children's Hospital rated oral contraceptives second only to aspirin in causing

accidental poisoning among children. Mothers too often leave these pills within reach of the small child.

The National Clearing House for Poison Control Centres in the United States reported that the most common cause of these fatal ingestions is the easy accessibility of medicines—despite repeated pleas by doctors and druggists, some parents continue to treat medicines carelessly. Labels are misread, pills are transferred to more attractive containers, children hear the medicines described as candy.

And I might make just one warning, if I can, to the general public, that surely those sort of things we can easily avoid.

Yet all along, according to some medical authorities, something other than human error has been involved in poisoning accidents. Why blame only the parents—why stress only education of the mother and child when what is really needed is a safer method of packaging, something that will make the dangerous medicines less available to prying little hands?

One solution of the availability problem is the packaging of the pills individually between two layers of plastic.

But this has really proved to be unsuccessful for most areas. A persistent child can quite easily find a way to pry the plastic up, and although considerably safer than the old containers, such plastic coverings have shown that they just do not protect the child if he is persistent. It has been recognized that it is a good contribution but it is not nearly enough.

Another promising development was initiated when Dr. Henri Breault, director of the poison control centre at Windsor, Ontario, held a contest—

And it is about this that I talk—

—that he hoped would uncover a new safety closure for containers. The contest rules stated that the package must be easily opened by adults, but next to impossible for children under five to get into.

There were hundreds of entries. So this shows the interest. There were hundreds of entries. Some of them turned out to be adult-proof as well, no one could get into them. But there evolved from this, one particular type of container that was acceptable and I am quite sure others that would be acceptable were we to look into it. And this particular container provided some remarkable results. In Tacoma, Washington, as I said,

it was tested on 280 children, aged between one and seven.

Bottles filled with candy and sealed with the closure were issued to the youngsters who were encouraged to remove the candy. Researchers watched anxiously as the children bit into, tore at, twisted, pulled, and pounded the containers. Little tempers flared and tears flowed as they became more and more frustrated. Only one child in the group managed to open the container.

That was good enough for the staff of Madigan Hospital, which began issuing prescription medicines in this particular type of container. During the next six months the number of poison cases entering the hospital plummeted from 45 to 55 per month to only three in six months. Of the three, one occurred when a parent forgot to cap the container after use.

There will always be human errors, but it was reduced from 45 per month to three in six months.

Having received this nearly perfect score, this particular container is now available on the market. And I am sure it is not the only container because I have seen others. I say to you as a parent who is concerned that no matter how careful you are, there is always the day when you inadvertently leave the pill jar on the kitchen table or when you leave the pills on the dressing table or perhaps you leave the aspirins down on the kitchen counter by error, there is always the day and everyone does this, no matter how careful they are. It takes only one such mistake and perhaps a child's life is snuffed out.

Now, we in this House have the opportunity to do something to avoid this. We can also take a great step forward by reducing the accidents, as they have done in Washington, from 55 per month to three in six months. We could make it mandatory in this province for all prescription drugs to be sold in containers that were at least child-proof.

And, if we do this, I feel confident that we will have the same kind of result as they had in the United States. We will have the same kind of results right across the province that we had in the Windsor and Essex areas, and we will save many, many children from death and from sickness. And we will also contribute considerably to the peace of mind of many parents.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this is the first time that this particular bill has come before the House, at least so far as I can

find out, and I recognize there may be some refinements required to it in order to make it acceptable to the industry at large, and acceptable to all members of this House. But I do think the basic premise is good, I think it is necessary since we have advanced technologically to the point where we can provide these containers, that we take the action now to start the ball rolling, towards having them made mandatory across this province. It would assure that, as I started out saying, once every 30 minutes a child is not poisoned in this country. Thank you.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 42, An Act to amend The Public Health Act Relating to Child-Proof Containers.

The use of safety closure for drugs and medicines has been closely studied since 1957. A number of firms have been promoting containers to this purpose with great success, except in the field of moisture-proof containers.

About 1958, the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning was formed in Windsor—primarily through the efforts of Dr. Henri Breault of that city. The OACAP has been supported financially by both the Proprietary Association of Canada and by firms in the industry with an interest in safety closures. In June, 1968, Dr. Henri J. Breault presented a report to the Canadian Pediatric Society's annual meeting in Saskatoon entitled, "Poisonings are preventable—experience with one million child-resistant containers"—which was a collaborative report of two similar pilot programmes conducted simultaneously, separately and independently in Canada and the United States.

Speaking of Windsor, Dr. Breault stated and I quote excerpts from his report:

Our project began in 1963, after 6 years, 5,000 poisonings and several deaths, it had become obvious that we were not in control at the Windsor Poison Centre.

Despite sustained intensive and extensive efforts to educate patients, parents and the public concerning the needless tragedy of childhood poisoning in the home, the situation had remained unchanged. Education as an effective tool in poison control had not been the answer.

The theory of accident prevention embraces reciprocal relationships between protection and education, but protection comes first. Safety closures are the only answer, containers cannot be kept "out of

the child's reach" but contents can be "kept out of the child's mouth".

Through a careful sampling of 560,000 consecutive prescriptions on the Green Shield Prescription Plan out of Windsor, we learned that 75 per cent are tablets or capsules—solid prescription drugs. Dispense these in safe containers and you protect the child against 45 million potential poisons! Liquids (oral and lotion) at 18 per cent would be target number two once a moisture-proof container has been developed.

In 1965 the Palm-'N'-Turn child-resistant prescription vial for solid medications was perfected. On January 1, 1967, at the request of the Essex county medical society the 60 pharmacies of the area began using this container for all capsule and tablet drugs.

There were a few exceptions, 30 in all, for various reasons. Finally in April 1968, a letter from the hon. Matthew B. Dymond, Minister of Health for Ontario to all pharmacists of the province settled the matter once and for all. Since that time we have had no unsafe prescriptions. Slide No. 7—Dr. Breault was demonstrating his facts with slides—shows this clearly, beginning with seven in January 1967, ending with zero in May 1968. In the USA, the study revealed that prior to safety vials, the poisoning rate was one per 5,000 prescriptions. Since 1967, including all failures, the poisoning rate has dropped to one in 60,000.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit further quotes from the eminent authority. However, I would draw to the attention of this House that there are now 30 poison control centres in Ontario, effectively controlling the solid drug formula. But, their reports confirm the significant factor of the dangers of household products, which topped the list.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Is the hon. lady supporting the resolution?

Mrs. A. Pritchard: Now, Mr. Speaker, commendable as Bill 42 is, it does not go far enough, inasmuch as statistics reveal that 90 per cent of accidental poisonings among children under six years of age, were from household products.

I suggest, therefore, that this is the area for drastic action. The hon. Allen J. MacEachen, when Minister of Health, brought this matter before the House of Commons. A special committee on safety closures has been set up. It is to be hoped that their

report will ensure safety closures for both household and drug products across the nation.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this party I rise to support the principles contained in Bill 42.

In a single year in Canada almost 30,000 people report to the poison control centres due to poisoning from a great number of substances usually ingested accidentally or through ignorance. The staggering total of 6,000 of these accidental poisonings are as a result of the ingestion of one single drug—acetosalicylic acid—most commonly sold under the trade name of aspirin. 5,000 of these poisonings take place in children under 5 years of age.

Another 2,500 poisonings are caused by other drugs and medications sold under various trade names or dispensed under the prescription of physicians.

The use of educational means and advertising to promote safety over the years has proved most ineffective in the control of such poisoning. Prevention must be fostered through inaccessibility to these substances, particularly in regard to young children. The latest statistics from the Hospital for Sick Children Poison Control Centre indicate that during the year ended December 31 last, there were 1,393 children treated in the emergency department for symptoms of poisoning. Of this number, 122 were admitted to the hospital for treatment, and three died.

The leading causes of poisoning according to the records of the Hospital for Sick Children, are ASA or aspirin, sedatives, insecticides, cigarettes, turpentine, cosmetics, furniture and floor polish, bleach and lye. It is apparent from these figures that prescribed drugs and patent medicines are the cause of almost 50 per cent of all the poisonings treated in emergency situations at the Hospital for Sick Children. Of this 50 per cent, nearly 90 per cent are caused by ingestion of over the counter drugs and patent medicines sold by pharmacies and elsewhere in supermarkets. These are packaged and manufactured by the drug industry itself who have taken no steps to protect the public in this regard. There is no question that the time has come that government regulations must be established to enforce the use of approved safety containers designed to prevent accidental poisonings among small children. Safety cap vials have been perfected and used with dramatic reductions in the number of accidental poisonings, particularly among infants and very small children.

Statistical studies and evaluations have been made, and are available, which indicate the value of these containers. Up until 1963 there was very little interest in this area of concern and only educational programmes had been used to attempt to persuade parents of the dangers involved. As I stated before, these proved most ineffective.

In that year, under the direction and impetus of the Windsor poison control centre, as well as the assistance of the Windsor Medical Association, and other interested groups, the Ontario Association of Control of Accidental Poisoning was established. Its purpose was to devise, implement, introduce, and support aggressive procedures and methods for the invention or design of childproof safety caps for the control of accidental poisonings. The association fostered the production of such a container in 1965, which was awarded their seal of approval. In 1967 a detailed study of the use of such containers in the dispensing of prescription drugs was carried out in the two controlled areas that were previously mentioned by the other two speakers.

In the Essex area over half a million prescriptions were dispensed using the Palm-'N'-Turn container. The result of the study indicates that with the total proper use of such containers, poisonings due to dispensed capsules and tablets would be virtually wiped out.

With the almost universal use of the approved child-proof container, the only prescription drug poisonings encountered at the Windsor poison control centre were those from liquid preparations and prescriptions dispensed outside the controlled area, as well as from drug samples, not properly packaged, distributed by the medical profession.

It becomes apparent from the results of these tests that the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisonings has been successful in having produced a safety vial applicable to common use which has led the North American continent in this field. The association has now been established as a non regulatory body which is providing, on a voluntary basis, a method for the approval and design and use of child-resistant containers. It has already set up requirements and indicated procedures by which it will give its approval to containers for the packaging of both pharmaceutical and household products.

Those safety features for solid medications that are child resistant are now a concrete reality. They are being mass-produced for

commercial use and are readily available at a cost only slightly above those that were previously used. The use of these containers, however, has not been as widespread as one would expect within the pharmaceutical retail profession. They are becoming the rule rather than the exception, but there are still many pharmacists within the province who, in dispensing these lethal medications, either because of economic factors or because of apathy, have not used the safety container which has been made available to them.

The Ontario Pharmacists' Association has supported the efforts of the association for the control of accidental poisonings and, within the near future, it is hoped that total use will be made of the Palm-'N'-Turn container, or some equivalent. With the passage of this bill, or its acceptance as part of the government programme, this use would be made mandatory, not only at the level of the dispensing pharmacist, but also by the large manufacturers of over-the-counter merchandise and patent medicines which can be found on the shelves of the drug stores, variety stores, or supermarkets in the province.

The hesitance of the patent medicine manufacturers, as well as the ethical drug companies who manufacture over-the-counter products, to use the proven safety container, is beyond comprehension when one considers the products that are manufactured and distributed by them as a direct result cause over 40 per cent of all poisonings, and over 90 per cent of all poisonings attributed to the ingestion of drugs and medications.

These drug manufacturers and packagers have apparently decided that the economics and expense of packaging with the safety type container are beyond the scope of a reasonable return for them. They have failed to accept the responsibility in regard to the people of our province, and particularly to those young children under the age of five years who are not able to differentiate themselves. How can apathy, disinterest and disregard exist among this affluent group of manufacturers where the life of every child in our province is at stake?

These same manufacturers who, because of the economic factors, refuse to co-operate, at the same time carry on promotional and advertising expenditures which at times represent over 20 per cent of the cost of their production. Acceptability in the market place and the creation of profit is placed far ahead of the safety of people. It is in this context that there is no question that governmental

regulation is necessary to make them comply with at least the minimum requirements.

The drug and patent medicine manufacturers within our province seem to understand only the strong arm of the government and without it will continue completely to ignore the urgent need.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) about a year ago indicated his support of the use of this type of container when he sent a letter across the province to all those involved in the packaging of prescribed medications. But apparently he does not have the same attitude towards drug manufacturers, who are by far the worst offenders. There is now a public outcry for the control of the packaging of the most common drug poison— aspirin, or its generic—and editorials have appeared in a good number of newspapers indicating their support for government regulations to control the poisoning of this one specific product.

We ask the Minister of Health to act in at least this one area to provide for the required control. We must, however, note that the bill before us today will eliminate only a portion of the number of avoidable accidents that happen each and every day. The effects of the bill would be at least partially limited by the lack of technical knowledge to produce suitable containers for use with liquid substances, and by the fact that the poisoning of many household products would not be controlled by this bill, because they are not included under the two Acts that are set out in the bill.

It is, therefore, essential that the government provide the control requested in this Act, as well as provide leadership, along with the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning and the research to produce suitable safety controls for many household products such as turpentine, bleach, and floor and furniture polish, which are of equal concern.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): In rising to speak to this bill, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult, because most of what I have to say has been said many, many times. My only concern is that some day we will pay heed to our own words and enact legislation so it will not be necessary to say them so often.

I must agree with the member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard). I, too, say the bill does not go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction and if we are to wait until we have an all-inclusive bill before this

Legislature, every minute that we waste—every half hour there is another child in the hospital. We cannot afford to wait and while we wait, watch the children die. We are not doing our job here.

As I say, everything that I say now has been said before. We talk about children who eat pills thinking they are candy; how do we stop this? Well, we have one answer in the pill container.

We also have a job of education that has to be done in this province. The companies that bring out the little doctor kits and the little nurses' kits, with the little bottle of pills and tell them how good they are, as children, to play doctor and keep out of mother's hair. We are leading them on the point that all containers contain candy.

We have to educate, not only the companies, but the parents that these are not educational toys unless they educate them towards the dangers of the pills, rather than on the good taste of them.

We have to educate the drug companies who flavour pills so that we can force them down their little throats a little easier. The Aspirin with the orange flavouring. I would much rather take the trouble of convincing my child that it is good for him and that he needs it—if need be, forcing him to take it—than to convince him that it is candy and that it should be taken without any problems.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): How many kids has the hon. member?

Mr. Jackson: To the question from the hon. leader of the Opposition, I have five children and I can assure him that I am extremely worried about the dangers of pills.

To go on, Mr. Speaker, this new container that this bill speaks of, I took one—after we were sent one by the Ontario Safety League—with two aspirin in it, which should not have been in it because they are unlabelled. I took that container and I gave it to four of my boys. The older one can surely open it, he is 16. But the four younger ones go down to two. Two of them opened it. The youngest one could not open it. The second youngest one did open it by jumping up and down on it until he broke it.

However, it did prove to me that under normal circumstances they would not have been able to open that pill bottle. I took a child's aspirin bottle which supposedly has a child proof cap on it—it is a plastic cap that is pushed on and is supposedly too difficult for a child to remove. All four of them removed that cap without any difficulty

whatsoever, which proved to me it was not child proof and should not be advertised as child proof.

I am a little worried that as we go along we are more concerned with curing an ill after it has taken place. Every hospital throughout the country is setting up poison control centres and I do not think we will ever be able to do without these centres. But when we listen to the facts that came before us today and realize that over 50 per cent of the reason that those poison control centres are there are because of aspirin and ASA tablets, the most common of all drugs, and the fact that children have too ready access to these drugs.

If we only realized what it costs to this country in human life and in actual dollar bills then surely the ones here or the ones throughout this country that are apathetic towards human life can at least look at their wallet and see how much it is costing them. We put very little effort into prevention. We put a great deal of effort into curing the ills that we cause by our own lack of consciousness.

I had the very unhappy occasion over the weekend of attending a funeral. A funeral of a woman who was 45 years of age. I watched those children and the grief that was in those children at the loss of their mother. Now just imagine the grief of the parents when they see their child lost through something they could have prevented.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, nothing I could put forward now would add to the facts and figures that have come before you. All I can say is that I support the bill and I hope that everyone in this House does.

Mr. R. T. Potter (Quinte): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity of speaking on this bill today. I am afraid I have not got a lot of statistics to back up what I have to say but I am speaking from 25 years' experience as a family doctor.

Everything that we have heard today is perfectly true. We see far too many children poisoned every year from taking drugs or other substances of one kind or another. In my experience I have found that most of these poisons, more than half of them, are of the household variety, of substances such as cleaning solutions, even lye, coal oil, oil of wintergreen, furniture polish and things of this nature.

On the other hand, we still have, as has been stated here today, cases of children dying from ingesting pills or capsules that

were prescribed for adults. And last, but by no means least, is the common aspirin tablet that everyone seems to treat very casually and leave all over the place.

Now for most of these solutions we have not got any type of container that is any way foolproof. Certainly, none for the solutions, none for the powders. But we have got one that I am aware of and most of you people are aware of—this container that you have to push the top down and then turn it. I do not believe it is sufficient to say to the pharmacists, please use these containers whenever possible, because it has been stated here today there are still pharmacists that are reluctant to use them, whether because of the cost or because they just are not interested.

On the other hand, so many of these common substances in tablet form that are poisonous to children, are dispensed across the counter and do not have to be put up by a pharmacist. I think it is most important that this type of tablet be put in as foolproof a container as possible. It has also been pointed out this afternoon that the name of this container is a misnomer, that it is really not child-proof and I think that I can bear this out very well.

Most children, after they have seen it used a few times, particularly in the four-to-five-year age group, can open it. On the other hand, I have found that when they have been used by pharmacists, elderly people who are suffering from arthritis or some other type of debilitating diseases, have trouble opening them. So when we are going to use them in one case to help people, for other people they are a hindrance. But the fact that we have not got anything better, Mr. Speaker, is no reason to me why we should not be using today what we have got or what is available to us.

I think that we should make it mandatory that the best container possible be used today. I think that we should encourage research to try to improve this container and at the same time to produce one that can be used for liquids. And last, but not least, I think that we should have an educational programme on the television and newspapers, to try to smarten up us adults and not leave these things around where children can get them.

I think that we cannot remove the responsibility that is ours, to see that we keep these things out of the hands of children as far as possible, but, on the other hand I think that we must use every means possible

to see that we use safety containers when we can get them.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my support to Bill 42, but also to make the point that it does not go far enough, and furthermore that the problems of the "pill culture" in our society today can probably not be solved by legislation. It is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, to note that at a time when sickness is decreasing in our fairly affluent Canadian society, pill taking is increasing at a phenomenal rate.

I suggest that this dichotomy in our society reflects a lack of responsibility on behalf of the private sector, both those who produce pills and put them into containers as well as those who advertise pills of all sorts—on television especially—implying that if you do not take a pink pill when you are feeling pale, there is something the matter with you.

But I would like to say that the point raised by my colleague, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith), can be endorsed in another respect as well. The hon. member noted that the hesitance of the patent medicine manufacturers, as well as the ethical drug companies who manufacture over the counter drug products, to use the proven safety container, is beyond comprehension when one considers that the products that are manufactured and distributed by them are the direct cause of over 40 per cent of all poisonings, and over 90 per cent of all poisonings attributed to the ingestion of drugs and medicines.

I would like to point out that private sector manufacturers produce little nurses kits like this, Mr. Speaker, which contain all sorts of things in them, including little pills in a number of colours and in a number of containers. Pill containers which open easily. Pills which are made out of candy coated licorice. This is an irresponsible act by the private sector, the manufacture of these little nurses' kits.

A little two-year-old opens up this kit, finds a couple of bottles of pills in it, finds the top comes off—a little snap top—takes the pills out, chews them, and says: "Isn't this nice. In mommy's medicine cabinet there are also pink pills for pale people. I will reach up to mommy's cabinet, take some of the pink pills, take a couple myself and give them to my little six-month-old brother, who will like them too. The pills are very nice."

So I would like to underline the point made by my colleague from Nipissing—if I

can get this licorice off my teeth—that the private sector manufacturers have a social responsibility. The sooner they face up to that, the sooner government will get out of their business.

But until the private sector smartens up, until the private sector, itself, adopts an ethical code concerning containers of pills, then this government must act.

Second, the manufacture of nurses' play kits with these candy pills, which inculcate the pill culture in society, which re-enforce the pill culture of parents, is an irresponsible act of promotion by the private sector. Therefore, on behalf of this party, and particularly my colleague from Nipissing, I support this bill, simply stating that it does not go far enough.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, just to support the resolution of my colleague from Hamilton, it might not be a sensational subject, but if the hour spent this afternoon saves the life of one child, it will be well worth while.

I noticed in an article concerning twist-and-turn containers, that eight out of ten children who take poisoned substances are between the ages of one and four. Of course, this container will deter them from getting to the contents inside, but I think the speaker who mentioned the educational job that is needed, touched on an important point.

I think the provincial government can take some responsibility in this regard. The Department of Health could circulate small leaflets or stickers, making them available to drug dispensers, to put on their counters for the purchasers of drugs to take home with them. These would carry the name, location and phone number of the poison control centre in each particular municipality across the province because all the education in the world does no good if people do not know where to go for particular assistance in any case.

And if they are in outlying areas and they have a situation where the child takes a drug, a poisonous substance, and they do

not know where to head for immediately, they are in trouble.

So the educational job can be helped by this government in providing leaflets, or stickers, so that every person some time or other gets in their hands the address and location of the poison control centre in their locality, and have it stuck near the telephone. So that, as soon as anything happens, they immediately know where to go and save valuable time and likely a life.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this? Otherwise, the House leader perhaps might deal with the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Deans: Perhaps the Minister would like to comment?

Mr. Speaker: Before the House leader deals with the matter, may I thank the Whips for making arrangements today, because today it would have been possible, if every member on Mr. Speaker's list had spoken his allotted time, to have come within the time limit. I am very grateful for this assistance and I am sure the members feel that the debate runs much better if properly managed from the beginning.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go to the order paper and do some legislation, following which we will return to the estimates.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Which estimates?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The ones presently before the House. We will complete the Provincial Secretary and then back to the Treasurer, and then Social and Family Services, Mines and Transport.

Mr. Singer: Then the public accounts.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Introducing Timmy for 1969, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Pilkey	2635
Presenting reports, Mr. Welch	2636
Tabling fifth annual report, pension commission, Mr. MacNaughton	2636
Twelfth report, standing private bills committee, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence	2636
Texas Gulf smelter, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	2636
Sewage treatment plant west of Richmond Hill, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Nixon and Mr. MacDonald	2636
Belleville shopping plaza, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon	2637
Indian land ownership, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. T. P. Reid	2638
Oakville psychiatric unit, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman	2638
Doctor shortage, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. T. P. Reid	2639
Uranium prospects in Quebec, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Nixon	2639
Mrs. Pearl Campbell, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Shulman	2639
Texas Gulf smelter, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Ferrier	2641
Algoma Steel, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Stokes	2642
Angling licences, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Martel	2642
Tax rebate, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mrs. M. Renwick	2642
Assessment ratio, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Sargent	2642
Land acquisition, question to Mr. Connell, Mr. Gisborn	2644
Third readings	2644
Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Welch, continued ..	2645
Recess, 6 o'clock	2673

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before you welcome our guests to the galleries this afternoon, perhaps I could be permitted to extend a welcome to Timmy of 1969, who is sitting under the gallery with Whipper Billy Watson, a man known, I think, to all of us, not only for his athletic prowess but for the great work that he has done in the whole area of crippled children over the years.

Timmy and Mr. Watson are here to promote the Easter Seal campaign which we all know is used to raise money from the public for the help of crippled children. His name is Ian Walmsley and he comes from Oshawa. He is 11 years old, he is in Grade 5, he goes to camp every summer, he wants to be a scientist, he has a cat called Sparky—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Do not tell the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart).

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Timmy will have to understand we have some private jokes in this House. He is a boy scout, his favourite hockey team is the Montreal Canadiens, and his favourite players, I am informed, are J. C. Tremblay and Bobby Orr, so perhaps Timmy, you will have some fellow supporters in those wishes of yours, and those interests of yours. I offer a very warm welcome to you, and I offer my congratulations to you for what you are doing on behalf of young people like yourself who have some handicaps to meet, and meet them with such a cheerful smile and with such energy.

I am sure that the campaign will be successful. It would be a sad thing if, in this province, it proved not to be. I am quite sure that with the impetus that we, and many like us, can give this campaign, it will prove to be successful, and once again these young people in our community will be given the support they need in order that they may lead full lives like the rest of us. Welcome to you, Timmy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if you will permit just another word in welcome to Timmy; I felt, when I saw the young man come in with his formidable bodyguard, that as well as thinking about a career in science, he might even think about politics because he can certainly attract the press and the photographers in a big way.

He has a few interesting weeks ahead of him and his responsibility is a heavy one. I know that he is concerned about not letting his school work get behind, but what he is doing for young people in our province is very much appreciated by all of us, whether or not we have boys at home that age, so I want to join with the Premier in extending a hearty welcome.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition in welcoming Timmy and congratulating him on the very good job that he is doing.

He is obviously a lad who leads a rich, full and a broad life, and he has just taken on this added chore as though it were part of the burden of life and, therefore, no burden at all.

I am informed by my colleague from Oshawa that not only has he all the attributes that the Prime Minister has indicated, but he comes from a very enlightened political family.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I know this is rather unprecedented, following the leaders, but I too would like to welcome Timmy and I have already sent him a letter congratulating him on his appointment. I know that when anybody from Oshawa heads up a campaign it cannot possibly be a failure, and I know the Easter Seal campaign will be successful and I want to congratulate Timmy again.

Mr. Speaker: Our other guests this afternoon in the galleries are, in the east gallery, students from Courtice secondary school at Bowmanville; and in the west gallery, from

Strathroy collegiate institute in Strathroy, and from Gledhill public school in Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the Minister of Lands and Forests of the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968; and the annual report of the Inspector of Legal Offices for the year ending December 31, 1968.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the fifth annual report of the pension commission for Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1968.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's twelfth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without further amendment, Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the city of London.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if there are no ministerial statements, I have a question for the Premier.

Can the Premier report further on the negotiations with Texas Gulf Sulphur Company on the location and time of construction of a smelter and/or refinery in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, I am in no position to make a further report. I can only assure the hon. leader of the Opposition, so that he does not need to ask this question every day, that as soon as I possibly can, I will, because I am very interested in making this information available when I have it.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps the Premier would permit a supplementary question? I am sure he is aware and has received the same communications, as all of us as members have, from the mayor of the corporation of the city of Timmins and it would indicate the great concern that the people up there, as well as we as members, feel in this matter.

I have another question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister is not in his seat.

An hon. member: Here he comes.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps when the hon. leader of the Opposition has asked his question, the member for York South, who has a similar question, would place it.

Mr. Nixon: Right. Will the Minister explain the factors leading to a Cabinet decision to override the view of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and approve the construction of a 1.4-million-gallon-a-day sewage treatment plant to be built on the west side of Richmond Hill?

Second, were there any threats of resignation from the Ontario Water Resources Commission in connection with this decision?

Last, what part was played by Mr. Hollis Beckett in persuading the Cabinet to overrule the OWRC?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is related to one of those asked, as follows: On what basis did the Minister come to the conclusion that the Don River could carry the effluent from the 1.4-million-gallon sewage treatment plant which he authorized for west of Richmond Hill, when the OWRC had already concluded, and laid down a rule, that no more upstream sewage plants would be allowed anywhere in the province, and particularly north of Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question from the leader of the Opposition first.

The decision to approve the construction of the sewage treatment plant was made in consultation with the OWRC, and consequently there was no question of overriding the commission.

The answer to the second part is no.

In answer to the third part, I have already stated that there was no Cabinet decision overriding the OWRC. Mr. Beckett never appeared before Cabinet in connection with this matter, and, therefore could not persuade Cabinet in any way.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot help it. I do not write the paper.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Pretty tricky operation!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In answer to the question of the member for York South:

The treatment provided at this location is of the most advanced type and meets all requirements laid down for sewage treatment plants by the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

In answer to the second part of the question: I am not aware that the Ontario Water Resources Commission has laid down the rule that no more upstream plants would be allowed anywhere in the province.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister might allow a supplementary question.

Is he aware of the fact that Metropolitan Toronto has spent millions of dollars eliminating package plants of this type south of Steeles Avenue; and that this was with the co-operation of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and under a policy expressed by the vice-chairman, the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) who does not happen to be here today? I would ask the Minister if he is aware of this conflict in the statement that he has just given the House?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I cannot see where there is any conflict here. I know there is a certain policy laid down by OWRC. As I said last year when I announced that this plant would be built, it was given the approval of OWRC in order to take care of a situation in that particular area at that time. As far as I am concerned there has been no conflict in any place.

Mr. Sargent: No politics are involved at all?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Sargent: The paper is wrong?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Minister a supplementary question.

He has stated that he is not aware of any such policy or rule having been laid down by the OWRC. That may be correct, but would he ascertain whether or not that rule has, in fact, been laid down?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I might try and ascertain whether the rule has been laid down but I have never heard of it and I have been in discussion with OWRC on many occasions.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the facts we want.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Of course, I cannot vouch for what was said by someone else, but

it has never been said to me when I have been talking to the commission and personnel of OWRC.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The fact is the Minister reversed the whole policy of Metropolitan Toronto in this regard.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister answer a question in this regard?

Mr. Speaker: Not from a member who has not placed a question.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs from yesterday.

Is an appeal to the Cabinet the only recourse for citizens of Belleville who object to the decision by the Ontario Municipal Board handed down March 17, concerning a proposed shopping plaza in the north end of the city of Belleville?

Second, has the Minister received any correspondence with regard to the decision or the possibility of an appeal?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is referring to zoning bylaw No. 8549, as amended by bylaw 8604 of the city of Belleville. The application to the city relating to this matter was heard in Belleville by the Ontario Municipal Board during the week of February 4. The public hearing, I understand, lasted the better part of a week, thus providing the citizens of Belleville a good opportunity to make their views known to the board.

The application to amend the bylaw was dismissed by the board by order dated March 14. In cases of this kind there are four methods of review. Now, sir—first, under section 93 of the OMB Act, by way of a stated case for the opinion of the Court of Appeal on a question of law. Second, an interested party may petition the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council under Section 94 of the Act. Third, an appeal may be taken to the Court of Appeal on a question of law or jurisdiction on leave of the Court of Appeal under section 95 of the Act. And, fourth, the board may review, rescind, change, alter or vary any decision, approval or order made by it under section 42 of the Act.

This method, I understand, is used only occasionally on the ground that new evidence has come to light which was not available at the time of the original hearing.

In reply to the second part of the question, I would advise the hon. leader of the Opposition that no such correspondence has been received to my knowledge. In any case, it should be directed within the required periods of time to the body or person having jurisdiction—that is, the Ontario Municipal Board, through its secretary, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, by filing a petition with the clerk of the executive council, or the Court of Appeal, as the case may be. I have not had any correspondence. I may say that both the hon. member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) and the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Rollins) have been in touch with me on two occasions about this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a point of order.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question and draw your attention to a situation I found on arrival at the building a short half-hour ago. The front doors of the building were barred by two Ontario Provincial Policemen against citizens wishing to enter the building. I hope we never see such a thing again, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask on whose orders the provincial police were acting? They were barring uniformed citizens of the humane society. Four or five had been allowed in and the rest were barred; however, I understand they have entry now. I challenged Mr. Godfrey, the OPP man, that they were keeping citizens out of a public building. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, to know if this was done on an order.

Mr. Speaker: This is the first time the incident has been brought to my attention. I know nothing about it. I will be glad to investigate—

Mr. Sargent: Ask the Prime Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I will be glad to investigate the incident and report to the House.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. One need only have looked out of the window at least 10

or 15 minutes ago, to see that humane society vehicles had virtually cordoned off Queen's Park. I do not believe that people are running about the halls with nets. No members were concerned, but I must say, sir, that it is worth looking into.

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

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier: Could the Premier advise what progress has been made in the negotiations with the federal Department of Indian Affairs in regard to the claims of the Indians in the Kenora-Rainy River area to the ownership of land beneath lakes and bays lying between the headlands of reserve territory?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, The Department of Lands and Forests is going through its own records to see what the situation is. It is waiting also for information which is coming from the Indians themselves, who are involved. The department is compiling information through the district office in the area. We do not propose to go outside the department until such time as this information has been gathered, so that, at the moment, in answer to the specific in the member's question, we are not negotiating with the federal Department of Indian Affairs but no doubt that will come in due course after we have gathered the information that lies within the department itself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Before asking my question, Mr. Speaker, perhaps, in reference to the point of order that was raised, it might be wise to send a search party for the Minister of Agriculture and Food who appears to be missing.

I have a question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. In view of the urgent need for a psychiatric unit in Oakville, will the Minister intervene with the Ontario Hospital Services Commission or make the necessary moneys available?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, intervention is not necessary. The Ontario Hospital Services Commission has already given approval in principle for this hospital to establish a psychiatric outpatient clinic in the nurses home on a temporary basis, until these facilities are provided as part of a proposed building programme. The approval is given, of course, on the understanding that it will be contained in

the overall list of priorities being reviewed by the commission.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will hear it.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister aware that in yesterday's Oakville paper it was reported that the Ontario Hospital Services Commission had refused the funds because they said they were not available?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have already answered the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a question of this Minister.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the Minister of Health: In view of the fact that the community of Schreiber is shortly to lose its only doctor and that doctor shortage is a critical problem in Northern Ontario, will the Minister act immediately to provide basic health services for that community and wherever needed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I answered this question on March 4, 1969, and I have nothing further to add.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition may wish to place his question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: Will the Minister explain the decision taken by the Ontario Securities Commission to enquire into the CBC news item dealing with the discovery of rich uranium prospects in Quebec?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the securities commission that this is a routine matter. It is not a formal enquiry. I assume that they are requesting information from all concerned in view of the press statements about the magnitude of the alleged find, and the claims that were made with respect to the content of uranium per ton which, in the press story I have before me, is quoted as being that the property contained some 29 million tons of uranium, with ore values ranging as high as 11 lbs. per ton. I would assume that the commission's interest in the matter arose from the fact that the highest content per ton, with respect to Canada's largest uranium producer — the

Dennison Mines—averages just over three lbs. per ton.

Mr. Shulman: Complete fabrication, that story.

Mr. Nixon: Could the Minister tell the House how many companies holding property in that area are listed? Are several of them listed on our stock exchange in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I could not answer that.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you. Will the Minister tell us further, is it a customary practice of the securities commission to enquire into the veracity of public accounts of this type?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would think that it would be a matter of good business acumen that the commission would try to keep abreast of press stories and information that is disseminated to the press.

Mr. Nixon: Beyond that—and this will be my final question if the Minister will permit it—would the securities commission be prepared to issue a statement disclaiming the truth of the press report?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would not go that far. I have always taken the position, with respect to departments of government or commissions with which I have anything to do, that if they perform their function they must keep abreast of the times and know as much as possible about what is going on: They must keep abreast of all information so that they are updated with respect to the subject matter that concerns them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer has a reply to a question asked on March 13 by the member for High Park, number 898.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to request your indulgence to make a rather lengthy reply to this question, since I believe the facts deserve careful examination.

I expect that the member for High Park, because of his reputation for research, is well aware of all the circumstances. I trust, however, he will not object to my intention of providing a full explanation of this matter to the members of the House.

The Mrs. Pearl Campbell named in the question was widowed in February, 1968. Her husband died of that most unfortunate disease, leukemia, following an illness of some two years. At his untimely death, she had four children, one of whom was born exactly one month before the loss of her husband.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that these were most tragic and trying circumstances for this mother.

Following the birth of her child, Mrs. Campbell was unemployed until September, when she joined the staff of the Ontario School for the Deaf in Milton as a contract teacher. She is now attending the teacher education centre in Belleville for one year for special education. Previous to that, the Ontario government had provided her with a mother's allowance to help her through her difficult period of mourning and childbirth.

I do not intend to elaborate on her financial circumstances. With the lengthy illness of her husband and the family she was serving, one does not need much imagination to conclude that Mrs. Campbell was faced with considerable difficulty and was receiving little income with which to meet it. I think it is significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that Mrs. Campbell was not prepared to give in to the circumstances and problems that confronted her; she was not content to sit back and get along with the mother's allowance she was receiving.

As I have mentioned she joined the staff of the Ontario School for the Deaf at Milton as a contract teacher, taking a one year in-training course to secure a specialist certificate.

Her personal physician, Dr. Neville Weston, has written that Mrs. Campbell is a competent, hard-working teacher. She has many responsibilities and merits every support and encouragement.

Against this background, the facts of which were not difficult to obtain, and many of which were outlined in several letters related to the pertinent question, another development unfolds, which involves the firm of Phil Glanzer Associates, 223 Coldstream Avenue, Toronto 12, which describes itself as agents in division court. As best I can interpret the file, the firm obtained a judgment against Mrs. Campbell for \$121 and costs on March 15, 1968, one month after the death of her husband and two months following the birth of her fourth child. The judgment was obtained in the sixth division court of Halton county located in Burlington.

For reasons which I suggest are quite obvious, Mrs. Campbell was not able to meet judgment and the firm of Phil Glanzer Associates, on September 25, 1968, obtained a court order under which Mrs. Campbell was to pay \$5 a month beginning on October 1, 1968. I point out again that the order was

obtained from the division court at Burlington.

On October 23, 1968, the transcript of the court order was sent to the first division court of Hastings county in Belleville. In the interests of brevity, let me trace the action of Phil Glanzer Associates in their tenacious pursuit of this judgment.

On November 18, 1968, the firm obtained a direction to garnishee, forwarded to the Ontario School for the Deaf where Mrs. Campbell was located.

On November 22, the superintendent of the school, after pointing out that employees of the provincial government cannot be garnisheed without permission, advised that Mrs. Campbell was making payments to the sixth division court. He outlined Mrs. Campbell's intention to meet her obligations, obviously convinced that the mother was meeting her responsibilities despite the ordeal she had been through.

On November 23, Mr. Phil Glanzer, of Phil Glanzer Associates, wrote to me stating categorically that Mrs. Campbell's statement of intentions could not be believed and requesting me to require her to pay \$10 each pay day, which is every second week. That same day he also wrote to the superintendent of the school for the deaf noting haughtily that employees of the Ontario public service can be garnisheed, and stating that Mrs. Campbell had done nothing to relieve her debt, except to use subterfuge to avoid payment. He accused her of shifting from one address to another, stated her word means absolutely nothing and wondered how the superintendent could be so naive as to believe her explanation.

On November 25, Mr. Glanzer arranged for the clerk of the sixth division court of Halton county to send an affidavit to the superintendent that she had received no moneys on the judgment.

On November 26, Mr. Glanzer demanded further action from the superintendent of the school, calling Mrs. Campbell "a bare-faced liar".

On November 20, Mr. Glanzer wrote my officials to state that Mrs. Campbell's claims that she had made payment were a figment of her imagination.

On February 13, Mr. Glanzer rebuked the superintendent's defence of Mrs. Campbell by stating categorically that the division courts had received no payments since December 5.

On February 21, Mr. Glanzer wrote to my administrator stating that Mrs. Campbell was playing games, and that the division court in Hastings had received no payment.

On March 10, my administrator advised Mr. Glanzer that Mrs. Campbell had paid \$20 to the court, covering the \$5 a month judgment for the months of October, November, December and January, and that she had paid a further \$5 on February 18, thereby meeting the terms of the judgment.

I understand she has subsequently paid \$10 for the months of March and April of 1969. I might explain here that Mrs. Campbell tendered payments to the division court in Burlington, but these were not accepted since the order had been transferred to the court in Belleville.

On March 12, Mr. Glanzer appealed by letter to the member for High Park, suggesting that The Ontario Department of Education refuses to implement the payments, advises him that provincial government employees are immune from garnishment, and states categorically that my department simply refuses to do anything about this situation. He further asks in that letter to the member for High Park, "Are we going to allow The Department of Education to harbour a known judgment debtor and refuse to make deductions on a legitimate court judgment?" He concluded his appeal to the member for High Park by stating "We would appreciate your co-operation in this matter".

The question before you, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the member for High Park has agreed to co-operate with Mr. Phil Glanzer of Phil Glanzer Associates in this particular matter. I must assume that in his energetic endeavours to embarrass this government on any pretext, and without regard to the pain he may cause individuals, he hopes to put me in a compromising position by asking this question.

I have one further document to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the family physician, Dr. Neville Weston, to whom I made reference earlier. At this point I might explain that the collection undertaken by Phil Glanzer Associates was on behalf of that same doctor, who had moved from Ontario to St. Vincent's Hospital in New York. Dr. Weston noted that "I have received no communication from the above-mentioned associates in almost two years". Let me quote directly from Dr. Weston's letter:

Mrs. Campbell and I have been, and remain, close personal friends for these many years. Her receiving a bill at all

must have been a secretarial error, she being covered by a PSI contract to the best of my recollection.

Aspersions and inferences concerning Mrs. Campbell I consider unwarranted and untrue to say the least. It is to be hoped that her career and future prospects will not in any way be prejudiced by Mr. Glanzer's communication.

The doctor then concluded with the statement I quoted earlier to the effect that Mrs. Campbell is a competent person, with many responsibilities, who merits every support and encouragement.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this detailed explanation will answer the question as to why my department has refused to make the requested payroll deductions.

I might also state categorically, sir, in case there may be supplementary questions, that I will not be pressured into doing so by the hon. member for High Park. I do not know what his objectives are, nor what his association is with Phil Glanzer Associates, but may I say to you, sir, that I will not countenance any further demands from either the member for High Park, nor Phil Glanzer Associates, concerning this case.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments and allusions made by the hon. Minister I must say that I asked the Minister for information, as I would if any constituent had written to me. The allusions and suggestions made by him are a flat lie.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): There goes the member's credibility again.

Mr. MacDonald: The latter part of the answer is completely out of order.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Just creditable to the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Trade and Development. Has Texas Gulf Sulphur consulted or discussed with the government the possibility of an equalization of industrial opportunities loan in connection with building their zinc smelter?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is no, because this is a federally designated area and we do not give

grants under the EIO programme to federally designated areas.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I have a question of the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Would The Department of Trade and Development be prepared to offer a loan or a grant to Algoma Steel if they decided to extract and/or process the large tonnage of iron ore in the Geraldton area under lease from the Longlac group?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, their application would be looked at. The merit of the application would be on the basis of processing, not extraction. If they made an application on that basis, we would give it consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East has a question from March 21 of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands and Forests: How much revenue will accrue, approximately, from the sale of fishing licences this year and what will it cost to sell these licences?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Sudbury East, the sale of angling licences should bring the following revenue: the resident angling licences about \$2,150,000, non-resident angling licences \$3,100,000—making a total gross revenue of \$5,250,000. The cost to sell these licences, which consists of printing and issuer's fees, should be about \$466,000.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a question from yesterday of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure the people of Ontario that they will not be required to pay income tax on their tax rebate?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this is a tax reduction programme and the home owner benefited by having his tax bill reduced by the amount of the applicable tax credit.

In the case of tenants, whose municipal taxes are a component of the rent structure, the landlord was required to pass the benefit to tenants by way of a reduction in rent or by a cash rebate.

In both cases, the amount of the rebate is a reduction of expenditures, and in my

opinion would not be subject to income tax in the hands of the individual householder.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

I would like to ask the Minister: He does not see the tax rebate, then, as income?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a question of this Minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the past decade there has been "unacceptable deviation", according to the association of assessors, in the ratio of assessment value to market value in every county. Will the Minister advise:

1. In how many counties the variance is more than ten per cent?

2. In how many counties is the variance between 15 and 30 per cent?

3. Will the Minister estimate how many millions of dollars will be lost because of the variance?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the variance of assessed values from one municipality to another in all the counties of the province is greater than ten per cent. In fact, the variance is greater than 30 per cent in every county as well.

It is reasonable to say that until the advent of county assessment each municipality had its own assessor, who acted and valued property independently from all other assessors in the county. Since some assessors valued property at fairly high rates and others had lower rates, it is reasonable that the variance should exist. The county assessment commissioner system was developed in the hope that the variance could be reduced substantially, if not erased entirely. The County Assessment Commissioner System was developed in the hope that the variance could be substantially reduced if not erased entirely.

The programme could only be successful if each county assessment commissioner undertook and completed a revaluation of all properties in all of the municipalities within the county. None have so far completed this work, and in fact only a few have started to reassess.

It is also worth noting that not only is there a variance among municipalities within the counties in excess of 30 per cent but there are variances among the classes of properties within each municipality of greater than 30 per cent. I would refer the hon.

member to the appendix to chapter 13 of the Smith committee report which gives in detail the results of that committee's finding in this regard.

It is impossible to estimate accurately the total loss of revenue through poor assessment practices throughout the province by the under assessment of certain properties, or worse still the fact that certain properties are not assessed at all.

The total tax requirements of the municipalities must be met regardless of the condition of the assessment on which it is based. So from that point of view no revenue is in fact lost. However, we have estimated that relative to the average of assessment of the municipality, some property owners are under assessed by an amount of assessment that would produce taxes in excess of some millions of dollars. I am not sure that we can assume that the property owners that are assessed above the average pay too much taxes in an equivalent amount.

It is safe to say, however, that far too many property owners are paying too little taxes relative to the average and that others are forced to make up the difference by paying too much.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: If in the last ten years we are supposed to have been operating under the provincial manual and your manual would have negated the need for this variance, why has it not been put into effect in every municipality?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have no doubt that we will discuss this during the course of my estimates, Mr. Speaker; or perhaps in the course of the legislation. I think the important thing is that we are doing something about it.

Mr. Sargent: Ten years later!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a question of the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: The municipalities are losing hundreds of millions of dollars and he does not know anything about it!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. Minister will please leave the member alone.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, leave me alone.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member place his question now to the Attorney General?

Mr. Sargent: Will the Attorney General advise what steps have been taken—as of this hour—to release Mary Cameron from the Walkerton Jail? She has been held there without trial for six weeks on a drunk charge because she would not wear a dress instead of slacks in court.

Second, what steps is the Attorney General taking toward the dismissal of this county judge, Otto McLevis?

Third, how many judges in Ontario are unaware of the civil rights of citizens?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I notice some interpolations in the question from the way I have received it.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not put as many in the answers!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am looking into the whole matter and I will give an answer very shortly.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister told me that last night. At 6.00 of the clock last night he said that he would have an answer today. And this is the answer of today.

An hon. member: She is still in jail!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We were not in the House last night.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a question to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the hon. member is rather in a dilemma, because there has been no answer to the question and therefore, no question supplementary to the answer.

Mr. Sargent: Well, he—

Mr. Speaker: No, there cannot be a supplementary. That was decided the other day.

Mr. Sargent: This is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is serious.

Mr. Sargent: A person has been held—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The hon. member cannot make a statement and he—

Mr. Sargent: Can the Minister answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: The member cannot ask the Minister another question; he has asked his question.

Mr. Sargent: Let him row his own boat here.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister is not in a position to say he will answer it or not. The rules of the House do not allow such a question to be put. Other members have tried in the past and so has the hon. member. I have no objection to it but we are in the same position as we have been in the past, that these are the matters that should be dealt with.

The hon. member for Hamilton East has a question of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Public Works:

Is the land acquisition branch of The Department of Public Works negotiating to acquire land for provincial park development known as the "Fifty-Point Project" in Saltfleet township?

If so, with whom are they negotiating—individual owners or land developers?

If land developers, who are they?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would draw the attention of the House to the anniversary of the National Independence Day of Greece, which is March 25, celebrating the emergence of that country to independence in 1821. I know that all here would want to join with the Greek people who are in Canada in wishing that the events of April 21, 1967, will soon evaporate from their history so that Greece will be restored or will return to the democratic tradition, which is such a valuable contribution to the heritage of the western world.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wonder if the Premier could indicate to the House when he intends to call the Constitutional debate once more. I know he is aware of how important this is, particularly as many of the members still have not had the chance to express their views.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to call it whenever the Whips will indicate to me who wants to participate. The same is true of the Budget Debate. To date I do not think anyone has indicated they are ready to go on.

I think we might safely refer this to the Whips and when they have a list of speakers I will be pleased to find a position in the business of the House to call them.

Mr. Sargent: The same way he is going to raise the pay.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 1, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Bill 17, An Act to amend The Milk Act, 1965.

Bill 22, An Act to amend The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act.

Bill 50, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 56, An Act to amend The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964.

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill 61, An Act to amend The Commissioners for Taking Affidavits Act.

Bill 62, An Act to provide for the consolidation and revision of the Statutes.

Bill 63, An Act to provide for the consolidation and revision of the Regulations.

Bill 65, An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.

Bill 66, An Act to amend The Matrimonial Causes Act.

Bill 67, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Bill 68, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill 69, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, as a fitting epitaph to this next particular bill on The Department of Justice and to the setting up of this particular department outlining the criteria and the scope of the responsibility for the Attorney General and Minister of Justice in this province, I would like to read into the record a brief statement which I adverted to only in part in the earlier part of this debate. As I say, it will cap, perhaps, the proceedings touching this bill.

I want to advert to the book called "Criticism of the Bar" published in 1819 by John

Payne Collier, who said this of the Attorney General:

Of all the offices in the gift of the Crown, that of the Attorney General is perhaps least to be coveted for, whether the government be popular or unpopular, the person filling that place can scarcely avoid being the object of general dislike. He is only to be considered as a servant of servants, the curse of the Israelites. The Attorney General stands forward almost alone as the public spy, informer and prosecutor. The wrath of the parties and the dislike of the nation at large are levelled principally against him.

It shows how long a way we have come since 1819. We cannot at this date think thus of the Attorney General and his office. This bill will bear out the important role and distinction he will have to play when not being so regarded within our law.

Having, partially as a result of his own personal merits, brought this office into esteem in Ontario, the Attorney General will still have to face the very grave implications to him that are contained in the operation of that bill. I commend him on putting the bill before the House and bringing it into being. I exhort him and hope to be able to compliment him in the future as to the exercise of the powers so conferred upon him.

Bill 70, An Act respecting The Department of Justice.

Bill 71, An Act to amend The Fines and Forfeitures Act.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I think these next three bills—78, 79 and 80—should be repealed and the government should launch their taxation in the areas that can afford it—the areas of corporations, insurance companies and banks. I think it is high time, when every other economy is looking for a way to reduce taxes. In these three bills we are loading the taxes and soaking the poor.

I am opposed to these three bills.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has covered the three of them in one statement.

Bill 78, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965.

Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Bill 80, An Act to repeal The Hospitals Tax Act.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Ontario Co-operative Credit Society.

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Bobier convalescent home.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the town of Lindsay.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting March Diamond Drilling Limited.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the town of Parry Sound.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Cornwall.

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the county of Ontario.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the town of Mitchell.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the county of Peel.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of Windsor.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the township of Teck.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Maimonides School for Jewish Studies.

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the Tilbury public school board.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Co-ordinated Arts Services.

Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Sarnia.

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Banks Alignment Limited.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the town of Mississauga.

Clerk of the House: The 74th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY
AND CITIZENSHIP
(Continued)

On vote 1701:

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

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I am sorry. I was not in the House yesterday when they

discussed this hospitality fund, but I know that this was an unusual year, having an amount of \$207,000 to expend on entertaining, etcetera. The fact is that I feel that this whole matter of entertaining at government expense is used for political purposes. I recall the dinner of the Princess Alexandra, an amount of \$29,000. I am wondering how you can spend \$29,000 in one bash like that?

I recall they held this party at the Inn on the Park, and my wife and I were there. We were not invited to the inner circle. The party was divided in two sections—for the brass and the common people, who drank separately. And then my wife decided she would like to sit near the Princess and so we got a table up near the front, as close as I am to his honour, the Chairman, and she got a good look at the chair the princess would be sitting in.

So I found myself rubbing shoulders with the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), and I thought to myself, this is a nice fellow sitting here. And on my left I had the bag-man, Harry Price of the Conservative Party, and Harry and I are not too buddy-buddy, and I thought it was going to be pretty strained relations, but my wife was enjoying things anyway, sitting that close to the head table. But one of the gendarmes came and touched me on the shoulder, and he said, "This is no place for you."

An hon. member: This is no place for a peasant.

Mr. Sargent: For a peasant is right. He said, "I am sorry, sir, you are not allowed to sit here". And I said, "What do you mean, I am not allowed to sit here?" He said, "Well, this is reserved for certain people." And I find that the Conservative Party allotted the seats to the brass in the party, and they are using public funds to do things like this.

So I was asked—I was embarrassed—but I was asked to leave my seat beside the Attorney General; I was not good enough to sit beside him or the bag man, Harry Price. Harry Price had a higher stature in the party than I did. Now, I know a lot of people think I do not rate that, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that the office of a member of Parliament rates higher than a bag man for a party. I think, if you will be perfectly fair as you sometimes are, that you will agree with that.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): What utter nonsense. The incident we are discussing took place in 1967. Why did the member not come and ask me about it after

it happened? I would have been delighted to have found out what the answers were.

But 1967, 1968; we are now in 1969, and here it comes up on the floor of the House. Why did the member not come and ask me then? We have lots of conversations outside the House; he could have asked me about it, and I would have been happy to look into it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, if I had ever asked the Prime Minister this, he would have said, "We will talk about it in the estimates". He would have taken that lofty perch and he would sneer at me and say that he does not equate things like this because it might be embarrassing to the government. But you cannot equate the fact that we should be getting a bit more than a quarter of the pay the Prime Minister gets; we should be getting as much money as the members in Quebec are getting, but he will not admit that. So that is how fair he is.

Getting back to the vote here, I think it is wrong, Mr. Chairman, that this Treasury bench can take \$207,000 of the public money to spend on about 50,000 cases of booze a year across this province, and to use it for political purposes. So I was told, along with my wife, that I could not sit there because the top brass of the Tory Party had to sit there. I was delegated to back and left field some place and of all things I found myself sitting with Ralph Cowan, and we could not even see the head table from where we were.

So here we have the supreme intelligence of the Tory Party filtering down saying, "Now here are two renegades, we will put Sargent and Cowan back in left field". But this is how things operate. They take the list and say, "These people do not have any stature and we will use public funds to put them where they should be". So here we have a man—I thank the Prime Minister, we will look for him coming back some time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will be back.

Mr. Sargent: Along the same line—booze—we had a case about Melchers, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister will not bring to trial because it is embarrassing to the government because people know this is going to hurt the Tory Party. It involves the fact that a member of the distillery had to pay \$10,000 to get his name on the board. The case is still pending, and never will come to trial.

If we look through all these estimates, Mr. Chairman, we will find not only \$90,000 here

in this department, but we will find probably \$1 million a year spent on tipping the bottle by you people who direct who shall drink, and where they shall drink, and how they shall sit. I think it is criminal when you are raising taxes across the board for people across this province who cannot pay their taxes, people who cannot get housing. We have all these problems, and you have the nerve to ask us to pass a vote for \$207,000 worth of booze. And you break down what you are spending each year—\$1 million worth of booze in this party in the year—it breaks down to about 1,000 cases of booze a month, or maybe 250 cases of booze a week.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Booze not food.

Mr. Sargent: All right, that is what we are talking about, booze, right here, now. I am talking to an expert. I take that back, the Minister is no more than I am, I am sorry. I did not mean it that way.

But I think it is wrong, Mr. Chairman, not because it is this Minister's vote, it is a Tory Party policy. They have been here 25 years, they can make these decisions and can laugh at us commoners over here, they can make us sit in the back of the hall while their bag man has a better seat than my wife, and I think that stinks.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I only want to say this, that certainly I want to disassociate the government from the seating arrangements at that luncheon, and any embarrassment that was caused.

Mr. Sargent: How did Harry Price get a better seat than I?

Hon. Mr. Welch: May I go on to point out that that particular function was a Royal visit and the entire reception was looked after, insofar as the arrangements were concerned, by the Lieutenant-Governor. The amount of money which we are being asked to vote for hospitality in the coming fiscal year is \$90,000, not \$200,000—odd, to which reference was made. It is my understanding that the hospitality function of government is, in fact, handled through this particular vote, which includes the many and diverse applications that come in from time to time during the course of the year for this type of hospitality.

Certainly in the seating arrangements, in the invitation lists, particularly during Centennial year, great care was taken with respect to those visits. The co-ordinator of

state visits always made sure that there was a great deal of consultation, particularly with the visiting dignitaries of the various ethnic and national groups which were in this province, to make sure that the list was a complete and representative one. I do not think I really can add anything more, Mr. Chairman, to the comments which have already been made in the last couple of days on this particular vote.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the Provincial Secretary for his explanation. I do not suggest he has any part of this, and I will take his word for it, but I think it is high time this party quit using the political gambit in all these entertainments—using the taxpayers' money to further the Tory party.

An hon. member: The only way to stop it is to throw them out of office.

Mr. Sargent: It has gone too far and I suggest the Minister's explanation of that particular dinner covers the bald part—not that I give a darn where I was sitting, but it just goes to show what happens when you people have all this money to spend at the public trough and the public funds. I think you have gone too far in using public funds for political purposes.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether he has any information on the three questions which I asked him last night. This might be an appropriate time—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday, the hon. member for Riverdale raised some questions in connection with the overall vote. May I simply point out in answer that the Budget statement made by the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) makes reference to the voted amount for 1968-69, plus the necessary and additional amounts which would be required to complete that particular fiscal year, making a total forecast gross expenditure of \$7,353,000.

It happens—and we should keep in mind that in order to complete the 1968-69 figure it was necessary to make a forecast and this, I think, explains some of the answers to the question which the hon. member wants—that this amount I just made reference to, the \$7,353,000, is \$145,000 more than the amount which is actually submitted for the consideration of this committee.

Practically all of this additional amount that we make reference to was required due to the length of the last session, as well as a fall sitting which was not anticipated at the time of the introduction of the estimates a year ago, and which we do not, of course, feel will be repeated this year. So therefore, keeping in mind these special amounts, these estimates which are now before the House will not require any curtailment of our present programme or the services provided by this department.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman—I am sorry, are you still on this? Go ahead.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member for Riverdale pursuing the same thing?

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I think perhaps he should be permitted to finish his questions in that respect.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am curious as to how the remarks of the Minister fit into the remarks of his colleague, the Treasurer, on page 16 of the Budget where the Treasurer takes credit for the remarkable success of the austerity programme. He then goes on to say:

—many of whom suffered painful restrictions on their programmes.

This is through the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board imposed severe restrictions and in the four departments of Public Works and Health, Energy and Resources Management, and the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, the approved spending for 1969-70 has been cut below last year's level. Almost without exception, new programmes, and programme improvements, have been deferred, capital expenditures have been restrained, and large administrative reductions have been made.

I just wanted to ask the Minister—and I take it from what he has said—if in fact, there were no new programmes which he was planning to introduce, no programme improvements that he would have made, and that no deferments have taken place? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is not correct, Mr. Chairman. The point I was trying to make is that I understand the question raised by the hon. member yesterday was to ask what new programmes were in fact postponed because of the cuts.

The point I am trying to make is that our estimates this year are \$145,000 less than what was estimated to be our total expenditure for the current fiscal year. Then I proceeded to give an explanation why, in the forecasting, this has happened. The end result of these estimates is that this department will be able to carry on its present programme and perhaps not expand some of its services as quickly as perhaps we would have liked, but there is certainly no cutting back with respect to our current level of service.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister, so that we can exercise some kind of value judgment on what the Minister's department wish to accomplish and what the Treasury Board, for purposes of economy, said that they could not accomplish, state just what are the new programmes then, since you are going to be able to carry on at your existing level of services? What new programmes or programme improvements did you intend to implement which in fact you are now not implementing because of the budgetary limitations that were imposed on your department?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, we exercised that restraint ourselves before we even made the presentation to the Treasury Board.

In other words we followed the theory that there was no point in making these presentations at this time. There would normally be certain expansions in the citizenship programme which we would not ask for this year in order to attempt to live within these estimates as we presented them. In other words we exercised that particular restraint ourselves prior to making any presentation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Then, Mr. Chairman, the presentation which you made to the Treasury Board was not cut back by the Treasury Board? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well the point is, that it was not required because we had exercised that particular responsibility ourselves before we made our presentations.

Mr. J. Renwick: Then, so far as your department is concerned, the Treasury Board does not participate in any of the success, which must be attributed to their skill, in bringing about these painful restrictions on their programmes, even though your department is named in it.

I take it, from what you have said, that in submitting your estimates for this year to the Treasury Board for the overall review,

you got the same number of dollars that you asked for? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, I think in general terms it is fair to say that the Treasury Board was satisfied in a very careful scrutiny of the estimates of this department, that we had, in fact, exercised care in the scrutiny of our own spending programme. So, they do share in it, in the fact that they concurred in the request.

Mr. J. Renwick: I want to labour the point, Mr. Chairman, because I want to get it clear. The Treasurer explained at great length in his Budget—not just the portion that I quoted, but throughout his Budget statement—about the painful operation that was involved by the exercise, through the Treasury Board, of restraint on the government departments.

I take it, speaking only about your own department, that in fact you submitted estimates that were below last year's estimates; that you internally in your own department decided that you were not going to implement certain new programmes or certain programme improvements. And, because you had done that, in fact, the Treasury Board in your case simply approved of what you had submitted. Would that be correct, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): Maybe I can make a comment here, Mr. Chairman. There were directives sent to all the departments prior to the estimates being examined by the Treasury Board setting out certain guidelines and respect to new programmes and requests to review existing programmes to see if they could be subordinated to new ones if necessary. In this instance it was possible for The Provincial Secretary's Department to conform with these guidelines and produce a budget for Treasury Board that met the directives that had been submitted.

I think that is a fair statement to make. The estimates were carefully scrutinized by the Treasury Board, but in each circumstance we found that the guidelines had been well complied with.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well then, I do not want to enter into a debate with the Treasurer because we will be coming back to his estimates. I think perhaps he will be refreshed after his holiday and be able to give more adequate explanations than he was giving before he left on his holiday, about this problem, because again I want to revert simply to the Minister.

The Minister in fact is saying that he submitted certain estimates to the Treasury Board and those were approved. Did the Treasury Board, apropos of your department, come back and say, "You have certainly done very well, Mr. Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship, but can you not do a little better?" After all, this was supposed to be an austerity year in the government's book.

What programmes did you forfeit and what improvements in programmes would you have undertaken had you been able to obtain further funds, or did you not want further funds? Are you quite happy to have your department level off?

In other words, in what way are the people of the province of Ontario going to suffer in the curtailment of your programmes? For example, I think it is proper under this first vote to say, in terms of the citizenship programmes of your department, that you are not operating at an optimum level in that branch of your operation by any means, so far as the language training requirements of language demands that are made on newcomers to the country. Did you curtail that programme? Did you curtail some other programme? Did you fail to improve some other area? This is the information which we want because it goes right to the very guts of the government's approach to the problem.

We tried to get the information from the Treasurer, now we are reduced to trying to get it from the individual Ministers, because the Treasurer would not tell us what the priorities of the programmes were, in detail. I therefore want to know either on this general vote, or specifically on the other items, what programmes did you not initiate and what improvements did you not effect, that you would have effected within a reasonable expenditure of a few more dollars?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I might speak to that point particularly. I think the area of expansion in a department such as this would obviously be the citizenship branch, and particularly the work that we have, or the responsibilities that we have in the citizenship branch function of working with our new people and in their integration in the Ontario, or rather, to put it a little more broadly, the Canadian community.

I would think that there are many aspects of our programme which could, in fact, be expanded with more personnel and, therefore, with more money. We made the decision internally that we would attempt to maintain

the programme at its current level of involvement, keeping in mind that even that required more money, what with salary adjustments and increased costs. However, I think it is reasonable to share with you at this time, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this House that if more money was available, I am quite satisfied that on the basis of my brief tenure of the responsibilities of this office that we would find other areas in the citizenship function, be it the information service or be it the field of research.

The field of research is one where I have a particular interest in wanting to test some of our new programmes, particularly the work we are now doing in research—and we will come to it in the debate—with pre-schoolers, and the mothers working with them in these programmes. You have touched on the language training programmes, you have touched on our relationship programme, if you can put it this way, and our community activities.

We have to maintain our community conferences at only four, rather than doing six, or perhaps eight of them. This is the type of approach which we made in really the main area, which would allow for and provide for, some type of expansion. So we attempted to maintain it as best we could, at that particular level of service and, as I repeat, notwithstanding the fact that that would require, in itself, some extra funds.

The other aspects of our programme are such that we, perhaps, do not have the flexibility. There are certain things we have to do and it is unfortunate in a way that the citizenship branch is one where you do have a bit of flexibility. You can have some control over the speed by which you develop and the way in which you might expand your programme activities.

In the internal scrutiny of our programme, this is the sort of problem with which we were faced and, therefore, it was our responsibility to satisfy Treasury Board in those discussions that we had, in fact, exercised that type of scrutiny and restraint ourselves within the department.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, to finish it off—if I could just put it in capsule form—in the one area in your department where your department is involved with rendering services to people in the province, this is where you exercised the value judgment that there was to be curtailment in terms of the guidelines that had come down from the Treasury? Do I take it that you did not feel that there

was any need for you to participate in urging the government that this was one vital area of your department's activities which should go forward; that in whatever scale of priorities the government came up with—and I am almost beginning to think it is part of the mythology that there was such a scale—you did not feel under any urge or any need to argue the case for the citizenship branch?

It is related so much to the newcomers to the country and the need is so great as anyone knows who, as I happen to, represents a riding in the city where there are many, many people from Italy, Greece and other countries, who need this kind of assistance.

In capsule form, Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious that in this particular branch, this particular Minister decided that where people were concerned they would not only curtail them, he did not feel under any obligation to argue for their extension in terms of the vast range of the other value judgments that the government had to make about these so-called priorities.

Mr. Chairman: I would just point out that we are arguing on vote 1701. I realized the hon. member for Riverdale used the citizenship branch as an example in his general comment under 1701 and therefore I did not rule it out of order. I would hope, however, that further comments in connection with the citizenship branch would be kept to vote 1703.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale. As you know, he is entitled to his opinion as a member of this House, and he has drawn certain conclusions which I would hope that we would recognize as being his conclusions.

No one knows better than I the tremendous responsibility that we have as a government insofar as our new-citizen work is concerned. I think he has been somewhat unfair to suggest that I have not recognized the responsibilities in this particular field and that I have some strange sense of priorities. If he really studies the entire estimates of this department very carefully, if a man is to be responsible in a Ministry to carry out some guidelines and to show some restraint and some curtailment, there are very few areas which provide for this.

This happened to be one and I am quite satisfied, notwithstanding my personal feelings in this matter, that I would have been less than responsible had I attempted to not

accept some share of the responsibility to live within the guidelines that were issued by the Treasury Board. I am quite satisfied that in maintaining our programme at least at the present level of service we will be doing, with a very dedicated staff, the best possible job that we can. I leave the record of the department in this regard for the judgment of those with whom we work.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I just make one comment? I have no intention of being unfair to the Minister or to the members of his department. I take it that the Civil Service of Ontario, by and large, is dedicated and resourceful and interested in what it is doing. What I am saying is I pay any amount of tribute to this Minister for having injected some new meaning into the citizenship branch in the short time which he had occupied that portfolio, but I do not draw back from coming to the conclusion—on the basis of the answers given to my questions by the Minister—that, in fact, there has been a curtailment of those services which would otherwise have gone forward where people in our community need those services. I have got no indication that, within the give and take in the discussions that took place about these priorities, the Minister asserted his priorities for his department as being of great importance.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have a related question and the hon. member for Dovercourt has indicated that he will yield the floor. May I get it in another context to the Minister? The Provincial Treasurer has indicated that the estimates were cut back \$400 million. By that I presume that the natural growth of existing programmes, plus new programmes would have taken your estimates up to approximately \$3,400 million?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, this is completely out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not out of order.

Mr. Sopha: We are not discussing the Budget. I rise on a point of order. Are we discussing the Budget here or the estimates of this department?

Mr. MacDonald: Can I ask a question of this Minister without the Liberals' running interference?

Mr. Sargent: No, you cannot.

Mr. Chairman: May I just say that vote 1701—

Mr. MacDonald: Obviously I can, but have I your permission to do so?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1701 is under general expenditure. We are not in the Budget Debate, but the remarks of the hon. member for York South, in my view, do relate to the general departmental administration under vote 1701.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. My question to the Minister is this: How much of the \$400 million that the government has cut back was cut back in your department from your original presentation of your estimates?

Mr. Sargent: Even the hon. Treasurer does not know that.

Mr. MacDonald: If the Minister says none, that means that nothing was cut back, that every department did it as a self-imposed cut-back. Apparently the Provincial Treasurer just reached out of the air and said that because of the series of self-imposed cut-backs, \$400 million was cut back. If \$400 million was cut back, it is an aggregate of which there were a number of components. One of those components was the cut-back in this department. My question is, what was the cut-back in this department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, please forgive me for speaking on this. I think it is out of order, quite frankly. I think we are talking about a situation that is totally unrelated here, but I explained it before. I will attempt to explain it again. First of all, as I mentioned before—and I am out of order now but if I am out of order I am replying to the general character of your question—

Mr. MacDonald: I did not ask the Minister to intervene. If he is out of order, let him sit down. I asked the Minister whose estimates are before us, how much of a cut-back was made in his department? Because when we are finished considering the estimates, we should have a series of cut-backs from each department which will aggregate \$400 million or else the Provincial Treasurer has misinformed the House.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. Provincial Secretary would handle this question from the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think we are getting into another question and the hon. member is approaching it in another context. I do not have my original presentation to the Treasury Board here with me. I only have the estimates that we have.

I go back to the answer which I gave the hon. member for Riverdale, that these estimates which I have tabled for the consideration of the committee are \$145,000 less than our current anticipated expenditures. That is not what the hon. member wants. He wants me now to share with him what we originally thought our needs were and what in the give and take discussion with Treasury Board, we had to cut back. I cannot tell him because I have not this information here with me.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I submit there are one or two alternatives; either this Minister provides us with this information because we are going to ask it of each Minister, or alternatively, the Provincial Treasurer, if he wants to do it neatly in a package, indicates to us where the cut-backs were made in each department because he boasted about the blood, sweat and toil—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I certainly did.

Mr. MacDonald: Right—involved in cutting back \$400 million.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: I think we are entitled to know where the cut-back was in each department. Indeed, we are entitled to go one step further; what were the programmes that you cut back? Because each one we examine we find you have cut back on those programmes that were servicing human beings.

Mr. Chairman: If I may just comment on the remarks of the hon. member for York South. He suggested that he intends to direct the same question to each department. It may be answered by the specific departmental Minister or by the hon. Treasurer.

Now I suggest that it would be proper for him to direct the question in the first instance to the Minister responsible. If that Minister does not wish to answer, or cannot, perhaps he could defer it to the Treasurer for the time when his estimates come up. But there should not be any projected debate in this respect without end.

Mr. J. Renwick: No, all we want is the information.

Mr. MacDonald: We just want the facts.

Mr. Chairman: In this particular case the hon. Minister has suggested that he is not able to provide the information at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps he can get it later.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister wish to provide this before his estimates are completed?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty I have at this particular stage is that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Welch: —is that I do not have the information here. If the member will give me some time to get this I hope that perhaps I might be able to provide him with some information.

Mr. MacDonald: Any time—by mail next week if necessary.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Will that be satisfactory then, if I have not got it by the time we are completed?

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman would like this clarified. Are we to get this information before the estimates pass?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The Treasurer has gone for it now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I cannot guarantee that. I do not know how long he will be.

Mr. Chairman: All right; the hon. Minister has undertaken to provide the hon. member with—

Mr. MacDonald: I will get you off the hook, Mr. Chairman. If a week from now I have not got it I will ask a question before the orders of the day to the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Sargent: That will shake them.

Mr. Chairman: That sounds like a very good solution.

The hon. member for Dovercourt on vote 1701.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. Minister for some information on that item of \$29,018.05 in the accounts; does the Minister have that question answered?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I do; thank you very much.

This had to do with the visit of Her Royal Highness, Princess Alexandria; the total amount was \$29,018.

Mr. Sopha: I think her name is Alexandra.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Did I say "dria"; I am sorry, "dra"!

Mr. Sopha: Alexandria is in Egypt.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be the last one to want to argue with the hon. member about proper names.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Particularly on Royalty!

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, particularly on the subject of Royalty.

That is right; \$29,018.65 made up as follows. The grand ball totalled \$14,986.24—are you making note of these?

Mr. De Monte: I will.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The luncheon at the Inn on the Park was \$10,191.43; the Lieutenant-Governor's reception was \$2,757.63; various printings—invitations, menus and so on—\$1,083.35.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1701; the hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, at the end of the estimates yesterday, when we rose, I was in the process of asking the hon. Minister who picks out the people that are invited to these functions, and I did not get the answer completely then. Could the Minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I answered that for the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) just a few minutes ago, but I think if you were to give me each particular one I could perhaps share with you the procedures, Mr. Chairman, that were followed.

We were talking about the heads of states and special visits during 1967. Any visits by royalty were handled by the Lieutenant-Governor and his aide and the procedures were—

Mr. Sargent: Well, that is a Tory setup to start with.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The heads of state visits were handled by the co-ordinators for heads of state visits; and as I understand, depending on the country from which the guest came, there was consultation with the various groups in Ontario who make up that particu-

lar ethnic community and group, to make sure that it was a representative group, depending on the length of stay and the type of function.

In many of the other hospitality functions, Mr. Chairman, the group itself specifically ask the government to extend hospitality, and the group itself looks after its list because it is related to the activities of the particular convention or association which is meeting.

So great care, I am advised, is taken on the invitation lists where we in fact have some nominations to make, insofar as this is concerned, along the lines which I have just mentioned.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, on the affair that took place for the President of Italy, Giuseppe Saragat, there were many people in Toronto and Ontario who were very upset about that list. I just wanted to point that out to the hon. Minister and suggest that perhaps this type of choosing should be left to somebody more responsible than the people who worked that list out, perhaps in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor, or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, or somebody else. I just wanted to inform the Minister that there was quite a bit of unhappiness about the list of people who were invited to that affair.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am sorry about that. This is the first I knew of it, and I appreciate the comments.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask this Minister, among his responsibilities are those of custodian of various insignia, and indeed the seal of the province of Ontario. I suppose when documents are executed under seal that it is the Provincial Secretary himself who performs that act; and of course he is in charge of protocol. Indeed all those matters that have to do with the traditions of this province, and both since Confederation and as it existed from 1792 onwards.

Now I should like to hear from him just what is the policy of this government, if a policy has been decided upon, in respect of the coat of arms of Ontario. Really, the coat of arms is a very pleasing, very artistic—in my view—design; and indeed in many ways reflects the life of this province from its inception. A few years ago, and I ask this most seriously, a few years ago the government of this province went to work with a surgeon's knife on the coat of arms, and as

we now see the coat of arms reproduced on Ontario's flag it is denuded of the livestock; they were taken off.

Even more serious than that; I want to call attention to this thing here, this stylized version that one sees with ever increasing frequency. I sometimes have called it a cross between the pretzel and a doughnut, sometimes a cross-eyed owl; and indeed, if you look at it long enough, it is an optical illusion.

Now it is on government stationery, and various government bodies use this symbol on their publications. Two illustrations of its use really startled me. I saw a laundry truck down on College Street, a vehicle apparently owned by a private entrepreneur. It was on the side of the truck. Really, the final straw is when I see it appear on doorknobs over in the other building, the new complex just opened.

I would really seriously like to know where the authority is? And where does that authority originate? Who gave the directive that the coat of arms of this province should be replaced by this symbol?

I am told—the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) told me, and I am in a state of disbelief; I would not believe it until I saw the contract—but he tells me, and he is not inclined to exaggerate, he actually told me that money has to be paid for the purchase of these things. He told me that the symbol for CN, that CN symbol, cost about \$20,000. The Hydro symbol—that stupid-looking thing on their stationery that they send out, the plug, the electric plug—they had to pay money for that one. I would like to know whether money was paid for this one; and if so, how much?

But more important, I am seriously asking where is the authority? Is it statutory? Is there some obscure statute somewhere, some Order-in-Council, some regulatory power, that enables people to use this device on official publications of this government?

Specifically, where was the authority derived to put it on the doorknobs of those two buildings, that new set of buildings over there? And where is the authority to denigrate the coat of arms of this province and to drive this coat of arms into the background, to render the coat of arms of the province obsolescent?

What is unsatisfactory in this is the nature of the question that I ask—what is unsatisfactory about the coat of arms on government publications that it has to be replaced by this modern and up-to-date thing of which I am asking if money was paid?

Mr. MacDonald: The member sounds like Eugene Forsey—

Mr. Sopha: I am glad the member mentioned Eugene Forsey, because that enables me to say that I also want to ask, is this another instance of the creeping repulicanism that bothers Eugene Forsey? Is that what it is?

If you look over the Speaker's chair, I think I am safe in saying that those are the coat of arms of the old province of Canada before Confederation.

And you will note that on those—and they are replete with the history, of course, of Great Britain, Scotland and Ireland—the whole history is depicted in that coat of arms, and on top you have the crown. Well, I am very pleased that that very fine woodwork exists and is treasured and kept above the Speaker's chair. That was replaced after we became a province by these, and I am referring to the coat of arms on a publication provided by The Department of Tourism.

My question is, what is wrong with them as being a traditional reminder of our provincial right? Why do they have to give way, showing as they do, symbols that can be understood, the maple leaf, the cross of St. George, perhaps the caribou and the moose, the bear, recognizable symbols typical of our province and our country? Why do they have to give way to this stupid thing? This optical illusion?

And under what authority do they give way, who decides when a government publication is sent out? The civil service commission is one example which came to my attention this morning. It does not have the coat of arms on it at all, it has the trillium, the stylized trillium. Who decides that?

Where does the authority derive that they shall use this symbol instead of the coat of arms of the province? I think it is about time that we got some rationale into this, and heard from the responsible Minister just when this policy decision was made, who was the author of the decision, how much money was paid for this version, where is the statutory authority for its use and what is the intention in the long run? Is it going to be this one, the old coat of arms of the province, or is it going to be this one, or are they going to compete, and if they are going to compete, which one is likely to win?

Or may we hope that, at some time, someone over there in authority—this Minister if he is responsible—is going to come in here and tell us once and for all what the situa-

tion is going to be? I have observed in the ten years I have been here that this government surpasses any other in the universe in changing symbols. They change from year to year.

But I am one who places a high value on tradition—meaningful traditions, ones that are part of the fabric of our life, our cultural life. That has nothing to do with going every two years to see if John Graves Simcoe is still dead; I do not value those traditions.

But meaningful traditions I do not want to see surrendered lightly, at somebody's whim, as the result of the winsome presentation of some advertising agency. I do not like to see these things changed lightly.

So for a few brief moments, and of course we do not want to take up too much time, I would like to hear from this Minister just what is the policy between these clashing symbols?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, actually I am delighted that a question of this kind would be raised, for it helps us perhaps to share the pride we have in the symbols and in the customs that we use here in the province of Ontario. I might say, if I can quickly review the questions that have been raised by the hon. member, in the first place no funds have been voted from this department for the art work or the style work, insofar as the logo or symbol to which he makes reference is concerned. So I am unable to answer the question with respect to cost and the development of the idea. I personally do not know by what statutory authority it may have been developed.

Mr. Trotter: I think it cost \$7,000.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I see. I have not the slightest idea, because it was not something commissioned under this department, at least since I have been Minister.

Mr. Sargent: It is a pretty complicated thing.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I might point out that there is a book on the logo published by the government. It is something controlled through the office of the Prime Minister. There is what is called a control manual for the use and application of the approved Ontario government symbol and logo type.

It is a publication here and if I had the permission of the member, I would be very happy to send it over to him in order that he might review it, rather than reading the entire contents of the book here. It may well

be, perhaps, when the estimates of the Prime Minister are before the House, he might then be in a position to give some more particular details after he has had an opportunity to study this booklet.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I would be delighted. I ask the Minister, does it say in there who approves?

Hon. Mr. Welch: It says:

This book was prepared under the authority of the government of the province of Ontario. The use and application of the symbol and logo type is to adhere strictly to the specifications herein stated.

And there are many pages, even as to the drawings and the height of print and so on. May I send it over to the member?

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

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as saying I do not think there is a more able Minister in the Legislature than the Provincial Secretary. I am not critical of the job he is doing, but I am critical of some things that have been done, sir, in the past. And the only way we can judge, Mr. Chairman, the only way we can get a track record is to check the accounts book. The Prime Minister took me to task for harping back to 1967. How else can we judge what is going on? We do not have anything for 1968.

So we are talking ancient history but it is the only yardstick that we, as supposedly intelligent directors of a large corporation, can assess the goings-on, as it were. So somewhere along the line, when we have an intelligent government in this province, under the leader of the Opposition, we are going to straighten things out and give you people, when you are sitting over here, a chance to see how we are currently spending money.

There is no business corporation in the world that sits down to judge its financial affairs without a current record of the fiscal situation. So here we are—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1701!

Mr. Sargent: I am getting to the point, Mr. Chairman. So if you are critical of me for assessing this record, I cannot do anything else but. What else do I have to look at? Somewhere along the line, if the Treasurer would bring into us, even in loose leaf form the 1968 expenses, then we could judge currently what is going on.

An hon member: It is too simple for him.

Mr. Sargent: That is right, it is too simple for him. But we have here two items in this first vote. We have an item here, as I mentioned, with Inn on the Park for \$29,000 for Princess Alexandra, and two lines below on page Q7, we have an item: Inn on the Park—\$23,000. So in those two items we have an expenditure of \$52,000 plus.

I do not suggest there is anything sinister in the delegation of these parties to one area, but I would like to know eventually, not today, the amount of money spent in the year 1967 in the different hotels in regard to Centennial.

Did the Westbury get the major part of it? I would like to know how much moneys were expended in the Westbury Hotel, in the Inn on the Park, and the Royal York Hotel—specifically those three hotels, in that particular year.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister wish to undertake to provide that information, or does he have any comments?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am advised that the various hotels are, in fact, listed in the public accounts and it would be a very easy job to make that list on the basis of the information already in the public accounts.

Mr. Sargent: You have the staff for it, I do not.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Fine, we will be glad to summarize what is already there.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much.

Vote 1701 agreed to.

On vote 1702:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat a point that I have made for several years now, and we still do not seem to be making any great progress. I have never really been able to understand the reason for part of the responsibility for corporations being in the office of the Provincial Secretary, and a substantial part being moved into the office of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree).

Now he has taken over a new aspect of this, or his department has taken over a new aspect of this. Within The Department of the Provincial Secretary we deal with names,

which is a very complicated thing. I understand there is something called a names committee—I had to wrestle with them in my practice not too long ago—and I gather the names committee is just another name for the fellow who makes the decision anyway.

He goes and meets in a little square room and throws it about by himself and eventually if you have shown him a good bill of goods, he says that name is okay. I gather, too, that you are going to take in the partnership names—that is in the wind somewhere is it not?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps the member is making reference to the proposed Bill 126 which required the registration. As you know, the select committee requires the registration of names in which companies are trading just as a matter of information.

Mr. Singer: Practising lawyers will recognize we have a little difficulty with this name business on many occasions. Then, of course, there is this whole business of forms. We have some computers down there, I guess, in the Minister's office which do a great job of turning out forms. There is hardly a mail that comes into any legal office where you have not got umpteen forms addressed to all companies you may have handled, and these things almost come through regularly. I suppose if somebody kept a calendar of them you could gauge the day of the month by which date you get a certain kind of mail out of the Minister's office.

I have been very concerned, Mr. Chairman, and I have expressed this on the company law committee, about the uselessness of many of these forms. The annual return form, for instance, I think is just really hopeless, I do not think it conveys any information to anybody. It keeps a lot of people busy; it keeps the machine busy; if the form is not in on time there is complaining letter number one, complaining letter number two, complaining letter number three.

Every now and then, I suppose, after 10 and 12 complaining letters, somebody gets summonsed; some lawyer in the department has a task. There are a couple of young ladies I had a discussion with—one of my clients got into this position—who worry about it and say, "Well we will not go to court, let us adjourn it for another week."

We must have spent a couple of thousand dollars of departmental time, and some dollars of my time, in figuring out whether or not we were all going to be hauled off to

jail because one of these company information forms had not been filed on time. Granted the law says it should have been done and it was not done when it should have been done, but what real purpose is achieved?

It would seem to me that when the Treasurer is sending out forms for corporation tax, and when the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is getting his feet pretty wet in this same field, that surely the time has come to take everything to do with companies and put it in one branch, under one direction, even with one set of computers, and to eliminate a lot of the useless pieces of paper that are kept somewhere on file.

The search of these company annual returns, other than providing ammunition for some question from the odd member over on the left, I do not think achieve really anything.

You look at a company return and the date is March 31 and it says that on March 31 the directors were so and so. You have no information for the next 12 months and the directors could have changed April 1 and changed half a dozen times from there on in. The information is not current at all.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We have to notify the department.

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, I know that and that is what the Act says and very few people do. If you do not notify them, who knows that you did not notify them unless there is some great public scandal involved in it? Most of these companies—99.9 per cent—carry on and do their business reasonably well and manage to stay out of the trials and tribulations of all these legal people that you have inhabiting these departments.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that in this day and age, when we are trying to get better methods of doing things, you do not get better methods merely by putting a computer in to gather the same kind of information that has been useless for many years in the past, and continues to be useless.

I would like to hear whether or not this Minister and/or his colleagues have any plans to bring together, under one central direction, all the myriad of information that is demanded, to cut down on the return, to make them more meaningful, and to stop all of these pieces of paper that constantly flow out of the department—the use of which escapes me completely.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think, in commenting on this very briefly, Mr. Chairman, it is a very reasonable question to ask. This question comes up from time to time and those of us who have been engaged in the practice can appreciate this very much. Various briefs have come into the department from some of the chambers of commerce and from the commercial world, generally, in their concern about the number of forms. It is my understanding that our department, along with Revenue, have been working for some time to attempt to find some way to combine this approach to the information they require.

This will necessitate some type of computer programming, as you can imagine, what with the number of companies that we have to deal with, and perhaps at this stage it would be sufficient to say that a study is under way to find some simplified way to combine these forms which would be consistent with the programming.

The whole position of the annual return, which is an interesting question, was touched upon recently by the select committee on corporation law and it is reported as the hon. member will well know. It was incorporated in draft Bill 126 when it came in, and the select committee, as it was reconstituted, was asked to continue its studies of the annual return because in the first place it did not have the time that it needed to go into that in some detail. So we are hopeful that maybe with that type of objective review we might have something to go on.

Reference was briefly made on names, and no one is more sympathetic than the Minister to the problems that must be faced by the public generally in this question of names. If the hon. member, or any member, has any suggestions, please do not hesitate to let us know because it is becoming increasingly difficult in a jurisdiction such as Ontario.

Whether we might have a bank of names for non-active companies—I use that term from a non-active commercial aspect—we might have a bank of numbers or names which we could use for that type of company, but the name search procedure is quite involved, as the hon. member has quite correctly pointed out, and it is an amazing job that they do in order to protect the public from any confusion, and to know with whom they are dealing insofar as this name business is concerned.

Sufficient to say that these and many problems are constantly before us and we are always open for ideas and open for anything

which would increase and improve the service which we give to the public through this branch of government.

Mr. Singer: My concern, Mr. Chairman, is that once we get something into the works, we never know how to get rid of it. Because we have had company returns for I do not know how long—I guess as long as we have had a Provincial Secretary's Department—much of our energy seems to be directed to getting them in more efficiently. Nobody has bothered to look at the forms and see whether or not useful information is given and whether the public is served.

We have the form, and it goes out whenever it goes out. Then, I am sure, there has been a programming pattern evolved as to the number of complaining letters that you send and the great hours that were spent on selecting the wording of complaining letter number one, which is less severe than two, and on down the line. But when all this information is gathered in and sits down in those files, what purpose does it serve? This is the thing that bothers me.

It is so like the building of useless administration that we see in all levels of government, and I would really applaud this Minister if he came in one day and said, "I have decided that we are going to do away with the annual return. I have decided that the extra little bit of information that is of importance can be put down at the bottom of the Treasury forms". The Treasury forms are more important because you collect some revenue from those, surely the same information could be there. "We have done away with two computers," or that "we have given them to another department and they are going to function somewhere else." And that, "we have done away with a pile of paper nine miles high," because I bet you send out that big a pile of paper every year. I wonder how much it costs you just in postage and in bulk paper to keep all these requests flowing year by year?

An hon. member: In three copies.

Mr. Singer: In multi-copies, yes. And then the demands: Once they get into the machine, the demands keep coming, even after your returns are in.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that this review, which is at present under way, might produce some of the economy of paper to which reference was made. One of the interesting problems, now this has come up on the study, is the fact

that all these annual returns come up at the same time. As you know, by June 1 you must file all this information that is gathered as of March 31. This review might give some thought to breaking this work load down in itself, perhaps to using the anniversary date of incorporation as the date, or something to spread it out a little more. This is only to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that these matters are under pretty active review. We look to the select committee for some help and direction in this matter as well.

Mr. Singer: The select committee, as reconstituted, does not have me on its membership. I was on the former select committee and I think it was perhaps on my suggestion that we put in—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They will try to get by.

Mr. Singer: I'll allow it is a struggle. I think it was at my suggestion that that recommendation was put in, but the obvious base of that recommendation is, to do away with the stupid old form. I do not think you need any great study to come to that conclusion. I do not think you need have a new series of sessions of the new select committee to come along that far. I would think if you took a good look at those forms and determined the practical use which they have it would be very simple to come to the conclusion, very quickly, that you do not need them any more.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. Under this vote, under The Companies Act, does this include racing charters?

Hon. Mr. Welch: It would include charters, but we do not issue charters for racing. That will be a special Act, by legislation.

Mr. Sargent: A few years back there was quite an investigation under your department, long before you were in politics, insofar as the issuing of charters for gambling, for private clubs, under this Act.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This had to do with the Roach Commission, I think, in which social clubs, those that are called non-profit, or those corporations that are of a social or a fraternal nature are incorporated under The Corporations Act. But not racing.

Mr. Sargent: I do not hear you too well, I think your mike is turned down. I cannot hear you too well. I would like to know if we can get a list; is there a list of the gambling charters now in force, or the social club

charters now in force under which gambling is allowed—or the whole ball park on what is going on as far as the issuance of charters is concerned in your department?

Hon. Mr. Welch: May I simply say there are no gambling charters issued at all. In fact, if gambling is the object they cannot get a charter. But I think, to be helpful here, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that all corporations of a social nature—social clubs, this type of corporation—in fact, do receive their charters under a special section of The Corporations Act.

Each corporation is published in the *Ontario Gazette*, and I suppose I sign 30 or 40 charters a day, some of which would be for social clubs of some kind, Lions clubs and other non-profit organizations. But I make the distinction between the social club on the one hand and what the hon. member refers to as gambling clubs or gambling activities. Because if that, in fact, is why they want the charter, they do not get it. It is just not a legal activity.

Mr. Sargent: I am told that there are still some charters alive in Ontario if they want to gamble; they are still alive if they want to be activated.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not have any information on that, sir.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Would the Minister check into that? I am told on good authority that there are some unactivated gambling charters still alive under your department. I would like to know if that is a fact.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be glad to give whatever information I can. I just want to make sure I understand; is the hon. member asking me to give information about charters which are still in force, through our department, which allow gambling? That might be a very easy question to answer right now. I am sure there would not be any, but if the hon. member feels there are some, we will have such a search conducted. Have you any names at all? Mr. Chairman, could the hon. member help in any way by giving me any names of such organizations?

Mr. Sargent: If the Minister says there are none—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am not saying that. I am saying I would be very surprised if there were any.

Mr. Sargent: I was told confidentially that there were some charters not activated for

gambling under your department—or under a government department, so I would assume it would be your department.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be glad to check on this, but you see, we could not incorporate such a company because the objects of the company are contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada. That is why I take the position I do. It may be that the hon. member is making some reference to some dormant charters which were around as far as horse racing was concerned, and which were the subject matter of something at a previous time. However, perhaps I can consult with the hon. member later and try to be as helpful as I can in that regard.

Mr. Sargent: In passing, there are some charters with wide terms of reference, or terms of operation, that I wish you would check into. Would you then let us know the number of race track charters there are in the province and who owns them? I would like to have an answer.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am sorry, fine.

Mr. Sargent: This will be furnished?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Whatever information we have in the department that is public information, we will certainly be very glad to give it.

Mr. Sargent: Is it the policy of the department to allow a monopoly on race track charters?

Hon. Mr. Welch: This department does not issue race track charters.

Mr. Sargent: Then who does?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Any charters now would be by special Act of the Legislature.

Mr. Sargent: Are there dormant charters in escrow you are holding?

Hon. Mr. Welch: We do not hold any charters in escrow. I think what the hon. member may be making reference to was some previous practice whereby someone went out and bought some charters which did make some provision for horse racing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Would that be Earl Rowe?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am not familiar with any of the names of any who were involved in that particular activity. I think maybe it may save the time of the House—and I do

not wish to curtail the questions of the member—if the member would sit down with the officials of our department and be specific on what he wants. We would be glad to share with him any information which we have in the department.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think it is anything for behind closed doors. I think it should be public information; who owns what, and how they obtain these charters. The fact is that we are talking multi-millions of dollars through political favouritism; inside deals with people in the government. I think it is time we laid things on the deck to see who owns what and how did they get them and what is still available.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Which members of the government are inside?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I just want to point out to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that we have about 100,000 active corporations on our files, and—

Mr. Sargent: Do not be evasive; I am talking about race track charters.

Hon. Mr. Welch: We do not issue race track charters.

Mr. Sargent: How do they get in business then if you do not issue them?

Hon. Mr. Welch: They have to make application now to the Legislature to get such a charter. Around the turn of the century there was some provision, I think, under the Criminal Code, for the granting of certain charters which provided for this racing business. Attached to these were a certain number of days which qualified, I think, under the federal Department of Agriculture, or some such procedure.

I am very hazy on it because I am not familiar with this. It is nothing that comes within the jurisdiction of this department. I think at that time, in the early 1900s, such charters were, in fact, granted. I may be quite wrong. Some were not used for a period of time and someone realized that these were available and then made offers to those who were—

Mr. Sargent: So any new enterprise in this field would have to be by an Act of Parliament?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. Sargent: I would still like to have a list of who owns what charters in Ontario. Could I have that?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Whatever information we have you can certainly have.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is difficult to incorporate a social club through his department?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, I do not think it is.

Mr. De Monte: What procedure is followed when there is an application for a charter for a social club?

Hon. Mr. Welch: May I speak in general terms? An application comes in in accordance with the terms of the Act with the actual directors named in the application. The name concerned would be checked out. The objects of the incorporation would be checked and where they had reference to some other department of government, they would be referred to that department of government for comment. With the usual detailed study which would be made of this type, and indeed and incorporation, in due time, all things being acceptable and within the statute or its regulations, the charter is issued.

Mr. De Monte: I am given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Ontario Provincial Police check out every person who makes an application for a social charter, a charter other than a private company. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There is some investigation conducted either by Ontario Provincial Police or by the local police officials with respect to those who are making application for incorporation and the premise which is set out there.

Mr. De Monte: What type of investigation do they carry on?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not know; you could ask them. We ask for some report with respect to the applicants and the premises which are recited in the application—I think this stems from the very commission to which the hon. member made reference, the Roach commission study—in order to satisfy ourselves that there is no intent to conduct activities that would be contrary to the criminal code or other related statutes.

Mr. De Monte: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the objects of the application are in

keeping with good social club habits. Why are the people checked out? I mean who decides whether they get a charter or not, the police, the OPP or the Provincial Secretary?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Provincial Secretary.

Mr. De Monte: Do you make a search for a criminal record? Do you know whether they do that?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Provincial Secretary relies on the police investigation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I follow up that same point?

Mr. Chairman: On the same point?

Mr. J. Renwick: The point that the member for Dovercourt raises is a very difficult one. I just do not agree with the procedure. The fact of the matter is that a police report is not available to the people who make the application if they are refused the incorporation. They have no grounds and no way of knowing on what basis the police make the decision that for some reason or other, the people are not acceptable. The member for Dovercourt and other lawyers will bear me out in this, and you find that you are up against a brick wall. You are also beginning to run into other things which are non-incorporation problems such as the city disagreeing with the incorporation of a club at a particular premises because you have not got adequate parking. But the principal point is this question of the police report. Neither the lawyer acting on behalf of the applicants, nor the applicants, are given any satisfactory explanation as to why they are refused incorporation.

The Minister knows that I had this problem with a club which the police report in the first instance said, "Wait a year and come back again." Then it was sort of—"Well, if you conduct yourselves properly unincorporated for a year, we will have another look at you and see whether or not you are all right."

It meant that I and these constituents of mine had to go down and speak to the inspector at the police department, who reviewed the matter, and have him come up and look at the place. Somehow or other we satisfied him that the people were just ordinary citizens who wanted to have a club, and we got the incorporation through.

But, I think there has got to be some procedure by which the lawyer on behalf of

the applicants or the applicants are entitled to know the specific reasons why the police will not approve of the incorporation of a club at a particular address. I do not think anybody is arguing about the point that the crime commission were dealing with, namely that you cannot have floating characters and that you should be able to specify where the premises are. But I would ask the Minister if he would comment about whether he thinks some procedure can be worked out by which the information, on which the police have turned down an application, will be made available to the applicants so that they can deal adequately with it, otherwise, we are up against a brick wall.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I think we should point out that it is not the police who turn down the application. In the process of considering the application for the charter the Provincial Secretary asks for a police report. On the basis of the police report and/or other material which comes back through the various referrals, the Provincial Secretary exercises the discretion which is provided for in the Act and so it may be a combination of matters, of which the police report is only one.

A great problem—I am glad the point was raised. We all understand, perhaps because of the investigations, that the department exercises this care. If we are to get complete reports I think that we have to satisfy people that we want their report to have some confidential aspect to it.

I go back to the main principle of incorporation of non-share corporations, and certainly it is not planned to change this principle, even with the new legislation under The Business Corporations Act the matter of the issuance of the charters is still discretionary. It is a discretion of the Minister, it is not as a matter of right. The Business Corporations Act will change this, if it is re-introduced and passed for business corporations. But at the moment we are talking about the issuance of a charter at the discretion of the Minister and he, in order to exercise that discretion, requires certain information in the public interest and consistent with the recommendations which were set out in the report of Mr. Justice Roach. The obtaining of a police report is one of these matters. Now I am asked whether or not, if the application is turned down, I would make the police report available. At this stage I am really not prepared to comment on it without thinking that particular matter out a little more carefully.

The point is, and I repeat myself here, that it may be a combination of matters of which the report of the police itself is only one. I certainly feel it is very important that we have very frank and full reports from our law enforcement people with respect to these applications. They would know some of these people and certainly the places at which they are going to conduct their activities. I do not really feel any legitimate social club in this province is particularly concerned about this type of investigation.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex Kent, if the hon. member for Riverdale is finished.

Mr. J. Renwick: I wanted to pursue the same point. I do not get the significance of the last remarks. The case I had is that ordinary citizens wanted to have a club and they were not able to get it incorporated until they came and spoke with me about it because they had been turned down. I agree obviously with the point which the Provincial Secretary makes; I not only understand it, I agree with it that it is a discretion which he exercises.

Even the exercise of discretion in this case is an exercise which must be made in accordance with the legal terms of the principles of natural justice, that is, the right of the person to be heard. He cannot second-guess the discretion or the result, but he has a right to be heard; he has a right to know what the case is that he has to hear. There should be some procedure to make certain that this does take place and that the case which has been made against him, which prevents him from having a club incorporated, has got to be a valid one. He should have an opportunity of answering.

I happen to think that it was most unfortunate that the club I intervened on was able, by talking to the police and others, to clear the roadblocks away. It left the impression that if you know a member of the Legislature, you can get it incorporated. This is the danger you run into in this kind of a situation. I think it is very important that the procedure be established by which the police report, either through some formal or informal hearing with the Minister or with the Deputy Minister, that the police report, or the police officer who makes the report, should be available to be questioned in those cases where the applications have been refused.

I do not think it would be difficult to establish that kind of procedure in the first place.

I think its very existence would militate against it being used very often and I do not think there would be all that many applications hereafter that would have to be dealt with in this way.

But I think the procedure involves the question of whether or not you have exercised your discretion properly. If the people making the application do not have an opportunity to answer the clandestine report that is made by the police to the Provincial Secretary, then you are in danger of denying people. You may call it the exercise of discretion, a privilege, but privilege which should be open to all the lawful citizens of the province of Ontario. I think you run dangers both ways unless you are prepared to set up some kind of procedure.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Along this line, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex-Kent has been trying to get the floor.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, mine was not on this particular item. It was with regard to the race track charters—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps, if there are members who wish to pursue this particular item, the hon. member would yield the floor? If there anything further on this particular item?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, I would like to pursue that for my own knowledge and information.

Am I correct that essentially there are two discretions to be exercised in connection with club charters? One is the question of the exercise of your discretion in the issuance of the charter itself and as to whether the club will be entitled to club premises and the benefits under the Criminal Code that accrue thereto. And, secondly, with reference to the rights to club premises, is it there and there only that a police report is required?

Hon. Mr. Welch: All such applications, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member will recall, have to set out the place of address. This is a must. In order to change the place of address, you must take out supplementary letters patent; that is how important the actual location of the activities is. It is that address which is checked out, and so on, as part of the police investigation.

There is only one discretion and that is the actual discretion which the Minister exer-

cises or does not exercise in the granting of the charter. As you know, in this type of incorporation, you are not permitted to use office incorporators; those who are actually going to be the first directors must be set out. These people, plus the location or the address of the social club, are matters of further investigation as part of the general routine in studying the application, prior to the Minister deciding whether he will exercise his discretion and grant the charter.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister through you; my experience is quite minimal in connection with these club charters, but those I have seen have provision that the club cannot provide for itself a clubhouse or similar premises. There is the exclusionary clause in connection with, I think, section 118 of the Criminal Code, the provision in connection with gambling. Do you make an investigation in connection with all club applications or just those where they are requesting a clubhouse?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think the charter to which the member is making reference must be an older charter because certainly any charter now has the specific address and the proviso is it cannot carry on its activities other than at that address.

Mr. Bullbrook: I see. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on this particular point? The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, at this point in the discussion, the hon. Minister is just referring to police investigations of applications to form social clubs. He and I know there was a charter in my own particular riding a couple of years ago that the police investigated, that was not of a social club nature. Could I ask—I believe this is not normal procedure—what was the percentage of incorporations, say, last year, where the OPP checked into the background of those people?

Hon. Mr. Welch: If I understood the question correctly—and the member may correct me—every application is checked, either by the Ontario Provincial Police or by the local police. Every application for this type of charter is checked this way.

Mr. Paterson: Whether or not it is a social club? Or a normal business transaction?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am just talking about social clubs. I am sorry, I thought that was what the member meant.

Mr. Paterson: I am referring to one that was not a social club. How often does it occur that the OPP would check into—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am advised the only type of incorporation where such an investigation is carried out is, in fact, a social club.

Mr. Paterson: I think I would have to disagree on that. The hon. Minister will be aware, because of certain discussions we had by long-distance telephone, of the OPP investigating the incorporation of a co-operative in my particular riding. I wonder on what basis the request would go to the Ontario Provincial Police to check a normal type of incorporation which *bona fide* farmers are entitled to carry out. I think the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would want to be very careful in answering this one. I think the hon. member would agree with me that there were some special circumstances surrounding this. This was not a case of this department requiring any police investigation at all. I think, in view of certain activities on the part of the applicants there with respect to a company with which he was formerly connected, was this not the matter where the Attorney General was, in fact, conducting certain investigations with respect to whether or not there had been violations under the Criminal Code? It had nothing to do with our department and the application for the new co-operative.

Mr. Paterson: I will agree with the Minister on this point that there was some approach made at some level of government to inflict the presence of the OPP upon these people. Basically, it turned out to be a very good thing because it cleared the name of a whole segment of the population in my area. But I wondered, does this happen in normal incorporations from time to time that we in this Legislature are not aware of?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The answer to that question is no. The investigation to which the member makes reference was not initiated by this department because of the application, but was the subject matter of investigations being conducted because of other activities, in which one of the applicants had been involved.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Yorkview want to pursue this point?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Not on this point.

Mr. Chairman: If there is nothing further on this point, the next speaker was the hon. member for—

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I have one.

Mr. Chairman: On the same point?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, this is about the social clubs. Do the police go around asking neighbours about the characters of people applying for the charter? Or do they simply go into their old records to see if there is anything there? Is there an active investigation or do they simply go through the records to see what the people involved have done, or have not done, with regard to police records?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not know that I am able to give you complete detail on what the police do in order to provide their opinion. All our department gets on them ultimately is some report on the basis of the location, or the applicants. I really would not be able to be more specific.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the reports that the Minister receives from the police department about the people applying for a social charter include a recommendation that these people are of good character, or that these people are of questionable character? Is this a character report on the people as well as about the location of their premises?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh yes, the report does go to the individuals who are making application, and if there is anything in connection with any of the applicants which they felt should be drawn to the attention of the department with respect to previous activities in which they had been involved, or indeed their general good reputation among the people of the community, this would be the sort of thing which would appear in connection with this type of report.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the police give the Minister the statement about the character of these people, even if these people had not, in fact, broken laws of the province, or of Canada, or of some other nation, by simply saying that their neighbours do not think much of them?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, this is not the type of reports which I read, the latter comment would not apply. This is simply a general investigation with respect to the people who would be known and how they are known

by the investigating force in that particular area.

Mr. T. Reid: Could the Minister explain, Mr. Chairman—I am not a lawyer so I do not know much about these things—why is it necessary to know anything more about the people applying for social charter, other than the fact that they have not got a criminal record or they have not broken any laws of the province, or of Canada? Why is it necessary to know anything more than that one simple fact?

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is generally all we do know. I was answering your question in a very general way. This does not preclude the investigating officer volunteering other information. But, generally speaking, I would suppose most of the reports we get would be of that particular nature.

Mr. T. Reid: But yet some are not. The thing I cannot understand, I will just state it right away, is why even in one case—and it only takes one case to contradict a principle—a person who does not have a record of any sort with the police should be judged guilty by the fact that he is not given a charter because the police simply say, "Although this man has no record, as far as we are concerned, we think he is a shady type."

Why judge a person guilty of getting a social club together for some nefarious means before he has broken the law? I do not get it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think perhaps the member has jumped to the conclusion that that would be the case. The hon. member now sets out a specific set of circumstances, and I would think it would be highly unlikely that we would have reports of this nature. During the course of my questioning by the member surely, I hope, I did not give this impression.

Mr. T. Reid: If I understood the Minister correctly, Mr. Chairman, he left the impression with me that the police are not simply concerned with the question of premise, not simply concerned in all cases with just the question of whether or not one of the applicants has broken a law, but also about the character of an applicant. He went that far. If he goes that far—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I did say that in the course of these opinions there could likely be, and there are likely situations where the police volunteer other information; that is information other than specific violations of

the law, or the fact that there have not been any. They might volunteer that he happens to be the mayor of the city, a great public servant—I mean there are all kinds of things that could come in in order to identify the applicants.

Mr. T. Reid: Why is it necessary to identify the applicant except in so far as to whether or not he has broken the law in the past?

Hon. Mr. Welch: This could happen quite obviously unless we get a printed form out and have them check answers. These come in in paragraph form, and the investigating officer shares with us what he thinks. There is no set form which is sent to these people to narrow the type of questioning down. If that is your point, this is one that could be taken under consideration as well.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, let us finish this up. The logic of what the Minister is saying is that he does not set the guidelines for the police investigation, the police set the guidelines for him and that is—I will not use the harsh term—the “mule backwards”. The simple fact remains that I can logically envisage, from what the Minister has said, that if the police say “This man is not of high character in the community,” the Minister might say, “Well, we should not grant this man a social charter,” thereby judging that man and his group of friends guilty by the fact they refuse him a charter.

Surely the whole point of the exercise that I am involved in now, Mr. Chairman, is simply that if a person has not broken the law, he must be assumed to be a man of good standing in the community—the courts have not proven him guilty and he is innocent until proven guilty—

Mr. Sargent: He could be a Liberal; he could not get it if he is a Liberal.

Mr. T. Reid: —and, therefore, although it is not a right—I can see why granting a charter like this should not be a right—so, therefore, there is an element of confused discretionary power in here, which in effect could amount to judging a group of people to be guilty of something before they have the charter.

If you think they are going to infringe upon the principles of your social charters, then you grant the charter and move in on them when they contravene the purpose of the charter, but you do not judge them guilty before they get the charter. You judge them

guilty after they have infringed upon one of the principles of the charter.

I would just like to refer this to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and leave it at this point with the suggestion that it is he who should set the guidelines for the police, not the police to set the guidelines for their reports to him.

Mr. Chairman: On this same point, the hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned about this position where the police seem to decide as to who gets the charter, and who does not get the charter. Bearing in mind the police attitude towards, as an example, people with long hair, what if a group of hippies apply for a charter? Do they automatically get denied because they have long hair?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not know of any reports that have been based on personal appearance at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why you do this police investigation at all. Is there any more public interest at stake in granting a charter of this kind than there is in granting a charter to a limited company with share capital?

What great public interest is there if six or seven people want to band themselves together to have a club for collecting stamps and to acquire premises for that purpose. Presumably you are going to send the police in to find out if they are suitable people to have that kind of a club. What public interest are you protecting?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, has read the Roach report, I am sure, and I only say, with the greatest respect, that perhaps if he would reread it he would see what has developed as part of our departmental policy. I am not that familiar—the hon. member would perhaps understand the Criminal Code better than I in this regard—but I understand that the code itself does confer certain benefits on an incorporated activity, as opposed to an unincorporated group, and so they were therefore, very concerned with respect to the type of organization.

I only point out that much of our procedure with respect to social charters has developed as a result of the recommendations of Mr. Justice Roach and there is concern in the department with respect to these charters. Now, as far as the other point to which

you make reference, where the use of office incorporators and so on, this would be, perhaps, a very difficult thing to do. They can change from time to time which is, of course, the reason why we insist on having the original incorporators, by name, who are going to enter into this activity. Here, once again, it is a matter of departmental policy, and we think, particularly with respect to those non-share capital charters with social aspects, that they are, in fact, subject to this.

Now, while I am on my feet, I might say to the hon. member for Brantford that we have, in fact, incorporated, in the department, a group known as the Yorkville Diggers.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister will agree with me. We are rapidly moving to the stage where we are going to allow one man companies, with or without share capital, if the first recommendations of the select committee are paid attention to, and I think they will.

Hon. Mr. Welch: With share capital.

Mr. Singer: With share capital, and maybe even without share capital, and I think it is going to come as of right, not as discretion. You would do it by filing a memorandum. Surely the disease is in the other protections that may exist, and not in the issuing of a charter. The issuing of a charter allows holding in common of property and that sort of thing, and maybe the disease is contained in the Criminal Code, rather than the type of investigation that you are carrying on. It seems to me, and again I harken back to what we were saying at the beginning of this vote, that we indulge in so much useless activity insofar as the granting of these charters is concerned. We are back to the days of the Royal favour that was being bestowed on someone to carry on. They get it under the great seal of the country and the monarch would smile happily on whoever he was granting the privilege to, and off you go and you can carry on business in a name other than your own. This day and age is quite different, and those recommendations that I talk about, and which were in the first report of the select committee, seem to make good and abundant common sense to me.

Now, insofar as social charters are concerned, perhaps there is a point in a little more investigation, because of what is in the code. Why do you not get at what is in

the code and put the people who run a social charter on the same basis as you and I are on? If we do something wrong that is contrary to the law, somebody is going to tap us on the shoulder and say, "Come away, you have sinned and we are going to punish you." Now, surely that kind of a concept makes sense in the world today, rather than all these artificial creations that we are creating—because we are reaching back into history and we are still bestowing a favour in the name of the Crown. "Here is a charter, you lucky person, you are getting some great benefit." I just do not think it makes sense in the kind of world we live in today.

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

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about my friend from Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston), but I just briefly want to suggest to the Minister, in this regard, that his department being the nerve centre, as it were, of all operations that make this octopus tick here—I think, to recall that back in the crime report, that the whole focus of the crime report was centred around his department, because it was through the issuance of club charters that great revenues were derived for the party by the Ministers in charge of the department, and by a man named Cudney, who resigned because of the stick-handling going on and all the close association with the criminal aspects of our province. And so the office of the Provincial Secretary was taken apart with a fine tooth comb.

It would seem to me that there were many reports that came to light that did a lot of harm to your party, and what I am leading up to is this. You have, in the course of your operations, a lot of police reports, and I wish to ask first, who has access to these reports, and secondly, if there is a dossier kept on citizens in general? How big a file do you have on people in this province and is there a dossier at large on the people of this province? In other words, do you have a master dossier of the people of this province on record in your department?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, Mr. Chairman, not in the context of the questions asked. Each individual application is treated separately. The police information and other confidential information is not on the public file, and is not available in the search office. Just to repeat here once again—I make reference to the Roach commission report, and although this was during a time under another Minister, I think the member would want to

have a fair comment on the record that this department received a clean bill of health with respect to that study—

Mr. Sargent: That is entirely wrong. I think the Minister will realize that there were wide scale resignations in your department, and there was proof positive in this large book we have, I have read it from stem to stem. The issuance of gambling licences was for a fee and many people went to jail for it.

You must know that, Mr. Minister. If you do not, you are very naive. Do you have a large dossier on many people? Who has access to it? Would a member of the Treasury Board have access to those files?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There is no such dossier.

Mr. Sargent: On whom?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I was just answering your question. There is no such dossier.

Mr. Sargent: These police reports that you have in your department, who has access to them?

Hon. Mr. Welch: These are interdepartmental. They are for the information of the Minister in exercising his discretion. They are not public documents.

Mr. Sargent: All right, they are not public documents, but are they available to a Minister of the Crown?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As far as I am concerned, they are private information in the course of the operation of The Provincial Secretary's Department.

Mr. Sargent: I would suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that if the Prime Minister of this province wanted to know something about some one person, he could direct that information to be laid on his desk in five minutes' time.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He would not have to ask me for that, I am sure. If he wanted information, there is a way.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to you that if the Prime Minister can have that information, Joe Doakes in Sault Ste. Marie can have the same information, and this is not the case. And I would like to know from you, sir, if you know that there is a file in Queen's Park, either in the Attorney General's office or your office, containing the history of a man named Sargent from Owen Sound, the history

of Lorne Henderson from Sarnia? Are these things on record in Queen's Park?

Hon. Mr. Welch: We have no such records in The Department of the Provincial Secretary, and that is all I am able to say.

Mr. Sargent: To your knowledge, is this in your department or the Attorney General's?

Hon. Mr. Welch: To my knowledge, I do not know in what department such a list would be, if one existed.

Mr. Sargent: With the permission of the Chairman, about police reports, and I suggest this is a very important area—

Mr. Chairman: We are talking about corporations.

Mr. Sargent: For those of us, in opposition, to watch you for 25 years, to see this bureaucracy you have built up, the complete control of the province, for you to say you do not have these files is a completely—

Mr. MacDonald: Careful.

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is hard to believe.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1702, the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakehore): At this point for a moment, just to keep the points clarified, I think the Provincial Secretary will agree with me that long before the Roach report ever came into being, and the recommendations were adopted to the extent that they were, that this police surveillance took place. Back in those days, there were also grounds in which you did not require people of religious, social and athletic clubs to be inspected by the police, or to receive a report from them if you imposed certain conditions. And I am wondering in this day and age whether it might not be a wise thing to reconsider the weight of those conditions, which, firstly, related to the fact as to whether access was available by police and fire departments.

In other words, the lock and bolt situation, in which case the police in those days complained and that in part, got the crime investigation off to a start. Secondly, you put a clause into the charter, in those days, and I suppose it is still there, that they could not operate; that any of the advantages conferred by the then section 226, now 168 of the Criminal Code, with respect to the area, or the amount of money, the quantum of the gambling, if the incorporators forfeited that and did not utilize it, then you would not,

according to your own report which was then submitted to the Roach committee, require any police report at all.

That, apparently, remains your policy, along with a number of other ones—for instance, that there be no office incorporators for social clubs, which is a very good move—and secondly, the limitation that they cannot change the designated place where they may operate without supplementary letters patent. But even again that was not novel, I suggest, with the Roach report, that was required as part of the departmental specification long before that time.

What I am getting around to is really querying the business of investigating people in social clubs, particularly members of many of these philanthropic and benevolent associations. It is an onerous piece of business. You do keep these police reports very severely under guard; it certainly is not available to the profession, nor to those lawyers who object that their clients have not been given the charters.

Therefore, would it not be better, since the nuisance, the evil and even the peril of social clubs, as they were in those days with the three thieves, the Feeley-McDermott situation, has been pretty well obviated, to write into the charter certain clauses restricting their range and type of activity, placing limitations upon them and obviating and getting rid of this business of having people who want to be joined together in that sort of community placed under police investigation and surveillance? It very often leaves a shadow over their whole situation; they do not know why in many cases they have not been brought under the cover.

Secondly, those who do know or have good reason to know why, do not make the initial applications and are nonetheless members and often in very high and very good standing in the clubs themselves. But they deliberately refrain from becoming the incorporators to start with. They set up innocent fronts and the police cannot penetrate. With that in mind, after all these years and after that fiasco has blown over, would it not be better to revert actually to your earlier position?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be quite willing to review that procedure once again. The thought that crosses my mind, as an initial reaction, is that perhaps it is better to exercise the control before the charter is issued than it is to try and follow up violations of objects clauses. Perhaps at this stage I could simply indicate that I would be very happy, in the course of the review of the proce-

dures, to include the points which have been raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: To follow up, could I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what happens to the police file on an application for a social club after the Minister has made his decision on whether or not that group of people will be granted the charter? Does that file remain in his office; does he burn it in ashtray or does he send it back to the police? What happens to that police statement after the Minister has made his decision?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As far as I know, it is kept in a particular file, in the confidential section of that file, and is not a public document. I draw that distinction because, you see, these corporations file annual returns as well. The information for public search is kept in one spot, but the application and the information which is relative to the application is kept in the confidential files of the department.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I ask the Minister why it is necessary to keep the police statement in his files once he has made a decision?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think under the circumstances, we just want everything on record, because Ministers do change, to explain the procedure that was taken at the time. It is just kept on the record like everything else which is relevant to the application.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, when the Minister is issuing these licences—or, rather, charters—if he looks at them and takes into consideration that possibly some of these clubs may be contravening the human rights of people; that they may be of a discriminatory nature. I also wonder if the Minister takes into consideration some of the clubs that are in existence right now, for an example, the Granite Club of Toronto, that I gather will not really qualify for a stamp of approval for the human rights people. Does the Minister take this into account in any of the places where the charters are handed out?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think it is fair to say in a general way, Mr. Chairman, that any application for a club which contains as one of its objects something contrary to the statutes of the province would not be per-

mitted. Any statement within the objects clause which would contravene any of our human rights legislation, naturally, would not be allowed.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be prepared to cancel a club charter if it could be proven or is proven in court that a certain club discriminates against people?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, just to have this matter clarified, I am talking about the objects clause. With respect to what happens on the part of a corporate citizen violating any of the law, this is a matter in which they are treated as any other. I mean the corporation can be brought before the courts for violating any particular statute of this province. I do not know anything about the charter of the club to which he makes reference.

I would venture to say there is nothing in the objects clauses, although I really should not even say that because I really do not know how long ago it was incorporated. But I would be surprised to find any discriminatory objects within the objects clause itself. What the practice of this or any club might be in this regard, it stands in the community as a body corporate which can be prosecuted for any violations.

Mr. Chairman: Are you finished with that point?

Mr. Makarchuk: No, I am not. From that, I take it the Minister would sanction the operation of clubs. Another example is the London Hunt Club, which also, I gather, discriminates against people of Jewish background.

Mr. Sargent: Liberals!

Mr. Makarchuk: No, it accepts Liberals. Am I to take from the Minister that he is not prepared to move into situations where a club, supposedly a public club, discriminates against people because of their ethnic or religious persuasion?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not know of any such clubs in the first place, Mr. Chairman. The member says he thinks some of these clubs do this. I do not know this. I am only talking now about applications for incorporation of social clubs; we would not permit in such applications clauses which provided for discrimination against the present law. As to the clubs to which he makes reference, I am sure of the same thing: if, in fact, there are social clubs that do this, then they are

subject to the same law as the hon. member and I are: It would be for some law enforcement people, or indeed the hon. member himself, to lay a charge before a justice of the peace to have the body corporate prosecuted.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, I am not too sure about my law; I do not think there is anything in the law that really says a club is not permitted to discriminate. I am appealing to him strictly on a moral basis; surely you will not sanction the operation or the continued existence of a club that practises discrimination? This is what we want to know.

Is the Minister for it or against it? In other words, will the Minister hand out charters to clubs that practice discrimination? Will he permit them to hold club charters as long as they practise discrimination? Yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Brantford is talking about discrimination in its broad context. This department would only deal with those things which are legally defined. When we get into the field of morality and beyond the law, this gets into another area.

I think under the circumstances—I speak now as a lawyer—we are faced with the law as it now is and I am not prepared to go any further except to say I am sure the hon. member would understand that all members of this House are opposed to discrimination and are working in a statutory way to provide for certain legal standards in this regard. I am speaking now to the legal implications of this, insofar as the statute law of this province or, indeed, this country, is concerned. Other types of discrimination may be going on with respect to men's clubs not wanting women in their clubs and all this sort of thing. I do not know; some people might even label that as discrimination. I really am not qualified to go beyond the fact that from a legal point of view this would be our interpretation.

Mr. T. Reid: On the same issue, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister, who investigated on behalf of the police, the policemen's social club application?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, but I would be glad to get that information for you.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the Minister think it right for the police to investigate themselves to see whether or not they recommend the charter for themselves?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am sure it would not be the same police, it would be some other

level of police investigation. But I will be glad to get that information. I do not know that particular answer.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on this particular point? The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned a while ago about some of these race charters being picked up. It seems to be, in some areas, and in my own area, that I have been informed by some of the people who belong to the agricultural societies and municipalities, that there were some racing charters they thought they had for a number of years back. They had not used them, of course, for a long time and they are of the opinion now that these have been picked up by someone and that they never were reimbursed for them, or just do not know where they went.

Hon. Mr. Welch: To go back to the racing charters, I think, if I have my dates right, sometime prior to 1912 there were some of these charters issued and they were forfeited over a period of years for non-use. Thereafter, someone discovered they were there, paid the back fees with respect to returns and so on and acquired them. Now all I am saying is, in answer to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, that in order to get a racing charter in those terms, would require a bill of this Legislature.

Mr. Ruston: These were picked up by someone else. Were the people that originally had them not notified of this, that they had a chance to either pay up the back dues and take them themselves, or not?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am not familiar with the procedure at that time. But I see no reason why they would. They lost them for non-use so, therefore, they were forfeited.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York-view has been trying to get the floor. Unless he wants to yield to the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside who has been trying for some time?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, I should like to explore the matter of the use and the purpose of the corporate records. As I understand it, this department registers the—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I think we have been pursuing the procedure of clearing one topic at a time, so if the hon. member would not mind, the hon. member for Grey-

Bruce wants to talk about racing charters again.

Mr. Burr: Again?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Very briefly, I would like to ask the Minister—this is very important to us here at this point—you raised \$50 million last year through race track charters, under the issuance of your department. What is the setup regarding off-track betting now, insofar as Toronto is concerned? What control do they have from your department?

Mr. Chairman: This does not come under The Department of Provincial Secretary at all.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment, I am under companies, Mr. Chairman. We are under companies.

Mr. Chairman: Not—the remarks the hon. member—

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment, this is companies we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Welch: There are no corporations in Ontario now, incorporated for the purpose of conducting off-track betting.

Mr. Sargent: Well, let us assess, under whose control are they?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, at the moment they are carrying on in an unincorporated fashion, I suppose, as agents or—

Mr. Sargent: Is any application before you for this?

Hon. Mr. Welch: We have some name requests before us at the moment.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to explore this, Mr. Chairman. This could open a whole new spectrum insofar as revenue is concerned. Why do you limit the terms of operation to betting on horses only? Why could you not make that baseball, hockey, football, soccer and dogs, the whole bit, and then the revenue picture for the province could be five times what it is. You could have \$200 million a year if you give people a chance to bet legally on all these things.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this Liberal policy?

Mr. Sargent: I think it would be a very good Liberal policy. In other words, if we are in this business to do things legally, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: This has nothing to do with The Provincial Secretary's Department.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is a good shot because—

Mr. MacDonald: A good shot at policy, too.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister does not see anything wrong with it? Do you see anything wrong with it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Wait a minute—

Mr. Sopha: I know of no horses that bet on people.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Minister is making reference to corporations with this object. Now the matters to which the hon. member is now making reference would require some amendments to the Criminal Code.

Mr. Sargent: You have the applications before you for off-track betting.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Let me finish. The matter that you are talking about now requires an amendment to the Criminal Code.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot hear you, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The matter that you are now talking about requires amendments to the code. To talk now specifically about off-track betting, I have reported to you that there are some people who have made enquiries of our department with respect to names, which is usually the first step. An application is now before this department on the part of some people in order to incorporate a company for this agency purpose.

This is specifically within the terms of reference I gather from the recent Supreme Court decision with respect to this type of activity. Namely, a man acting as an agent to take bets to the track for his principal. When you get involved in other forms of betting you are talking about areas which come within the purview of the Attorney General and would require amendments to the Criminal Code, as indeed would the whole field of wagering.

Mr. Sargent: As a matter of public interest, sir, there are a number of these places operating in Toronto now. They have no charter and there is no control to protect the public as to their stability or their ability to handle money. Do you not think it is an area where by you should investigate?

Hon. Mr. Welch: This would be a matter of government policy and I feel quite confi-

dent that the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has this matter under very active consideration.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Get a dossier!

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, before this discussion turned to horse racing and finally went to the dogs, we were discussing corporate records. This was in your absence. As I understand it, this department registers companies under their correct name, with the officers of the company indicated and the addresses of the company. The payment of a yearly fee of \$10 I believe, shows that the company is still alive.

That does not seem to give the public very much of a bargain or very much information for a third of a million dollars. We have, in Windsor, an American company known as Sirrah Limited. This company bought an island in the Detroit River a year or two ago and began to develop it as a recreational area on a commercial basis. Now the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: We have difficulty hearing the hon. member.

Mr. Burr: The hon. member has difficulty speaking in the first place.

The company was very successful in getting over \$0.5 million of work done on the island, paying out very little or no cash at all for it, and was successful in acquiring about eight almost new canal boats which had been used for a few months in 1967 at Expo. It succeeded in persuading the federal government to pay large sums of money for four ferries. According to the publicity that was used in the city several times, these ferries cost \$250—pardon me, \$250,000 each and the federal government is supposed to have put up three-quarters of the cost.

What I am coming to, Mr. Chairman, is one of the interesting facts about the company; it purchased—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Burr: —Peche Island for about \$310,000 and paid only ten per cent—some people say even less—down in cash. It has acquired some land on the Windsor side of the river near the island, and perhaps some land on the American side.

The strange thing is, a Dun and Bradstreet report says that the assets of this company

are about \$10,600,000 and the company's liabilities are about \$10,300,000. I have not seen this report but this is the gist of it as I understand it.

Mr. Chairman, many people are interested in what American companies are doing in our province, and the logical place for them to go would be to the corporate records branch of The Department of Citizenship. Why could not companies include a one-page financial statement of their operations each year along with their annual return?

How can we in Ontario, or in Canada, hope to have any effective control over our own economy when such a large proportion of corporations, that is the Americans, do not make any financial reports? Why are those American-owned or American-dominated corporations, which are registered in Ontario, not required to make to the Provincial Secretary, a financial report concerning their operations in Ontario? A report which any citizen could examine?

Because they affect the livelihood of too many of our people, we can no longer treat the operation of American corporations as sacrosanct; we must treat them the same way we treat Canadian public corporations, whether they sell stock to the public or not.

I would like the Minister to tell us why this information could not be added and make these corporate records of some use to the people of this country.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we can require any information that we like and think would be in the public interest. Earlier today, the hon. member for Downsview was making some reference, in fact, even questioned the information which we are now asking our corporate people to file.

Any shareholder who wants information, financial statements with respect to the operation of his company, may now requisition it. It is a matter of opinion as to whether or not, in the public interest, we would want to have some financial particulars with respect to extra-provincial corporations. They are no different from any corporation here. They have to file their annual return as well.

Any company coming into this jurisdiction and dealing with the public, has to fulfil the obligations that are set out under The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, through the Ontario Securities Commission. This type of information would have to be filed with them by certain companies. But in the day-to-day operations of our department we do not, as the hon. member has

already mentioned, require the filing of the financial statement, keeping in mind that insofar as the public is concerned, the information which we do now require is the information which most of the public want in order to know who is behind the limited liability classification.

The financial statement, as it would have reference to shareholders of the company, any shareholder, of course, would have this under the terms of the Act, as they are provided either at the annual meeting or specifically requested within the terms of The Corporations Act.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702. The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Minister, in line with the statement made by the Minister—he says that any information we want that would be in the public interest can be obtained from the company. As I understand it according to the Watkins report, one of the problems faced by them when they were writing this report, was the fact that they could not get information, particularly on American corporations, as to their financial status, where their money is going, what transfer there was from Canada to the United States, royalties, management fees and so on. This is the kind of information that is needed for the public interest, particularly if you are going to start deciding what your investment is going to be provincially; how you are going to plan your economy and so on. This is the kind of information needed. Is the Minister prepared to follow this up? In other words, bring in legislation eventually that will make these companies file this information, their financial reports, the transfer of payments and so on, and make this public knowledge?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the hon. member for Brantford, I did not make the first statement as he said. I said that in dealing with the public type of information that is required in our office, the annual return now does provide the questions for which most people want answers. This other information—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Wait a minute—let me finish this.

Mr. MacDonald: Most people—

Hon. Mr. Welch: We made a survey in the public records office in this regard. I am not talking about the financial implications. In

those companies which are going to the public for money and which are dealing in the financial community in this respect, this is the sort of information which is required under the securities legislation of the province.

I really fail—and this may be my problem here—to understand what you expect this department of government to produce in its public office which would not be obtained by The Financial and Commercial Affairs Department particularly, through the Ontario Securities Commission, in their dealing with the public.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, some of the information that is wanted, or that a Canadian would like to know, is the financial status of the company, not just the companies that borrow money in Canada; very few of them do at the moment. As a result they do not have to file anything with the securities commission or anybody else. But in terms of finding out how these companies operate, whether they operate in the interest

of Canada or in the interest of the province of Ontario, we have to know a lot about the internal workings of, and operation of, that firm. This information, in many cases in the States, is on file. All companies in the States, to a great extent, have to file this type of information with their people, their own security exchange commission, or whoever it is. But this is not done in Canada and this is the kind of information that is in the public interest.

This is the kind of information the public is entitled to have and this is the kind of information that the people who are dealing with the economics of this province should have. They should have this information and they want this information but they cannot get it. This is where the Minister can help by bringing in legislation. Perhaps we can have this information on file here in Canada, a lot of it that is only on file in the United States.

It being 6.00 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, March 25, 1969
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Welch, continued	2677
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2710

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1969

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP (Continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1702. The hon. member for High Park is on his feet.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, last year I had the pleasure of having some discourse with you under this particular vote, and through you to the Minister (Mr. Welch), and at the time I was talking about an anti-social company whose name at the moment escapes; it was one of the breweries. The Minister suggested that if I should supply the evidence to him that that particular company was breaking the law and that it was hurting certain members of the public, then he would prosecute. I was wondering if the prosecution has begun, because as I recall I did supply the information to the Minister.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I would remind the member that that was not an undertaking at that time. The exchange was on the basis of the failure of that particular company, if I am thinking of the right company, to hold its annual meetings. I explained the procedures that were open to him as a shareholder of that company, and subsequently, without going into all the details, he provided me with some information by letter dealing with the operations of that company.

I was satisfied later—I must admit on the basis of press notices of course—that he had an opportunity, as a shareholder of that company, to discuss all these matters with the directors of the company at the time that those meetings were being held. I at no time gave any undertaking to prosecute the company. I told them the conditions under which the department would be interested in approaching this particular problem on the basis of the specific question which he asked me at that time.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps one of us misremembers. I will get the *Hansard* out; there were several exchanges. To refresh your

memory, Mr. Chairman, the situation was that this particular company, for whatever reason, has not held annual meetings for some 12 years, and this is of course against the law in this province. I pointed this out to the Minister as coming under his department and that he should lay charges against this company, and that he should enforce the law in this province.

He suggested that I should lay the charges, or that somebody else should lay charges, or anybody but the Minister should lay the charges. He did not think this was really his responsibility, and he said, "I cannot see that any harm is being done." I pointed out to him that the directors of this company had taken all the money out of the company, some \$1 million, and lent it to another company which they also happened to be directors of, interest free, for a period of 12 years.

This did seem a little odd. We do not often see million-dollar loans from one company to another where there are public shareholders involved, with no interest on the money. It turns out that the company that had made the loan, as a result was out some \$1 million in interest over these years. No charges have been laid, of course. We do not expect the friends of the government to have charges laid against them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: No, no charges were laid. I thank the Conservative back benchers for their interjections.

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it is a great shame that you people do not enforce the law, but we hope that in two years when we have a new government, the law will be enforced in this province.

An hon. member: You will not be in the government.

Mr. Shulman: I think even the Liberals will enforce the law if they happen some time to form the government, but we know the Conservatives will not. We do hope that with similar cases, the Liberals might, you never know.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: No. I refuse to believe that.

Mr. Shulman: In any case, Mr. Chairman, the company in its good time did hold an annual meeting, and they said, "Yes, it is true, we did loan the money out. No, we did not charge any interest. No, we do not intend to try and collect interest back from this other company that has the money. It is too bad but maybe we should wind the company up and solve this problem. But do not worry, as long as the company is around we are going to hold an annual meeting every year from now on."

I come back again to you Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman. The directors of this company have taken the money out of that treasury, and have given it to another company which they also control, interest free. For some 12 years they were able to do this without publicity because you did not prosecute them, even though you knew they were not following the law.

I am not too interested in this particular company, because this is pretty well water under the bridge now, but going into your records I found there are many companies in there that are not holding their annual meetings. Leaving the brewery aside, leaving good old E.P. aside—and I know you do not want to disturb him too much—the only question I want the Minister to answer, if he will, is: Is it your intention in future, if a company is not holding its annual meeting as required by the law of this province, to lay the proper charges? That is really all I want to know. If you answer yes, I shall trouble you no further on this whole matter.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, may I repeat, for the benefit of the member, the shareholders' remedy in most cases is under section 341 of the present Corporation Act, which was in existence at the time the matter was first brought up. There is no change in the departmental policy in this regard, that where facts are brought to the attention of the department—which, if established, would constitute a violation of the Act—it is not the policy of the department to commence prosecution proceedings in respect of such violations unless the department is satisfied that some public interest is being adversely affected by such alleged violation. I go on to repeat the answer which I am sure the hon. member is familiar with anyway: "The essential point is that in many of these matters there is a procedure provided in the Act for the shareholder to seek his own remedy in this matter—"

Mr. Shulman: Yes. Mr. Chairman, just to conclude this matter, we get the same answer from this Minister—who, we have been led to believe, is a little more up-to-date than perhaps some of the other Ministers of the front bench—as we do from the Minister of Commercial and Financial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), when we find frauds in stock deals and we appeal to him, "Why does not the security commission do something?" It is always the same reply: "The shareholders can go to the courts." And this is what we are getting from the Provincial Secretary. We expect better from him, because he is one of the two or three in that front bench who we think know what they are doing. And this makes us wonder a bit.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Be careful.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, well, it is true. I give him a compliment, it is deserved.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We are still wondering, though.

Mr. Shulman: We are still wondering, but he is one of the two or three where there is some room for wonder. The rest we can cast away with no hesitation. But for him to say that the government is not going to carry out the function of seeing that the laws are followed, that it is up to the individual members of the public or the individual shareholders, is not good enough. This old *laissez-faire* and 19th century attitude is typical of what we hear from the Minister of no resources and no energy, it is typical of what we hear from the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), it is typical of what we hear from the Minister of Commercial and Financial Affairs. We expect better from you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, let me just follow up on the point the member for High Park has just made on this question. The Minister has referred to the one section of the Act, and I am not engaged in one-upmanship on the proposition at all, but the fact of the matter is that that section of the Act to which the Minister refers, deals with matters in addition to the levying of the penalty. I have been the beneficiary, practising in that particular field, of the laxity of the government over many years in failing to collect those penalties that are imposed by the statutes. I think the point, however, that the member for High Park makes is perfectly right. Either we get rid of them or we enforce them. If the Minister will refer to the preceding section of the Act, it states that

every corporation and every person who, being a director or officer of the corporation or acting on its behalf, commits any act contrary to any provision of this Act or fails or neglects to comply with any such provision, is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction, if no penalty for such act, failure or neglect is expressly provided by this Act, is liable to a fine of not more than \$200.

Now, the section to which the Minister referred is the next section, 341, where it states that where a shareholder or member or creditor of a corporation is aggrieved by the failure of the corporation or a director, officer or employee of the corporation to perform any duty imposed upon it, or him, by this Act, the shareholder, member or creditor, notwithstanding the imposition of any penalty, and in addition to any other right that he may have, may apply to the court for an order directing the corporation, director, officer or employee as the case may be, to perform such duties, and upon such application the court may make such order, or such other order as the court thinks fit.

The point is very clear that there was no intention, when the Legislature passed that particular section of The Corporations Act, to have the one exclusive of the other. The obligation on the Provincial Secretary is very similar to the obligation which, in fact, the department of the Treasurer does exercise under The Corporations Tax Act. For example, the Treasurer does not hesitate, after giving the defaulting corporation all sorts of opportunities because of human frailty—again, of which I have had the benefit over a period of time—to meet the requirements of the statute, does not fail nevertheless to take them to the court if, in fact, they want to impose the penalty to make certain that tax returns are filed. I think that the point the member for High Park makes, is perfectly valid. I think the time has long gone by when we can afford to have provisions assessing what are in substance very nominal penalties, but at least, token penalties, to make certain that the provisions of the statute are complied with. I suggest to the Minister that he should consult with the Treasurer of the province and adopt the same kind of procedures that the Treasurer adopts if there has been a default and failure of filing returns under The Corporations Tax Act, because they do not hesitate to take companies to court for that purpose, of levying again, fairly nominal fines.

This point has come up time and time again, and every lawyer in the Legislature,

because he has benefitted, has been reluctant to insist that the penalties be exacted. I think that the Minister, in order to meet the point the member for High Park makes, and which has been made on many other occasions, has got to institute a procedure. We are voting about \$750,000 for the administration of the companies branch of The Department of the Provincial Secretary. Now, if we are voting that kind of money—and I understand from the Provincial Treasurer that money is scarce at the present time, certainly expensive, although I do not know if it is all that scarce—if we are voting \$750,000, the principal part of the activities of this branch is the administration of this statute, and I think we have got to get down to using the statute in the way in which it was intended. If the Minister believes that we should eliminate all the penalties—the \$5 penalties and the \$10 penalties, and the other penalties, day by day, that are not used by the Act, or are imposed by the Act but not exacted by the Minister—then my guess is he should bring in amendments to the Act.

We are engaged in voting \$750,000 on a point which to everybody but the persons involved, namely, the legal profession, is something that the public cannot understand. They cannot understand why, if the statute says that a corporation must hold an annual meeting every year, the Minister, when he says there is no real public interest involved in this other than if you happen to be a shareholder, or under that section of the Act if you apply to the court, thinks it is all right to have no meeting. If the Minister wants to rely entirely upon that attitude toward the operation of the corporate law, then that is fine. But let us get rid of the other provisions, let us not kid people that in fact there are penalties which are imposed by this Legislature which are not in fact exacted.

I think the member for High Park has a very, very valid point and I think the Minister should reply to it and answer as to what he intends to do about procedures in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, may I simply repeat, the hon. member for Riverdale was making reference to the question of the filing of returns when he was talking about my Cabinet colleague? You understand that in this situation there was no failure to file annual returns.

Mr. J. Renwick: Or at least to hold meetings.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is right. The point was the returns were being filed as required under the Act because if, in fact, they had not filed their annual returns, you realize what the implications of that would be in the procedure of cancellation of the charter.

Mr. J. Renwick: But not the exaction of the penalty.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, I understand, I just wanted to make the point clear. Now on each of these annual returns when the question is asked, "When did you last have your annual meeting?", they in fact reported when they last had their annual meeting, which of course indicated that they were not having a meeting under the terms of the Act. It is at that stage where I mentioned to the hon. member for High Park—and I repeat now—that as a matter of departmental administration the statute provides the requirement for the holding of an annual meeting. The statute also provides a penalty if you do not. Unless we have some evidence of prejudice to the public interest, the vehicle is provided in the internal arrangements of the company. The aggrieved shareholder may proceed to lay an information before a justice of the peace which, in fact, creates the offence when the penalty for it is established.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Absolutely.

Mr. Shulman: Would you not agree that it is in the public interest, if the directors of a company have taken all the money out?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am really not competent to speak about the internal arrangements with respect to the financing between these two companies. Does that not illustrate the very problem?

Mr. Shulman: The very problem is that you should exercise the law with everyone or with no one.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, no, I understand the hon. member, and he has specifically avoided the particular question. It is my understanding that in the company in which he was interested as a shareholder, 99.92 per cent of the stock of that company was held by that particular company and .08 per cent of the shares were held by a limited number of people including the hon. member. As far as I am concerned, when you got into the internal arrangements, we felt this was best solved by the shareholders themselves.

I am not competent to discuss the propriety of what went on between the shareholders. Certainly if I was a shareholder of that company I would want to know, and if I felt aggrieved I have the prerogative to do something about it.

Mr. Shulman: Why do you keep these laws on the books if you do not intend to exercise them?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Because that in fact is the law—they must have an annual meeting and if you do not hold an annual meeting there is a penalty. We simply say to the aggrieved shareholder there is the law that provides for the annual meeting, there is the penalty, and then you lay a charge and if the judge is satisfied, there is a conviction under that particular section of the Act—why would we remove it?

Mr. MacDonald: Who lays the charge?

Mr. J. Renwick: It is you who should lay the charge.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh, well of course that is where the difference of opinion comes in.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying for about an hour to get in on this and I feel that this is the appropriate point to get in here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, since 5 o'clock. An hour of consecutive time in the operation of the House. I have three points that I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman. The first one is this: I was rather interested in reading the editorial in the *London Free Press* following the report on the conflict of interest, when the *London Free Press* enunciated a principle which I suggest applies not only in the conflict of interest, but here. The government that makes the law has the obligation to enforce the law. In short, do not say that a shareholder in this instance, within this Minister's jurisdiction, or in the conflict of interest a lowly citizen, has the obligation to lay a charge and pay money out of his pocket to see that the law is lived up to. If you make the law then you have an obligation to enforce it. Otherwise, take the law off the book.

I do not know why the Minister shakes his head. If the Minister feels that the public interest is, in some way, threatened by not living up to the obligations then I suggest that the government that makes the law has the obligation—when it is suspected or when

somebody draws to their attention that the law is not being lived up to—that they should initiate the process and not leave the responsibility to the shareholder and not leave it to the lowly citizen in the instance of conflict of interest. That is my first point and I leave it.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): This is a strange theory of jurisprudence, I must say.

Mr. MacDonald: It is what?

Mr. Sopha: Strange theory of jurisprudence.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Well I do not know if it is a strange theory of jurisprudence—

Mr. Sopha: There are all kinds of laws that the government does not take the responsibility of enforcing.

Mr. MacDonald: When they impose penalties I suggest that they have the responsibility to take the action to see that the law is enforced and the penalties imposed—which leads me, Mr. Chairman, to the second point that I wanted to raise.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): What if somebody hits you, do I have to lay a charge?

Mr. Sopha: Well, your second one had better be better than your first one.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, my first one was valid, but you lawyers on the Liberal and Tory side have a queer concept of how the public interest is protected.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Queer—that is not a misplaced adjective when referring to the Liberals.

An hon. member: Oh come on, Donald, now really.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister with regard to a point that has been raised with him on a number of occasions in the last two or three hours of the sitting of the House and that is, how the regulations are enforced in terms of cleaning up all those company charters within the company branch files.

I recall years ago when his predecessor was holding the position, and we were dealing with racing charters, that the excuse of the Minister was that the whole situation had been neglected down through the years

so that there were literally thousands of dead files. We were trying to cope with the problem of dead files that could be activated by somebody waving a wand, usually a Tory wand, and they came back into life by paying the obligations over all these years in which they had not filed annual returns and held annual meetings.

My question to the Minister is: How long do you let this situation go on? During the past year for example, there are at least two occasions that I can recall, when people have been in touch with me regarding certain companies. When we check, when we look into the files we discover that they have not held an annual meeting, so we get in touch with the Minister who bugs them and they hold their annual meeting, or at least they send in their return. The lawyer acting on their behalf talks to himself, or his secretary, and sometimes his secretary may be more interested in them than himself and he sends in the return and presumably, the law is fulfilled.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is a mockery. What is the state—if I may deal with my point two—what is the state, at the moment, of the cleaning up of what was frankly conceded by the government to be a wholly unsatisfactory situation in terms of dead charters and unfulfilled charters and unfulfilled regulations with regard to the holding of charters?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, the department has been engaged in a very active programme in this regard. We have been cancelling charters at the rate of about 2,500 a year. It is my understanding, I am advised now, that we are caught up to 1966, which is where we really should be on the basis of the Act. And we can keep up to date now that we have reached this point on the question of filing. Of course, many of these cancellations are on the failure to file annual returns and there is a certain procedure there. So the simple answer is that we have caught up to 1966 and can keep this matter now in hand because of this accomplishment.

Mr. MacDonald: So, when I write the letter and, discover that they have not held an annual meeting for a couple of years, the company is in this three-year period in which it can sort of play with the law?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, not play with the law. As soon as they fail to file on the first year they are given notification and if they still have not filed within three years we start the proceedings. We are current, now,

with respect to these. In this three-year period they have been advised and have received their warning about their failure to file the annual return.

Mr. MacDonald: What happens on the second year?

Hon. Mr. Welch: They receive another notice.

Mr. MacDonald: And the third year, they are cancelled?

Hon. Mr. Welch: And the third year there is a regular procedure of registered notices, following which the Minister cancels the charter.

Mr. MacDonald: Supposing we go no further than this. Why? If I am driving along Highway 401 and drive at 80 miles an hour and I violate the law, I do not get a chance for two years to continue to violate it.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The member does not need to speak on that subject.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister can speak on behalf of himself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: In this instance, if the law is violated, why do you give two succeeding years in which the law is violated before you impose some restrictions, or the cancellation of the licence?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think really we measure the severity of the penalty. The cancellation of the charter certainly brings it to an end and the corporation is dead. I think in the example the member uses, you are still allowed to drive; and we think before we take that drastic action that we should provide a certain period of time. So we think in terms of a three-year period to allow them to bring themselves up to date. This happens to be a matter of policy and the member's opinion in this regard is as valid as anyone's. But this is where we are now in this backlog of catching up.

Mr. MacDonald: Having caught up to the backlog, may I make a suggestion to the Minister, that if the law is not lived up to in a single year, perhaps with another three months or six months of grace, if a company has gotten a charter, knows what the obligations are, and is then unwilling to fulfil the obligations of the charter, why should the licence or the charter not be cancelled immediately, with three or six months' grace;

why do you go on for three years? The Minister concedes in his normally generous way that I am entitled to my opinion. Well, I am expressing my opinion to the Minister now.

It seems to me that having cleaned up an almost impossible kind of situation, you should clean it up further; that if a person seeks a charter and that charter carries with it certain rights and certain obligations—the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) this afternoon even raised the prospect that the charter would be a matter of right, rather than any beneficent concession on the part of the government—that beneficent concession now, or whatever may be a relaxing of the regulations in the future, should carry obligations that are lived up to, so that with a fair period of grace, three or six months, you hold your annual meeting and submit your return. There is no stalling from that point forward, the licence or the charter is cancelled. I suggest to the Minister that if this were the procedure, you would have no more trouble at the end of one year plus the days of grace or the months of grace, than you will at the end of three years.

Quite frankly, what happens now—I hope I do not offend my friends in the legal profession—is that these matters are neglected in legal offices by lawyers, or their secretaries or the operating officials for certain chartered companies. Either the company is not really operative or the lawyers are negligent of their responsibility. So nothing happens for six months, or a year, or a year and a half. All right, place the obligations that the charter is cancelled, and you will find that at the end of the one year you will clean up the situation and you will not have the kind of untidy mess that still remains to some degree, although I will concede it has been cleared up to a considerable extent as compared with a few years ago.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the third point I wanted to raise—and it is following from what the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) this afternoon was initiating with the Minister: There is a growing request—demand, to put it in stronger terms—on the part of people that if a number of important public objectives are to be met, then governments, at either the federal or provincial level, have to get more information in the returns from the companies that are chartered. At the moment, the information on the returns submitted to the Provincial Secretary is surely of a routine nature—the officers of the company, the time of the annual meeting, things of this nature. I suggest to the Minister that there are three objectives that legitimately require a much

fuller revelation of information with regard to the operation of companies.

The first one is the so-called public disclosure, so that those who are investors, or those who may not be aware of the fact that the company in which they have invested money is heading toward bankruptcy, such as Prudential Finance, will be fully informed and can protect their own interests. This, I think, is the first reason why we should have a much fuller revelation than is the case at the present time.

The second one is that this government, with the Provincial Treasurer now taking the lead—I do not know who is pushing him because I can hardly believe that he, on his own initiative, takes the lead—is now dedicated to genuine economic planning. You simply cannot do economic planning at the provincial level, or even more important, at the federal level, until we have much more information with regard to what are the facts of the companies that are now in operation in this country.

There is a third objective which legitimately requires the revelation to the public of much more of the information than hitherto has been regarded as private by the corporations, and that is in the area of collective bargaining. Today, when union-management negotiations get under way, unions find themselves completely in the dark with regard to the financial status of the company. In the United States the returns are such that the union has readily available, as has the public, much more detailed information with regard to the operation of that company. In Canada they are operating in the dark, so that in many instances the company pleads poverty, they simply cannot afford this, and the whole union-management negotiation reaches something of an impasse.

So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that for the purpose of public disclosure to protect the interests of the investor; secondly, for the purpose of economic analysis that is necessary to meet the needs of economic planning, either privately or publicly through the direction of the government; and finally for purposes of collective bargaining, that there must be much greater revelation of what has hitherto been regarded by corporations as being exclusively their private concern.

In moving to suggest to the Minister what this government should do—and I recognize immediately, Mr. Chairman, that the government at the provincial level has to work within rather circumscribed areas—the real answer to this problem lies at the federal

level; not the whole answer, but a considerable part of the answer lies at the federal level.

One of the problems at the moment is that even when we do get some information, for example, at the federal level, it is poured into the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and it comes out in aggregate, so that you have no information with regard to any specific company, or even with regard to any specific group of industries, so that you are not in the position to be able, for example, to engage in sensible economic analysis and thereby plan the development of the economy.

More important still—and here I think we are getting into an area that the Provincial Treasurer can do something—foreign firms in Ontario—and a very significant proportion of our firms are foreign firms, foreign controlled—are relieved of the necessity of public disclosure by virtue of the status that they are private companies. The status of a private company was presumably intended originally in Canada to permit an individual or a family to have the benefits of corporate status though not the right to issue shares publicly, without the cost of disclosure imposed on public companies. In fact, however, corporations have successfully used such legislation to obtain for themselves, with respect to their wholly owned subsidiaries—these are American dominated, or foreign dominated corporations—this legislation to protect their rights of privacy intended originally for individuals and for families. Hence wholly owned subsidiaries of foreign corporations can avoid disclosure in spite of the fact that their parent company in the United States, for example, is obligated and willingly provides this information.

In short, these subsidiaries in the province of Ontario do not provide the information because our law permits them to hide that information that the parent company readily, willingly, traditionally, provides in the United States. What is the significance of this? I was interested in looking back in the Watkins report, Mr. Chairman, to discover that on the basis of data on 743 of the largest companies in Canada it appears that 60 per cent are private companies. That means that 60 per cent of the largest companies—743 in number—do not have to reveal any information because they will hide under the cloak of being private companies. What are the private companies? Let us take a look at them.

In Canada we think of Eatons as being the classic example of the private company, the family concern that has grown up. But under

the protection of American subsidiaries acquiring the same status, what do we get when we have private companies who do not have to divulge information? Companies like British Petroleum, Canadian International Paper, Canadian Kodak, Chrysler, Coca-Cola, General Foods, General Motors, Household Finance, IBM, Kraft Foods, Procter & Gamble, Sun Oil—in short, many of the largest corporations in this country are exclusively removed from any divulgence of the information regarding their operation as far as the public domain is concerned. That means that the investors—well, the investors of course are not involved, at least in this country since they are wholly owned subsidiaries; but certainly the government, in terms of economic planning has no information at all. Finally, of course, the trade unions, if there happen to be trade unions within this corporation, are operating almost completely in the dark when they move to negotiate with the company and the company indulges in the normal procedure of pleading poverty and not being able to do anything about it.

Let me get down to specifics as far as this Minister is concerned. I was interested in reviewing the proposals of the Watkins report which had reference to the federal sphere, as to what might be done in providing the legitimate amount of information for the public for purposes of investors, the workers, and the governments, for economic planning. There were a number of areas in which there were at least combined or complementary responsibilities between the federal and the provincial sphere.

The first one that the Watkins report referred to was that there should be an amendment to The Canada Corporations Act so that federally incorporated private companies, without respect to the nationality of ownership, must file returns with The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and make returns of all companies available to the general public. Then, of course, they added that they should seek provincial co-operation to make this an effective means of obtaining public disclosure.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Minister that for all of the worthy public objectives that I have enunciated, here is a place where this government should move; that in terms of the incorporation of provincially incorporated companies, there should be laid down the requirements for public divulging of information of the operation of that company so that you will have full and clear informa-

tion to the investors; so that secondly the Provincial Treasurer can quit playing games with economic planning, and be able to indulge meaningfully in economic planning; and finally the workers in that company will have the information so that they can negotiate with that company above board and not be guessing as to what is the financial status of the company concerned.

This government can do it within the province of Ontario for those companies that are provincially incorporated, I suggest to the Minister. If he argues that this would create certain obligations on these companies that would place them at a disadvantage, that action by the province of Ontario, because of its position in the national scene, would place pressure on the federal government to do likewise federally. In other words it would be comparable to the kind of thing that I commended earlier in the government threatening to move with regard to tax reform. If we are going to move with tax reform it will force the federal government to do something about tax reform. You move with regard to the divulging of information in provincially incorporated companies and it will force the federal government to do something about federally incorporated companies. You have a bit of leverage, so exercise that leverage.

Now, there is a second area in which I think the provincial government can move because it lies for the most part within your jurisdiction. I refer to the Watkins report where they said, "Use securities legislation in co-operation with the province" to obtain improved disclosure from companies which issue shares to the public. Let us face it. One of the anomalies in the Canadian political scene is that the biggest stock market is the Toronto exchange. This comes under purely provincial jurisdiction. If this government were willing to use this, if the incorporation of companies in the Provincial Secretary's branch is not adequate to move for the divulging of information, then you would certainly complete the picture in terms of information. I concede that this lies, for the moment, in the jurisdiction of another Minister, namely the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

There is another area that I draw to the attention of the Minister. If he is not willing to move, or, by his moving in terms of the incorporation of provincially incorporated companies, to get the necessary information, then it seems to me that within the province of Ontario he can intercede with his colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) or

the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, to establish in the province of Ontario a provincial counterpart of what is known federally as The Corporation and Labour Unions Returns Act, which requires that both unions and corporations will submit whatever information you demand that they should submit—so that there is adequate and full and public revelation.

Finally, if it were acted upon, this lies within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Treasurer. Two or three years ago, Walter Gordon—who, at that time, was disturbed about what was happening to the Canadian economy—he may be a great man, but as the hon. member says, if there is anybody more redundant within the Liberal Party, and he himself recognized it and got out, it is Walter Gordon—at one stage, submitted a questionnaire to American subsidiaries, or to foreign subsidiaries, to get information so that we would have some idea of what the impact was of the guidelines that were laid down in Washington in terms of the necessity of sending reserves back to the parent company: the obligations with regard to patents and things of that nature; the obligations with regard to restrictions placed on export. He was seeking all this information. In typical Liberal fashion, of course, the request was made to the subsidiary companies on a purely voluntary basis, so only a small proportion of them replied; most of them ignored it.

In summary, if full revelation at the company's branch level within the jurisdiction of this Minister does not do the job, or if securities legislation and the revelation of at least those companies that place securities on the market does not do the job, if what the provincial Minister of Labour might do with regard to a provincial Corporation and Labour Unions Returns Act does not do the job, then finally, here is another procedure with reference to American subsidiaries which are an important part of our economy, where we can get the necessary information so that we can really do a job in terms of economic planning, in terms of providing the information for unions to negotiate realistically with management, and in terms of investors being fully protected—protecting themselves because they have the facts.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the public is entitled to this information. At the moment, they get nothing of any value other than the routine information as to the officers of the company and what lawyer may be acting on their behalf.

So my question to the Minister is, what is this government considering in terms of the growing, public request for a fuller revelation, for these highly important public objectives? Are you going to move within your jurisdiction? Or alternatively, is there any prospect that the government is going to move within other departments such as the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs?

I do not think we can neglect this any further, otherwise when for example, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) gets up and talks about economic planning we can quietly laugh because he has not got the facts to do any economic planning. At the moment, he is playing games because he has not got the facts. Who is he kidding? Himself, the public, us, everybody. I suggest that the time has come to quit kidding people and to get down to doing the serious job. But we cannot do it without the information which the government, at the moment, through its laws and regulations, is permitting to be hidden.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, could I also elaborate on this issue which the leader of the New Democratic Party has brought to the fore. I would like to underline the issues that he has discussed and to relate some of these to the issues that a number of us were quizzing the hon. Treasurer on about the co-operation between his department and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the federal government.

It is quite obvious that until we, in this province, do get the facts on the operations of the wholly owned subsidiaries operating in Ontario and the branch plants of American companies operating in Ontario, we cannot have any rational economic planning in this province.

This again was related to the comment that the member for Riverdale and myself were addressing to the Treasurer. Therefore, I would like to underline the question about this type of information in the hands of the present provincial government. Do they know what these companies are doing in this province? If they do not know, what are they doing to find out? If the Provincial Secretary does not believe that this lies within his jurisdiction—to quote the Minister of Education's (Mr. Davis) favourite word—then where does he believe it lies? Does it lie with the office of the Chief Economist under the Treasury? If it does not, then it must lie in his department. Or does it lie under the Cabinet committee on the co-ordination of

economic policy? If it does, who can we quiz at the appropriate time on this type of estimate?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that there are a lot of issues involved in the question of American ownership and control of companies operating in the province of Ontario. Unless we are to maximize the economic benefit of these companies and to minimize the economic costs to Ontario of the operations of these companies, we cannot control their impact on our economy.

There are issues such as the pricing policies between the subsidiaries that operate in Ontario when they purchase goods and services from their parent companies in the U.S. We should have the facts on their pricing policies.

We should know whether or not the prices they pay for these goods and services from their parent companies, and from related subsidiaries, are market prices or inflated prices or give-away prices. For example, Mr. Chairman, if an American subsidiary in this province purchases services from the American company or purchases goods—imports—from American companies, we should know what prices they are paying. If they are paying inflated prices then what this means is that the parent company in the U.S. is getting a subsidy from the operation of the subsidiary in Ontario. It is a way of transferring profits to the parent company from the subsidiaries without paying Canadian corporation taxes on that type of profit.

I suggest, sir, that the Watkins report and the 1957 report called the Gordon report, identified this as a particular issue—that there are many techniques whereby the wholly owned American subsidiaries and branch plants operating in Ontario can reduce their taxable corporation profits; a number of very neat arrangements can be made with their American companies.

The paying of higher prices than normal for goods and services received from the parent company is just one such technique. And unless this provincial government realizes that these multi-national corporations with branch plants and subsidiaries in Canada are using these very sophisticated techniques, then this government is not collecting its maximum revenue from the operation of these subsidiaries in this province. I would say that the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) should be very much interested in this type of issue.

Without dragging this debate out any further on this particular issue, Mr. Chairman, I would again like to ask the Provincial

Secretary whether he considers the issues that I have raised, the issues that the hon. leader of the NDP has raised, the issues that many members in the two Opposition parties have raised over the last two years, are relevant to government in this province. If, as a Minister of the government, he does not consider these issues to be relevant, then let him say it. Let the people of this province know that he and his colleagues in Cabinet do not give a damn about the takeover of this province by Americans. If that is the case, let him state it very clearly.

An hon. member: What about Trudeau?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What about the federal Liberals?

Mr. T. Reid: The member for Scarborough West should fight his battles here. He should fight his bloody battles here.

If the Minister and this government does not consider this to be a problem, let him say so. If he does consider it to be a problem, then let us know in this House and let the people of Ontario know that it is a problem, that they consider it to be a problem and they have policies to do something about it.

Interjections by many hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, may I, in somewhat of a summary form, touch on two or three of the points mentioned? I think the members of the committee will appreciate that many of the points raised are not particularly within the purview of the responsibilities of the department. I wanted to make specific mention, however, of some points which perhaps would fall under the purview of what could be The Corporations Information Act. And it becomes a matter of members expressing their opinion as to what information you would require of Ontario corporations to file with government under that Act.

We have seen some evidence even in the discussion of the opinion here as to what value this information would be. I might just speak to this—I do not want to dismiss it summarily—but I do want to remind the members that part of the terms of reference that the reconstituted select committee on company law deals with this question of returns and I suppose the question of returns could be expanded into this field of information. Perhaps, as a matter of developing this argument, the comments of the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party are now on record and could be considered by government as well as by the committee. It would not be, I

think, proper for me today to be speaking in terms of government policy. That remains for the government to announce in the proper way what its policy would be in due course.

May I simply say this? Insofar as the filing of information, whatever it may be—it may well be that the House has an opportunity now that this matter is before the select committee, to press some of these particular points. I quickly move to this though, to say that insofar as the investing public is concerned, I thought this was part of the reason behind many of the things that had to be filed with the Ontario Securities Commission now, and we have complementary legislation in The Corporations Act which covers Ontario corporations in this whole field of disclosure.

Mr. MacDonald: But this does not cover private companies, which, in effect means all American subsidiaries.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This may be the deficiency. I am talking about all companies at the moment who offer their shares on the public market. They are covered by the securities commission.

I suppose many of the points that have been mentioned—and perhaps we could comment to this extent tonight, that many of the points that have been mentioned do in fact touch other departments of government. The Minister of Revenue no doubt is interested, as would be the Treasurer and The Department of Economics, not to overlook, of course, as well, The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs under which the Ontario Securities Commission functions. So these points are now made and so far as the information which we now require is concerned, we have in the neighbourhood of 3,000 searches a month going on in the public office of the department, seeking out the information which is there filed. What additional information in the public interest might be required is now a matter of opinion, about which I am sure there could be many expressions of opinion both in the select committee and during the course of debate in the House.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon before adjourning at 6.00 o'clock, the Minister indicated that he had the authority and the power to require disclosure of any information from any incorporated company chartered in this province. I take it that he derives that authority under section 4 of The Corporations Information Act, which states that the Provin-

cial Secretary may at any time by notice require any corporation to make a return upon any subject connected with its affairs within the time specified in the notice, and on default in making such a return every director of the corporation, and so on, is guilty of an offence.

Clearly the Provincial Secretary has the discretion and the authority to call for the kind of information that members on this side of the House have stressed tonight to be of such importance in the management of our economy; in the improvement of collective bargaining relationships; in the surveillance of company operations that might well lead to the avoidance of any such future spectacles as the collapse of the Prudential Finance Company; that might well lead to a deterrent to the kind of operation that is going on now in connection with the sale of Peche Island by the Sirrah Company Limited of Detroit, an extra-provincial corporation operating in this province, and a corporation about which we know nothing whatever of its financial operations except that which the principal of that firm chooses to divulge in connection with the option that is to take place on Thursday of this week—at which time the very valuable piece of property and extremely important asset of this province, an asset that ought to belong to the people of this province, to be held in their name for their use and enjoyment, will be conveyed or transferred, again probably to another extra-provincial corporation, if it does not in some manner remain within the control of the present owner, as many people suspect it well may.

Under The Corporations Act, Mr. Chairman, the Minister now requires the disclosure of very extensive information about the operations of companies in this province. The Corporations Act, in the sections 70 through 80 through 90, I believe, calls for the provision to shareholders of detailed income statements, balance sheets and where appropriate, statements of the source and application of funds. It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, on looking at section 4 of The Corporations Information Act, that the Minister could well require the filing of returns by private companies which would contain that very extensive information that is required by all corporations, both public and private, to be afforded to their own shareholders, so that we get away from this secrecy that surrounds the operations of so many of our major corporations in this province—corporations which in the motor vehicle manufacturing field, for example, Mr. Chairman, account for the leading volume of exports by

this province, according to the press release of the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) which arrived on my desk today.

In the motor vehicle manufacturing field in this province, two major corporations of the three—General Motors of Canada, Chrysler Canada Limited—are private, wholly owned subsidiaries of United States parent corporations. We know nothing about their operations under the laws governing those firms offering their security to the public in this province, nor do we know anything of their operations under the requirements of The Corporations Act in connection with the operations of the companies branch.

Some years ago, I happened to be given certain information about Chrysler Canada Limited which was obtained from the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States Government in Washington. In that country, the United States parent corporations are required to file extensive information about the operation of their subsidiaries overseas and in Canada; and it is possible to learn more about the operation of firms such as Chrysler Canada Limited, and General Motors of Canada Limited from the Securities Exchange Commission of the United States than it is possible to learn from the legislation which this government in Ontario has on its own books.

Those three firms, Mr. Chairman, accounted for almost 100 per cent of the \$1.5 billion worth of exports of automobile components and finished cars that left this province in 1968. And yet, beyond the listing of the names of the officers and directors of those subsidiaries operating in this province, we know nothing from the records of this government, nothing whatever about their operations.

When you want to look at operations of Chrysler Canada, General Motors of Canada, even the Ford Motor Company of Canada, Canadian Westinghouse, or Kraft Foods—in fact all of the major international firms, listed by the leader of the New Democratic Party a few moments ago—you must look either at the returns filed by the firms, whose head offices are in the United States, with the Securities and Exchange Commission, or at the consolidated financial reports of these firms. These reports cover their world wide operations, in which the Canadian operation is completely buried, and about which no information appears apart from the odd footnote and the extent of the parent company's interest in the Canadian subsidiary.

It means that we have no knowledge whatever of the extent to which decisions are made in the United States about the volume of exports that are to be provided by the Canadian subsidiary to the U.S. parent firms or about the transfers of dividends or capital. When we get to the collective bargaining field, we have not nearly the same amount of information provided to collective bargaining agents on behalf of employees of these major international corporations that would enable them to bargain with the same knowledge and sophistication that their counterparts in the United States under Securities and Exchange Commission regulations and under National Labour Relations Board regulations are provided with so that they can deal confidently and rationally with these major corporations in their collective bargaining relationships.

In this country we will continue to be frustrated in achieving a similar sophisticated and intelligent collective bargaining relationship until we have this kind of disclosure. It cannot be provided under the aegis of The Department of Labour, it must be provided by a department of the government which has regulatory authority over the financial and corporate affairs of these companies. That means it must be provided by The Department of the Provincial Secretary, which now has the administration of the corporation tax, and Corporations Information Act, or it must be provided by The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Except that, that department, of course, regulates only the affairs of those companies offering securities to the public in this province. And, as we know, many of these major corporations—this has been the subject of much discussion in recent years—simply will not provide for Canadian participation through the acquisition of their shares. Therefore, they will not provide, and are not required to provide, under this province's legislation, any information concerning their activities in this province.

To return to the point I was making at the outset, Mr. Chairman, it would seem that the Provincial Secretary clearly has within his powers under section 4 of The Corporations Information Act, the means of providing full disclosure in these areas of concern: In the planning of the economy; in the surveillance of the affairs of these companies with a view to the prevention of collapse and bankruptcy that has afflicted a number of major concerns in this province, and to the improvement of the collective bargaining relationship in

this province. It would not be difficult or impossible at all for the Provincial Secretary to require the filing of a return, which would include that information that is now required of all corporations to be afforded their shareholders. Also, that those returns be available to the public in the same manner as the present information is available under the returns that are now filed by these corporations with the Provincial Secretary.

There is always the question of exposing information which these firms may consider prejudicial to their business interests, but that, however, Mr. Chairman, is something that can, I think, take second place as it has in the operation of the securities legislation in this province to the overriding importance of disclosure to the public at large. I would hope that the Provincial Secretary would find it timely to undertake measures to implement the provisions of section 4 of The Corporations Information Act, which I think he can do at this time.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Provincial Secretary would like to explain to the House why he does not request the companies that were named, to provide the information which is entirely within his authority to request under the Act? Why does he not request General Motors or Chrysler, or British Petroleum, or any of the others, for the information which comes from many of the other companies? It is, after all, information on which much of the planning of this province must necessarily depend.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have listened with a great deal of interest to the member for Windsor West in connection with his interpretation of the possibilities of section 4. May I be very frank to admit that I really had not read into section 4 the wide berth that one might take insofar as to attain this information. I would like an opportunity, more than just this first hearing, to look into this and perhaps even suggest to the chairman of the select committee, that they might take a look at section 4 with respect to this.

I think the first answer to the member for Scarborough West is that the government itself has to decide what information they feel they do in fact want to elicit from these companies. And so, here once again, I come back to comment, as I did in connection with the member from York South. We must make up our minds as a government what type of information we feel would be in the public interest to obtain. Then I am sure we would

find some procedure to obtain it, whether at section 4 or through some other legislation, this department, or some other department. I think there are other questions that would have to be settled first on this whole question of disclosure.

I repeat once again many of the comments made tonight with respect to the type of information required upon which certain judgment can be made by certain representatives of the public—be they members of labour unions, be it the government itself or be it the investing public—of course, form an interesting proposition, and which has been enunciated by the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you for one moment deny that each of those three objectives is a worthy one—requiring government action?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, of course the point is, a disclosure of what? This is the interesting point that is raised and, I must say at this time, The Corporations Information Act is part of the administration of this department, and it is very opportune to be raising these particular questions. The member for Windsor West has raised a very interesting one with respect to the application of section 4. I was just consulting with my advisors and I understand that section 4, in its application, has never been questioned by the courts. We have no court decision with respect to any limitations in respect to the power I have under section 4, or rather which the Minister has. So, I simply want to leave it that way, and to give it consideration so far as development of policy is concerned. To add any more would get me involved, at this time, in a matter of government policy which I am not prepared to do.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if one did not know the Minister to be such an ingenuous and forthright a politician one would think that there might be some peculiar tension at the back of the government's mind about the use of a section, the clarity of which could not be more explicit.

The Provincial Secretary may at any time, by notice, require any corporation to make a return upon any subject connected with its affairs within a time specified. What court interpretation does the Minister require to effect that clause? The simple proposition, as the member for Windsor West pointed out, is that there are the very elemental facts, financial facts, that can be elicited by such requests from these corporations, which would provide the government a basis on which to plan this economy. Nothing less.

Many of the corporations involved, Mr. Chairman, have corporate interests — have financial and economic interests—which exceed those of the Ontario economy itself. Let this be noted, Mr. Chairman, that while there are restraints on what the Provincial Secretary is prepared to request, there are no restraints on what the government is prepared to give away. The Provincial Secretary will not require Kraft Foods to file a return, but the Minister of Trade and Development will give them \$500,000 free, under a forgivable loan? That is the way the government works. It should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that if the government is prepared to give away sums of \$500,000 of public money on a forgivable loan, to a company that is not required to file a return under The Corporations Informations Act, then it is a rather interesting anomaly which perhaps reveals more of the government intention than the Minister would wish to extend to the House.

There is really, Mr. Chairman, no basis on which these firms do not disclose information, except the Tory reluctance to win from them economic facts which are then open to public scrutiny. It is part of the essential predisposition of the Minister's colleagues towards the corporate world, and the willingness to extend to them rights and privileges which are granted to no others, and at the same time to extend to them moneys which are granted to very few. Inevitably they are wholly owned subsidiaries of foreign interests. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us not play games with the proposition of sending it off to a select committee so that we wait another two or three years while Ontario's economy is inappropriately planned in the interim. The Minister has the capacity now, God knows. It is a valid request if one is going to hand out hundreds of thousands of dollars to companies on an indiscriminate basis. It is a valid request that the people of the province, at least the members of this Legislature, should know the nature of their financial returns in fairly precise detail. And it does not speak well of this government, it does not speak well of this government at all, that they allow everyone from British Petroleum to Sun Oil to get away with the perpetual hidden nature of their economic dealing, inevitably to the detriment of the people of the province, for economic planning reasons, and to the detriment of the workers who are employed by those firms, for bargaining and negotiating reasons.

I want to add this footnote, Mr. Chairman, if I may, that while that is entirely reprehensible of this government, let it be pointed

out that it is as nothing compared to what the government at Ottawa has afforded the international corporations in this country. And let it be pointed out that whether it was Walter Gordon's picayune scheme of 25 per cent ownership which did not avail one of any control, or whether it was the dismissal of the Watkins report or the refusal to implement the Canada Development Corporation, or the rabid continentalism of the Trudeau's, the Sharps, the Bensons, *et al*—the record of the federal Liberals is so reprehensible in this field of selling the Canadian economy to American corporate interests that it cannot be appropriately documented.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: And while we will fight the issues on this floor with this Minister in the area where he should put his documents on the table, let it be fully appreciated, Mr. Chairman, that we recognize that, to some extent at least, even this government's hands are tied by the policies which are presently followed in Ottawa.

Mr. Sopha: To which it must be added that there are no people on the face of the planet who own less of their industry and their natural resources than do Canadians. It is no coincidence, of course, that there is no country on the face of the planet where there is less in the way of regulation of foreigners who come here and rape our resources.

Mr. MacDonald: Disgrace to the Liberals at Ottawa and the Tories here; what are you going to do about it?

Mr. Sopha: There is none. Even Mexico, which we are inclined, being superior English-speaking people, to look down upon, has far more in the way of regulation than we do. Any business operating in pitiful Mexico must be owned 51 per cent by the Mexicans. There is a deightful story told about the Hilton hotel, which is a striking analogy. When an earthquake struck Mexico City and half the hotel was closed because of a gigantic crack that ran down one side, Mexicans said, "That side belongs to the Americans, the one still operating belongs to us."

But in Canada, of course, we in this country, alone in the western world, have utterly failed to build up any sort of regulatory device against foreigners and make them at least disclose the operations that they carry on in our own country. Put aside entirely as being the responsibility of the federal government, the business of the branch plants taking

orders from the head offices in the States, about trading with Cuba, trading with Communist China, and so on. Let us not dwell upon this, but at least we owe it to ourselves, at the very minimum, within the purview of the responsibility of this Minister, to say to these people when they come here and carry away our natural resources, built their branch plants, re-invest and aggrandise themselves by means of the capital that they generate in this country—the greatest mythology of the 20th century, of course, is Canada's dependence upon capital. It is re-investment of the capital that is earned here that they are using. We at least owe it to ourselves—to get back to the beginning of this sentence—that we say to them, "Let us know what you are doing. We are entitled to know the intimate operations of your businesses that you carry on here."

So, what has been said here, apart from the invective heaped upon the Liberals in Ottawa and Walter Gordon, who sacrificed—let it be said about Walter Gordon, he sacrificed himself on the altar of daring to speak out, and his peer group in Toronto could not tolerate the traitorous activity, and saw that he was destroyed—but he had the courage, at least, to speak out; and what is going on, of course—this is merely illustrative, a minor thing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Stop the barking. A minor request such as made by the member for Windsor West about disclosure should not deter this Minister a moment's time to say that this is the least we can expect. The problem, of course, goes far beyond that. But what is happening in this country, that we colonial people—ingrained colonials; we have really always been colonials, and now we are in the midst of the transition, the great transition. The last vestiges of the colonial ties with the motherland across the sea are being obliterated, and a new colonialism is arising, the colonialism to the American eagle. And I have said before that the annexation manifesto of 1849 is a viable document; and really the legacy of the annexation manifesto was what killed Walter Gordon politically, which is a good McLuhan-like statement to make. But it is that desire of the powerful corporate people in this country to make that transition to the acknowledgment of the hegemony of the American eagle. If you speak out against it, what you say is bad for business; it is bad for business, you must not say these things because it will interfere with our business with the States.

How really could the Provincial Secretary be consistent and accede to the request of the member for Windsor West when the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Development, the happy couple, are off in California selling more of Ontario to the Californians, more branch plants, "Come on into Ontario." The indicia under which the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Development can peddle Ontario is that they can truthfully say, "When you come to Ontario, you will find the least inhibitions against your operation of any place on the planet".

Mr. Lewis: And the greatest concessions.

Mr. Sopha: So generations of politicians throughout the ages have cheerfully sold Canada, sold the land of Canada to foreigners. We end up with the two-thirds part of the 20th century where somebody else owns our birthright; we have lost it. Well, as I say, I have been preaching this doctrine here for a long time—

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the member not get out of the Liberal Party—

Mr. Sopha: My friend, the member for York South, declaimed against me for preaching it.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, nonsense!

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member has done a complete flip-flop.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Are you finished?

Mr. MacDonald: Is the member finished?

Mr. Sopha: On a Friday morning—he is not worth tarrying to quarrel with, but just to make the record complete—on a Friday morning I said these things and he said, "You are wasting the time of the House."

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, nonsense!

Mr. Sopha: I do not recall any time that he ever spoke out.

Mr. MacDonald: The member was on the other side for years when we were fighting to protect the interests—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. And I must look at the record—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member for Riverdale says the member for York South is not credible, what can he do?

Mr. J. Renwick: You are not suggesting the member for Sudbury is credible?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I do not stop to tarry with these labels used in the modern argot, I try to speak a better form of English than that. If you take away their labels, they are inarticulate and, indeed, they are without thought, if they forget the appropriate label. But the thing is, to make the point, that these are sensible suggestions made, and by the time the clock rolls around a year, I would hope the Provincial Secretary, with the broad-minded outlook he has on these things, he will look into this.

Mr. MacDonald: The member is in the wrong party.

Mr. Singer: The member for Riverdale says you are not credible.

Mr. Sopha: Why is it, when someone promotes reform, that one has to tolerate this picayune nit-picking from the fringes? Why do we not join together and achieve the results?

Mr. MacDonald: Why does not the member join together with us instead of—

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to commit suicide.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Before a year is up, I hope, I was unaware—I am deeply grateful to the members to my left—I was unaware of the intimate effect on collective bargaining that this type of thing has. And I got up with something of fervor that the government use its good offices in this area.

Mr. MacDonald: Where has the member been?

Mr. Sopha: All right, where have I been? I was dining with my daughter between six and eight. Where was the member for York South?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1702. The hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, continuing on the same point over the mutterings of the members to the left, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he discussed his knowledge of the operations of the American mining

companies in this province before the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) made his rather gross generalizations the other night concerning the mining industry in Ontario. If I recall the news report of what the Minister of Mines said, he said this, sir, that politicians had better lay off talking about taxing the mining industry in Ontario a bit more *à la* Carter, because if we keep talking this way they will get up and flit down to South America and take the employment with them.

Mr. MacDonald: That is how the Liberals act in Ottawa.

Mr. T. Reid: And so I would like to ask the Minister over the mutterings of this nut from York South—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, if I can have some order, please, if—I would like to know, has the Minister made available to the Minister of Mines any factual evidence concerning the operations of the mining industry in this province, and if he did not, where might have the Minister of Mines got this information that the American mining interests are getting scared?

Mr. MacDonald: He got it from the federal Liberals.

Mr. Chairman: We are still on vote 1702, are we?

Mr. Stokes: It is hard to tell.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, we are. I would like to suggest, sir, that the Minister ought to collect information about the wholly-owned American mining operations in this province so when a Minister of the government does make a statement, he will be able to speak from factual evidence instead of muttering away on hearsay.

There is another issue, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the question of getting facts on the operation of American mines in this province, which comes under the purview of the hon. Minister, and that is finding out the extent to which American investment in Ontario is tied to the war budget of the American government in Washington. He should be collecting information on companies and branch plants of American companies, who are associated with the war industry in the United States, particularly as related to the Vietnam war. If we are to understand and be able to prepare for disarmament in this province, the Minister must

know what the armaments industry in this province is up to. Thank you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The hon. member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, in order to come back to the vote and from the ruminations, I have before me, Mr. Chairman, the corporation information returns of the province of Ontario from year to year—and this will bear out what has been contended earlier and should be reinforced throughout this debate. It is designed either deliberately or ingenuously, take your choice, to hide far more than it ever hoped to disclose. What does it show? Let us look at it. I wonder for whose benefit the tawdry piece of tissue is designed, because it is a tissue of innocence.

You name the number of directors. Now, as you well know, the directors may hold one share. There may be literally hundreds of thousands of shares out, but the directors of the company may be the most negligible of individuals, they may be pure front men, and so you want the names of the front men disclosed. They all hold one share apiece. But the big shot, the boy who controls the show, the one who really runs the thing, never appears on the face of your document at all. You want to know the dates of the transfer from one of these rather negligible individuals to one of the other negligible individuals while the substantial figure grows shadowy in the distance.

Half the page is used up in these machinations and in this form of shadow play, to what intent and purpose completely escapes me. You say that perhaps sometimes someone might want to sue the corporation and they put their finger upon somebody along the line who might be desirous of seeing the writ. Well I suppose that could be true. Nevertheless, you have down here the officers of the company who receive writs generally and they would be quite outside the purview of the person who makes the determinate decisions for a corporation.

As was mentioned earlier tonight, when you asked for the annual meeting, that annual meeting reigns surreptitiously in a corridor as many say, particularly when the return comes in and the date has to be set up. I just wonder to what extent your department has ever investigated, just as a spot check for instance, as to particularly private companies, when the annual meetings are held, whether they are held, whether there is any-

thing on record, whether the minutes have been drawn up, whether there are any shareholders' meetings or directors' meetings on that particular day and what transpired. I have seen them a hundred times. They are done by rote. You can buy them from Dye and Durham Stationers and fill in the blanks. I mean this thing is a hodgepodge and an empty cavil, the pretensions of a corporation return.

Then you say, well, what would we like to know? Some of the things have been brought out. We would like to know what the income, the profit and loss and the balance sheets of these corporations are and if there is the argument that this would be detrimental to the secret interests of the competitive ethos, I would reply to you that we all make disclosure, where everybody is under the obligation, that undermines that argument severely because the competitive aspects of the thing are then abnegated or obviated and it is not the intent. It is only when you bring a few within the disclosure principle and exclude others in pretty much the same area on some discriminatory basis, that you can cause a great deal of harm in industrial life.

But to make full disclosure on these particular points would be highly beneficial to union negotiations, to your whole statistical set-up and I will come to that in a moment. I would like to know—it has been pointed out—a place in these forms to indicate whether or not the company in question is a subsidiary. On the second page on the back of the form, on the yellow sheets, you have sections set out here touching the number of par value shares, the no par value, preference stock, the class, but nothing is ever mentioned here—and I just wonder what the intent is that it should not be so mentioned—nothing is ever mentioned as to who owns these shares or what proportion any particular person owns. There is nothing set forth here as to the inter-company transfer of shares from year to year.

You do have a place where you say new shares are being issued, you want to know the basis upon which they are being issued; whether they are in return for commissions or services and I suppose that is for the purpose of the corporate transfer tax certificates and that particular thing within Treasury, so you can catch them that particular way. But what about the already issued shares of a corporation that is being shifted around internally, within the corporation, from person to person? Where is the disclosure with

respect to that? The ownership and determining voice in the corporation in the last analysis may shift from time to time and different people emerge into the picture, and there is nothing to make any disclosure of that. Therefore, we want to know where the true ownership lies. If it is a subsidiary, who owns the majority of the shares in it?

I suggest to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that this is all extremely necessary if you are to get adequate statistical information upon which to make your budgetary forecasts and projections, for the first time in your history. You have managed to come out with an *ad hoc*, day-to-day establishment of the economy into some kind of rationale. You are, for the first time, glimmeringly breaking through into the possibility of a framework within which to design an economic system. That is quite a step for a Tory but in this recent Budget the initial baby movement was made. But you cannot make it and you cannot forward the cause, nor will the infant grow without adequate statistical information. And your forms, I repeat, are designed deliberately, as far as I can see, to suppress the vital statistical information which will make economic planning a possibility even within the rather truncated terms in which you think of economic planning.

During the Smith committee's hearings last summer we heard *ad nauseam* the facts for The Department of Municipal Affairs. There was a dearth of statistical information upon which to make the allocation of grants, upon which to make a distribution of the services of the province and in this day and age everybody seemed to throw up their hands and say, "Is it not amazing, is it not incredible, that a government with all the machinery and with all the apparatus and with the computer age having come upon us, should lack basic facts upon which to make crucial decisions." That is equally and more *a fortiori*, borne out within the economic sphere of this province, touching the corporate return, and I think you should give good thought in the near future to amending your returns so as to make the disclosures here vital and worthwhile.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to mix the two things, but quite separately from what I said before, I would like the Provincial Secretary to consider before this time next year an amendment to the Act that would enable him to gather information about American domination of our unions in Canada.

I would think it would be in the public

interest if we were to ascertain how many unions are wholly owned or largely owned subsidiaries of the parent American body and I would think the Canadian people is entitled to know how much money from union coffers goes to the United States.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Usual red herring—

Mr. Sopha: I have reason to believe—that this really exercises them—that there are several in this group to my left, that would agree privately with what I say and want to see the development of an indigenous Canadian union movement. And we are entitled to know as well. I see no difference between the large multi-national corporation and the parent union in Pittsburgh or Detroit. No difference at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Now I am going to say this, I may take some time because this really gets under their skin. I see no reason, any logical, rational consideration which would preclude the Canadian people from knowing, and indeed union members having full disclosure of the financial affairs of unions and the transfer of payments made.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I happen to know that there are a good many people in the largest local in Canada and—well let me interpolate by saying I will be delighted to hear, when I finish, from my friends, what the difference is—

An hon. member: You will.

Mr. Sopha: —what the difference is in the two considerations. But I want to say that quite genuinely in the largest local in Canada, there are a growing number of people who are becoming very concerned about these large transfers of money that are taking place from the union dues to Pittsburgh. And at the same time, commensurately, there is the growth of an ever-increasing body of opinion in that local that Canadians should, in this area of management of their labour relations have complete autonomy. Having said that, what is wrong with that? What is wrong with that? As a matter of principle and—

An hon. member: You are wrong and you know it.

Mr. Sopha: And I will be delighted if someone gets up and tells us what is wrong. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the

gander and the Provincial Secretary might well consider requiring full disclosure of these financial affairs of the parent organizations. I do not think it is quite enough, you know, really for Mr. Abel to make one trip every three years to account for his stewardship to the largest local in Canada and then, only on the eve of an election—the only time he comes to our community and he is a highly respected man—on the eve of his own election he comes and makes a fleeting visit to the community to win over votes. There are a good many people in the local, in the community, among the citizenry who would like a much fuller disclosure.

I say that in the light of the activity of that important group in my community whose existence I with great pleasure acknowledge, and I would say this at the steelworkers hall, given the opportunity. This other group in Sudbury that bends very far reaching efforts and a great amount of energy to promote the idea of indigenous Canadian unionism—and I refer to the adherents of Local 598, who indeed are willing to test their principles in the courts, and have done so—and as a Canadian (I say it as a matter of principle). I am ready to stand or fall on it in my community that we will be far better off in our labour movement when we have a totally indigenous union movement and when our friends, the union leaders, do not have to look across the border for any guidance, sustenance or advice or support, but can manage their affairs wholly within Canada. To promote that ideal the Provincial Secretary can require under this Act full disclosures of the financial affairs. And I hope that would begin at the earliest time, because I and others are very worried about the millions of dollars that are pouring across the border to Pittsburgh, to Detroit, to fatten the coffers.

Indeed, let me end with this additional thought that oft-times there is a suggestion, a very unsalutary suggestion that ought to be acknowledged—and people in the NDP have told me about this—that when the chips are down and the hard bargaining takes place, and there is perhaps the imminence of a strike to win the demands that are being made at the negotiating table, then there are some inhibitions, some reluctance, that creeps across the border from the head office of the union to settle at something less than they might otherwise expect because a strike would impair the American coffers in the head office.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the member for Sudbury on a point of order—

Mr. Sopha: Well, I have finished so you go ahead.

Mr. J. Renwick: We have sat while he has had the opportunity of making this rather diverting point that he wants to make, but this has no bearing whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, on vote 1702. The substance of the remarks that had been made until the member for Sudbury interjected did in fact deal with the heading companies and the programme as designed under it.

Now if the member for Sudbury wants to propound this proposition—ridiculous as it may be—

Mr. Sopha: I have propounded it. What are the arguments against it?

Mr. J. Renwick: I would suggest he do it on another occasion while we get on with the substance of this vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Well, may I just say that—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, I must say I have been very interested in the comments of the member for Sudbury, and I am impelled to ask which members of the NDP are actually on the payroll of these American unions. I have very good reason to think that it is rather a large number, and in keeping with the member for Sudbury's query, I would like very much, Mr. Chairman, to ask the number of such members and the amount of salaries—

Mr. J. Renwick: What is this—London South or the London *Free Press*?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. Renwick: The member for London South is as out of order on this occasion as the member for Sudbury, and I would ask the—

Mr. Sopha: Well how many of you are on the payroll?

Mr. J. Renwick: I would ask the Chairman to rule on the point of order, not to allow the interjections, inane as they may be, of the member for London South.

Mr. Sopha: He never wants to answer, he wants to—

Mr. Chairman: May I say first of all that the hon.—

Hon. Mr. White: Before you rule, sir, I can recognize about 12 members of the NDP who are the paid agents of these American unions.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am asking on a point of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, we have gone through the ridiculous nature of the rules when we cannot discuss Texas Gulf in this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, for the first time I think you are making the procedure ridiculous.

The member for Sudbury is out of order and the member for London South is out of order. We are quite prepared to discuss this matter at an appropriate occasion, but not on the estimates of this department under the companies branch.

Mr. Sopha: When they think up some arguments.

Mr. Chairman: May I say first of all in reply to the points of order—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Beg your pardon.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member speaking to the point of order? Are you speaking to the point of order?

Mr. Pilkey: No, I want to speak to the—

Mr. Chairman: Well, the Chairman has been requested to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Riverdale which I propose to do if I may have the opportunity.

Mr. Singer: Will you state it again? I was not here.

Mr. Chairman: I would say first of all that the hon. member for London South certainly was out of order. His remarks had nothing whatsoever to do with the estimates.

May I say that the hon. member for Sudbury, while he seemed to be straying and wandering around, nevertheless—

Mr. Stokes: Seemed to be straying? You let him talk for twenty minutes without calling him to order.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: You let him talk for twenty minutes and—

Mr. Chairman: All right, if the hon. members wish to take charge of the meeting, proceed.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if you are going to allow all these subsidiary interests to be discussed, then the Legislature should spend some time discussing these lackeys of a foreign power in Ottawa. Then we are at the guts of the issue, Mr. Chairman.

I think this Legislature would like to have full disclosure about the puppeteering that exists in the foreign power. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the point that I am making on the point of order is that you will allow the debate to descend to turmoil, sir, unless you bring order to it.

Mr. Sopha: Nobody wants to say any more.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. members are ready for the Chairman's ruling. The hon. member for Sudbury was straying all over the place, but he did come back to the point—disclosure, insofar as unions were concerned. We were talking about companies. He was talking about disclosure on the reporting of returns—the filing of returns. In that respect he came right back on the topic, just as much as the hon. members from the New Democratic Party, who were wandering all over the place talking about anything else but vote 1702, in addition to the hon. member for Sudbury.

In my view there was much of the discussion that was completely out of order, but the Chairman permitted it because he let it proceed in the first place and it was not fair to cut one member off when others had been speaking.

Now we are on vote 1702, and I would hope that all the members will return to vote 1702, the companies branch.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! On vote 1702, the hon. member for Oshawa was on his feet.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to answer all of the charges that were made here by the hon. member for Sudbury.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: Just a moment. I have not said anything about them. I said I do not want to get into all of those charges—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I think there were no charges that should be answered by the hon. member.

Mr. Pilkey: I suggest that this Legislature set a day apart to discuss this whole question that the member raises.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Vote 1702, Department of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Pilkey: All right, vote 1702 then. I agree that there ought to be a full disclosure of the companies' reports and I make this comment on the basis of collective bargaining because many times with the trade union movement in their periods of negotiations, the corporations point out that the demands that the unions make are rather unrealistic. But in my opinion, many of those demands are made in terms of the progress that the company has made, but without complete disclosure.

Now, if the unions, or the trade union movement in this province, understood exactly the position of a company then I am sure that they could negotiate their equity within the framework of those disclosures. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the reason that we have not got full disclosure is because it would be in the interest of the workers in this province in terms of their negotiations, and this government will not put the companies in a position of full disclosure, giving the workers of this province an opportunity to get their equity.

Now let us go to General Motors as an illustration.

Mr. Chairman: Let us go to vote 1702, the companies branch.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, that is what I am talking about—vote 1702.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. member please indicate to the Chairman the relevancy of his remarks.

Mr. Pilkey: I am talking about the companies, information and disclosure, that is what I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman: The filing of returns to the companies branch?

Mr. Pilkey: Sure. It certainly does. Yes, why does it not?

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member talking about the filing of returns to the companies branch?

Mr. Pilkey: I am talking about the filing of returns.

Mr. Chairman: To the companies branch?

Mr. Pilkey: Right.

Mr. Chairman: All right, proceed.

Mr. Pilkey: That is exactly what I am talking about—so that the workers of this province can get their equity in terms of the

progress of the company so that they will understand.

At the moment, with many of the corporations, my colleague from Windsor West has pointed out, there has been no revelation of the company's progress in terms of information. I only go to General Motors which is in my home town. We have to do a hell of a lot of digging to find out the position of that corporation because it is tied in with the American returns. They make their returns, but it is all in with the American returns.

That corporation has been described many times in Canada as the brightest jewel in the General Motors empire. We do not really know that, but I think we ought to know prior to any negotiating period. Or every year there should be this kind of disclosure so that the workers in this province, along with the shareholders get their just equity.

I think it is important that we have full disclosure and I just wanted to support the comments of the member for Windsor West. I think his point was well taken, and I suggest very frankly that the Minister take this under advisement and in the future enforce that section of the legislation that will guarantee full disclosure.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702, the hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I believe any corporation operating in Canada, whether it be public or private, should have to make the same returns. I cannot understand why it is that we have three different places that a corporation has to make its return, some of which information is open to the public for some companies and not for others.

Many companies are quite concerned about the fact that they have to disclose certain statistics in public returns because they are publicly owned, which private companies do not have to make. It puts them at a disadvantage over such private companies. It seems to me that we should be consolidating the three returns we make, namely, the corporation tax return to the Provincial Treasurer's Department, the corporate annual return that is made to the Provincial Secretary's Department and the reports which are made to the public through The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

In every case whether there be one shareholder, two shareholders or a thousand shareholders it seems to me that the same information should be made available. It should not matter whether the corporation is owned by

one shareholder south of the border or in any other part of the world, the information should be a public return available for people to see.

I would appreciate getting the Minister's view on this matter because I cannot see why we continue to treat private and public companies in a different way; why we should not have just one category of corporation, and each corporation as soon as they are incorporated, should not have to file common returns disclosing a basic amount of information that would be of value to such people as the union negotiators at Oshawa. But also, since our public companies in Canada have to disclose many figures that are of value to their competition why should they not have the advantage of the competition's returns and similar knowledge about their internal figures?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, may I simply say in answer to the hon. member's question: in the first place there is no distinction as far as this department is concerned. Regardless of the nature of the company the same return is filed with this department. The member must be having some reference to other departmental planning requirements. Earlier today, the member for Downsview raised this question, and at that time, we pointed out to him that studies were underway between this department and Treasury—Revenue, as it is now—to find some way in which we might combine our returns so that they would in fact go out as one return. As I explained at that time, this required some approach as to the programming for the computer and so the point that he makes in that general line has already been anticipated by this department in working with other departments.

But I would simply say that as far as the annual return required under The Corporations Information Act is concerned, it is the same return from all corporations, as far as Ontario corporations are concerned.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's views concerning the integration of these returns that are internal and available only to the Revenue Department and also available only to you. Your returns are quite limited in their content. Information that is available to the corporations tax branch, the revenue branch, is far more extensive. But we have a third department that is involved with many corporations of this company, that is, Financial and Commercial Affairs, and I cannot understand why

we cannot have the same return available and made, and require it of all corporations so that public and private companies are not differentiated against. Why should we unfairly discriminate against the public corporation, the kind which we really want to have increase in this province if we are going to have more Canadian ownership? We have to have more public companies in which Canadians can buy shares. Why do we not require that private companies disclose the same information as public companies? Why do we not eliminate this category of private versus public companies and merge the departmental returns into one, the three departmental returns?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I cannot add anything more to what I said because I only speak for this department and the returns that are there and to assure you that there is some attempt to study the combination of returns.

As the hon. member will know, at the time of the introduction of the new bill, The Business Corporations Act in draft form, the distinction between private and public companies is in fact eliminated, and we are thinking more in terms of those companies that are in fact going to the market for their securities and the type of information which would be offered along with other classifications. I have noted the hon. member's remarks and will certainly see that they are shared with the Ministers of the other departments to which he makes reference.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, under section 4 of The Corporations Information Act, I understand you can require additional information. Would this not be a good way to start the ball rolling? Why hide behind the fact that it should involve a different department—Financial and Commercial Affairs?

It seems to me important that we get moving now on this matter because we have been talking about it for a long while and we may be talking about it for a lot longer. But at least if you take action you will get the matter in motion and we will find out if there are any particular problems. I cannot see that there should be. But, even if there are any particular problems why should private companies have a different privilege than public?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I will be glad to take a look at it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I gather this is the vote under which the extra-provincially licensed companies can come.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes.

Mr. Brown: I am interested in some information that I have not been able to get from the material provided. That is, the number of extra-provincially licensed companies that are operating at the present time in the province of Ontario, who have their head office in other provinces of the Dominion, as compared to the number that have their head offices in other countries; the gross earnings of these companies, the net earnings and the income derived by the province from the licensing of these companies. I would like to get some sort of comparison between the income realized in terms of licensing their operation in the province as compared to the kinds of net earnings that they take out of the province.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I will have to take that as notice. I will get the information. I can provide you—we can get the information for you as to the numbers. We would have no way of knowing their gross earnings or their net earnings in this department, through the returns that are filed.

But those questions which have been raised for which we have information in our department, I will be very glad to provide for the member.

Mr. Brown: Could you give me the information in terms of the amount of income that comes from the licensing?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh, I am sorry; yes, that is the one I meant. The numbers and their head offices and the income produced to this department by the licence fees is certainly available, and I will get that for you.

Mr. Brown: In your figures presented in the estimates for 1969-70, what items refer to the anticipated incomes that will come from the licensing of extra-provincial companies? One of the problems, you understand, is that it is very difficult to make sense out of the presentation here because we do not have these kinds of breakdowns, and I would appreciate that sort of information from you.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Thank you. These estimates before us are for expenditures, there is no revenue.

Mr. Brown: I am going back to the other material that you have presented along with

this, such as the public accounts for the province.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can certainly provide you with the information concerning the revenue which these licences do produce. I will get that information for you; I do not have it here with me.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702. The hon. member for Yorkview was on his feet.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I am coming to another matter, Mr. Chairman, at this point.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702 is still open for general discussion.

Mr. Young: This matter, Mr. Chairman, comes back to the matter which was raised in the first presentation this afternoon under vote 1702, and that is the name of companies. I have in my hand a communication from a Mr. Jim MacDonald who is executive secretary of a National Labour Co-operative Committee in Ottawa. This is a problem which he met recently when he drove into a City Parking (Canada) Limited lot, a parking lot, thinking that he was giving his patronage to a public rather than a private enterprise. It did not make that much difference as far as he was concerned but he did favour the civic lot. And he said:

When I protested that their rates were higher than in the adjoining private enterprise parking garage, for poorer facilities, the kid in charge agreed but pointed out that the rates were set by the company.

Raising the matter by phone with the Ottawa Parking Authority the next day, my suspicions were confirmed that it was a private company, and not a city lot. The parking authority manager willingly agreed to my request to put her reply in writing.

I want to put that reply on record, Mr. Chairman, and to ask the Minister for his comments. This is the reply:

Parking Authority of the City of Ottawa

March 14, 1969.

Mr. Jim Macdonald;
111 Sparks Street,
Ottawa 4, Ontario.

Dear Mr. MacDonald:
Regarding City Parking (Canada) Limited
Our File P42.

Thank you for your telephone call to my office on February 13, 1969. We regret your unhappy experience with a private firm City Parking (Canada) Limited, and share your opinion that the name should

be changed so that it does not lead the public to the belief that the firm is owned, operated or sanctioned by the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, or its agent the Parking Authority of the City of Ottawa.

The Parking Authority has a very thick file of complaints dating back to 1960, and has itself, and through the office of the city solicitor, approached the Provincial Secretary to require this private firm to change its name under the provisions of subsection 2, of section 12 of The Corporations Act. It appeared in January 1966 that we had met with at least token success, but then we were advised by the Deputy Provincial Secretary, that as a condition of incorporating City Parking (Canada) Limited, City Parking Limited on December 16, 1964, undertook to either dissolve or change its name to some dissimilar name.

In June 1966 we were advised that the City Parking Limited had been instructed to change its name and had, in fact, by letters patent, dated April 30, 1966, done so. The name chosen as a replacement was Athos Parking Services Limited. Those lots at Ottawa which had been operated by City Parking Limited, however, continued to operate under that name.

This point was brought to the attention of the Deputy Provincial Secretary, and subsequently City Parking Limited lots began to operate under the name City Parking (Canada) Limited.

The Parking Authority of the City of Ottawa continues to object to the use of a name which implies civic sanction and has attempted to have the name City Parking (Canada) Limited changed, under The Corporations Act, but without success.

In a copy of a letter from a Toronto city solicitor to the director of Companies Branch Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, dated October 7, 1968, we learned that the department reaffirmed its position, that the name City Parking (Canada) Limited is not objectionable under section 12 of The Corporations Act. We regret that confusion exists in the mind of the parking public between the Authority and a private operator. It would appear, however, that we are powerless to have the situation changed so that the interests of the parker may be protected.

Yours very truly,
Helen R. Fisher,
General Manager.

That is the letter from the Ottawa authority,

Mr. Chairman, and I would like the comments of the Minister as to why it is that this company cannot be requested, or ordered to change its name so that there is not this confusion between the public authority and the private corporation which is operating a parking lot in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, Mr. Chairman, this question has been before this department, as the hon. member knows—through the correspondence to which he has made reference—and there is a considerable amount of correspondence that has been exchanged. This name was granted some years ago. There are other incorporations with the word “city” in them. I think there is a City Laundry, and different connotations thereof. It is perhaps sufficient for our discussion tonight to say that after a very careful review of all of the matters, we were satisfied—I think in the case of Ottawa, do not hold me to this—that the incorporation of the City Parking was even before the Parking Authority was established itself—that there is no confusion. I would point out to the hon. member that under subsection 3 of that same section 12, if the Ottawa Authority, or whoever has complained to the hon. member, is not satisfied, the matter can now be taken to court and my decision, of the entire matter, reviewed by the courts, under subsection 3 of section 12, on giving seven days notice to the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702.

Mr. J. Renwick On vote 1702, there are three brief comments I would like to make about the earlier discussion this evening.

First of all I do not think we should hold out too much hope that the select committee will deal adequately or effectively in this area of disclosure of information for strictly non-corporate purposes. The kind of information that has obviously been discussed this evening is the kind of economic information which will have the impact on the foreign-owned corporations which are operating directly or through subsidiaries in the province of Ontario. I think it is appropriate to raise the matter here because they are corporations and The Corporations Information Act appears to provide the avenue through which this information could be obtained.

The select committee, so far, has not dealt adequately with the question of what distinction you can make between a public and a private company. As the Minister has mentioned the new Corporations Act purports to abolish the distinction and goes to this differ-

ent distinction of those who are offering securities to the public. But, it does not come to grips with this wide open door which has been available for such a long time for foreign corporations to operate in Ontario, in Canada, under circumstances which permit them to not even make the limited disclosure which is required of public corporations.

This is the point, and I think the only way in which this point can be resolved is for the Minister to take it as a matter which requires clarification by the government of its policies. It is just ridiculous, when you actually look at it, to think that General Motors US can operate in Canada through General Motors Canada—a tremendously large corporation—under the guise of a private corporation. Under the existing Act, it is not even required to provide the additional information which would be available, not in terms of the annual summaries, but in terms of other disclosures, that would be required to be made.

It is equally ridiculous to think that the solution has been found in the new Corporations Information Act, which abolishes that distinction between a public and a private corporation and goes to this question of whether or not the securities have been offered to the public. Now, I do not think that either within the realm of the select committee dealing with the form of the annual return, which is under consideration, or in the select committee on the question of disclosure by corporations of information of an economic nature, important for the assessment of their impact on the province of Ontario, we can expect that from the select committee.

As a member of it, I think I can almost guarantee that the select committee is not going to feel that it can deal with that question. It is not within its terms of reference, as broad as those terms of reference may be. This question of disclosure is difficult to raise in the various estimates—and this appeared to be the appropriate estimate because of the section of The Companies Information Act—in the context of this department or in the context of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, or in the context of the economic planning by The Department of the Treasury and Economics or in the department of the Minister of Trade and Development. So of all the possible places, this did appear to be an appropriate place to draw the attention of the government to this vast gap which appears in the information which is available.

The tragedy of the Watkins report is that people now consider that there is a report which can be studied. Yet, the point that Professor Watkins and his colleagues who presented that report, emphasized time and time again, is the lack of information on which they could make the assessment about the impact of the foreign ownership and control of large segments of the Canadian economy in order to develop either measurements or indicate some method by which they can assess the impact which that ownership has made on our economy.

The substance, therefore, of what we are talking about is that it has got to be in the province of Ontario where this information must come. There is no point in suggesting that we can await the federal government. The strange fact of the matter is that the members of the Watkins committee were under the misapprehension that a substantial part of these matters were solely within the jurisdiction of the federal government, whereas, as the Minister knows, all of the companies that the leader of this party, the member for York South, dealt with—the major companies—are all subject to the jurisdiction of this government because they carry on business here, one way or another, either directly or by just carrying on business or having their head offices here. Now, we can get at those companies.

The other aspect of it is one which can more appropriately be dealt with in The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, and it is we have to get the equivalent of the civil side of the anti-trust combines law in operation in the province of Ontario, an cease to deal solely with those kinds of matters related to public policy only on the basis that they are criminal offences.

For this whole area, the member for York South outlined to the House, vast parts of it fall within the jurisdiction of this government. This government can, in fact, deal with this whole question of adequate disclosure and adequate assessment. I do not myself believe that it is an appropriate matter or that indeed the select committee can deal with it perhaps other than by way of a passing reference. A select committee which had sat under the chairmanship of the now Minister of Mines produced a report which indicated that in the abolition of even the distinction between public and private companies, there was going to be no requirement of filing any kind of financial information.

Now, this is the hang-up. Where in the government is the financial disclosure—that

kind of financial information—about companies going to come? I come back again to the very simple point that it is really quite ridiculous and infantile that we should have allowed for so long this fiction of the private company to be used by the large corporations who are going to have such a substantial impact on the Canadian economy.

I want to come back to what the member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) raised earlier—the matter is of great concern to him and to the members from that part of the country. That is the question of the island in the river, Peche Island. My understanding is that that island is going up for auction in the next few days. I do not know whether or not the government is just not interested in that island, or whether it is quite prepared to see that particular part of the Canadian heritage disappear as part of the public patrimony. I find it difficult to assess whether or not the Minister himself has any feelings about it.

The member for Sandwich-Riverside was assuming that somehow or other if the government were interested, it could have used section 4 of The Companies Information Act to get all the information which was required in order to found a government policy about Peche Island. Maybe it is the kind of thing which should be acquired when the opportunity presents itself by something like the Ontario Heritage Foundation. That Act is being amended for the purpose of including recreational or scenic properties in the heritage of the province.

But I think what bothered the member for Sandwich-Riverside and the member for Windsor West, and I am sure other members in the House, is that this statute appeared to provide a method by which, in such circumstances where the public interest is so specifically and definitely involved, the government could on its initiative get information which would permit it to make an assessment and a decision as to whether or not the public interest was such that the government itself should intervene.

Now, those are my comments on them and I would invite, as we draw to the end of this particular vote, the Minister's further comments about it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really have nothing further I can add to what I have already said during the course of what I found to be a very interesting discussion with respect to the whole matter of disclosure. I really fail to see how this Minister

could be particularly involved with respect to the auctioning of an island in the Detroit River.

It may well be under the circumstances this is something which should be brought immediately to the attention of the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) or some other Ministry of the government or the government generally with respect to what is the position. If there are any constructive suggestions to come from the member for Sandwich-Riverside in that regard, he might direct them to the attention of that Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: You are so requested now.

Vote 1702 agreed to.

On vote 1703:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who was very enthusiastic about the translation of this hon. young gentleman into this department, especially with regard to my hopes that in this branch, the citizenship branch, that he might exercise the talents of which he has many, to render it into a viable, effective and meaningful force in the life of the province.

It is true to say—and I think it fair to make the comment—that under the previous Minister this branch of the Department was little more, as indeed it was, not little more, it was a department of propaganda of the government and mainly a department of propaganda directed to the so-called ethnic groups. The previous Minister never missed an opportunity, of course, to propagandize those people whose mother tongue is neither French nor English.

It was sometimes said that two Bohemians could not meet in this province without the previous Minister popping up in between them, saying, "I am here" and handing them some sort of placard or making a speech for which he has great aptitude.

I do not think there was a newspaper in the so-called ethnic press published that the previous Minister did not have a government ad in, and he saw the citizenship branch as really being a vehicle to propagandize those people whose mother tongue was neither French nor English.

With that remarkable hubris that he demonstrates to aggrandise himself, that culminated in that very revolting and divisive speech that he made here a few weeks ago in which he referred to them as the third element. Now, having put it in that context—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Of course they have all disagreed with you.

Mr. Sopha: You will get your opportunity later. It was the most divisive speech that I have ever heard in the ten years I have been here.

But, to turn to a more constructive approach, I am one of those who is intensely worried about the appreciation of the incidence of citizenship among our people. I abhor, I eschew, I avoid, talking in terms of generality. I like to support the things I say with evidence.

I refer to two items. One was the report of the national history project, which reveals to us that the teaching of the incidence of citizenship, or that rubric under the dusty old word, civics, is in a very low state indeed in this province. Not only does it receive little in the way of attention in our schools, but Mr. Hodgett tells us that the burden of inculcating knowledge about the value of citizenship to our young people is most often sloughed off as a chore upon the most incompetent people on the teaching staff, who take it on as being something of the nature of a remission into a penitential purgatory, and carry out with the degree of enthusiasm implicit in that description.

Now, that is one piece of evidence. The other piece of evidence is, of course, the realization that in the great city of Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto, and all the composite municipalities that make it up, that little more of a third of the people take the trouble to go to the polls in election year to exercise their choice of the civic leaders. And that is a matter that causes me grave concern.

I use Toronto only as an illustration of our largest and most important city. That causes me a great deal of anxiety, and I hope that it instills anxiety in the mind of this Minister. I see no other way that we are going to rectify one mistake of the teaching of citizenship and, two, its practice in such an important thing as voting, other than making some positive efforts to acquaint our people, and particularly, newcomers, to our country, with some of the values, some notions of the values of being a citizen of this province, this country beyond.

And rather than continue the path that was set out by the champion of the ethnic groups, when he occupied the department, the self-appointed champion, I would like to see a new direction taken and this Minister seize upon a device such as the creation of citizen

forums throughout this province. The inauguration of groups of people, and particularly new Canadians, where meaningful efforts, intelligent efforts, by well equipped people are made to stimulate them to come together to discuss, in an exciting way, the incidence of citizenship, the privileges and the rights—the liberties that it gives in the first place, the responsibilities that it entails in the second place; perhaps the teaching of a smattering of history.

Now, this, to me, seems to be a much more exciting and far-reaching programme than that which has been used by this department, which limited itself to, I think, the teaching of language to new Canadians. A very important subject, but none of the business of this department. None of the business of this Minister. The teaching of English, facility in that tongue, ought to be entirely within The Department of Education, which has the plant, which has the administrative setup, which has the teachers to do it, and it ought to assume the responsibility. But in an overcrowded curriculum where there is always great pressure to add new subjects, then it is possible for this department and the citizenship branch, to take the responsibility for a curriculum such as I propose, and that is, the teaching of the incidence of citizenship.

I do not hesitate to refer to my earlier words when I say that we are in danger of making the transition from being English colonials to American colonials, and to call attention to the importance of the uplifting, the focusing upon the value, the inherent work, the great birthright of being a Canadian, and increasing the knowledge, our own knowledge, but imparting the knowledge to new Canadians, of some of the exciting history of this country. Without dwelling on it, of course, it is most often said that our history is dull. That is the label that is put on it. It is not true a bit. But I want to see, under this Minister, some forthright steps being taken in an intelligent way of imparting a meaningful message to these people, because, look at it in this framework: We are enriched by the progress across the seas, or over the seas, I guess is more appropriate. They do not come across the seas but over them. We are enriched by the progress of tens of thousands of people annually, who come to Canada; most of them apparently want to come to Ontario. Most of those who come to Ontario want to settle in Toronto. Oh yes, they do. The statistics I share with the Minister of Health, the gloomy statistics show that they make that unfortunate choice, they do.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): One or two go to Port Hope, and to Port Colborne.

Mr. Sopha: And a great many, of course, jam themselves into downtown Toronto, into central Toronto.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I say we are enriched by that, because that is a conscious choice.

Mr. Singer: 80,000 a year.

Mr. Sopha: They come here, and the moment they arrive, those people, they acquire every right—well almost every right, some they must get by operation of law—but they acquire the great composite collection of rights which are the heritage of Canadians. And that is why it is true to say that Canadians are treated, or ought to be treated alike, whether they came early or whether they came late. All right, it is our responsibility, government's responsibility, to take immediate steps to acquaint them with the exact nature of that very valuable acquisition in Canadian citizenship.

But, what do we do? What does this department do? This department I say—and that path across the snow that was beaten out by the man who never quite recovered from the fact that he was sent to Hungary to persuade some people to come here and thereafter saw him as the spokesman of what he calls a third element—they organize elaborate citizenship rituals, and the acquisition of citizenship, and, sometimes, with all the Mounties and provincial police that one sees around them, one gets the impression that it is a military ceremony, instead of attaching the dignity to it of a civil ceremony of utmost importance where there is the grant on the one hand, and the acquisition on the other, of something, the value of which they will probably never obtain the like again in their lives.

All right, while in that vein. Let us make a break with the past, and let us take some forthright steps to establish throughout this province some kind of citizen forum among these people where competent teachers could be hired and set out to talk to them in an intelligent, comprehensible way about the meaning of Canadian citizenship. Really, that is the only justification that I see for having the branch such as this. We do not need an immigration branch in this province. We can leave that to the federal government, to foster immigration, set the standards for admission and look at health and all that sort of thing,

and as far as I am concerned, they do it very adequately.

We have the power under the Constitution, it is true, to be engaged in immigration, but really from another point of view I adverted to earlier, we ought not to exercise many efforts to attract people to Ontario because apparently the statistics tell me, and I looked at them as recently as last week, that people come here anyway, they come to Ontario. Ontario is the Mecca and it is not because of the Minister of Trade and Development they come here—he builds up with smiles—that is not the reason.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Good government for 25 years attracts them.

Mr. Sopha: The reason is a simple one and that is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I think you had better quit when you are ahead, if you are going to make statements like that because you will have to live with them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Living conditions—

Mr. Sopha: They come here because many of their fellow countrymen are here and they seek the safety and the refuge of joining their cultural peers. That is the reason they come.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Housing attracts them.

Mr. Sopha: Well, this promises to be a very yeasty discussion. I am glad that I got my oar in first because I want to plead with the Minister that he develops some sort of theme as I have laid out because I am very worried. Indeed, I was really impelled, propelled into throes of depression when I read that report of the National History Project and saw the low state that the teaching of Canadian citizenship has come to in the pride and heritage of this country. Here, I see, is a device, a means whereby a remedy can be afforded in a very important area of people who have no impression at all of this country when they come here.

Rather, I should not say that they have no knowledge of this country. The Minister, I hope, will soon cut out that practice of putting an ad in every ethnic newspaper as being his total contribution to this department to citizenship, and the sending out of the scrolls and placards and that sort of thing, and get down to some fundamentals in respect of citizenship and its values and in privileges, its rights and responsibilities in the life of this province and beyond it.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, without embroidering the question, I would like to ask the Minister, why should the human rights commission not be brought under the Minister of Citizenship? Is that not its logical place? One of the first important features of our country about which a new immigrant should become well informed is the matter of his rights as a citizen and a first class citizen at that. As human rights and citizenship seem to me to go together quite naturally, and quite logically, I would like the Minister, when he gets a moment, to comment on that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, may I at this stage say, quite sincerely, how much I have appreciated the comments of the member for Sudbury. I really feel—that is a proper word—I really feel with him the need for this type of emphasis, and can assure him that much of our concern and a great deal of our study at the moment is centered around the type of involvement to which he makes reference.

We have experimented already with a community conference in Windsor. We are going to Fort William Saturday of this week—the Fort William conference is along this particular line—and then to Cornwall within two or three weeks.

It is sufficient to say too, that I share with him the concern. I think he is making reference to Professor Hodges' study, "What Culture? What Heritage?" at OISE. It may be at this stage, perhaps just sufficient to say that he has a great feeling for the work of this department, and he sees a great deal of opportunity for the expansion and the deepening of its work. I share this view and hope that as resources, both manpower and money, will provide, that we can continue to develop the type of programme so well launched by my colleague, the Minister of Social and Family Services when he was the Minister of this department.

If I might turn to the specific question and I would like to speak further on this, it is an aspect of the work of this department which is very close to my interest as my officials will know. I can assure him that I am hopeful that we will be able to develop, before too long, some tangible evidence of implementing many of the things to which he has made reference.

The member for Sandwich-Riverside has raised a question with respect to the human rights commission and all I can say in answer to it, is that as a matter of government policy it has been placed with the Minister of

Labour. Perhaps it is not proper for me to comment on any change which might be made until such time as the government has had an opportunity to, in the review of the assignment of responsibilities within departments, make that announcement itself. With respect to where the human rights commission should be, at the moment it is the decision of the government to have that work with The Department of Labour.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, a year ago in the Throne speech address, these words were spoken:

My government has accepted its responsibilities to our new residents and is committed to further action to ensure that such equality will continue both within the province of Ontario and throughout Canada. This is in keeping with the plans of my government to initiate a series of conferences throughout Ontario to foster interest in community affairs and to improve communications between the newcomer and the established residents of our province.

Then, going from there over to a brochure issued by the department in question we read these words above the signature of the hon. Minister:

The department also undertakes research into the educational, social and economic needs of newcomers and conducts pilot projects to determine effective means of meeting these needs.

Now I always think it is chastening for the individual, at the odd time, having basked in the sunshine of praise; beyond the reach any human being; which is the condition that this Minister approximates to, I think a chastening exercise to get him to pull up his socks and to put some weight into this department, the citizenship branch.

I make allusion to a project initiated by the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto this past year which states itself to be a social opportunity project, a report of a survey relating to urban immigrants and receiving areas in Metropolitan Toronto. I read through this document compiled by many, many individuals, community-minded people, including the Reverend Graham Cotter of St. Mark's Anglican Church.

I turn to page 6 of this report which has to do with the job and range of problems which face this Minister in his department

and for which he has been given funds. On page 4, I read a series of names; everything from Manpower Centre, the department of public welfare, that is the metropolitan department; liaison division of Canadian Citizenship; Travellers' Aid; Young Christian Workers, YMCA, Parkdale Library.

I could go on for quite a while reading the list of people who participated in this enterprise. The people who put money and effort and a bit of brawn into it but nowhere in the list do I see your department. Where were you when the revelation came? This is the first major task force working in this city with respect to the very areas in which you are most interested.

The social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto launched this enterprise. True they launched it very close to the line of the Canadian Manpower Centres. Nevertheless you are supposed to have some liaison with those centres.

If your department is to have any vitality at all, it is to the extent that you do have such a relationship with these centres.

You should be concerned with informational agencies. The latter part of this report is taken up with the various agencies such as Travellers' Aid, who I never realized previously, play such a highly social role. They are very much concerned with the indigent, with the ambulatory people who are down on their luck coming to this province. I felt that they gave us simply an informational service to travellers. But not really. They have gone into social welfare work in a big way, and you give a small grant to them every year.

I notice back in your citizenship estimates of 1968 there was a sum—I think it is \$3,000—a munificence against the work that they are doing in this city for people coming through this territory and trying to accommodate themselves. That is less than respectable for the kind of job these people are carrying out.

This study—which I am saying that for some mysterious reason the Minister seems to me to have been deficient in entering into, participating in, or advancing any funds towards—was concerned with a study area, largely Parkdale area in Toronto, chosen rather arbitrarily just to be able to determine again the business of statistics, to find out what the facts of immigration were.

They found out what the incidence of immigration from the Maritime provinces was. For the first time they were able to make some determination of income levels, job opportunity, the lack of information.

My friend has spoken of forums—well be damned with the forums—I am for information. I would think that what we really need are information centres. We spoke of orientation centres; a different kind of thing.

For the nonce, and this ties in with what the member for Sandwich-Riverside had to say on civil rights—we will come to that in a moment—there is a deficiency in communication, in the basic communication of the faculties of everyday life. Where do they go to get certain information? There is no one there to tell them what services are available; that would be the initial task of your department to make that kind of information available. The cost, I suggest to you, would be negligible. You are using churches and using the social club outlets, to be of benefit in this regard. Here is the federal government moving in ahead of you in this particular matter, and all these organizations—a list of which is on page 4—are all vitally going together in the enterprise; and you are left out in the cold.

You are not left out yet, I trust, because there is a phase two of the study which would support the first phase and it is a proposal for a community benefit project in the area designed to assist workers and their families to cope with problems within the context of employment, health, welfare, recreation, and educational services in the Dufferin-Parkdale area.

To mention some more of the objectives of this study—"since the objectives envisage an area-based project that was to deal with migrant problems by way of community development; direct contact, or systematic interviewing of migrants was not planned for." It goes on to say:

While a summary of agency migrant involvement is basic to any description it must be stressed that there is, in Toronto, no one agency or facility specifically designed to assist the integration of immigrants of concern to this project. The experience of any one agency is naturally related to the type of service or intervention for which it is organized.

The experience is fragmented further by the age, sex and family status of immigrants to which specific services of reference—the YMCA for example—would tend to have contact mainly with unattached males; churches more often may be assisting families and so forth.

Again I would suggest that your role would be a healing role, synthesizing, playing that

central function, instead of having no function at all so far as one can determine with respect to the ongoing work which is the finest piece of study I have seen touching this whole business of immigrant integration into our communities. To continue with the quote:

The project had its origin partly in the insight of those who have frequent contact with migrants, that the needs of migrants were not being met, or at least that unmet needs of migrants affected their work adjustment.

It would be entirely possible that under conditions of mobility, if for no other reason, the needs and problems of migrants might remain unfocused and unknown.

And that is largely what they have remained.

They recommended, among other things, apart from these informational services—which are lacking, and which are basic, and which only Travellers' Aid seems to basically supply—a friendship house where people can meet in the day and evening on a casual drop-in basis. This would be a good place to have someone available to answer questions or to give information as required.

The report goes on, over a space of close to 100 pages, to document and outline what the work of the Good Shepherd Refuge is; how many beds they have, how many men they service, what payment they take in the evening for men staying over, the whole problem of housing and the notoriety of that problem, and the role of youth in the wind-breaker group, as they call them.

I would commend this study very much to the Minister. It is right up his alley and just to hammer home the point that I was making, on page 14 they say among their recommendations:

Initiate a neighbourhood information centre, or a citizens' advice bureau, in the Parkdale area of Toronto. In this respect the needs of migrants for gatekeeping services are similar to the needs of other Parkdale residents, including immigrants and senior citizens.

So the Minister's role really cannot be confined or constricted to the business of providing some translation service, and is this, I wonder, really extensive in terms of the vital need?

Over and against that is the teaching of second languages. Someone in this House has already mentioned that it should not be in your department at all. Obviously it is a job for the educational department. All it

does, as far as I can see, is divert attention from what the true education budget of the province is. It is one of those areas in which educational services are being provided outside the strict educational budget and it would be far more fair and equitable, for this particular disclosure to be made to the Ontario people at large.

Turning for a moment to the business of civil rights. In a brochure which is called "Human Rights in Ontario," issued by this government, it mentions minority and ethnic groups and civil liberties as follows:

This is one area, however, where the commission has a big job to do. Many minorities and ethnic groups are not aware of the provisions of the code and they do not understand the areas of jurisdiction which the code covers.

This is your own document.

Many suffer discrimination quietly and resentfully without realizing that action can be taken and the wrongs righted. Or they are unwilling to come forward to file a complaint with the commission because they are fearful, for example, that they or their relatives will lose their jobs, or that in some cases, if they speak up and attract any kind of attention to themselves, they will somehow hurt or embarrass other members of their own group.

With many immigrants, the language barrier makes it more difficult to understand the legislation and how the commission operates.

Can there be any question in our minds at all about the whole of the human rights thing, the weight of the thing, the benefit of the thing, the need of the thing, for those within these minority and ethnic groups?

These are the people more deeply afflicted, these are the people for whom you should have some kind of paternity. The Minister of Labour is quite conversant with this and I would urge you, within the Cabinet, and I would urge every member who thinks this way, to have that whole department switched away from Labour and put under the Provincial Secretary's jurisdiction.

This would give some depth, some meaning, some breadth, to the whole work of the citizenship branch. It would give it an orientation that it does not have presently. It seems to be all out at the elbows; you know, over here a little English being taught, and over here, some translations being done, and apparently very little being done in between, particularly as disclosed again in this social

research project, as to the role of immigrants in this province.

So, two things: first try to bring human rights legislation under your surveillance, as it would probably receive a good deal better attention there than it does where it is at the present time—in a rather desperate and wholly unaligned situation with a man who has other tasks to perform than worry about the problems of strict human rights which you know only have a relative relationship to the Labour Department. In terms of that, perhaps you would switch the company branch completely out from where it is.

This is one of the dregs from the old days, you know, when this department used to handle the whole of the economic affairs of the province. Before that it handled all health subsequent to that I believe, it handled all the economics. That is long past but the companies stay where they are, as I suggest, mere dregs of that tradition. They have no business there really and they should be under The Department of Commercial and Financial Affairs, where the securities legislation lies. That is where the corporations should lie. You should govern, you should be responsible for the like of the citizenry in this province; that would be a full-time task which could give you a very worthy object in life.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, on the first item of vote 1703, programme administration, what type of programme does the hon. Minister administer? I see the salaries amount to \$151,500.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Are you making reference to the programme administration being the first item? This particular programme, the administration of the entire citizenship programme, includes a staff of 18 people including our liaison officers who, in fact, give the co-ordinating activities for the administration of the entire departmental programme.

Mr. De Monte: May I also ask what programmes has the department initiated in connection with citizenship? What seminars or conventions, in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As the member will know, the planning for the citizenship or the community conferences to which reference is being made; the organization and conduct of the programme for the teaching of English as a second language; working with

the various volunteer groups who conduct certain programmes and assist us in this regard; our work with the international institute. I would like the expression of the member for Lakeshore, and I prefer to think of the department as the catalyst whereby we are the common ground to which we can invite people with various interests. This is a very diversified type of activity, and all of the co-ordinating activities bring together many branches and groups who work with us in the conduct of this particular programme.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, the thing that bothers me about this whole aspect of The Department of Citizenship is that I do not think the Minister is trying to get this catalyst moving. I know that the work he is doing in the teaching of English as a second language is a very laudable job but I think that can be extended. I do not think that his programme should be so limited. The Minister has said that his programmes act as a catalyst but I cannot see where his programmes are acting as a catalyst, Mr. Chairman. I know that he has had two one-day seminars on teaching of English as a second language; he has had a conference in Windsor in connection with community unity.

With the greatest of respect, I would suggest that the Minister has to move more programmes, more ideas, in order to become a catalyst among the immigrants in Ontario, particularly to unify the immigrants with the other groups that are already here in Ontario. I do think that a very important aspect of this department is the teaching of English. I do think that the Minister can conceive some programmes as to the problems of immigrants, as to the problems immigrants have in appreciating our history and our culture, and initiate programmes where these things could be taught to immigrants as they come into Ontario.

I notice also that we have an information service costing \$101,000 for the maintenance of that information service and the salaries are only \$16,800. I would personally like to ask the Minister why there is such a variance in these figures? Also why is the department spending \$101,000 on maintenance when the salary aspect of it is merely \$16,800!

Hon. Mr. Welch: The salary item includes the salary for an information officer and his secretary. The large item for maintenance, of course, is the government publication series, as the hon. member will recall. We publish the government brochures on services in 13 languages as a special information

programme together with other related publications. The bulk of the vote is for the government information series.

Mr. De Monte: By the information series, are you referring to those small booklets that are fixed up in a package? I understand they are published in 14 languages. I am wondering, the information set out in those booklets is a bit meagre, it has pictures of the Parliament building and I know we must explain Parliamentary institutions to the immigrant, no doubt about that. But I feel it would be valid if the Minister could possibly explain to the immigrants their rights under the labour laws, under the health laws, the Ontario Hospital; there are many immigrants that do not know about these laws and I suggest that these booklets have less of a public relations aspect and be informative enough as to the rights of citizens in this province and as to the laws that affect them in their work, their play, The Highway Traffic Act. Certainly, none of them know anything about these things and perhaps these might be made known to them under this maintenance-public relations aspect of your department. Could you answer that for me?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Of course; if the hon. member reads the publications, this is what we think we do. There is a book on The Department of Labour, a book on The Department of Health, and one on the Workmen's Compensation Board; there is a book on these and there is a whole package of at least ten different subject matters in the folder. If the hon. member will take the time to look at them and study them, that is what I assumed they were doing.

Now, I think there is some value and we are doing some research on the fact as to whether these books should be published on a departmental basis or whether we should now be coming out with what we call the semantic approach. When we deal with welfare, for instance, the whole field of welfare or social and family services, we should be putting in one booklet what is available in all levels of government so they can get it in one booklet. This type of research is in fact going on. But I invite the member to re-read the series as it presently stands. I really thought they were an information booklet to give people in 13 languages, including English and French, the story of the departmental programmes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister did not reply to the questions posed by the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: That is why I am on my feet.

Mr. Chairman: But if the hon. member for Dovercourt has a series of questions, perhaps the Minister should reply—

Mr. Lawlor: I wonder if the Minister would not care to reply, if on nothing else but the social opportunity project. I suggested that you were deficient somehow in not participating—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The points raised by the hon. member for Lakeshore are of great interest. I would direct his attention to the fact that \$33,500 is asked for in these estimates for research and grants. We do involve ourselves with the work of the social planning council, with the international institute, with the Travellers' Aid, with the Ontario Welfare Council and such groups, and I have no explanation why there is no reference to this department in that particular publication to which the member makes reference. We like to think we have very close liaison with this organization and with many.

We have made it a point, particularly recently with some new programmes and changes at the federal level, to meet on a more regular basis with Manpower and Immigration, the federal department, so that we are quite familiar and up to date with new trends in that department of government. We have always worked very closely with federal Citizenship and we recognize—I could give you more—we recognize and underline the need to be keeping in very close touch with all groups who are involved in this work, where we have no monopoly in it or no monopoly of concern.

I would also point out that in the field of research, we are and have been working with the department of sociology of York University, with Dr. Richmond of the university, doing some specific research in this field as well. So may I briefly say I do not argue with the hon. member at all, about the need to take some initiative to make sure that we are abreast of all these matters.

There is a very interesting study done by the social planning council of the greater Hamilton area on the neighbourhood approach to this whole community thing. As many of our communities get bigger, the need to sort of bring back the concept of neighbourhood—and I never cease to be amazed at the tremendous quantity of very helpful reports and seminars and meetings that are available all the time. Our liaison people are continuously attending these meetings and identifying the

work of this department. If you were to look, as I do quite often to remind myself of my terms of reference as long as I have this responsibility, it is a tremendous wording, challenging wording in the Act of this department, where among other things it says that "this Minister in co-operation with everybody who shares this interest will work tirelessly to ensure that all residents of Ontario enjoy full and equal citizenship." And I would like to point out that although they may only be words to some people, I only hope that we all work together, for there is really no partisan approach to that interest, I am sure, that we may all work together to accomplish that fact for our people in this province.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have ascertained from among the official Opposition and from the members of the NDP that there are perhaps seven or eight speakers at least who want to join in the debate on this vote, and I wonder since it is now ten past eleven, whether the hon. Minister who is the House leader, will not consider moving the adjournment because if it is his thought that we go on until this vote is finished, we could be here for another hour and a half. Certainly he is not going to get his estimates through tonight.

Mr. Chairman: I do not know that the hon. member has a point of order, but his remarks are well put.

Mr. Singer: It was just a suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go to the order paper to consider legislation that will be ready, and if time permits we will return to the estimates.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, what does the Minister mean by that euphemism "legislation if it will be ready"? For example, is he talking about the college of arts; is he talking about Bill 73 and Bill 74?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be any more specific. I really will have to depend on the Ministers who are here for calling it.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Is the Minister privy to the order of business?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I guess anything on the order paper is fair.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.15 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

District school boards, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. R. S. Smith	2713
Peche Island, question to Mr. Auld, Mr. Burr	2714
Dislocation of industry, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	2715
Radio and TV facilities, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent	2717
Rent subsidies, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Sargent	2719
Uniform tax collection, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Innes	2720
Green Meadows housing, questions to Mr. Randall, Mrs. M. Renwick	2720
Mr. Stanley Dubrueil, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman	2721
Provincial pavilion construction, CNE, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Trotter	2722
Texas Gulf smelter, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Ferrier	2723
City of London, bill respecting, reported	2724
Carleton University, bill respecting, reported	2724
McMaster University, bill respecting, reported	2732
Third readings	2740
Royal assent to certain bills, the honourable the Lieutenant-Governor	2740
Borough of East York, bill respecting, Mr. R. G. Hodgson, second reading	2741
County of Welland, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, second reading	2741
City of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, second reading	2741
University of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. Peacock, second reading	2742
Public Finance Companies' Investments Act, 1966, bill to repeal, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	2742
Credit Unions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	2742
Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	2742
Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	2742
Conservation Authorities Act, 1968, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading	2742
Ontario College of Art Act, 1968-1969, bill intituled, Mr. Davis, on second reading	2743
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lewis, agreed to	2750
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2750

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests in the galleries today are, in the east gallery, students from Preston High School in Preston, from the Adult Education Centre at Keele Street in Toronto, and the Waterloo-Oxford and District Secondary School in Baden; in the west gallery, the Huron County Council from Goderich, and students from Etobicoke Collegiate Institute in Islington.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Yesterday the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) rose on a point of order with respect to an incident that afternoon at the main entrance to this building.

I have now had the opportunity of investigating the matter and have received reports from the corporal in charge of the OPP detachment in the buildings, and from the executive officer from the Prime Minister's department, who also was present. It appears that some 40 humane society officials or officers bearing petitions for presentation to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) were met at the main door by Mr. William Kinmond from the Prime Minister's office. Apparently there was no prior notice of this delegation and it was necessary to arrange a suitable place for the Prime Minister to receive the delegation. It appears then that Mr. Kinmond asked two or three members of the delegation to accompany him, in order that necessary arrangements could be made and requested the others to await entry until he returned for them to be conducted to the reception area.

It further appears that the members of our OPP then on duty at the main entrance to the building, following Mr. Kinmond's suggestion, which was concurred in by the delegation, stood in the doors, which may have in some measure impeded entrance by visi-

tors, members and the public. I am advised further, however, that at no time during incident were the doors locked nor anyone denied entrance, which would seem to be substantiated by the entrance to the building of the hon. member herself. I am further advised that room 263 was made available to the delegation who then entered and were received by the Prime Minister.

From this it is apparent to me that there really was no denial to the citizens of our province, including members of the delegation in question, of the right of free entrance to our Parliament buildings. Rather was it an honest attempt to arrange an orderly reception by the Prime Minister of the delegation.

I have, however, made it abundantly clear to the officer in charge of the Parliamentary detachment of the OPP—who I may say have been serving us in a most excellent and exemplary manner—that except in most exceptional circumstances, which do arise from time to time, the Parliament buildings are open to the public.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Since he is not in his place I would not ask it at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes) is not present. I have nobody there. The member for Oxford is not there either and he has a question.

The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

What provisions or changes in the grant structure does the Minister intend to implement in light of the fact that the educational tax level in the Nipissing district and other northern Ontario districts will rise sharply, and in some cases double, as a result of the amalgamation of separate school boards into district boards under provincial government direction?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, under Bills 44 and 168 provisions were made for the individual former

school jurisdictions to raise the same amount of money through the local levy in 1969 as they did in 1968. This was written, perhaps as the hon. member will recall, right into the legislation so that the only additional sum to be provided, either for the separate or the public schools, will be for any increase in growth or additional costs for the new programme. The proportion of this additional amount required because of growth factors will be apportioned among the municipalities on the basis of the provincial equalized assessment.

The new grant regulations which were made available the latter part of last week—and which I would assume are presently being digested and, hopefully, understood by the various boards—provide for a weighting factor, which is a change this year, in terms of grants of 1.1 over the base generally applicable in the province for a student resident in a territorial district. So there has been recognition under the new grant plan of the additional cost in these areas of the province.

We have also suggested to the local boards in the calculation of the specific amounts they will receive, that any questions at this moment should be directed to and discussed with the regional directors of education, and this information in turn is being transmitted to the department.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would accept a supplementary: In the grant structure regulations that have been set out there has been a limit put on the increase of between four and ten per cent; is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been, shall we say, a minimum or a floor of 104 per cent of last year's cost and a maximum of 110.

Mr. R. S. Smith: This is regardless of what the additional costs have been because of moving into the larger boards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this applies whether it was part of a new amalgamated board, or perhaps one of the designated cities. The floor is 104, the maximum is 110, no matter what the causes or the reasons may be.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside has a question.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A question for the Minister of Tourism and Information.

Will the Minister consider the possibility of acquiring Peche Island under The Province of Ontario Heritage Foundation Act, 1967, as now being amended to include recreational and scenic areas?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment to the Act now before the House is to permit the foundation to accept gifts of this type of property either by themselves or primarily in connection with historical buildings.

I think it is unlikely, in the foreseeable future, that the foundation would ever have sufficient funds to purchase recreational land; however, even if the foundation did, I do not think it is likely that this would happen because I think if that were to be done, it would be done by some other department.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a question of the Minister of Health also. A supplementary?

Mr. Burr: Yes, a supplementary question: What does the recreational and scenic aspect of the amendment refer to then?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I think on introduction of the bill, there have been lands where the solicitors for those wishing to make a gift to the Crown in right of Ontario, wanted to ensure that their gift could be accepted where there was land in connection with the building—large chunks of land in connection with a building which might be of historical interest.

Mr. Burr: A question for the Minister of Health. Is Ted Boorsma now being treated in Toronto General Hospital and if so, for what ailment?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before taking responsibility to answer such a question in the Legislature I would like to have the written consent of Mr. Boorsma that he wishes his private affairs made public in this way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader of the Opposition has a question of the Premier who is now in his place.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to rush this too much. Has the Premier arranged to meet with the representatives of Local 512 of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America in connection with the situation at the Etobicoke plant of the Canadian Westinghouse Company?

What action will the government take to safeguard the interests of the 102 employees who will lose their jobs as the phasing out proceeds?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the leader of the Opposition on his rapidity in getting on top of these things because his question was delivered to me before the telegram; but I now have the telegram here.

Mr. Nixon: We give the Premier very good service.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well it all depends who people are talking to, I guess.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I have the telegram before me. To be quite frank with you I have not had time to go into the detail of the request. Of course my door is always open to any group that wants to see me and I will look this over and I will do what I can to assist in the situation.

I have not made any arrangements to answer the question specifically because the request only arrived in my office a very short time ago, but I will be quite happy to go into the whole matter and do what I can to assist in this situation.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary to that question: Is the Premier aware that the EIO programme of the government seems to be resulting in some shifts in these industries—at least being partially responsible for some of these shifts—which are working some hardships, at least serious dislocations, on the labour force?

There is one example, there is another one in London and there may in fact be another one in Brantford. I think this is something that is going to be a continuing problem and I guess we have to deal with it on a situation basis. And yet it seems to be recurring quite frequently. I would ask the Premier if he is in consultation with the Minister of Trade and Development as to how we might get around these recurring difficulties?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the problem no doubt is there and I think as a government we are aware of the fact that if we are offering incentives to industry to go to areas which we think need industry more than other areas do, certainly it always can be said that the government is doing some other area a disservice. In each of these—and I do not know that this is involved in the particular situation with which we are dealing because, as I say, I have not had a

chance to get into it, but in answer to the general question being put — assume this government tries to encourage industry to go from one area to another. Our motives, of course, are of the best, we want to put industry into certain areas where we have employment problems and where we want certain development to take place, of course it is going to result in some dislocation. Now, we would want to keep that dislocation to a minimum and I do not think it has been great to date. I am certain that when we deal with the estimates of the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), he will be able to give the member that information, chapter and verse, because each one of these applications is dealt with as a unit on its own merits. There are standard rules, but the point is the complete circumstances of each application and each grant is gone into.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): No politics at all!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce cannot get his mind off the petty part of this whole business. We are trying to do something for people in this province; we are trying to put industry where there are people who need it; we are trying to develop the north. And if the member must relate everything to partisan politics, Mr. Speaker—you see how successful it is when one attempts to relate every action of the government to partisan politics, you just simply create chaos and discord. Really, it is not worth my time in even replying to these comments.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier is paid pretty well to do it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But I would point out in answer to the question, that in dealing with these applications, we are looking after the greatest number of people in the greatest area of interest which we think exists in the province, and we will, of course, attempt to alleviate any difficulty that may be caused.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this is in the form of a question. Surely the Premier would agree that the aim of the policy is not to relocate industry, but to make industry grow? If the government is going to move one industry from one community to another, then this programme is not going to be in the best interests of the province. They are trying to get new industry, or industry to grow, and this is to the advantage of the province. But surely, if the aim is to move

it from A to B and then not have a programme to deal with the problem that evolved in the first location, then the policy is not in the best interest of the province.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, that is not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just a moment, please!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I told the House—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not need any assistance on this.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister thought the Premier did.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Let the real Premier stand up!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh Mr. Speaker, they need not try to drag us into their difficulties.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Premier is very touchy today.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, of course it is not our intent to move an industry from one place to another. But there is the establishment of branch plants, and it might very well be in the interests of everyone concerned if, instead of a huge addition being built in the centre of an area which has all the problems that some of our big urban areas have, that addition was built in some other community where we were having difficulty—for instance, with the farm population, with the contraction of labour used on farms and the labour surplus, young people needing jobs. It might be a good idea to locate an addition someplace else. It is not our intent to close a plant in one place and move it to another.

Mr. Nixon: Unfortunately this is what happened.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Maybe it did and maybe it did not. We will find that out when we delve into it.

Mr. Nixon: That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight) has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order? I apologize for my delay in arriving at my

seat in the Assembly. I have read your remarks with great interest. I would like to put on the record, however, Mr. Speaker, that I did have to identify myself to come through the front doors of the building yesterday. And I have with me a letter of which I would like to read one paragraph, to show you that it happened to a public citizen.

This letter is signed Marguerite E. Parker, 72 Millbrook Crescent, Toronto 6.

Dear Mrs. Renwick:

Just a short note from a member of the public to say "thank you" for your timely intervention yesterday afternoon when, for the first time in my memory, the doors of the Parliament buildings were barred and closed to a few members of the general public who wished to enter: I, for the purpose of using my ticket to the Speaker's gallery and listening to the afternoon session, and a few other orderly gentlemen from the Ontario Humane Society who had petitions from a large section of the population of Ontario which they wished to hand over to Mr. Robarts or his representative.

I will not take the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, to read the next paragraph which is not exactly charitable towards the attitude of government, but I do think it is important that you have a view that is not a partisan view, such as I might present myself at finding those doors with a policeman on each side of the main entrance.

Mr. Speaker: I may say to the hon. member that not only do I have a written report from the two gentlemen I mentioned but I have talked to them personally, and I have every confidence in the corporal of the detachment who tells me that he recognized the hon. member and that she was allowed in without anything further than that.

That was the information which has been conveyed to me and I think it is reasonable to assume that there is a misunderstanding here so far as the person is concerned, to whom the hon. member refers in the letter. It is quite possible that it could have happened in accordance with the report which was given to me and which I gave to the House. It is an unfortunate incident. I have said that I will endeavour to see that it does not happen again, because obviously it was quite a misunderstanding between those who were on the door and those who were endeavouring to come in yesterday. We would hope there will be no further occurrence.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put on the record that I was at no time critical of the police.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising again to a point of order? If she is then she is entitled to say so. If she is just making a remark then she is out of order.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I rise again on my point of order?

I would just like to state, Mr. Speaker, that at no time was my purpose in raising this issue, to criticize the corporal on duty at the door. I asked the corporal on whose orders he was keeping the people out of the building, and asked him if he felt he had a right to do so. He said he was doing so on the orders of Mr. Kinmond. I said, "This building is the citizens' building. Are you sure you are right, officer, in keeping the people out?" And with that he then apparently checked, Mr. Speaker. I was not critical of the policeman who was carrying out an order of government.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I would understand from the hon. member, then that she was not kept out. It was on behalf of the others that she was discussing it. I wish to have this important point decided because certainly of all people who are entitled to come into this House, a member is entitled without any question whatsoever, and I want to have that straightened out. Would I be correct in assuming that as far as the hon. member went that she herself did not have any difficulty?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, may I speak again on my point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Would you please?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you.

I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that I in no way had to fight my way into the Parliament buildings yesterday. I would like to say that I came to the doors, I was behind one or two citizens—I presume this lady must have been one, and the two orderly columns of the humane society men—and I went to grab the door handle and found two policemen. I was just astounded and said, "Are you keeping these people out? Surely you are not!" in an affable way. And he said, "Yes, my orders are to keep people out, keep them out." And I said, "I am Margaret Renwick, the member for Scarborough Centre, officer. Are you sure you are right in keeping these people out? I certainly have to get in."

Now, he did not attempt to keep me out,

Mr. Speaker. I would like that definitely, clearly on the record. That was not my point yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I was being kept out. I am concerned about the people who are being kept out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has now answered my question because, as I say, I think it is most important that members, certainly should not be impeded in any way. She has already made her point with respect to the general public which I have endeavoured to ensure will not arise again. I thank the hon. member for bringing it to the attention of the House, because certainly it is something that should not be allowed to occur here except in special circumstances which do arise. I trust that as far as the hon. member is concerned, at the moment at least, this ends the matter. Thank you.

The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker; to the Premier: In view of the fact that the Premier has not answered my supplementary question to the questions which I asked five weeks ago concerning the bilingualism of Queen's Park guides and security guards, is the Premier now prepared to indicate the ethnic origin of bilingual guides and security guards, and whether their bilingualism qualifies them for higher salary?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, frankly when I received this question I did not realize that I had undertaken to do anything in answer to a supplementary question. So the first thing I am doing is checking *Hansard* to find out precisely what did take place on that occasion. If I gave an undertaking, I will carry it out. I do not really know whether I will be able to find out from The Department of Civil Service what the ethnic origin is. I would have to find out whether we asked for this information on application forms, for instance. There are quite a few aspects to it. I do not recall undertaking to do this but if I did, I will get the information and I have people on my staff digging into *Hansard* at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a question of the Premier.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Prime Minister.

Will the Premier advise the House how many times the TV and radio facilities of the Legislature have been used by Alan Eagleson, President of the Ontario Conservative Party and on what authority?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should start at the end of this question rather than at the first. I will answer the specific question asked.

The hon. member asks "on what authority". When the TV room, as it is called, was established it was set up to do away with the sort of corridor press conferences which were becoming popular. We felt that we needed to create a room in the buildings in which a press conference could be held where radio and television and the written press could attend all at the same time and each perform their own function. As to the authority by which it is used, so far as having somebody who has a key to the place and looks after it, it is run from my own department. To the best of my knowledge no one has ever been refused the use of it, on any grounds whatsoever. It is there really more for the convenience of the news media than it is for perhaps those they are interviewing, but it has meant that over the years we have been able to get away from the corridor press conferences, as I call them, which we were trying to avoid when we set it up.

As far as Mr. Eagleson is concerned, he has been in the TV studio twice since his election as president. On February 3, 1969, he attended the press conference which I called myself, part of which was devoted to a review by me of some reorganization that had taken place in the Conservative Party.

Mr. Nixon: Revitalization!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Pardon?

Mr. Nixon: Revitalization!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I believe that is the term I used, and it is coming quite well.

So among other things discussed at that press conference was this question, but that was not the sole question discussed. I do not know really whether that is germane. Then on March 5, 1969, CJBC requested to use the studio to do an interview in French with Mr. Eagleson. I was not present at that particular press conference. We do not really ask what use is going to be made by the studio when one of the news media wishes to use it or asks to use it.

The members might be interested in knowing, while I am on my feet, just what use has been made of it. It has been used by various members of this House for press conferences. The hon. member for Sudbury used it on one occasion when he had something he felt was of interest to the people of Canada and—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Need the Premier remind me?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Charles Templeton has used it, Tommy Douglas has used it, and so has Andrew Thompson. John Diefenbaker has been interviewed in there. I believe Bob Stanfield has been interviewed there. I believe that two members of this House had conferences there at one stage to air some of their differences.

I mention these matters, Mr. Speaker, only to indicate that there is no attempt made by the government to control who uses it. I will go back to my original statement, it is really there in order that the news media may conduct their affairs in an orderly manner.

From March 2, 1966, to March 2, 1967, the government held 39 press conferences in that studio; the Liberal Party held six, and the New Democrats held seven. I do not know what that indicates but those are the figures. From March 1, 1967, to March 1, 1968, the government held 43 press conferences, the Liberal Party held 21, the New Democrats held 16, and other groups used it on four occasions. From March 1, 1968, to March 13, 1969, the government used it for 43 press conferences, the Liberal Party for 19, the New Democratic Party for nine, and other groups for eight.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Who keeps the records?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The records are kept in my office, just as a matter of course. We want to know who uses it, and the use that is made of it. I think the members can see from what I have told the House here that it is serving the function for which it was established.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to know that much about it. Would the Prime Minister accept a supplementary on this?

The point that I am making in my question to the Prime Minister, is the fact that he is using this Whip's office as a base for the Conservative Party, and I object very much.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. member does not object at this time, he asks a supplementary question.

Mr. Sargent: All right, would you agree that I should object, as a taxpayer?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, if I may answer the question. I realize the hon. member is not interested in my answer. He really wants

to make his speech and have no answer, but I will answer as a taxpayer. I think the taxpayers of this province are well served by this room and the purpose to which it is put.

It provides an opportunity for all parties in this House to put their point of view to the news media to be disseminated to all the taxpayers of this province in an orderly, proper fashion. And if the member thinks that the leader of the Opposition goes down there and speaks impartially, he is just kidding himself.

We do not expect him to, any more than we expect the New Democrats to go down there and say they love the Tories. It is not going to work that way. But here we have the facility, paid for by the taxpayers, that permits the views of the three parties sitting in this House to be presented to them in an orderly fashion.

I do not find anything wrong with it and I very much doubt whether any of the taxpayers of this province will find anything wrong with it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A question to the Minister of Trade and Development: In view of the fact that the Hon. Paul Hellyer indicated that \$160 million could be used towards a subsidized rent programme in Toronto, will the Minister advise what steps are being taken to acquire 10,000 vacant apartments in Toronto on behalf of the 17,000 families on the waiting list?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister will note that there was a change from "could be taken" to "are being taken".

Mr. Sargent: That is the way I dictated it!

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, this is the way it was submitted to the Speaker's office.

Mr. Sargent: It does not make any sense that way.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is anticipated, Mr. Speaker, so I do not worry about the changes.

In replying to the hon. member's question, I would first of all point out that I am not personally familiar with the statement which he has attributed to the hon. Paul Hellyer. In the *Toronto Daily Star*, dated Friday, March 21, 1969, there was an article headed: "Ottawa May Help Needy to Pay High Rise Rents". In this article, Mr. Hellyer is pur-

ported to have told MPs that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has earmarked \$160 million of its total 1969 budget of \$650 million for public housing, and a considerable portion of that figure could go to subsidized rents in existing buildings.

Mr. Hellyer is quoted as saying there were "a lot of unoccupied apartments in Toronto now". At no point, however, does he appear to have indicated that \$160 million could be used exclusively towards a subsidized rent programme in Toronto.

In the same article Mr. Hellyer apparently cited the housing registry of Metropolitan Toronto's waiting list as containing 13,500 names of families who want to move because they cannot afford their current rents, because of overcrowding or because they now live in substandard accommodation. He did not refer to a waiting list of 17,000 families and I am advised the family waiting list for Metro currently stands at 15,000.

However, as we have learned from experience in allocating Ontario housing units in Metropolitan Toronto, it is frequently necessary to offer the same unit to at least three families before receiving one acceptance.

On February 18 of this year, at my direction Ontario Housing Corporation wrote to the president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation concerning rental supplements. The letter referred to the rent certificate plan which was introduced by the government of Ontario in 1962 on an experimental basis. It pointed out that this plan was discontinued because of a number of factors, including the fact that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation did not participate in any cost-sharing arrangement. The letter concludes as follows:

It has come to our attention that in Metropolitan Toronto the private apartment market is becoming softer and there are at present some 5,000 vacant suites which admittedly fall into the smaller bedroom category.

An analysis of our current waiting list indicates that some 60 per cent of the applicants require two bedrooms or less. With these facts in mind and in view of the task force recommendations we would ask whether you would give consideration to a proposal from us for the re-introduction of a rent certificate plan or its equivalent, with the operating losses to be shared jointly under the terms of section 35E.

To the best of my knowledge, we have not yet received a reply.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford has a question from the other day of the Minister of Education.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that municipalities have varying tax collection dates, what regulations will the department set up to provide an equitable method of making payments to the county school boards since the reorganization of the system in the province?

Has the Minister's department made a request to The Department of Municipal Affairs for the establishment of a uniform tax collection date for Ontario for the individual?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, section 88(1) of The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act requires that the council of the municipality transfer to the divisional board the amounts that have been raised for public and secondary school purposes. These requests come from time to time, but no later than December 15, so that each board can requisition from the municipal councils those portions of the tax levy as they are required to meet their needs. This has been, really the procedure for the past number of years.

This does not alter under the new legislation. However, in order to assist the divisional boards with their problems of, shall we say, cash flow, it has been determined to increase this year from five to ten, the number of payments made on grants—general legislative grants—so that this can improve the cash flow position for them.

Mr. Innes: Could I have a supplementary? The Minister realizes that many of the municipalities have to borrow extra money to make their payments with high interest rates.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At this moment they may be borrowing, but they can requisition. Once their budgets are set they can then start to requisition from the municipality.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has some questions of Ministers who are in the House.

Mrs. M. Renwick: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Attorney General: Would the Minister advise the House of the findings and recommendations of the coroners' juries in each of the following inquests into infant deaths in Toronto: (a) Carol Ann Young; (b) Patrick Carr; (c) the Ambing infant born of two mental defectives.

In the Ambing infant case, was testimony received that conception probably took place at the Toronto Psychiatric Hospital at 999 Queen Street West?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I will enquire into these matters and get an answer as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: I have an answer to a question—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we will allow the hon. member to finish her questions.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A question of the Minister of Trade and Development: Will the Minister assure the tenants of Green Meadows in Guelph, whose homes will be sold to them by the Ontario Housing Corporation about the end of March, that any repairs or maintenance over and above normal wear and tear will be made before the sale is completed, and at the expense of the corporation, or that the sale price will be adjusted accordingly?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, in all cases where a tenant of Green Meadows in Guelph indicated an interest in purchasing the house, a maintenance inspection was carried out by Ontario Housing Corporation engineering staff prior to the execution of an offer of sale and purchase.

Those items of repair or replacement which were considered to be the responsibility of Ontario Housing Corporation were listed, mutually agreed upon between Ontario Housing Corporation and the tenant, and a signed copy retained by each of the two parties. This list was then incorporated into the offer of sale and purchase.

Certain work of an exterior nature may not be finished prior to the closing date of the transaction because of seasonal conditions. It will be completed as soon thereafter as conditions permit, and the closing will be subject to the undertaking that the corporation will meet these contractual obligations. Under these circumstances, there is no necessity to adjust the sale price and the tenants involved have been so advised of the foregoing.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Are the tenants advised in writing that the work to be done will be carried out by the corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I stated that, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has the answer to a question of a member who is in the House.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question from the hon. member for High Park on March 21 of this year, question number 968, and I would like to reply to that question today.

The question was:

Was Mr. Stanley Dubrueil taken from his home in Windsor on August 16, 1968, by four Windsor policemen who were under the impression that he was mentally ill?

Was Mr. Dubrueil sent to the St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital by the Windsor police?

Was Mr. Dubrueil released by the St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital with the explanation that an error had been made?

Why and how did this incident occur?

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that I made enquiries into this matter and I am informed that in the early hours of the morning of August 16, 1968, Mrs. Anne Dubrueil of the city of Windsor, telephoned the Windsor police department telling them that her husband had threatened her with a knife and was acting very strangely.

An immediate investigation was made and from his conduct at the time and from what Mrs. Dubrueil stated to the officers, the man was removed from his home by the ABC Ambulance Company, accompanied by two policemen I might say, to the psychiatric wing of the Hotel Dieu Hospital for examination, in accordance with section 10 of The Mental Health Act. That was the only part the police had to play in the matter.

Mr. Dubrueil was examined by a senior psychiatrist and was then sent in an ambulance to the Ontario Hospital in St. Thomas. The authority for such a transfer is contained in section 22 of The Mental Health Act.

In this instance the action was taken by the psychiatric facility of the Hotel Dieu Hospital, and I stress, Mr. Speaker, that there was an examination by a senior psychiatrist of the medical profession at the Hotel Dieu Hospital. It was on his authority that the patient was transmitted to St. Thomas in accordance with section 22 of the Act, and I am not aware of any comments at the time of the patient's release from the St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of personal privilege.

I have now had an opportunity to examine the comments made by the hon. Treasurer yesterday in reply to a question put to him, and as his remarks about me were not accurate I wish to set the record straight.

Several weeks ago a Mr. Philip Glanzer forwarded to me numerous allegations of misconduct in our division courts accompanied by certain corroborative evidence from the inspector of legal offices.

To ascertain the accuracy of these allegations I asked the Attorney General a number of questions on the matter. The hon. Attorney General asked that these questions be placed on the notice paper and as yet they have not been answered.

Subsequent to this Mr. Glanzer forwarded to me a further allegation in connection with the question which I asked the hon. Treasurer on March 13, and to which he replied yesterday. In his reply the hon. Treasurer said that I was aware of all the facts in the case. This was not correct. I did not know of Mrs. Campbell's tragic circumstances. What is more, the hon. Treasurer knew this as he had been given a copy of all the correspondence which I had received.

Furthermore, the hon. Treasurer suggested in his comments yesterday that I might have some connection with Philip Glanzer. And the Conservative propaganda outlet, the *Toronto Telegram*, went even further today in suggesting that I had some relationship with this man.

For the record, not only have I no connection with this man but I have never met nor have I ever spoken to him. Mr. Speaker, what I find most disturbing about this incident is that these comments were not blurted out by a backbender in the heat of debate but were made by a senior government member in reply to a question which had been placed two weeks previously. His comment contained misleading information, improper allegations as to my motives, and at least one flat misstatement of fact. The Minister has accused me of using this incident to embarrass the government. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the reverse is the truth. The Minister in order to embarrass myself has deliberately misled this House.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I think you will recall during my remarks yesterday I stated clearly that I was not aware of the nature or the extent of the association between the member for High Park and Philip Glanzer, the agents in division court.

I say again, sir, that the purpose of this association is not known to me. The hon. member's response to the request from Mr. Phil Glanzer for co-operation represents the sum and substance of what I have put on record. And I will say this to you, sir, at this time, that the information required could have been obtained from myself over the telephone, or by exchange of correspondence. I personally see no purpose in asking questions that will parade the problems of unfortunate people before the Legislature and before the people of this province.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I will not allow that man to mislead the House again. We have made numerous attempts to get information from government Ministers by writing. They will not answer their letters. There are exceptions in the front bench but the hon. Treasurer is not one of them, nor is the Minister who sits to his left.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. members that when the statement was being read yesterday I was paying particular attention to it in view of what obviously would be the results. I have in my hand a copy of the transcript as it will appear in *Hansard*, and I would point out that so far as my reading of it goes, the hon. Treasurer's statement was very carefully worded and in my opinion did not impute any motives to the hon. member although the matter, of course, of his association—of what it might be—was raised.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker has no control over newspapers.

Mr. MacDonald: But the *Telegram* took the innuendo that the Minister clearly intended.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was quite correct in rising to his point of order but the only point that I can deal with is the point of what was said in the House here, and I have looked it over very carefully. I certainly think that the hon. member had a point of privilege so far as the newspaper report was concerned and I thank him for giving me notice that he was rising to that point of order.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, just to complete this matter might I ask you to enquire when the Attorney General will file answers to the original questions which would have prevented this whole unfortunate incident?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why is it still on the order paper?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the questions were put on the notice paper.

Mr. Lewis: Why are they still there?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is the proper place for them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order. Here we are with another illustration of how the business of this House is frustrated.

A question is put on the order paper and its answer can be gotten in 48 hours or 72 hours. It lies there for literally months on occasion. Now, do not blame the Opposition for getting into difficulties when it is the government that refuses to provide the information that the public is entitled to.

Mr. Speaker: We have had this experience over many years. I recall that last year I took the action of sending to the Prime Minister a note regularly as to questions, and I found that he was very co-operative in having them tabled. I have also asked him—the letter is in the mail to him now—to try to table any answers that he has before the Easter recess so that we may have those answers and that information.

So far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, of course, his only duty is to see that the questions are asked and are placed on the notice paper, and from then on I am afraid it is up to the hon. members to endeavour to persuade the government to answer those questions at the earliest possible time. I shall assist the members as best I can in doing that.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask in future that when the Ministers answer a question, they answer a question and not put in their own suggestions, impressions or questions. This instance—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is now out of order. The member for Parkdale has a question for the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): This is a question of the hon. Minister of Trade and Development.

As a result of the provincial pavilion construction at the CNE grounds, will the Lake Shore Boulevard be closed to through traffic for two years?

If not, why is it necessary to close the south end of Exhibition Park for two years to the general public?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, Lake Shore Boulevard will not be closed to through traffic as a result of the provincial pavilion construction at the CNE, so there will be no difficulty there.

And as for the latter part of the question, it is necessary to close the Exhibition Park south of Lake Shore Boulevard during the period of construction in order to provide truck access for land fill operations to create islands and to provide staging area for construction activities such as the assembly of structural steel. We think it would be rather difficult to operate under those conditions if that road was left open for people to come and park and get in the way of the trucks and the construction equipment down there.

Mr. Trotter: I would just like to ask this, if traffic is allowed to go through, which I hope it would be, why does this stop people from actually stopping on the road or parking?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are going to dump something like, I think, roughly 400 truckloads of fill down there each day. There will be bulldozers pushing that around in order to level off that ground and put in that major staging area, and there is not going to be too much room for anybody down there to park or drive under those circumstances. I think for the sake of their own safety, they should not be allowed in there until the building is completed.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management:

Is the Ontario Northland Railway prepared to provide such special equipment as may be necessary to facilitate Texas Gulf Sulphur in its location of a smelter in the Timmins area? Specifically, will the Ontario Northland Railway provide special tank cars to transport by rail sulphuric acid byproducts from the smelting process to various parts of the continent?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there has been no request from Texas Gulf to furnish any equipment, nor have they asked for a rate to transfer sulphuric acid from proposed new smelters to whatever destination they should be shipping.

However, I have said to Texas Gulf and to the council in the town of Timmins that

when and if they decided on building a smelter in the north, the Ontario Northland Railway would be only too pleased to cooperate in any way they could in order that the acid might be transferred to its destination.

As to the supplying of special cars, I think perhaps this is something that would be worked out. Perhaps the company might want to furnish its own cars, or depending on the destination of where the acid is to be shipped, no doubt we would supply cars or we would have to work out the supplying of cars with whatever railroad would be transporting the product.

Mr. Ferrier: Am I to understand that the government is not consulting with the Ontario Northland Railway in the negotiations at the present time about a smelter location?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that transportation has been discussed with Texas Gulf as to ores. The question has been asked whether, if a smelter were built in the north, we would be ready to give special rates on this acid, as I understand we could not charge the high rate on it. We have agreed that we would sit down at any time with Texas Gulf and work out a rate that would help them move the product if the smelter were built in the north.

Mr. Ferrier: My question was, at the present time the Minister is not in negotiation, along with the other government departments, as to the location of the smelter. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think we are talking about the location of the smelter; I think we are talking about transporting sulphuric acid, and this has never been negotiated with the mine up to this time.

Mr. Ferrier: It is an important part of the negotiations, I would think.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Evidently not, or they would have asked for it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre was on her feet a moment ago?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, in light of two reasons—first, that I have a question which I consider of urgent public importance to the Minister of Health; and second, because I think I am beginning to observe

perhaps a shadow of a system of absence of Ministers on certain days from the House—if there is such a system when Ministers do have a day off from being in the House, a system perhaps of which you are aware?

Mr. Speaker: It is a question which Mr. Speaker cannot answer because Mr. Speaker has nothing to do with the attendance of the members in the House unless there should be less than a quorum. Then, of course, Mr. Speaker would take the necessary action to have those present recorded. But that is entirely a matter for the Prime Minister and also for the House leader, and if either of them would wish to speak to the matter I would be quite content.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, we have an arrangement within our caucus to ensure that we have what we consider a requisite number of members in the House at any time and also to give the members of our caucus an opportunity to carry out their duties other than those duties involved in sitting in this House and listening to these very interesting debates. There is no system by which any Cabinet Minister is absent from this House for anything to do with questions. It is impossible, of course, for us all to be here for the question period five days a week. I suppose one has to take one's chances with the questions. But I can assure the hon. member and all other hon. members that we are not trying in any way to avoid answering any proper questions that are put to the government in this House.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, may I speak further to my original point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the hon. member may.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, that is not exactly what I was trying to get at. It does seem to me to be an urgent question. I was not trying to say the Ministers were not here to not answer an urgent question, Mr. Speaker, but I did recall an instance where I did want to know if the Minister would be in the House for a specific question which mattered to me, and I was told by his department it was his day off; and that has prompted my watching for a pattern and asking this question.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the hon. member that the Minister of Health was here this afternoon but unfortunately the hon. member did not catch my eye while the Minister was in his seat. By the time we

got the hon. member's eye, the Minister had gone.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 77th order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

CITY OF LONDON

House in committee on Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the city of London.

Mr. Chairman: Section 1 has been carried on this bill; section 2 has been carried.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill Pr3 reported.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Carleton University.

On section 1.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on section 1 of the bill, this is the bill that we asked to have stood down a few days ago, in anticipation that when it was called again in committee of the whole House, not only the sponsoring member but the Minister himself would be present. I am delighted to see that he has just come into the House.

The point which concerns me, Mr. Chairman, clause I of the bill—apart from its larger ramifications in terms of the government of Carleton University—is that it establishes procedures by which the faculty board will have members from the student community on those boards, but it goes on to say that the procedures are to be established by bylaw, and there is no reference at all as to the terms of the bylaw which will establish those procedures. Indeed, the very presence of students on the faculty board is permissive.

I would draw the attention of the House to the provisions of The Carleton College Act, in which the authority to pass bylaws is vested in the board of governors of Carleton University. Not only is it vested in the Board of Governors but the only authority that the senate has to pass bylaws is in a very restricted area and then only if the board of governors themselves have not passed the bylaw.

My concern is with whether or not the member sponsoring the bill in the House or

the Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) can advise us as to what the terms of the anticipated bylaw of Carleton University will be. Otherwise this bill does not clearly make provision for student representation on the faculty board, which in turn will provide a method and a mechanism by which they will become members of the senate of Carleton University.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, just on the same issue, when we discussed—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Mr. Chairman, does the member want an answer?

Mr. T. Reid: On the same issue, when this question was put to the president of the Carleton University in the private bills committee by both the representatives of the New Democratic Party and myself and other members of the Liberal Party on the committee, we were assured by the president that this section must be read—in terms of their intent—in the light of a background document prepared by the students, staff and administration of the university.

He assured us at that time that the intent of this clause was definitely to have students on the faculty boards. The question I raised at that time, with my reading of that section, did not necessarily mean the students had the right to be on the board, that it was in fact permissive. But we were assured in the committee, if my memory serves me correctly, that students are already on such boards and that they would continue to be on those boards.

But I do feel uneasy, as the hon. member for Riverdale does and I am sure the hon. member for Peterborough does, that we are concerned now with legislation. We are not concerned with the intent of the legislation. We are not concerned with any document prepared by these students and teachers and administration of the university which may remove our fears in this regard in actual fact.

So I, too, would like to express our reservations that this section is, in our opinion, not clear. It is subject to interpretation and it does not include students on the faculty boards as a matter of right, if I read that section correctly.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Carleton East.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Did you wish to speak before I did?

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Yes, it is on the same issue.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, perhaps the member for Peterborough could go ahead. I will sum up my interpretation afterwards.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, this is on the same issue. I wish to associate myself with the members for Riverdale and Scarborough East on this issue.

We were assured by the president that there could be as many as 32 students on the senate as a result of their working their way up through the faculty boards.

I think this brings up the whole question of trying to find our way to patterns of university governments or understand individual university governments through the private bills committee. If this was a bill coming through this House as a public bill, one which the university in a sense presented through the Minister of University Affairs, as the member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock) has pointed out, then I think we would be able to clarify it. We would be able to bear the responsibility for assuming that such by-laws would be a part of this legislation, and I think that this is where we really get hung up.

We, as responsible legislators, are trying to find our path towards an effective university administration. We are concerned about unrest, we are concerned about this whole backdrop of Sir George Williams and of unrest in other universities. I think that we attempted in the private bills committee to be as generous as possible. We attempted to be as helpful as possible. But I must say, I share some of the concern which has been expressed on this side.

I will feel very badly a year from now if I turn and I find that on the Carleton senate there are only maybe two or three students because of the way in which the faculty boards were set up, and the way in which the things occurred within those faculty boards that we, in this Legislature, had allowed a bill to go through which did not effectively allow for student representation.

I will feel even worse if there is a building being occupied; if there is a building being destroyed in Ottawa because of our failure in this Legislature to ensure that those kinds of communications were set up within that university, and that representation was

made possible as a result of the bill passed through this House.

I hope that the sponsoring member will be able to enlighten us. I would be even happier if he could give us some idea as to what the nature of this bylaw will be. I think the hon. member is a member of the board of governors for that university. Perhaps he might be able to use his role in the educational arena to enlighten this House on this particular aspect.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will not purport to deal with the broader policy questions raised by the member for Peterborough insofar as they relate to the form of passage of the bill as to its procedures through this House, and whether or not it be a public or private bill because I would suggest that this is a part of the question that should be dealt with by the government through the Minister of University Affairs.

However, with regard to the more particular questions that were raised by the members who spoke earlier, I think I might underline this as point number one. That is, the existing legislation under which Carleton University operates reposes all power, and certainly all residual power, in the board of governors. This bill that we have before us today, does not, in my opinion, change that fundamental legal situation, and, in fact, this bill is probably not in pure law required if the board of governors wish to stand on an absolute interpretation of its ultimate absolute rights.

However, the bill did come before us and is before us now because it expresses a general intention on the part of the board, supported in Carleton by the faculty and by the student body, that there should be greater recognition of the role of the students in the university community of Carleton University. That is why in section 1 we find the enlargement of the definition clearly set out so that there is no argument that students would be disqualified. We also find a section at the end which qualifies students under 21.

Insofar as paragraph 2 of the bill is concerned, our minds are directed there to the way students become eligible for service on the senate.

Now, as has been pointed out, this bill is essentially permissive, but it does express the very current intention of the community, as I have described it, of Carleton University to the extent that by-laws have been drawn. I am advised by the university and, in fact,

students, although not formally permitted to do so, are now serving on the senate of Carleton University.

Substantial numbers of students are serving on each of the faculty boards, and interestingly enough, I am told that the limitation on the number of students on the faculty boards and on the senate have been ones that have been placed before the board by the students themselves.

In other words, apparently the atmosphere and co-operation between the board, the faculty and the students at Carleton is sufficiently good that the students are not only participating, but on their own, are placing certain limitations on the numbers they wish to have participating on the faculty boards and from there, on the senate. That is the current situation.

As I point out, this bill is not one which would force the university to have student representation. But it is one which formalizes and recognizes the *de facto* co-operation and working together of the students on the faculty boards and in the senate.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to add one point here. I hope that this bill when passed—as it will be passed—will be read by the members of the Carleton University community, all the members of that community, with the *Hansard* remarks of today, so that all members of that community will see that we are clearly passing this bill in the light of the remarks of the hon. member for Carleton East about the intent of those who have the power to make this type of decision now at Carleton University.

I know one cannot do this in any formal way, Mr. Chairman, but I really would like to see this legislation passed with the debate in this House today, forming part of that bill.

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

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I do not imagine that the members of the governing body of Carleton University will pay one jot of attention to what is said in *Hansard* on this particular day, but perhaps, forlornly, the Minister of University Affairs might. I think that it is worth pointing out what clause 1, subsection e, is. It is a pretty patronizing extension of tokenism to students, and it does not reflect well on Carleton University that the student body has somehow been seduced into taking what is essentially an inferior role in the governance of the university community.

It is very nice of them and charitable indeed that they should draft a clause which says "students are not disqualified from membership". It would have been rather more a part of the 1960's had they drafted a clause which said that the students were qualified for membership, rather than putting the permissive intent in the opposite direction. I think it is again a reflection of the invidious position which the House is in when we have to deal with these housekeeping amendments.

The member for Carleton East is entirely right, the final authority residing in the board of governors, the board of governors could have done these things without legislative approval, which indicates how inappropriate the funnel for the bill actually is. It indicates again, Mr. Chairman, and indicates rather vividly, that we are not dealing with the substance of the university structure at all. Until we get to the board of governors of Carleton University, until we begin to deal with the real decision-making authority, the universities will continue to be open to the kind of corruption of intent that was so obvious in that tumultuous presentation and aftermath of the University of Western Ontario bill which was brought into this Legislature a couple of years ago.

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): There has been no trouble at Western ever since that bill was passed.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): I would like to say a few words about the manner of presentation of this bill and several others that are on the order paper in connection with changes in university government. This bill comes to the House in committee of the whole House and, as it did in second reading and first reading, under the sponsorship of a private member as a private bill.

While the bill was before the committee on private bills I raised the question in that committee as to whether it was appropriate at this point to treat bills changing university forms of government, or establishing new universities, as private bills of the Legislature petitioned by a group of people wishing to incorporate themselves for the purpose of establishing a university. I suggested in that discussion in the standing committee on private bills when the McMaster bill was before the committee that such bills should be introduced by the Minister of University Affairs as public bills.

I find it most inappropriate, from the point

of view of the public interest that is involved in the changes that we have here before us in this bill respecting Carleton University, that it should come to us as a private bill, and most inappropriate that a bill of this importance, this critical public importance, should have been handled in the way in which it was by the private bills committee.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the private bills committee has a great deal of expertise, if you wish, in respect to a large number of areas of concern—in municipal government, and so on. I find that its consideration, in my brief experience in this House, of matters affecting university government, to be inadequate, to be impatient, and to be without the degree of concern that must be brought to bear when we are engaged in the consideration of such an important matter as the framing of government of our post-secondary education institutions in the light of the circumstances on today's campuses.

The province of Ontario has engaged in capital construction expansion plans for the 14 universities of this province amounting to over \$1 billion between 1967 and 1972.

Mr. Chairman: I am not at all sure that the member's remarks are in order in dealing with this bill in committee of the whole. We are dealing with section 1 of a specific, private bill and the hon. member is making remarks, in my opinion, that deal generally with bills of this nature. I suggest that it is not in order.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that I am not strictly in order but I am attempting to engage the ear of the hon. Minister of University Affairs for whose benefit, I think, we asked that these bills be stood down in committee of the whole House until he was present in the Chamber.

May I say though, in respect to clause 1, in respect to the questions that have been raised by members on this side of the House, that for the sponsoring private member to be put in the position to have to answer these questions, to have to speak for the university community and the university government—the board of governors and the senate—is not the position that I think any member of this House wants to find himself in today.

I do not wish to find myself in that position. I think it is far more within the competence and the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the Minister of University Affairs to be the member of the House with whom members on this side are engaged in

this kind of exchange and dialogue about such an important subject.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I only want to make one point from the point of view of the New Democratic Party caucus in this House and that is, that from this year forward we do not intend to support bills relating to the governance of the universities of this province which are introduced as private bills. It is absolutely essential that we understand that there is no hurdle which prevents the bills coming forward as public bills even though they originate as private bills.

The governance of the university establishments in this province and their financial support through this House, are matters which require the urgent attention of the government and it is no longer sufficient for the Minister of University Affairs to absent himself intellectually, if not physically, from the discussion of the problems related to government. From this point forward, excluding of course the bills which are presently before the House, we do not intend to support any bill relating to the governance of the universities that is not introduced by the Minister of University Affairs as a public bill of this province.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, on the occasion of the Minister's good-natured interjection, I really feel that—I wonder if the Minister would not comment on this whole matter in view of the fact that it is not suggested that the government should create a single pattern for governing bodies for each university in the province just as we have seen the professional engineers create their own legislation; just as we have seen the medical profession, the legal profession, create their own legislation and bring it forward as a public bill into this House. I find it very hard to understand why it is impossible for the Minister of University Affairs to find it in his heart to see this as a means—a more appropriate means—of bringing before this Legislature something of such important public importance.

I would hope that in view of the fact that he is in his seat, he might find it possible to at least engage in this dialogue and indicate what his views are on this matter.

Mr. Chairman: I must respectfully point out again that the remarks are not relevant to section 1 of this specific bill and they are out of order. However, we have permitted certain comments and in this particular case if the hon. Minister wishes to comment he may do so. Otherwise, I put section 1 of the bill to the committee.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I am sure the members opposite would be so deeply disappointed if I did not make some observation on this issue, and I shall accept your very kind extension of the rules, which will permit, perhaps, one or two observations that probably are out of order.

The first point, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that I think should be made, relative to the two bills that we will be considering this afternoon, lies basically in the historical position of the universities of this province. While I appreciate the observations made by the member for Riverdale, and the statement today that the NDP will oppose the universities coming forward in the existing fashion in the future, I think one also must observe, Mr. Chairman, that there is some rationale for the universities themselves developing an appropriate approach to their own government.

While I recognize that the member for Peterborough feels this can be done through presentation by a Minister of the Crown to this House, of the ideas or attitudes developed by a single institution out of 14 or 15, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that before such a policy decision is made, one must reflect very carefully as to whether or not the logical conclusion of this, or the inevitable conclusion, would be the imposition by the government upon the universities of an appropriate governing situation.

Mr. Lewis: You might do that, but others would not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I realize that the hon. member for Scarborough West would never contemplate doing such a thing, although he has suggested this in other situations, but I know now, on reflection, that he would not. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, we would have to be very careful and give this matter really very appropriate consideration. I must also point out that I, personally, have no objection if these bills, under the rules of the House, could be referred to the committee on education and university affairs rather than to the private bills committee.

This I have no objection to, Mr. Chairman, but on checking the rules and the precedents of the House, I believe that it is not possible to do this under the existing rules. In fact, I checked—after the observations made by the member for Windsor West, and I understand his point of view—to see whether it would be possible to have the committee on education and university affairs consider these, rather than the private bills committee, but the rules of this House do not permit this, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it. All I can say is that, personally, I would have no objection whatsoever to this being done.

I should also point out, although I do not pretend to be completely knowledgeable on the subject, that speaking generally to the point raised by the member for Riverdale, as to the desirability of entrenching in legislation certain of these situations, surely we are at a point in the development of university government where we must have, I think, an increasing degree of flexibility.

Surely having general principles that are laid down with the ability, by bylaw, to move into and meet situations as they may develop from, say, month to month or year by year, makes very good sense. And surely, Mr. Chairman, the whole intent or the desire by the university community to make these changes, to have them emanate from the student body, the faculty and the university itself, is far better than having this imposed on them by this Legislature, certainly at this point in history.

I think the whole spirit of the Carleton bill, what is happening at that particular university at the moment, should be very encouraging to the members of this Legislature. If this is the case, surely it is the spirit of what is happening that is as relevant as what we lay down in statute itself. I think I could speak on this, Mr. Chairman, at some length—although I do not intend to—because it is important. I think it is really the desire on the part of the participants to make this thing work, that could be as relevant as the actual statutory requirements that we may or may not lay down.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, would the Minister permit a question?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the Minister, as he has just suggested, could speak for hours on this topic, but with respect, we are out of order. We are dealing with section 1 of Bill Pr25. I think another occasion may arise.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on the clause of the bill, which was my opening comment.

Mr. Chairman: As long as the hon. member does not become repetitious, in connection with the remarks he made earlier.

Mr. J. Renwick: No, I do not intend to become repetitious. The Minister, in the course of his remarks, said that it was the spirit rather than the substance that was important in a clause such as this. I simply point out—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say the spirit of the clause, I said the spirit in the university and the desire to make it work.

Mr. J. Renwick: All right. The spirit—

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a distinction.

Mr. J. Renwick: There may well be a distinction. The spirit that the Minister is talking about is reflected in language which has come before us, which has not established the principle of student representation, nor has it in any way, shape or form, affected the substance of the fact that the power at Carleton University is to remain totally vested in the board of governors. This is what we have to get at, that the board of governors at that university has total power.

Regardless of what the Minister may think of the spirit, the only place from which this legislation emanated was from the board of governors. They are the only ones who could bring it forward. They may have had to have other persons' agreement but they had the power to make the representation. They have done it on the most minimal basis in a situation which is fraught with great concern in the province about the relationship of the students and the faculties and others in the government of universities. I simply reiterate that we have before us a bill which, in this clause, provides a permissive representation of students upon the faculty boards, in an institution where the board of governors not only has total authority within the university, but has total authority, by bylaw, to determine who are the members of the university. In theory, the board of governors could exclude students in attendance at Carleton University from being members of that university.

It is that kind of traditional framework of university government that we are so much concerned about. We recognize the arguments that the Minister has made. We assume that he recognizes the validity of the position

that we are taking. I simply say that this clause 1 of the bill will remain—despite the Minister's remarks, and with the explanation accurately given by the member who has sponsored the bill—simply a permissive section, which, by bylaw, in the circumstances, the board of governors or the senate or the board of governors overriding the senate, could eliminate just like that.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, rising on the same issue, but not repeating myself, I would like to solicit information on one point, and comment on another. I would hope the Minister of University Affairs might answer this rather than the private member who introduced it.

Does this section about the faculty board, listing the teaching staff who are eligible for that board, include members of the teaching staff of the appropriate rank who are part-time appointments to the institution? For example, as the Minister well knows, Mr. Chairman, there are quite a few people with ranks of assistant professors, teaching on a part-time basis, or on a part-time leave of absence basis, at these universities. My specific question is whether or not these people would be eligible, under this proposed change in The Carleton University Act, to be on the faculty boards. Perhaps I could ask that question first and then more on to my comment.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: This is a question of interpretation, Mr. Chairman, and I do not know whether I am any more qualified to answer than any other member of the House. I would think that the interpretation of the section would include anyone who was on the staff so far as basic qualification was concerned, and in the same way, any student, whether he be fulltime or otherwise.

So far as I recall, a question similar to this was asked at the private bills committee, and if I recall correctly I think President Duncan assured the committee at that time that this section was interpreted broadly. In other words, that both faculty and students were considered in their broad sense and not as being permanent, or having tenure, or being fulltime students.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would welcome that interpretation and hope that it is in fact the interpretation that becomes law, because I think too many of the part-time teaching staff of our universities, too many of the part-time students at our universities, have been excluded from their participation

in the decisions that affect their learning at those institutions.

The comment I would like to make on this point is this: My interpretation of the section, assuming all the worst possible things about human behaviour and members on boards of governors, is that it would enable the board of governors of Carleton University—assuming that they make the bylaws—to play the faculty and students off against one another. I would not attribute any intent to the president, who presented this bill, or to the hon. member for Carleton East who spoke on this bill with him in private bills committee, but I would say, looking at this section in a logical way, that it enables the board of governors to play students off against the faculty.

Let me put it this way, Mr. Chairman: I am very much convinced now, much more than I have been over the past five years, during which I have been associated with the university, that although there is a real issue concerning the board of governors, the faculty and students, the issue that is coming to the fore now in our universities, an issue that is going to create the tension—and hopefully it will remain “creative” tension, and will not go on from there into antagonisms with the threat of violence—is that of the relationship between the teaching staff and the students.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, thank heavens the member recognized it.

Mr. T. Reid: If I could reply, I would like that remark in *Hansard*. The Minister of University Affairs said, “Thank heavens you have recognized that”. I would say to him, Mr. Chairman, through you, sir, that if this government had acted—and I think it will be forced to act before 1971—to eliminate the anachronisms of boards of governors and senates, to eliminate that aspect of friction, of tension, and of violence, and unless this government moves to eliminate that source of tension, the tension between the teaching staff and the students will become much worse.

I would say, Mr. Chairman that this section assumes the domination. In fact, it is a legal domination as various members on this side of the House have pointed out; the legal domination of a learning institution by a board of governors not just the financial domination, it is a domination over the learning, the domination of who teaches there, who goes there.

With the perpetuation of that type of domination, the board of governors can, in the state of crisis which is building up because the Minister is cutting back on the funds to universities, make the strife in the relationship between teachers and students that much more difficult. So I can see, sir, speaking very realistically that this section will enable the boards of governors to increase the number of students on these faculty boards, or to decrease the number of students on these faculty boards as they see fit, and to play off the teachers against the students in such a way that will be detrimental to the institutions of higher learning in this province.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I think what this demonstrates about this clause is to reinforce the absurdity of the procedure which the Minister has chosen to follow. We have the member for Scarborough East using his creative facilities, in whatever way he wishes to exercise them, to speculate about the possible outcome of this kind of clause. You have the sponsor of the bill in the House saying, "He would think" that it may be subject to this interpretation or that interpretation. You have a bylaw referred to in the clause for which there is no interpretation.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot allow your governance of universities to run amuck in this fashion when the Minister of University Affairs could bring in such a clause as a public bill without in any way violating the individuality of the university that sponsored it, as he did with York, as he did with Guelph, as he did with Carleton, as he did with at least half of the universities that are now public bills.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not bring—

Mr. Lewis: The Minister's predecessor then. It is an absolutely absurd anomaly that all of us should spend our time this afternoon speculating in the House about the possible intent of a given section of a bill. The member himself who sponsored it can only speculate, when in fact it would become a matter of public record with a Ministerial interpretation, without in any way infringing on the university's individual expression of their own governments.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, one short comment on section 2. Of the Minister or of

his colleague: What is the rationale for one-half the total number of persons on the senate to be elected by the faculty boards of the universities—to become members of the faculty boards? Why is it not three-quarters, why is it not one-quarter?

This is a very relevant question, Mr. Chairman, because the rationale of the two-tier system, as the Minister knows, is that the board is supposed to be responsible for the financial affairs, the legal affairs of the corporation—which is the university—and the senate should be responsible for the academic affairs. The basic academic body in Carleton University is the faculty board, a series of faculty boards.

And yet by legislation, with the approval of this government because it has a majority in this House, it is saying: "Well, the teachers and the students really will not have a majority vote on the senate, just one half. The rest will be administrators, the rest will be people who got into teaching to get out of teaching."

Why is it not three-quarters? Why are not these people who are involved in the learning process, the teachers and the students, the majority number on this body concerned with the education and learning process at Carleton University?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, I think the member is gravely misinterpreting the section and the existing Carleton bill. I do not think there is any question but that the total senate is an academic body. I do not believe there are any administrators or persons outside the academic community on the senate.

I think he can confirm, if he will get the 1957 and 1952 forms of the University of Carleton bill, the half of the senate that is not mentioned in this paragraph 2 of the current bill is there by appointment; namely, the *de facto* appointments as deans or assistant deans or whatever their offices may be.

I think if the member would get the original bill, he would find out that mathematically this other half is already appointed directly from the academic community on a faculty basis.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I think the point I raised is relevant, particularly in the light of the hon. member's reply, because what he has said confirms my worst reservations about this section. I like deans, some of my best friends are deans and assistant deans. But while they might try to teach a

little bit to keep their hand in, with the turmoil being created by the Minister of Education in universities they have not got time to teach.

The point is simply this, that teachers, full-time teachers, people who do nothing in universities but try to teach, who are involved in the learning process, and students, are the ones who know what learning is all about.

Why pack a senate with administrators, people who have gone into teaching and then whether or not their motive is this or not, have left teaching for higher salaries, in many cases for administrative work or for some perverted sense of greater prestige in the university. Why make the senate an administrative power block?

Why not make it an academic centre, a learning centre? Why increase the power of the administrators who are appointed by the president and the board over the power of the learning process? It makes a farce of the two-tier philosophy when we have this type of section coming in on a private member's bill.

This confirms my view that you cannot have a dichotomy of government within a university because what it really means is exactly what this section means, that the university is run by the board of governors and administrators who are appointed by the board of governors and not by those who are involved directly in the learning process, the teachers and the students.

I think that is an atrocious statement, an atrocious clause, to have in a university Act in this day and age. In 1956 that would have been nice, but today it is a farce.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to interject at this point. I must express disagreement with the member for Scarborough East on this particular area, because I do think, as I remember from the private members' committee, that half of this senate were people who were actively engaged in the university.

I realize that this may be different in different universities, but I know that in the university which I happen to be associated with, those who are involved in the administration as it exists in this particular type of a setting, are involved in teaching and are involved in the educational process.

I would also like to indicate too, that I find it hard to understand how you can have a single tier if you are going to have no representations from the community in this particular situation.

I see two problems here. First, the fact that the community is not going to be effectively represented, and in the second theory there is the suggestion that every university should have the same form of government.

These problems really do bother me. It bothers me very greatly, this whole question of dealing with this in the way we are doing this afternoon; in a very *ad hoc* basis. I come back again to the comments of the Minister a few moments ago, and I think they are relevant to this section, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that placing it in a public bill, bringing it forward in a public bill through the universities' activity would, in any way, be imposing the power of The Department of University Affairs upon the individual universities. I sensed a degree of openness about this in the Minister's comments when he said that this is a policy decision that really has to be taken. It is something that must be thought about. The implications must be considered.

But surely in a province where each university comes before the committee on university affairs and opens out its entire affairs before that committee, a committee which is surely fairly close to the Minister, it advises the Minister, in a sense it has an even close relationship, it would seem to me that in all candour and honesty it is time that we cleaned up this whole thing and made the debate on university government in this House meaningful and relevant.

Sections 2 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr25 reported.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill Pr32, An Act respecting McMaster University.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on section 2 we notice that the board shall be composed as follows. The chancellor, the president, the vice-chairman of the senate—and then another clause, skipping subsection (b)—one member from the divinity college, four members from the alumni association and six members from the elected faculty members of the senate and 18 members to be elected for terms of four years by the board.

Now, can the member or the Minister explain to me the rationale for that kind of subdivision of the board's authority?

An hon. member: It is called board packing.

Mr. Lewis: On what basis is that introduced: 18 members appointed, elected for terms of four years by the board—which means appointed by the board?

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton West): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to this bill: When I was asked to introduce this bill I asked Dr. Thode, the president if he would appear at the committee and he did. He read a comprehensive report and my understanding at the committee was that this recommendation of McMaster was loudly applauded and he was commended for having made this step. I am a little surprised to hear the member for Peterborough say that he has any objection to this. If I understand—Scarborough East or Scarborough West—I am sorry but you did at the committee, commend Dr. Thode on introducing this type of bill.

Mr. Pitman: On extending to student representation.

Mrs. Pritchard: Yes, it was accepted by the committee and received second reading and I think that the whole intent of the bill was to increase the student representation, and perhaps—

Mr. Pitman: That was the aspect I commended.

Mrs. Pritchard: Perhaps the member for Scarborough West can tell me what it is he exactly wishes to know.

Mr. Lewis: I thought that I had made it fairly clear, Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Peterborough applauded the university governor for extending some small smattering of power to students. It was, for McMaster, a considerable intellectual wrench, worthy of applause. But I wonder why in section 2, 18 members, the dominant portion of the board, are to be elected for terms of four years by the board. What is the rationale behind that?

Mrs. Pritchard: Dr. Thode's report, Mr. Chairman, he said that on the new senate the faculty will hold 50 per cent of the seats and the students will have significant representations—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I am asking about the board in section 2, not the senate. I appreciate the senatorial division.

Mrs. Pritchard: Well, possibly it is a continuity of terms.

Mr. Lewis: Could it possibly be that McMaster wants to perpetuate the corporate elite in that university? Could that be it?

Mrs. Pritchard: No, I think that McMaster was making a serious attempt to do the very thing that you have been prating about ever since I have been in this House.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am asking a question. Could it be a wish to perpetuate the corporate elite at McMaster University? The member for Carleton East shakes his head in disdain, but I think it is a—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: They all—

Mr. Lewis: All right, Mr. Chairman, all right. The board of governors of McMaster University, right on this clause Mr. Chairman—now let us trot it out on the floor. D'Arcy Martin, who is the chancellor in the most recent past: His credentials for chancellor of the university were as chairman of Ferro Enamels (Canada) Limited; secretary and director of Gerard Company Limited; director of Ash Temple Limited, National Trust Limited, Royal Oak Dairy Limited, Industrial Corporation Limited, Steetly of Canada Limited, Butler Metal Products of Canada Limited.

H. G. Thode, the president and vice-chancellor—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): This would qualify the capitalistic members from Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) and High Park (Mr. Shulman) as governors.

Mr. Lewis: No, this is directly on the clause, Mr. Chairman: H. G. Thode president and vice-chancellor. He is—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I do not think the qualifications of the present members of the board of the University of McMaster really relate to whether there should be or should not be 18 members appointed by the board.

Mr. Lewis: I am offering the contention, Mr. Chairman, that the reason for the appointment of the 18 members is to perpetuate the corporate elite at McMaster University. In order to give substance to that suggestion, the members of the board—it will not take me more than a couple of minutes, the Minister perhaps could hear it too, because it is directly on the clause; I am not impugning their backgrounds, I just want the House to know the nature of the governance, let me just run through them.

H. G. Thode; director of Fidelity Mortgage and Savings Corporation, trustee of Western New York Nuclear Research Centre, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

St. Clair Balfour, Jr.; president and managing director of Southam Press Limited; chairman Southam Business Publications Limited; vice-president and director of Niagara Television Limited, Murray Holdings Limited, London Free Press Printing Company, Selkirk Holding Limited, Sun Publishing Company Limited, B. C. Journal of Commerce Limited, Greater Winnipeg Cablevision.

G. H. Blumenauer; chairman and president of Otis Elevator Limited, Dominion Foundries and Steel Limited, Mutual Life Assurance Company Limited.

C. C. Brannan; president, International Harvester Company Canada Limited; director, International Harvester Credit Corporation Canada Limited.

R. R. Craig; executive vice-president of Dominion Steel and Foundries Limited, National Steel Car Corporation.

C. P. Fell; honorary chairman and director of Empire Life Insurance Company, Royal Trust Company, Canadian Surety Company.

D. M. Firestone; president of Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, Firestone Textiles Limited.

D. K. Frid; president of Frid Construction Company Limited.

J. W. Kerr; president and chief executive officer Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited, Banner Petroleum Limited, Great Lakes Gas Transmission Company, the Manufacturers Life Insurance.

I am reaching the end, Mr. Chairman.

W. P. Pigott; Pigott Construction Company, Crump Mechanical Contraction Limited, Royal Oak Dairy Limited (Royal Oak is an interesting inter-locking feature), Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited.

V. W. Scully; The Steel Company of Canada; chairman, director of the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada, British American Oil Company of Canada, Bank of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have made your point.

Mr. Lewis: All right, when I—the Chairman is weary.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman is not weary. The Chairman is trying to find out whether or not this is in order and—

Mr. Lewis: I assume by your indulgence, sir, that it is in order.

Now, one could read off the other numbers amongst the 18. I would be loath to prostrate myself before these titans of industry. I am not sure that they merit that. I cast no aspersions on the elevation to which they have aspired. I just ask, Mr. Chairman, I ask in terms of this clause of the bill, what kind of university community it is we are creating when all the substantial authority lies in the hands of the corporate elite—and this is the corporate elite in no uncertain terms.

I rattled off but a third to a half of the various ventures involved and the various personalities involved; if one is seriously talking about a community of learning rather than a self-perpetuating oligarchy, then one has to contemplate shifting entirely the make-up of the board of governors.

We have to live with this individual clause, but I wonder whether it would not be possible even within these constraints, to allow for some democratization of the board of governors. Are there no other representative elements in the community? Are there no representative groups from consumers, or labour, or farmers, or any other group in the community beyond the appropriate credentials of the corporate elite?

What kind of university are you allowing to perpetuate itself by putting all this authority, and inevitably the final authority, in the hands of a self-impressed respecting corporate group; inevitably self-perpetuating? That is what I read into this "18 members to be elected for terms of four years by the board".

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what conceivable rationale can be contrived to justify it. If one does not want an antidemocratic board of a university, then one at least extends the scope of its participants to other areas of the community to make it even marginally representative. What you have had in McMaster University, and what we are in danger of repeating, is a corporate board running an essentially authoritarian regime with very little possibility of the kind of social change within a community of learning which all these other community facets would introduce.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, that is a legitimate question to ask.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, could I speak to this section or would the—

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with section 2. If the hon. member has comments pertaining to section 2, he may proceed.

Mr. T. Reid: It has to do with section 11, part (e) on page 2, which reads:

Six members to be elected for terms of three years by the elected faculty members of the senate from among the faculty members except—

I fail to understand why the principle of exclusion of certain members of the senate, as we shall see, is being practised in this subsection (e). As the Chairman will note later on, the senate contains six students of the university, and yet this section here excludes them from participation, from the board, or even the change of participating in the board.

Surely the mentality of the people who brought forward this bill to the Ontario Legislature is a very suspicious mentality. Why should they, in a sense, say to the members of the senate that "we do not trust your judgment on electing from your own number the best people to be representatives on the board of governors".

Surely if the board of governors and the people who were responsible for bringing this bill to this Legislature had confidence in their own recommendations concerning the composition of the senate and the people who will be on the senate, surely, Mr. Chairman, they should allow that group of people, whom they surely must deem to be competent, to select from among their own numbers the best people to sit on the board of governors.

One or two, or even six of the best people in the senate might just happen to be people called students. My question then, Mr. Chairman, is why is this principle of exclusion contained in this section when some of the best people might be excluded from being elected to the board by members of the senate?

Mr. Lewis: Well, who answers the question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not really sure the hon. member was asking a question *per se*. As I recall the procedures, this bill went to the private bills committee. I am not sure that the member for Scarborough West—I had better not get him in the wrong part of Scarborough, it would upset the other member from Scarborough East—was a member of the committee. But I understand he was there, and it was sug-

gested that he might discuss some of these matters with the president of the university at the conclusion of a private bills committee.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, these specific questions as they relate to the individual sections contained in this bill, were the matters that should have been discussed, and discussed at some length, at the private bills committee. To come here in this Legislature and to ask questions of the private member who introduced the bill that obviously must relate to the opinions or the decisions made by the university itself when it prepared this bill for presentation to the House—

Mr. Peacock: That makes the rest of the process meaningless.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —makes it very difficult indeed. If the hon. member wishes me to make any personal observations I would say that this bill reflects the consideration and the study given by the University of McMaster as to the reorganization of its structure.

I think I have said in this Legislature before, and I will repeat it here again, and I think the bill that hopefully we will get to some time this afternoon related to the Ontario College of Art reflects this, as will amendments to the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute bill, that neither I nor the government, have any objections *per se* to students on governing bodies.

What the University of McMaster is suggesting, and what other institutions have also suggested, is that perhaps the most logical place for student participation in the decision-making process is in some other way than on the board of governors itself.

I think this view is shared by a number of students themselves. To come here, Mr. Chairman, and to have the member for Scarborough East ask the private member who introduced the bill the rationale for matters that were surely discussed by the members in the private bills committee—and I would assume there must be some members from the Liberal Party who were present, and who, I am sure, perhaps discuss these matters with the, shall we say, university critic—ignores the fact that these questions could have been raised by a member from that party in the private bills committee. I am sure this opportunity was there, and surely that was the occasion on which to raise them.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Minister suggesting that when we get to discussion in committee in the House here that we should skip the whole thing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am not suggesting that, Mr. Chairman. I am saying with respect to this particular question that to ask the private member who sponsored the bill a specific question of this nature really does not make a great deal of sense.

Mr. Lewis: Who else do we ask?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the hon. member would agree with this.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is trying to get himself off the hook and this is what we have been trying to draw his attention to for some time. The private member who is introducing it is really only a catalyst, or a vehicle, or an agent, for bringing the bill. It is neither fair nor is it effective to ask a private member to deal with the intimate details of the bill.

Some of them we will get in the committee. But we do not get an opportunity to discuss it in terms of its broad public implications. That is why it should be a public bill introduced by this Minister, and I refuse to hear this Minister say once again that that means you are going to stamp a common mould on it. It is nonsense.

This Minister brought in the bill that established York University, and York University had an amendment two or three years ago. I was lobbied by the board of governors and by the president of York University to assist in the amendments that were going to be made by the government to the public bill. This can be done across the board and we are dealing in a meaningful way with it rather than this anachronistic way up until now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like some further information on this because there is a parallel somewhat to the position we find ourselves in now. Other private bills are inspected by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) which are in a different area of responsibility. He is either at the committee himself, or his representative is there, in order to give an official opinion on these matters.

Now, if the government is going to continue dealing with bills having to do with post-secondary education in the private bills committee, then surely we can extend the same right to the Minister, who undoubtedly

examined this bill already. If he was not at the committee he should have been; either that or have had someone from The University Affairs Department prepared to give a professional and policy opinion as far as the provisions of the statute are concerned.

In the same way, when certain private bills come before the House in committee of the whole, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is usually prepared to get up and defend the government's position which is usually in support of the bills that are called.

Occasionally his views are overridden in the private bills committee and we rarely see those bills here again. As a matter of fact, there are one or two private bills having to do with his responsibility that have not been brought forward.

Now, I agree with everything that has been said. We should be dealing with these university bills in another way, but since we are trapped by the present rules of the House, there is a good and, I think, a responsible rationale. You would simply conduct yourself the way the Minister of Municipal Affairs does and, in fact, take the responsibility away from the private member who introduced it in order to give the opinion of the government and to answer questions of the type that have been so well put this afternoon.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a danger of misinterpretation or misunderstanding here. I think I can categorically say there has been no bill involving the universities, or private bills involving universities that has come before the private bills committee than has not had either the presence of the Minister, a member of the department or a formal note from the department agreeing with the policy comprised in the bill that had gone forward.

Mr. Nixon: Right. I think the hon. member makes an excellent point. That means that passively it is supported by the government and is a part of their general policy. The hon. Minister should be prepared to answer questions that are put to him under these particular circumstances and, in fact, defend the thing, instead of sitting there and letting the hon. member at the other end of the row get up and say that the president of the university was here once and could have answered these questions if they had been put.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, is the answer to the member for Scarborough East then that because McMaster is a community of learning, the board may exclude students?

That is acceptable to the Minister, is it? That is precisely what he is saying. These 18 men with exclusively corporate backgrounds, exclude students from the board and that is acceptable to the Minister's concept of a community of learning, is it? Is that what the Minister is saying to the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member knows very well this is not what the Minister is saying to the House. What I am saying to the House—and this has been the policy followed by the government and I hope not to have to repeat it several more times this afternoon—and I think it is relevant, is that we are anxious for the universities themselves to work these things out. It does not matter, I am sure, in the minds of the members opposite, really, who presents the bill. I would say with respect, Mr. Chairman, that if we had accepted the position, shall we say, taken by McMaster or Carleton relevant to their own individual reorganization, obviously some of this discussion would have gone on in any event whether I introduced the bill or whether it had been introduced by a private member.

For some members opposite to suggest that a lot of this discussion would then go by the wayside, I think really it is wishful thinking. The position that we have taken, Mr. Chairman, is very simply—

Mr. Nixon: No one suggested that!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to repeat it once again.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes; our policy is very simply this, that we look to and anticipate that the universities themselves will reorganize their administrative structures in a way that is in keeping with the situation as it exists in the year 1969 and beyond, and that the bill presented by Carleton University, the bill now being considered with respect to McMaster, represents the discussion, the decisions, the reports and, shall we say, the position that they have taken as a university, which then finds its way into this particular legislation. That is the policy, Mr. Chairman, that has been adopted.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister think it is in concert with the spirit of 1969 to exclude students from a board of governors? Is that what he is saying to the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am saying, and I am saying this personally, and I

do not really want to go through this whole debate again, that I personally have taken the position—and I believe the Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) has—that we have no objection to students being on boards of governors. What we are saying is that the universities themselves surely are the ones who should determine the best way for student participation, and there are a number of universities who—

Mr. Lewis: What do these corporate people have?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Scarborough West—

Mr. Lewis: All right!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —has asked certain questions. I could also say that in my opinion a board of governors today should reflect in its membership a very broad spectrum of our society today. I have no reservations in making this statement, none whatsoever.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that is being on both sides.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of University Affairs indicates implicitly that he does not much like the idea of excluding students. He will accept the *fiat* of the university, but he does not much like it. He then goes on to say that he thinks the university *fiat* should be delivered by a group of men who are broadly representative of the community, but the group of men who deliver it are all corporately oriented.

Now, where is the consistency in the Minister's policy, Mr. Chairman? He has no policy whatsoever. He is prepared to see the emasculation of a community of learning for the sake of some almost anti-intellectual idea of keeping hands off.

The government will not, in any sense, alter the dictate of the university, however perverse or destructive that dictate may be. I just do not follow the Minister's view, Mr. Chairman.

I would ask him when he has a university board of governors before him so obviously unrepresentative as that at the University of McMaster, what does he think about the conclusions to which they may have arrived? Does he think his department might give them some scrutiny? Has he any anxiety about the kind of conclusions which they presented to him? I am interested in knowing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think I can say this objectively, that the bill presented

here by McMaster University, after two and a half years of very careful study in which students were involved, represents a very significant step forward in the administration of that university. I think for the member for Scarborough West to predetermine all members of the board in their attitudes, really is, perhaps, being somewhat on the negative side.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want to repeat it again, that my own personal point of view is that a board of governors, if this is to be the administrative structure adopted by a university, should be broadly representative of the total community.

Mr. Lewis: Why is it not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who says it will not be?

Mr. Lewis: All the experience says it will not be.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, one brief comment on this principle of exclusion of students from the board of governors which is incorporated by law in this proposed Act. The Minister said that the people involved in those universities must work out themselves any changes in their existing Act that they would like to have.

In some universities where there are open lines of communication, where there is not such a clamp by a single group within the university on the entire power of that university, then it would be possible for a collective decision to be made and to have Acts proposed by the institution.

But what I would like to say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is simply this, that history over the last ten years in North America has proven that there are universities that cannot do this in a democratic collective manner. There are universities in Ontario which cannot come to terms within themselves on the changes to be made in their internal government.

I will just say to the Minister that this is an evaluation on my part, and the evaluation of many other people, and unless he acts, unless he realizes that there are universities where there is a stranglehold, unless he realizes this to be so, the only way change is going to come about, generated from within a university, is by the threat of violence on the part of some students.

I say that should not happen. He has the power to prevent that from happening, and I say, sir, that he is not living up to his responsibilities as the Minister of University Affairs in this province in this regard.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Could I ask two questions? Would it be appropriate to ask the chairman of the private bills committee—perhaps he might answer them, I should like to know—first, were there any students at the meeting asking to be represented on the board at McMaster? And second, is there anything to suggest that of the 18 members to be elected that some of them will not be students?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: There were no students at that particular meeting as far as I recall, but there was a statement made by the president that might be pertinent to this, if I might yield the floor to the member on my left.

Mrs. Pritchard: Mr. Chairman, if I may quote from Dr. Thode's report:

Let me add that at our open meeting with students last November, the undergraduate students stated that they did not wish to have representation on the board of governors at this time. This was confirmed by a motion passed in the student representative assembly in November, 1968.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 2 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. Lewis: Just before it is carried, I would like to ask the Minister of University Affairs, can he give the House assurance that the 18 members will, in fact, on this occasion reflect the broad interests of the community to which he refers? Has he had that undertaking from the university?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have not discussed that with the university. I can only say I am expressing, I think for the fourth time this afternoon, my personal point of view in these matters, and that is, that a board of governors should be as broadly representative as possible of the total society today.

Mr. Sopha: Well, what do you mean by broadly representative?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In other words, that there should be various parts of our society, if I can define it better this way, representative on the boards of governors.

Mr. Sopha: Including students?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I have no objection to students, I have made this clear.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, just a very short remark on this. The Minister has said on two or three occasions that it is his per-

sonal feeling that the board of governors should express the sense of the community. But surely, it is more than his personal feeling. He is the Minister of University Affairs of the province of Ontario. Has he not the responsibility to set the guidelines?

I am not suggesting that the Minister should decide on a particular form of government for every university in Ontario. I am simply suggesting that there should be guidelines that are more than simply the Minister's personal feelings. And this is very strange, Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time that we have had an opportunity to hear what the Minister's personal feelings are on this matter.

Mr. Sopha: That is not your problem. That is not to say—

Mr. Pitman: On a private member's bill about the role of the student in the university, surely some guideline is needed as to what is the role of the board of governors and how it should represent the community. These surely are the things which can best allow the universities to find their way. They are looking for guidance. Is not this within the Minister's purview, that he should at least set these kind of guidelines that are more than his personal feelings. They are rather an indication in the province of Ontario, a recognition, of how university government must comment in the 1960s and 1970s.

Mr. Sopha: Interesting division between them, is there not?

Mr. MacDonald: There is no division.

Mr. Chairman: Section 2.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Identical!

Mr. Sopha: That is why you call him ferocious.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. T. Reid: Surely not the member for Hamilton West?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to ask the member for Hamilton West, Mr. Chairman, whether right now there are any members of her sex on the board of governors at this university, and if not, why not?

Mrs. Pritchard: Any members of where?

Mr. T. Reid: Are there any lady members of the board of governors at McMaster University at the present time? If not, why not?

Mrs. Pritchard: I am sorry I cannot answer that question, I do not know.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on section 4, just a question. It says in section 2(g), if I have this right, that the board has the power to make recommendations to the senate as to educational policies. I thought that the rationale of the two-tier system was that the board was concerned with things financial, and the senate was concerned with things academic, and the twain should not meet. If that is a valid theory of university government, why, then, should the board be given this very confusing power to make recommendations to the senate as to educational policy?

Mr. Chairman: Is there an answer to the question?

Shall section 4 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. MacDonald: No, we asked a question.

Mr. Nixon: Surely the Minister can give some views on that matter. Perhaps if he just said—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the question is really self-answered. If the hon. member for Scarborough East would, in fact, specify that section of section 4 that he thinks really makes this a part of the Act, then I shall try to answer it specifically for him.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I understood that in my previous remarks I identified the section as under what is now labelled section 4, subsection 2(g) at the very bottom of page three—"To make recommendations to the senate as to the educational policy". I understood, from reading the Minister's speeches very carefully, which he sends me all the time, that in his view university government could be either single-tier or two-tier, that either system has its rationale; and that the rationale of the two-tier system was that the board, in its wisdom, since they were of the corporate elite, knew about things financial and how to build buildings, and that was their job. The senate's job was to be concerned with things academic, the learning process within those buildings. Why, if he had that rationale of the two-tier system, is he now, by implication, in favour of, or at

least condoning, a system that confuses all this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, surely the rationale for all of this is a greater communication between the board, if there is to be a two-tier structure, and the senate, if the senate represents, shall we say, the educational or the academic part. Surely there is nothing to prevent the board making recommendations to the senate and vice versa. The senate does not have to adopt the recommendations. Surely this is an avenue for communication that makes some sense. I cannot understand the hon. member's objection to it.

Mr. T. Reid: I simply say, Mr. Chairman, and it is probably a logical objection, that if the Minister believes in greater communication within the university community *ipso facto*, if that is the right Latin, all universities ought to have a one-tier system.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on section 6, it says in clause 8, on page 5, that the president shall be chairman of the senate, and then something else.

The point I am interested in is this, that some universities specify, as this Act does, that the president shall be chairman of the senate. Other universities, and I believe that York is one of them, state that the senate chooses its own chairman. I was wondering if there was any philosophy behind this, because the implication of legislating that the president shall be chairman, is again to say to the full-time academics, the full-time teaching staff, somehow ought not, in their wisdom, to choose someone who is not the president to be their chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I just have to make this observation. I do not think that this is really a very basic philosophical issue, surely, that the president is named as chairman of the senate. It varies from one university to another, as the hon. member is fully aware. I really do not think it is that relevant as to whether he is or he is not. This was, once again, the decision made by those—including the academics, the faculty association—at McMaster University who made this determination. They think this is the best way to make it work.

Sections 6 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill Pr32 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House reports certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Carleton University.

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting McMaster University.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the city of London.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will call upon His Honour and ask if he would come into this Chamber and give Royal assent to certain bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the Chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

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

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed several bills to which, in the name and on behalf of said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 1, An Act to amend The Evidence Act.

Bill 17, An Act to amend The Milk Act, 1965.

Bill 22, An Act to amend The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act.

Bill 50, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 56, An Act to amend The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act, 1964.

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill 61, An Act to amend The Commissioners for taking Affidavits Act.

Bill 62, An Act to provide for the Consolidation and Revision of the Statutes.

Bill 63, An Act to provide for the Consolidation and Revision of the Regulations.

Bill 65, An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.

Bill 66, An Act to amend The Matrimonial Causes Act.

Bill 67, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Bill 68, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill 69, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill 70, An Act respecting The Department of Justice.

Bill 71, An Act to amend The Fines and Forfeitures Act.

Bill 78, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965.

Bill 79, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Bill 80, An Act to repeal The Hospitals Tax Act.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting Ontario Co-operative Credit Society.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the city of London.

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Bobier convalescent home.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the town of Lindsay.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting March Diamond Drilling Limited.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the town of Parry Sound.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Cornwall.

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the county of Ontario.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the town of Mitchell.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the county of Peel.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of Windsor.

Bill Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the township of Teck.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Maimonides Schools for Jewish Studies.

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting Carleton University.

Bill Pr26, An Act respecting the Tilbury public school board.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting Co-ordinated Arts Services.

Bill Pr28, An Act respecting the city of Sarnia.

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Peterborough.

Bill Pr30, An Act respecting Banks Alignment Limited.

Bill Pr32, An Act respecting McMaster University.

Bill Pr34, An Act respecting the town of Mississauga.

To these Acts the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), in the absence of Mr. Meen, moves second reading of Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the borough of East York.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF WELLAND

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland) moves second reading of Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville) moves second reading of Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West) moves second reading of Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the University of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PUBLIC FINANCE COMPANIES'
INVESTMENTS ACT, 1966

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 84, An Act to repeal The Public Finance Companies' Investments Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves second reading of Bill 85, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LOAN AND TRUST
CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves second reading of Bill 86, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INSURANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves second reading of Bill 92 An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Will that bill be discussed in committee?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES
ACT, 1968

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves second reading of Bill 89, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1968.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, before the House carries this particular bill, I would just like to pass a few comments on it. I do not know whether my thoughts are correct on this, but I seem to view this as another erosion of the powers of small local municipalities.

Having served on the select committee on conservation authorities for a couple of years and taking part in the debates in this House concerning amendments that we passed last year which set out guidelines whereby representation was established on the basis of population, it seems inherent to me that here again, the implication I see in this bill is that if we get into a situation of a two-tier system of regional government the regional government itself will be designating those officials who will participate on the conservation authority, rather than the smaller units of administration within that region designating the people of their own choice.

I think it would be very hard for these people to act on behalf of areas within that regional conservation authority, to really speak for their own section of the region. This is most serious in the apportionment of administration costs, maintenance costs and capital costs.

Certainly, the Act that we passed last year does mean that every member of an authority should be resident in the participating municipality. Well, if the region, in fact, becomes that municipality, a great number of sections in this Act that was passed last year have little or no meaning, in my particular thoughts.

I might ask the hon. Minister for an explanation. Am I off base on this or, in fact, in a two-tier system of regional government would those smaller municipalities still have the right to designate the number of appointees on the conservation authority as laid out in the guideline of, say, one appointee per 10,000 population?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I doubt if there will be any regional government that would coincide with a conservation area. This matter has been discussed with the chairmen of the conservation authorities and with many of the members of the various conservation authorities, and it was felt that where there were regional governments, that the regional government would appoint the members for the area that they represented. Of course, the water shed might spill over into many more municipalities and that will not be changed.

It was felt that it was about the only way this could be handled, and it seems to meet the approval of all the conservation chairmen. I think we have spoken to about this bill and there have not been any complaints.

Mr. Paterson: Well, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister, if the conservation people who were in convention last week have no opposition to this particular bill I am satisfied. But I just felt that it should be drawn to the attention—

Mr. Speaker: Under the rules of the House the member may speak once on a particular bill.

Mr. Paterson: It was for point of clarification I asked the question during my remarks.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): After everybody else has spoken then he can speak again.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO COLLEGE OF ART ACT, 1968-1969

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 41, The Ontario College of Art Act, 1968-1969.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the question of principle on Bill 41, I would like to make the members of the Legislature aware of the basis on which many of my remarks are made.

Last January 3 I sent a letter to about 30 people associated with the Ontario College of Art asking them for their views on the proposed Act, and in my letter I said this:

At this time it is important that carefully thought out amendments designed to improve the equity and the practicality of the bill be brought forward.

I am, therefore, writing to you to seek your assistance and co-operation.

This letter is being forwarded to about 30 people associated with the college in governance, administration, in teaching, or as members of the student body.

I concluded my letter by saying—

Let me emphasize that the whole purpose of this approach in seeking your views about this proposed bill is to improve the quality of the bill and to make the Ontario College of Art as good as it can

be. Neither I, nor my colleagues in the Liberal Opposition are interested in tearing institutions down. We do, however, want to update the total educational structure where we can so that it fits modern expectations and human goals.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where are the words "Liberal Opposition"? Is that the hon. member's?

Mr. T. Reid: Oh the Minister got a copy. That is in mine.

The result of this letter, Mr. Speaker, was a number of very—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Did the member send one of those letters to the Minister?

Mr. T. Reid: I always keep the Minister very well informed. He sends me copies of his speeches bound up in expensive books and I send him these cheap little letters I send out.

An hon. member: I wonder how come?

Mr. T. Reid: The result of this letter, Mr. Speaker, was a number of very good written replies and a number of requests for luncheon meetings and so forth. So today I have some detailed comments to make on the question of the principles incorporated in the bill.

The first matter I would like to say is that I agree with the principle that this is a public bill. We have discussed that very fully this afternoon. It needs no repetition at this time.

One of the best replies I received in response to my letter was a two-page memorandum from the Students Administrative Council Executive of the Ontario College of Art. This is signed by the president, Allan Close; the vice-president, Dan Wladyka; the treasurer, Susan Curry; the secretary, Irene Kayama; and the student members of the council's advisory committee, Jeff Fear and Salvatore Amenta. Also included on this executive committee was the editor of the student magazine, *Cult Magazine*, Randall Lawrence, I shall be quoting concerning the principles of the bill from this two-page memorandum which they were kind enough to prepare for me.

The first comment I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the students administrative council executive believes:

We feel that the Act as presently drafted does not reflect the spirit of Dr. Wright's report.

I think this is the theme of my remarks today on the principles of the bill. The principles of the bill, Mr. Speaker, do not reflect the spirit of Dr. Wright's report which on the whole was an excellent report. It certainly was much, much better than the bill the Minister has brought forward for second reading at this time.

The first principle then, or the third item which is really the first principle, is the principle of continuing the Ontario College of Art. The Act, by coming forward in this form, states in one of its sections that, "the Ontario College of Art is continued."

Here is what the students of the college said:

We feel that a companion study of the entire area of education in the arts in conjunction with Dr. Wright's report is necessary.

The improved curricula in the arts at the secondary school level, the rise of the community colleges, and the new fine arts departments at York University and Queens, has made the present role and objectives of the college obsolete, and in many areas, redundant.

The students continue in their letter to me, Mr. Speaker, by saying:

The government assumes the responsibility of determining the object of the college without first determining the validity of that object.

It is our contention that one of the clauses as presently drafted concerning the objects of the college is premature, and as such should be set aside, or amended, until the college is able to resolve its aims—directions and relationship to Ontario's educational structure.

The point here, Mr. Speaker, the first principle, is that the Minister has adopted a very haphazard approach to the Ontario College of Art. He is bringing forth a revised bill without first examining the whole area of art—fine art—education in this province to see what the role, if any, of the Ontario College of Art should be in the years ahead.

For example, there are the new colleges of applied arts and technology—I believe one is Sheridan College. There is a very good curriculum which duplicates, in many respects, the curriculum at the Ontario College of Art.

If this is the case, why should there be such duplication, because as you know, sir, the Ontario College of Art does not grant a degree, it grants a diploma. Sheridan Col-

lege also grants a diploma. Why then, is this examination of the administration of the Ontario College of Art, was not a companion study done to ensure that the whole place of art education in this province was also looked into.

If, and I say this with respect Mr. Speaker, if the decision as to this hard-headed evaluation of the expenditures of public money in this area of education in this province after high school, if the decision is that the Ontario College of Art should continue as opposed to being disbanded, then I would say that the Ontario College of Art must become an institute of high quality, very, very high quality. It should become, in a sense, like the Royal College of Art in the U.K.—outstanding.

It might become like, I believe it is the Bauhaus in Germany—another outstanding institution for the arts. If it is not to become a first rate institution then I suggest the Minister should seriously consider the continuance of this college in any form at all, if art education is being sufficiently fulfilled at York and Queens and in some of the community colleges.

So I question the principle, Mr. Speaker, of continuing the Ontario College of Art because the Minister has not done a companion study of the whole area of art in this sense, this type of art education in the province, and indeed, its relationship to the whole of Canada.

It is another reflection, another example, of a lack of an overall view of post-secondary education in this province, and I think the Minister should at some point learn from his mistakes.

The second principle I would like to turn to, sir, is the principle that the academic staff and students do not have a majority of the people on the single council of the Ontario College of Art.

At the present time the details of the Act embody the principle that the single body should not have a majority of its members from the academic staff from the student body. Right now, I believe there are six academic staff members proposed, three students proposed, the president, plus another nine people who are not students or teachers or the president.

To bring to the Minister's attention, Mr. Speaker, some of the other opinions concerning the nature of this council, I would like to let him have the benefit of a letter I received in response to my request from Professor Stephen H. E. Clarkson, of the

department of political economy at the University of Toronto.

Professor Clarkson's letter to me is dated January 13, 1969, and he says this about this principle in the Act.

I do not know why any members of the council should be appointed by the government, unless it is assumed that the government has a superior capacity to judge policy problems in and out of the school.

If it is an absolute political necessity, as opposed to an academic one, I think that three members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council would suffice. This would give the academic representatives equal power with the combined students and appointed members.

That is the way Professor Clarkson, an eminent political scientist, feels about the political composition of the council.

The views of a staff member of the college, whom I will not name because the person asked to remain anonymous, about the principle of who has the power in the council, is this, sir. The staff member notes that there are nine members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and this is what the staff member says.

It seems undemocratic that half of the governing council of the college should be appointed, no matter by whom. Moreover, what in fact, does their appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council mean? If it means, as I think it has in the past, that these appointments are made automatically on the recommendation of the principal in council, then the staff and student representation could be meaningless. The appointed council, plus the principal, should outvote staff and students.

And the staff member concludes:

Could not some more democratic method for the naming of these outside councillors be found?

There is another letter from the editor of the Founders College newspaper at York University, Mr. Don Long, and he says there are students involved very actively in the reform of our institutions. Mr. Long says, as a second suggestion:

It would appear that the president and the nine appointed members can outvote the six elected academics and the three elected student members. This would almost seem to deny the academic and democratic aspects of the university.

By which he meant the college of art.

There are these three possible changes that would alter the situation sufficiently. Either the president becomes a non-voting member, or the chairman becomes a non-voting member, because in the Act the chairman must be one of the appointed people, or the number of students and academics should be increased by one from each group.

So there are a number of possible changes in this Act, Mr. Speaker, which would change the principles involved in the representation on the council.

For the final evidence from people involved, I would like to quote from a very lengthy letter I received on the subject, from Mr. Stephen Langden, the president of the student administrative council at the University of Toronto. Mr. Langden, I should note, made it quite clear, that these were his personal views and not the views of the students' administrative council at the U of T.

On the issues of the principles incorporated in the council, Mr. Langden says, and this is a very good point by a very astute observer in the university scene today in Canada, and I should say, sir, in my opinion, a very responsible observer of the university scene, Mr. Langden says this:

It is my feeling that the correct relationship between government and an educational institution implies that The Department of University Affairs should represent the people of the province in all negotiations with regard to money and so forth. It seems to me that the nine members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council are, at best, superfluous, and at worst dangerous to the public interest as a whole.

Mr. Langden continues:

My conception of relations between an institution such as the College of Art and the government, would be that the governing council of the institution be responsible directly to the institution. That is to say, it be composed of, and chosen by, the members of that institution. These members should then have to negotiate for the funds which they require with the Ontario government, and that government should have the responsibility to the people of the province as a whole, and at that point, see to it that the public interest as a whole is followed. Thus I suggest there should not be members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor at all.

This is Mr. Langden's view, Mr. Speaker, of the relationship between government and university. I think it is an interesting view. I think it is a view that has merit of consideration, and I would accept those parts of it that say the government should really exercise its influence not by appointing people to the governing council of the Ontario College of Art, but by negotiating with that council which is reflective of the institution.

I would also point out that I feel there is a balance, a different type of approach, a more balanced approach, which might be an acceptable solution in terms of the principle of the council.

The student council's executive at the Ontario college believes that the council of the Ontario College of Art should be reconstituted to consist of the president, six members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, six members elected from and by the academic staff, and six members elected from and by the students registered at the college. And, in making this recommendation, through me, to the government, and I am sure they have made it to the ministry themselves directly, they point out that they recognize:

the responsibility of the government to protect the public interest in educational institutions which are supported by public funds.

However, the student executive continues:

If the college is to have no direct influence in its choice of the lay members of its council, then surely a more equitable solution could be found.

They suggest the tri-partite division, if you like, of six members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, by the Minister, six elected from and by the academic staff, and six members elected from and by the students, with the president in there. And I, sir, would endorse this principle of the composition of the council rather than the principle which is now incorporated in the bill that the Minister has brought forward.

Just in closing, on that particular principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I do not think any group within the institution should dominate the council. I think students should be represented, for example. But I do not believe they should have the power to run the institution themselves. The university does not belong to the students, the Ontario College of Art does not belong to the students, just as it does not belong to

the government, just as it does not belong to the principal of the school or the president of the college, just as it does not belong to the teachers.

It is a collectivity. It is a place of learning, and it belongs to everyone who is associated with it, and that, of course, Mr. Speaker, includes the public.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member speaking to the—

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I accept his critique, and I think his views should be represented directly in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But the member disagrees with him.

Mr. T. Reid: I disagree with him to the extent that the Ontario College of Art council should be composed along the lines as suggested by the students at that college.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): If it makes the member feel better, I agree with him.

Mr. T. Reid: I am sure we will hear from the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I should make my position a bit more clear on this particular issue. If The Department of University Affairs was abolished and the Minister did not have that particular job and could devote more time to education, and so do a better job there, if the advisory committee on university affairs did not exist, and in place of that we had an independent universities commission, then I think, I would be much closer to Stephen Langden's view about the council at the Ontario College of Art.

But until The Department of University Affairs is abolished, and until we have an independent universities commission, then I think that the council, as proposed by the student executive of the College of Art, contains the proper principles.

Another principle I would like to turn to, Mr. Speaker, is this. The bill contains the principle that only full-time academic staff are eligible to be represented on the council. I would like to let the Minister, who has introduced this bill, and the members of the Legislature know the views of a staff member at the Ontario College of Art.

The letter I have received from the staff member notes that there are six members

elected from and by the full time academic staff. Then this person goes on to say:

This clause clearly and decisively places whatever power the staff will have through six elected members in council in the hands of the senior members of the faculty.

The letter continues:

As you are perhaps aware, the practice at the Ontario College of Art has often been to appoint junior people to a part-time position. Sometimes they are working artists who want only a limited teaching commitment. Sometimes they are people from the business community who prefer to keep their outside interests. This clause denies them the right to participate in the future development of the college and to be consulted in decisions affecting their own welfare.

The letter continues, Mr. Speaker:

Naturally, the full time faculty tends to be older and perhaps less capable of new approaches and attitudes. Some of them have been closely identified with the present administration of the college and with the kind of decisions that that administration has made with the disastrous results that were evident at the college last spring.

This particular letter concludes, Mr. Speaker, by stating:

I would plead strongly for a voice for faculty members, either on the basis of teaching load, say half time or years of service, say three years or more. In my experience many of the junior part-time faculty have a great deal to contribute to the college in terms of ideas, energy, rapport with the student body.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that when one examines the Ontario College of Art, when one examines certain administrative decisions that have been made in the past that this college is unique, or has a "special characteristic"—that perhaps would be a better term—and that characteristic is that the college relies very heavily on part-time teachers.

These part-time teachers often have titles which are not the senior titles. My understanding is that somewhere between 30 and 40 per cent of the people who teach at the Ontario College of Art are part-time. I would say that the principle in this bill which excludes them from participating effectively at the highest level of decision making is a principle that is wrong in terms of that institution.

These part-time people, many of whom have taught at the Ontario College of Art for many years, are being denied representation on the council. I would say that this principle, the principle of exclusion of up to and perhaps over one-third of the people who teach at that college of art from democratic participation in a decision-making process is a principle that should be denied by this Legislature.

Before I move on from that principle, Mr. Speaker, I would say, if I could have the Minister's attention because it has to do with some of the comments he has made about my views on education—perhaps he is too busy talking about how to cut back in university funds even more with the Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton). The Minister says that the various institutions of higher education have different characteristics, therefore, he does not want uniform legislation. Here, the Ontario College of Art, sir, is an institution with a very large part-time staff, larger than is normal at any other institution of higher education in this province that I know of, and that uniqueness is not recognized in the Minister's own bill.

So I would say to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, that either he drops the argument that he does not like legislating principles applicable to all institutions of higher education in this province because they have unique characteristics, or he accepts the recommendation I have received from a number of people at the College of Art that the part-time people be franchised as well.

I am pointing out to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, that there are many, many part-time people at the college who have been disfranchised by this bill. The Minister will have time to make a complete rebuttal, when I finish my remarks.

All I am saying is that he cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Lewis: He will defend the Minister's right to rebut.

Mr. T. Reid: Who knows, Mr. Speaker, the member for Scarborough West might even side with the Minister again on this bill.

There is another principle and, that is, that only—

Mr. Sopha: East is east and west is west!

Mr. Lewis: And I wish he would redistribute those ridings.

Mr. T. Reid: Another principle incorporated in the bill, Mr. Speaker, is that only academic staff employees are eligible to be on the council or to vote for people to be on the council. My view of an institution—and I suppose I apply this particularly to the institutions that call themselves universities or colleges—is that all the people associated with those institutions should have some say, even a token say, in the decisions made by that institution that affect their livelihood.

Stephen Langden notes in his letter to me, Mr. Speaker, that:

So far as I can tell, no provision has been made for other than academic employees of the institution on the council. As I recall the crisis there last year, the non-academic employees, most especially the models used, played a distinctive role in the affair. I would suggest that for you to leave them out—

And I suppose he is talking to the Minister.

—I would suggest that for the Minister to leave them out of the governing structure is both shortsighted and unacceptable.

Now, I make the Minister aware of his point of view and that I support it fully. I have made that point repeatedly in this House, in my own discussions about the governance of university bodies.

The principle, I think, is that the non-teaching staff at an institution and by that, I do not mean the deans and assistant deans and chairmen, vice-presidents, I mean the people who work there, people like departmental secretaries who make departments function, should feel they have a say or at least have their views represented on the governing council.

But this principle, Mr. Speaker, is reinforced by the unique nature of the Ontario College of Art. There are many people closely associated with that college who are not academics, or who are not members of the teaching staff. They are people who have technical skills, whether they be models or people who provide some of the equipment necessary for the teaching members of the institution to carry out their function, the learning process. There are many people at this college, people who feel they have an interest in the college, people who have knowledge about the college, and people, who I think, should not be disfranchised from voting or being themselves on the governing council. So I object, Mr. Speaker, to the principle that only academic staff em-

ployees are eligible to be members of the council and to be voters of the council.

There is another principle in this bill, Mr. Speaker, and that principle lies in the way in which the selection of heads of teaching divisions and departments is made in section 6(b).

Stephen Langden, I think, makes a very good point on this issue. Remember what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the power of selecting heads of teaching divisions and departments in the college. In the Act it says in section 6(b), that the council may appoint and remove the heads of all divisions and departments—administrative officers, teaching staff and other such officers and employees as the council deems necessary or expedient for the purposes of the college.

Let me read to members what Stephen Langden says about this. He says:

The centralized power of the council to appoint and remove the heads of divisions and departments and the said courses of study as outlined in this section of the Act also strikes me as unacceptable.

The major problem of the college last year centered about the integrity of the department. I would suggest that the centralizing authority both for appointment of heads of divisions and departments, and for the setting of courses of studies be to the persons involved in the department which would be both more efficient, more democratic and more likely to lead to the education really desired by the people involved.

I support this principle that there must be in the Act, provision for fuller discussion. Stephen Langden is a very sensible fellow. There must be fuller consultation than is implied in this Act on the appointments of heads of divisions. Anyone who has discussed the problems at the college last year will realize that we are concerned with shifting power within that institution. And to make more rigid the existing power structure through legislation, I think, might bring the downfall of the college.

So I say, sir, that the principle of selection does not go far enough. The principle of selection should include at least the recommendation of the president who has received recommendation from members of the teaching staff, full and parttime, and other divisions and departments concerned. That type of consultation should take place first.

Another principle is the principle of the

one-tier system and I accept this as a good form of government. I object very strongly to the contrary principle, that it is useful or helpful to divide the universities along two tiers. So I would commend Dr. Wright and I would commend the Minister of University Affairs, Mr. Speaker, for accepting this single tier principle of university government in the case of the Ontario College of Art.

Another principle can be called the principle of "exclusion of eligibility" from the chairmanship of the council to certain members of the council. As one can note, Mr. Speaker, the Act, as drafted at the present time, states that the chairman of the council must be one of the members of the council appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Section 4 of the Act states, "The council shall elect a chairman from among the members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council."

Again, I cannot conceive why this type of statement must go in a university Act or college Act, as we move into the 1970's. I cannot understand why this principle of exclusion of eligibility of the faculty and student members of the council should be incorporated in this Act.

The principle of exclusion, Mr. Speaker, seems to be based on the assumption of fear of faculty and students. What is there to be worried about? If the members of the council, including the nine members appointed by what amounts to the Minister of University Affairs, why should he, as the Minister, be worried about a faculty member or a student being elected in a democratic way from and by all the members of the council, particularly when the people he appoints together with the president, have a majority of the votes.

So I suggest, sir, this principle of exclusion is shortsighted and based on the assumption of suspicion and fear. Why does the Minister not follow, for example, the principles incorporated in Bill Pr32, McMaster University Act? The McMaster Act says with regard to the board that the board shall elect a chairman from amongst members. It does not say from amongst the members who have been appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Well, McMaster is a two-tier system. It says about the senate that the president shall be chairman, so that is restrictive.

Again, in some senates, as I noted to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, the senate itself can elect anyone from amongst their members.

He does not have to be a particular member of the senate. I will conclude by saying that I cannot understand why the Minister, in bringing forth his public bill, which is his responsibility as Minister of University Affairs, has incorporated in that bill the principle of exclusion of eligibility for the chairmanship of the council.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have discussed some of the principles incorporated in the bill. I think there are many other more specific matters which could be discussed, and which I probably could drag in as matters of principle, but I will not do so at this present time.

Mr. Lewis: What does the member suggest?

Mr. T. Reid: I have just listed about eight of them.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Did it very ably too!

Mr. B. Newman: The member has not been paying attention there.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the opportunity of trying to drill into the head of the hon. member for Scarborough West what my views are. My views are these sir, that there are a number of principles that should be incorporated in this bill, which are contrary to the principles now incorporated in the bill. I believe that the teaching members, whether they be part-time or full-time, the teaching members of the staff of the Ontario College of Art, together with the students should comprise a majority of the council. The principle of the bill—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the member said that.

Mr. T. Reid: I thank the Minister, but the hon. member for Scarborough West does not seem to be able to listen too well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Go on to the others please.

Mr. T. Reid: As I said very clearly, I thought, Mr. Speaker, there should be six members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, because we do not have an independent university commission yet in the province. I believe that part-time members, particularly at the Ontario College of Art, should be eligible to be on the council and should be able to vote as well. Perhaps in a pro-rated way, I would leave that open.

Mr. Lewis: How does the member pro rate voting?

Mr. T. Reid: Well, this is an issue. Without getting into detail, the principle is that the part-time staff, have indeed the part-time students, should have fair representation on the council. Another principle which we stand for Mr. Speaker, is that people should not be excluded from being chairman of the council because they are teachers or students.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point clear. I was pleased with the response to my request, and I pass the information of the people who replied to my request for further information to the Minister in a constructive way.

As I said in my letter soliciting this information, when legislation comes before this House, myself, who happens to have the role of the university affairs critic for the official Opposition should be informed of the issues behind a particular bill, and should know perhaps the views of the various people concerned about the bill as proposed by the government, I should be able to represent the views of people who might not have had an adequate opportunity to make their views known, and be given the peculiar history of the Ontario College of Art. It is a place where there is a real power struggle going on, so I am very pleased to have this opportunity to make these views known to the Minister, and to suggest, sir, that he take this bill back and amend it in a number of

respects so that it contains many more democratic principles than it does at the present time. In fact, I would suggest, sir that many principles are quite undemocratic.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the member for Scarborough East—I have no difficulty in distinguishing between the constituencies—I am very pleased that the member for Scarborough East ended as he did because he may then have the opportunity to support the amendment which we, in this group will make at the end of our argument on second reading.

I would request, sir, in view of the Speaker's dinner, which is due in some four minutes' time, and because we too have a distended contribution to make, that I could move the adjournment of the debate if the House leader agrees.

Mr. Lewis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we plan to discuss Bill 83, which is in committee of the whole House, and then turn to estimates.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Introducing 24 civil servants from many parts of the world, Mr. Welch	2753
Final report, standing private bills committee, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence	2753
Burwash inmates, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman	2753
Daily rate for nursing homes, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Gaunt	2753
Brockville psychiatric hospital, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mrs. M. Renwick	2754
Effluent flow, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Young	2754
Copper Cliff smelter, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Martel	2754
Humane trapping, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Martel	2755
Medical doctor for Schreiber, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Stokes	2755
Judge Lucien Kurata, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Bullbrook	2755
Sales tax on production machinery, questions to Mr. White, Mr. Peacock	2756
Legal aid plan, tabling report, Mr. Wishart	2756
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	2758
Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Welch, continued	2778
Recess, 6 o'clock	2786

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests this afternoon in the east gallery are students from Ridgetown District High School in Ridgetown; and in the west gallery, from St. Raymond's Separate School in Toronto and Monarch Park Secondary School in Toronto.

At this time, the hon. Provincial Secretary has guests whom we also wish to have introduced to the House.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce to you, and to the members of the House, 24 civil servants from many parts of the world who are at present seated in your gallery at the north of the Chamber.

They have been attending a three-day seminar arranged by this department in co-operation with the Canadian International Development Agency of the government of Canada, and six Ontario government departments which have provided seminar speakers. The departments are those of Agriculture and Food, Education, Health, Municipal Affairs, the Treasury Board and, of course, my own department. All of the speakers have described to these students the procedures which govern the operations of these departments.

All of these officials, Mr. Speaker, have been chosen by their respective governments to learn as much as they can about Canadian methods of administration. We are happy that Ontario has been chosen for the sixth consecutive year to conduct this seminar.

I should explain that these young people are in the midst of a course in public administration at Carleton University in Ottawa.

Our guests in the Chamber today represent 12 countries in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and South and Central America, and they are accompanied by officials of both the federal government and Carleton University.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I speak for all members of the House when I wish them every success in their studies here and indeed even greater success when they proceed to

apply what they have learned to the greater advancement of the countries from which they have come.

To each of them we extend the hand of friendship and goodwill.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's 13th and final report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the city of Toronto (2).

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the city of Toronto (1).

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Your committee would recommend that the following bills, having been withdrawn, be not reported:

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the town of Whitby.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 24, the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) asked me a supplementary question with regard to inmates concerned with the Burwash incident which took place on February 4. He asked how many of these inmates were still being held in detention. The answer, as to that date, none.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce has a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

Upon what basis did the department arrive at a daily rate of \$9.50 for nursing homes under The Homes for Special Care Act?

How can the Minister justify the rate in view of the fact that the rate for county homes for the aged, excluding capital costs, is \$12 per day?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I answered the first part of the hon. member's question, placed by the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown), on Friday, March 21, pages 2568-69 *Hansard*.

To answer the second part, the information I have from The Department of Social and Family Services is that the county homes for the aged rates range between \$3.69 and \$9.24 per day; charitable institutions are subsidized through The Department of Social and Family Services up to 80 per cent of \$8 per day.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a question from yesterday of the Minister of Health.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health:

How many staff vacancies for doctors exist at the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital at this time?

What is being done to fill those vacancies?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Three, Mr. Speaker, and as usual we are trying in every way we possibly can through advertising in the professional journals to fill the vacancies that are there in Brockville. I must admit that there are not enough psychiatrists, apparently, to go round.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

As recently as a month to six weeks ago, was the vacancy then eight? Have we filled five vacancies or was that an incorrect figure of eight originally in the health committee?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know to what the hon. member refers. There are three vacancies presently. That is what my complement calls for.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

What is the stream flow in July and August at the point where the Baif Associates development in Vaughan township will discharge its effluent?

What will be the comparative effluent flow at that point?

What type of sewage disposal plant will be constructed?

To what standard will the effluent be processed?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part, one to two cubic feet per second; second part 2.6 cubic feet per second; the third—activated sludge with effluent polishing, chlorination and nutrient removal; and the last part—to the highest degree technologically obtainable.

Mr. Young: Could I ask the Minister for the first figure again, I am sorry to have missed it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: One to two cubic feet per second.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East, has questions for the Minister of Mines and the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): A question of the Minister of Mines:

Because of written complaints on July 10, 1968, January 31, 1969, and March 21, 1969, by Mr. Paul Palkowski on behalf of the men working in the crushing plant in Copper Cliff with respect to the high gas and dust concentrations, and because the Minister's staff has indicated in the past that these conditions do not exist, will the Minister instruct his staff to accept the offer of the safety and health committee of the United Steelworkers of America to point out to them the time and place for the appropriate tests to be taken?

What action does the Minister intend to take to ensure improvements in the dust and gas concentrations being experienced at the crushing plant in Copper Cliff smelter?

If it is impossible for the men to wear protective equipment while performing heavy manual labour, as is being stated, will the Minister ensure that these men will not be disciplined if they refuse to work in gas and dust concentrations which are too high?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, we have repeatedly conducted our own survey in this part of the crushing plant in Copper Cliff and we have used, on a consultative basis, the environmental health branch of The Department of Health.

Our jurisdiction and our authority relate to the safety and the health of the men working in these plants, and the survey is made by engineers, both for us, by The Department

of Health, and by our own engineers, who have consistently come to the conclusion that it is not considered that a significant health hazard is present in that crushing plant.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has question of another Minister.

Mr. Martel: Several questions of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Is The Department of Lands and Forests co-operating with the National Research Council, other provincial governments or the federal government to find a substitute for the leg-hold trap? Will The Department of Lands and Forests make funds available to do research to eliminate the leg hold trap and to find better ways for humane trapping?

How widespread is the department's training programme for trappers? Will this course become mandatory? Will the government provide assistance to trappers to change over from leg hold traps to more humane trapping?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Sudbury East.

1. The department has co-operated with the National Research Council by consultation in effort to develop a humane trap.

2. The department, through its continuing programme of trapper education, promotes humane trapping practices. The leg hold trap used in a drowning set is a humane trapping device. It takes less than three minutes to drown a fur bearing animal. Since the National Research Council is underwriting the cost of research on traps, this department has no immediate intention of making funds available for such research.

3. Through direct contact and local trappers' councils the department officers meet most trappers annually and instruction in trapping technique is given at working sessions of these councils.

4. The degree of interest shown by trappers has not indicated a need for a mandatory course.

5. Assistance to trappers in changing over from one type of trap to another has not been considered and will not be until a satisfactory new type of trap is developed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the municipality of Schreiber was able to persuade an English doctor to

practice in their town would the Minister prevail upon the Ontario Medical Association to allow him to go into practice immediately upon his arrival in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Medical Association has nothing to do with this, but the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario is the body of course.

It is my understanding that if a physician is a graduate of a recognized British University—that includes the English—he would be eligible to begin practice under supervision by having his name put on the special register as soon as he arrives in Canada. However, without knowing the specific details of the person in question I could not answer the question more definitively than that.

Mr. Stokes: If I might ask a supplementary: Who would supervise him in an isolated northern town? Would it be possible to make some kind of arrangement like this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, it really could be because he could come under the supervision of the medical officer of health. That is just one example. I am quite sure that a system could be worked out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General: in view of the observations made by the Attorney General to the House on February 13, 1969, in relation to the institution of an inquiry under The Provincial Courts Act into the conduct of Judge Lucien Kurata. In particular, I refer to where he said that in his opinion there was not sufficient evidence to warrant the laying of criminal charges. Would the Attorney General inform the House whether in the light of the evidence adduced in the inquiry he has changed his opinion?

In any event, has the Attorney General considered the question of whether he should discontinue the inquiry and proceed with the matter in the courts of justice?

Has the Attorney General any observations to make to the House in connection with the conduct of the inquiry by Mr. Justice Keith with particular reference to the admission of evidence which would not ordinarily be admissible in a court of law?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, without in any way suggesting that the question the hon. member has asked is not in order, I would think it unwise on my part to make any comment upon the inquiry while it is going on. Certainly, I would not

reply to the third part of the question. I think any comment might prejudice either the administration of justice or the party whose conduct is being inquired into.

Mr. Bullbrook: If the Attorney General would permit a supplementary question in this connection, I am prepared, of course, Mr. Speaker, to accept the position taken by the hon. Attorney General, if he feels that comments on these questions, or responses to them, might in any way prejudice the hearing. I purposely phrased the questions, if I might, sir, so that in my opinion they would not. But I am wondering if the Attorney General would consider, after the termination of this particular hearing, if he might reply to this question as to the general aspect of the admission of evidence and right of cross-examination relative to inquiries under The Provincial Courts Act?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intend of course in any event to review the evidence. I would be very glad then to discuss all the matters raised in the hon. member's questions and perhaps other matters that are relative to the inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West has a question.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue: Is the Minister aware of any instances in which the proposed extension of the sales tax to production machinery and equipment is forcing companies which had planned to locate in Ontario, to alter their plans and locate elsewhere?

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): No.

Mr. Peacock: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: has the Minister received correspondence from manufacturers and representatives of manufacturers suggesting this might be the case?

Hon. Mr. White: A number of letters have been written, in particular to the Treasurer, objecting to this and other taxes, as one might expect, because no one likes to pay taxes, able businessmen least of all, I suppose one could say. These letters say it is going to be detrimental to their industry and they try to make that case. We have evidence to indicate it will not be burdensome for the industries concerned and the information that I put before the House during the debate is the point of view which we continue to hold.

Mr. Stokes: That is not true.

Mr. Peacock: Specifically, what I asked the Minister, Mr. Speaker, was whether he had received correspondence suggesting to him that certain industries would not locate in Ontario which had planned earlier to do so?

Hon. Mr. White: Not to my knowledge, no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General has a request.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to table the annual report of the Law Society of Upper Canada on the Ontario legal aid plan and the annual report of the advisory committee on legal aid. Both of these reports are for the year ending March 31, 1968, and they present to the people of the province a comprehensive and informative picture of the legal aid plan.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of the province may be proud of this unique plan which, in its first year of operation, provided legal assistance to over 118,000 people at a cost of approximately \$4,080,000. The report of the law society provided extensive statistics which may be of interest to the hon. members, but these statistics alone cannot reflect the fundamental concept of justice, and equity, that are inherent in the legal aid systems under the plan.

No person may read these reports without a deep realization of the significant advance which the Ontario plan represents in the development of meaningful rights and liberties.

The report of the advisory committee is interesting in its new concept, as it provides an objective review of the annual report on the Ontario legal aid plan. We thus have before us, a commentary of a group representing the public, the social agencies, the bench and the bar, and these views are quite independent of those put forward by the persons who administered the plan. They are most helpful and we are indebted to those men who serve us by acting as members of this advisory committee. They do so because of their spirit of public service, and their dedication to the concept represented by the plan.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members will share the concern of the advisory committee as expressed about particular aspects of legal aid in Ontario.

For my own part I wish to advise the House that I will be introducing a bill for its consideration, which will represent the implementation of some principles designed to im-

prove and modify the plan. At the same time, I am proceeding with amendments to the regulations, which will have a similar purpose and effect.

Early in January of this year, my officials met with representatives of the law society, and The Department of Social and Family Services, to institute a review of the criteria on which eligibility for legal assistance is assessed. This review is presently in the hands of the welfare officers of the latter department, so that we were even then implementing one of the recommendations of the advisory committee.

The areas of possible abuse have concerned us all. The Law Society has been diligent in this regard, insofar as it relates to the legal profession, and severe disciplinary action has already been taken in one case while investigations are readily taken wherever circumstances justify such action. Special investigators and auditors are made available as required, and no effort is spared to ensure the proper administration of this aspect of the legal aid plan.

The report emphasized the effectiveness of the administrative devices that are being used to achieve this efficient and revealing supervision of the services and funds which are being administered under the plan.

The contributory aspect of the system will constantly be kept before all of us engaged in this programme, in order that its true purpose and effect can be achieved.

I commend these reports to the attention of the people of the province, Mr. Speaker, I believe they take pride and satisfaction in having provided this most significant and fundamental assistance to those citizens who have need of this important social service.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question by way of clarification? I note he used the term modification. Is the import of his remarks that there is going to be a curtailment of the right of persons to have legal aid available to them under the plan? Is that the meaning of the term modification of the system? Is this going to be accomplished through some curtailment of the financial regulations or rules under which legal aid is provided?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. I think it is well taken.

I have mentioned the intention to submit legislation very shortly of amendments to the plan and regulations. I do not want to refuse to assist the hon. member but, I would ask if perhaps he might be good

enough to read these reports and allow me to expand then upon that whole matter, perhaps, as I introduce the legislation. It is difficult for me to get into it when I am about to introduce some legislation and these reports have not been studied.

Mr. Bullbrook: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General, and if I am unfair you will tell me, but is the Minister going to consider in the proposed legislation the question of strengthening—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is not asking for clarification of the report. He is now asking the hon. Minister about the report which has been tabled.

Mr. Bullbrook: With respect, sir. During the course of his remarks, the hon. Attorney General related to legislation that he anticipates bringing before this House. I was just going to ask by way of clarification if he anticipates the strengthening of the recovery aspect of costs under the plan?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That will be one of the features. I can certainly go that far.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege again. One of the most important privileges of membership in this House is fair reporting, and the reason that this is so very important is because we represent so many thousands of people and the only way we can reach the people whom we represent is through the press.

On Tuesday, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) rose in the House and made certain remarks in reply to a question which I had submitted. These remarks were extensively and elaborately quoted in the *Toronto Telegram* and the other newspapers.

Yesterday I rose to correct the record on that matter. The other two daily newspapers, in their usual responsible way, printed both sides of the coin. In yesterday's papers they printed the Treasurer's comments while today, they printed my explanation. The *Telegram*, of course, is making no effort to correct the misinformation which was placed in yesterday's paper. In fact, in today's paper they have a further article which is headed "Debt Issue Made Public and Widow Breaks Down". In the sum of that article they state:

Mr. MacNaughton had attacked Doctor Shulman for trying to pressure the government into garnisheeing her wages.

This, of course, is not correct.

Unfortunately we, as members of this House, are only entitled to the privilege of fair reporting in theory. In actual practice this privilege, particularly as it applies to Opposition members, depends on the willingness of the government to preserve that privilege. I am only too aware that this government is beholden to the *Telegram*—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member can dish it out, but he cannot take it!

Mr. Shulman: I am dishing a little out now. I am only too aware that this government is so beholden—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is now off his point of personal privilege.

Mr. Shulman: No, sir, I am not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now not speaking to a point of personal privilege. He is attacking the members on the other side of the government and it is not open to him to do it in that manner.

Mr. Shulman: I do not wish to attack any member of the government; I wish to complete my point of privilege. The point is that we can only have this privilege if the government extends it to us. I am only too aware that it is useless to appeal to the government at this time to have this privilege asserted and I am bringing this matter up only at this time so it may go on the record. I am aware there is nothing you can do about it. I wish this matter on the record so that after the next election, I can request that the appropriate action be taken.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member amended his remarks, I agree that they are quite in order and I would presume that that closes the matter for the time being.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, if I may.

In looking at the order paper, I notice that questions I have asked of the government take up approximately three pages, and I am not unappreciative of the fact that this is costing the taxpayers of the province considerable money to reprint these inquiries day after day. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that, the government, having recognized I asked these questions, we discontinue printing them day after day because I do not want all that unnecessary expense.

Either let the government answer my questions or please let them be removed from the order paper but only for the purposes of printing. Let them remain on there—I still

want the answers—but I do not think the three pages ought to be printed every day at considerable expense to the government. I would estimate that it must run into hundreds of dollars daily just to print three inquiries. If there is a way that they need not be reproduced or perhaps reproduced once a week until they are answered, I would appreciate that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 6th order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

The hon. the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That every corporation as defined in The Corporations Tax Act shall pay to Her Majesty for the use of Ontario, the taxes imposed by that Act in accordance with that Act,

as amended by the provisions of Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

On section 1:

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, on section 1, I would like to move an amendment on section 1, subsection 5.

I move that subsection 18 of section 5 of the Act, as enacted by subsection 5 of section 1 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(18) every corporation referred to in clauses (i), (l) and (m) of subsection 37 of section 4, and subsection 1 of section 45, shall, in lieu of the tax payable under section 1, pay a tax of \$50.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is certainly clear.

Hon. Mr. White: Perhaps I can offer an explanation.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Hon. Mr. White: A word of explanation, Mr. Chairman. The (a) was dropped because while the Act has, I suppose since the beginning of time, levied a nominal tax on muni-

capital corporations with share capital, there are no such corporations left in Ontario. Therefore, there is no point in perpetuating that particular provision.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Have you just discovered that?

Mr. Singer: That is a great discovery; it justifies your portfolio all by itself.

Hon. Mr. White: The other change is to delete the words "including a co-operative corporation". It was not the Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton) intention that capital tax on co-operative corporations be limited to \$50 when the Act was drafted. The co-operative corporations were put in that category in error and I did not catch it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to section 1.

First of all I would have you, Mr. Chairman, advert to what was said about this capital tax by Smith at 113 of his book:

The continuance of the capital and place-of-business taxes in their present complex form cannot be readily justified. Their nuisance value is too high in relation to the revenue yield, particularly since they, too, are now payable only to the extent that they exceed the tax on income. While we recognize the point that they have some value to the administration as a means of identifying, for the purpose of assuring that the income is not evaded, incorporated enterprises doing business in Ontario, we note that federal authorities and authorities in other jurisdictions manage without this form of impost.

Then jumping down a bit he says:

An amount of revenue equivalent to the yield from the present complex capital and place-of-business taxes could be obtained by a single annual corporate business tax payable by a corporation.

Then he goes on to recommend that a \$50 levy be made.

This section does not take cognizance of the recommendations made by the Smith report, not does it in turn appear to be aware of what was recommended in the committee. What has happened in this section is that the place-of-business tax, which is a further section along and deleted, is not incorporated into the capital tax whereas the recommendation was that both of these taxes should be tossed out and incorporated into a third tax, a business tax levy.

Why this occurred I would be most inter-

ested to learn, because really all we have here is a retention of a formal taxation which on two occasions, after good scrutiny, had been said to be inefficient, onerous, administratively bad, and so on. But if I may address my remarks to the hon. Minister, I am terribly interested in seeing how, in turning over this tax, he is able to maintain the levies; how he is able to maintain and exceed anything being collected, or come anywhere close to what is collected, under the present situation. Smith discloses—I will not run through all the figures, starting with 1961 and coming to 1966—on page 82 of his book that the capital tax in 1966 brought in \$2,239,000, and the place of business tax brought in \$1,500,000.

The differential between these two taxes down through the years is pretty well parallel. What we have done here is take the \$1,500,000 out so it becomes a deductible item from the \$2,300,000. In other words, just a little over \$1 million would be collectible under the capital tax that was then.

You have doubled the rate, but if it is just a little over a million, then the most that it could reach, superficially, would be somewhere in the region of \$3 million. Your budget statement has indicated, I believe, a figure of \$17 million. The partial explanation, perhaps, is that whereas formerly they were able to make a deduction from the income tax—or *vice versa*, that the income tax was deductible from the levy—now this the tax, as applied, would be in addition thereto.

I would like assurance from the Minister that this factor, perhaps the most salient one, is the determining one also with respect to these increased revenues that he is expecting to get from the imposition of this new tax rate and this new tax.

I have several rather more minor thoughts touching this section. I notice that there is no provision, as the section is set out, allowing for taxation on a *pro rata* basis for only part of a fiscal year. I believe that was contained in the earliest Corporations Tax Act. Is that an oversight or an omission? Does the hon. Minister intend that the full levy should fall, irrespective of how long the company has been in operation in that particular fiscal year?

Apart from that, the section in question should be differentiated from the second section. In other words, this Corporations Tax Act in its amendment and in its scope touches on three major sections of the Act itself.

The fourth section is the income tax section. The fifth section is the capital tax section, and there is the sixth section of the Act, all of which have numerous subsections, each one being interrelated to the other. For instance, the capital tax set up incorporates and refers back to some of the 43 subsections of section 4. Section 5, the capital tax section as such, has 17 subsections, some of which are presently being either deleted or changed.

There are numerous exemptions allowed. This is in continuity with the previous legislation. In subsection 2 of section 1, adversion is made to sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 13, under which the tax is not payable. If the hon. members would inspect those sections they would see that they apply seriatim, to banks, the railway mileage tax, the telegraph companies, to wireless companies, to car companies and to certain kinds of insurance companies.

But why are they exempted in the terms of this Act?

Again, the recommendation of Smith was that these so-called special taxes should be caught up and brought into a general levy, and a single form filed. I believe that the same type of recommendation, under 274 of the recommendations, was made by the Smith committee; that a single proposed annual corporate business tax be collected and that a single form be used.

Again, as in the previous legislation, the hon. Minister will probably claim that he is clearing out a little underbrush prior to entering into the forest. But the point is that in this type of legislation you can hardly see the forest for the trees. The whole point of the exercise was not just to clear a little underbrush here and there so that we can come on some straight paths, but to make the path straight to the centre of the forest.

If one reads through these Acts—they are intricate enough, heaven knows—in trying to disinter what exactly is the intent of section after section, and the inter-relationships among the sections without having had the opportunity to launch forthrightly into it, as we recommend it to be done, obviously it can be done without preserving a whole host of exceptions and anomalies.

The thing might have been attacked now, once and for all. But no. All it is, is an alteration in the rate structure, a certain basic tax of \$50 imposed, leaving a whole host of these anomalies and discrepancies which we felt were burdening the business operations of the province. Why have you not gone further? In other words, you have had this

opportunity, to make some further pruning and grow a straight apple tree instead of one that is all burred over.

I want to go one step further on this section 2. It ties in more, I suppose, with the subsection 5 which refers to a whole host of various types of corporations, some of which fall inside a certain figure, some of which fall outside. Up to this time, section 5—the capital tax section—referred always to section 4, subsection or paragraph 37, which contained the exemptions. Subsection 37 said that no tax whatsoever—I mean capital tax—would be levied upon certain corporations running from A to P.

Now what the Minister has done, and I will mention a few of these corporations in a moment, what the Minister has done, or appears to have done, is he has segregated some of these corporations from the other, namely four different types of corporations, and he has imposed the full range of the tax upon these of \$50. To the other ones he has applied a lesser tax, a mere \$5.

So, whereas previously there was no tax at all, he has further added to the underbrush in this taxation jungle which we were trying to do something with, by making a distinction between two different kinds.

A point I want to make to him right off the bat is that under 437(b) certain types of municipal and other forms of Crown corporations appear to be subject to the tax unless they are outside the tax by reason of section 58 of the Act.

I wonder if the Minister would clarify the point. It appears to me that that section and your retention of the section may be unconstitutional in so far as federal corporations or federal Crown agencies of various kinds under this legislation may fall under the provincial tax. I suggest that there should be some question as to its constitutionality.

The four kinds of companies that have been taken out of the exemption clause and the full range—that is the full range of the \$50 taxation now applied to them—are personal corporations. One can see the reason for that insofar as a personal corporation is taxed, the profits or dividends are taxed as moneys in the hands of the shareholders, and the corporate shell is voided or is penetrated and goes right through.

Therefore, it is like personal income and not as the two levels. The corporate tax, together with the dividends or profits, then transposes into the hands of the shareholders.

Nevertheless, these personal corporations do now have to pay at least \$50. The foreign

business corporations now have also had a tax imposed of \$50 where they had none previously. I see the beginning of the taxation on co-operatives taking place in this province. The co-operatives are now taxed \$50 also.

There was one other type of corporation, a type of mutual insurance companies which have premiums wholly derived from premiums from churches, schools, or other charitable institutions. Now, if that is the way in which their premiums are solely and entirely earned, I have some grave doubt as to whether such a type of corporation ought to fall into the tax at all, but I would leave it to the Minister to tell why these types of corporations are now being taxed under a capital tax levy when really they have no capital in that sense to tax. The capital of a co-op is obviously the various shares presented to it out of the pockets of the individuals and is held thus individually.

For the others, the tax of \$5 is really something that is superficial and picayune. Why would housing for aged be taxed \$50, while credit unions, housing corporations, farmers and fishermen's insurers, all be taxed \$5? The business of trying to collect the \$5 is probably going to outdistance by many times what you are going to receive back from the taxation.

Why not just leave them exempt as they have been up to the present time? What is the point of taxing non-profit corporations, charitable organizations, agricultural societies, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, various municipal bodies and agencies under the labour organizations, benevolent and fraternal benefit societies, the munificent sum of \$5? They say these taxes were nuisance taxes and that we had an obligation to alleviate the business men of this province of nuisances. Then the Minister comes along in one of his first acts of gallantry and imposes a further nuisance. I trust that the business community does not think the Minister himself is a nuisance in bringing forward legislation of this kind.

I would like to know again the justification, if any, for moving in this field in this way. And under that particular heading, just what precise sum of money would you hope to derive from a \$5 tax? What would be the aggregate sum? What would the administrative costs, to print forms, send them out, and supervise or police the collection, be in comparison to the aggregate collected?

I feel that there are many aspects of this

Act and this particular section which deserve no commendation at all.

Hon. Mr. White: I am interested in these comments, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, just a few comments before the Minister makes his comments and then we could perhaps finish off with them.

I would like to just ask him two questions.

1. Would he give us the rationale of this tax—why this flat rate tax has been historically or traditionally levied within the province?

2. Why is it a flat rate tax and not a progressive tax if it is going to be maintained as such?

The next point on which I would like clarification—the member for Lakeshore has alluded to it—is why did he, in fact abolish the place of business tax and then transfer those corporations to liability for paid-up capital tax at this nominal rate of \$5 in the classes which were formerly exempt from this tax?

These are the principal points that concern me about this clause. I have great difficulty in understanding why there should be this kind of a tax on a flat rate basis.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer the questions that have been posed here. I will start in the order that they were raised in the comments of the hon. members.

First of all, we come up with the yield of \$17 million as follows:

The gross amount anticipated is thought to be not less than \$26 million. Is my hon. friend with me to this point? I am explaining how we arrive at this estimation of \$17 million more.

Mr. Lawlor: I am all ears.

Hon. Mr. White: The gross amount anticipated is thought to be not less than \$26 million, from which we must deduct present collections—\$4.9 million; produced Ontario income tax—\$3.1 million; and other adjustments because of the timing in of the tax \$1 million. That brings us back to \$17 million.

Now, of course, the reason for this very substantial increase is not so much that the rate was doubled but that the rate was doubled and it was made payable in addition to corporate income tax. That is the way we arrive at this figure.

I might add that the estimation is very difficult to make. We have used every statistical method available to us. Some of these methods turn up a somewhat larger gross than \$26 million. However, we think this is the best conservative gross estimation and that the \$17 million is the best conservative net estimation.

Mr. Lawlor: I followed the hon. Minister to the \$21 million figure; could we bring it down to \$17 million?

Hon. Mr. White: All right. Gross capital tax is \$26 million. This, less reduced Ontario income tax of \$3.1 million; less present collections of \$4.9 million; and other adjustments because of the timing in of the tax, \$1 million, which brings it back to the \$17 million.

If there are no questions on the aspect of yield, I would like to deal with the "prorating".

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question. Do I take that to mean that the income tax is no longer deductible from the paid-up capital tax. That, and the increased amount which the Minister states that he is going to obtain by reason of this, coupled with the deductibility under the federal income tax by corporations, means in substance that this is a transference of money which would otherwise go to the federal treasury, or to the provincial treasury—at least to some part of the amount which is stated. So, it is a direct transfer from the revenues of the federal government to the revenues of the provincial government.

Hon. Mr. White: A portion of the increase is—yes. I suppose one could say about 40 per cent of the increased revenue received by us will be offset—so far as the corporate taxpayer is concerned—by a decrease in the federal proportion of his corporate income tax. Of course I have mentioned already the amount that the Ontario tax receipts will diminish. Because of the 12 points the amount paid to Ontario will be decreased, in that this tax is applied in the determination of profit for corporate income tax purposes.

So far as the *pro rata* aspect is concerned, I am quite familiar with the proposition that this should be phased-in in some fashion. We considered the pros and cons of that and we decided that the method we have chosen is the most suitable for a number of reasons. This is not a tax on a period of time, this capital tax does not cover 12 months' or something.

This capital tax comes on at a point in time, namely, the fiscal year-end of the corporation involved. It is, in a sense, a licence fee for doing business in this province and for that reason it was decided that it should be payable in full commencing with the date cited by the Treasurer. This is not quite as severe as it looks because of the offset from corporation income tax, because the rate is relatively modest and I will deal with that more fully in a moment or two and because in the first year it will be paid as part of the fourth instalment. In subsequent years it will be spread out in six equal amounts, together with the corporation income tax.

I think it is not a bad tax. The main reason, I suppose one must admit, that we have not gotten rid of it is because it does turn up about \$26 million gross, which is a great deal of money and certainly at this time, we are not able to let go of that particular source of revenue. That fact that it is deductible from corporate income tax purposes maximizes our revenue while minimizing the burden on the business sector here in Ontario.

We have very greatly simplified this tax by eliminating the place of business tax, by having a minimum of \$50 so that we no longer have nickels and dimes—I will deal with the exceptions in a minute or two—but the tax, of course, has been increased from a twentieth to one-tenth of one per cent. On that point I think I should tell you that at one time Quebec had its rate of a twentieth, a few years ago it moved to a tenth, and this year it has moved to a fifth. So our capital tax, even with this increase, is just exactly half the capital tax being charged in the province of Quebec.

It is not, I think, an onerous tax to put on a corporation when one considers that the amount of tax is \$1,000 for every million dollars of capital, and a million-dollar corporation is a relatively strong taxpayer so that the \$1,000 I think in nearly all cases will be not too difficult for the corporation to pay.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Would the Minister accept a question at this point, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I am answering some questions. I have half a dozen here. Maybe the hon. member's will be one of these.

There are exceptions and in many cases the exceptions shown under this early clause are because there is a special kind of capital tax in another clause. Let me use the banks as an example. I have not the section in front

of me because it is not in the bill, but the banks pay on the capital in their corporation not only here in Ontario but worldwide, as I understand it. They pay a sum of money for their head office and several hundred dollars for each other office. They pay up to one-fifth of one per cent, if my memory serves me correctly, on the capital—I am sorry I do not have that section in front of me—and a lesser amount, I think one-tenth of one per cent, on their reserve.

The point I am trying to establish here—and I am not doing very well—is that because of the nature of the capital in this particular institution, the form of the tax is different. The exceptions which the member has referred to are—I have it here now—section 7, banks, taxes on paid up capital.

Every bank shall for every fiscal year thereof pay a tax of one-fifth of one per cent on the paid-up capital stock thereof and one-tenth of one per cent on the reserve fund and undivided profits thereof.

So the point I am trying to make is that these financial institutions and certain other types of corporations which are excepted in this clause referred to by the member for Lakeshore, are taxed in a special way because of the unusual form of their capital and that is done in subsequent sections.

Now, Crown corporations do pay this tax. The list of taxable Crown corporations is in my possession and if the hon. member wishes, I can read that list to him or alternatively, I can show it to him at a later date—perhaps that would be a more satisfactory method. The federal government permits its Crown corporations to pay these particular taxes and there has been no change in their approach as I understand it.

The co-operatives were taxed previously in rather an unusual way, they were required to pay a \$5 place of business tax for each of the first three years and then a place of business tax ranging from \$20 minimum to \$50 maximum on each of their outlets. This puts them on an equal footing with privately-owned enterprises but I must point out to you that the amount of money concerned is very small and I think will not be troublesome to this particular class of enterprise.

The active incorporated co-operatives with share capital in this province number 92. Those without share capital, 142. The estimated capital tax at one-tenth of one per cent is \$50,000, which is an increase over the previous tax of \$42,000. Now, \$42,000 spread among more than 200 co-operative enterprises and more than 100,000 co-opera-

tive shareholders, members and patrons, amounts to 50 cents each and we think that this is entirely fitting.

Mr. Lawlor: Then why bother at all? The argument cuts both ways.

Hon. Mr. White: Because, as both Smith and the select committee recommended, we want to get rid of this hodgepodge of taxation. And dealing with the capital tax, we want to have these enterprises on the same basis. Now, it may be, as the hon. member suggested, that some of these benevolent corporations, shall I say, should either be excepted or put on the same basis as a regular privately-owned enterprise. I think, as a matter of fact, there is more work to be done on that. But anyway we have taken a long stride on the straight and narrow path that the hon. member recommended.

Mr. J. Renwick: Perhaps the Minister would let me comment on that point, if that is convenient. I propose later on simply to move that clause 17 of subsection (5) of clause 1 of Bill 83 be deleted to eliminate the \$5 nuisance tax on, amongst others, agricultural organizations, charitable organizations, non-profit corporations, non-profit corporations for scientific research, housing for the aged, labour organizations, non-profit organizations such as clubs, credit unions, housing corporations, which are some of the ones which are listed as being subject to this \$5 nuisance tax. I propose the amendment both because of the nature of the corporations but also because of the point that the member for Lakeshore makes, that they are in the nature of nuisance taxes. However, I think the appropriate time to move the amendment would be a little bit later.

Hon. Mr. White: I will not be able to support that amendment because, while it may be wise, it may not be wise and I would want to have a very careful study done before we did this. The members of this select committee will remember that a very expensive aspect of administration was the marginal tax payer that was taxable one year and not taxable the next. That type of taxpayer, whether we are talking now about personal tax administered by the federal government, or some other tax, that type of tax payer must be followed up to ensure that he did not forget to pay the money that was owed. From an administrative point of view one of the reasons we found the credit approach to retail sales tax rather attractive, was because the administrative efficiency would be increased and not decreased by

having every head of household filing a personal income tax.

This, I think, is one of the reasons why we require such a return from every corporation. My hon. friends opposite will ask why we do not incorporate this with the provincial secretary's requirements. We have a task force on that subject doing this very thing. We have a degree of co-ordination now through the computer and it would be my hope that, I think not in this session, but my hope would be that in the next session we might hope to get closer to that objective.

Mr. Lawlor: Is it possible to tie that up?

Hon. Mr. White: Well that is what the task force is developing.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, I beg your pardon, the securities tax?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: I think that is not part of the study, but it is a suggestion that should be explored.

Now another reason I think, Mr. Chairman—as I understand it from the tax administrators—is that sometimes this type of corporation, which is now non-profit and benevolent and paying the nominal capital tax, may alter its status, or its operation, or its profit or capital position, and may, in fact, not be in the non-profit benevolent class. Sometimes, I am informed these corporations alter their character very greatly, and this—

Mr. Lawlor: They must have altered their charters too.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, the charter is sometimes very broad. At any rate, this is a reason that is offered to me for continuing this. I think that deals with the matters that have been questioned so far. If there are others.

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, mentioned the base of computation for the tax and how the tax of one-tenth of one per cent is now arrived at. In glancing over this aspect of the matter, there are two ranges of the tax—the paid-up capital of the corporation as a whole, and then a second definition of a taxable paid-up capital. Maybe it is as well to mention the paid-up capital of a corporation for a fiscal year is its paid-up capital as it stood at the close of its fiscal year, including the paid-up capital stock of the corporation; its earned capital and other

surplus, all its reserves except any reserve the creation of which is allowed as a charge against income under part 3 of the Act; all sums or credits advanced or loaned to the corporation by any other corporation except a bank; and all its indebtedness—I am just wondering, do banks borrow from other banks and utilize the moneys in this way and still not fall within the definition—and all its indebtedness represented by bonds, bond mortgages, debentures, etc.

The determination of the paid-up capital of taxable foreign corporations is governed by special provisions.

Then coming to the thing I take exception to, I direct your attention to it for possible further surveillance and amendment.

In determining its taxable paid-up capital, a corporation is entitled, under section 69, to deduct certain amounts in respect of good will, discounts allowed on the sales of shares, investments and securities, and amounts invested in mines and related plant and works.

That bothers me, those sections. I wonder if some perusal of them might be given. There is obviously, in the case of investment in mines, an incentive or inducement section to cause corporations to invest their money in natural resource industries in the province, and they are given special concession for so doing. But I wonder to what extent this is really applicable in determining the taxable paid up capital.

Perhaps a stronger case could be made on this business of good will. Now you restrict it in the amount of good will, I think it is 50 per cent of the book value that is the limitation that is placed by the legislation itself.

I wonder whether good will should be considered in one way or another at all.

I am told that some major corporations in this country have no good will, or have good will, let us say, of \$1. Other ones would have, just as a book entry or figure, massive good will. There could be arguments and nice points raised and it is a device, I suggest, this floating quantity called good will, to escape the fair measure of taxation under this capital tax to which the corporation will otherwise be subject.

I will ask the hon. Minister to take these remarks under some consideration as to eliminating the basis of these deductions and exemptions.

Surely if the total amount from all the corporations of this province is to be something in the region of \$17 million and most of it is mulcted from the federal treasury in

the process of doing so—rather sleight of hand, you know—I wonder how the federal officials in terms of federal-provincial co-operativism regard this particular type? I mean you are doing it all the time admittedly, but your recent budget has got it in three of four instances.

In other words, all you have done is take from the left hand what Johnny pays with the right, and it is only the federal treasury that is suffering.

It is your way of saying, "Well, if you fellows are not going to give us the money, we will find a subterfuge to get it anyway." They are pretty well available, and this is the utilization you are making of this thing. Admittedly, at your present stance with the refusal of Benson to talk, or at least to talk intelligently on these matters, I really do not blame you. But I think it is a very dangerous practice in terms of the future unity of the country.

This is an instance in point, and if this is going to multiply and proliferate—you have done it three times in your present budget—the ultimate effects are going to be very disrupting, and disintegrative fiscally, to the overall interests of the country. You must not tax on that basis, I suggest, unless it can be avoided, which perhaps it cannot be in the present context.

Just to return to the basis for the computation of the tax itself, I think that various forms of amendment and a wider range of the weight of this tax, can be made to fall other than what you have presently arrived at.

Hon. Mr. White: I cannot accept the proposition that has been put to the House by the hon. member for Lakeshore. I would like to draw a parallel between two other levels of government in the hope of winning his concurrence.

The city of Toronto must raise a sum of money in order to finance its public services. In the process they establish a mill rate and, in fact, they establish a separate mill rate. If they increase the property tax along with the business tax, that increase becomes an increase in expense to the corporations or the enterprises concerned, and diminishes their profit and lowers the income tax which they must pay and which we collect in part.

Now, would you suggest that the city of Toronto in striking its mill rate and levying it against businesses thereby decreasing our corporate tax receipts, was being in some way injurious to the province of Ontario. I know you would not.

We in Ontario must provide a certain amount of money to pay for a wide variety of public services. In order to do that we have to utilize the tax fields available to us. In most of the cases I think it is fair to say the increased revenues in no way impair the federal collections. In some instances there is a partial offset. That is something, I think, over which we have no control.

Now, running through the amounts of money again—I am sorry I have just forgotten the question you asked before you sat down. Did you want me to review these sums of money?

Mr. Lawlor: On this computation business?

Hon. Mr. White: Just before you sat down you mentioned something about the computation—

Mr. Lawlor: I felt that you, within your ministerial discretion, or at least the Minister of the Treasury within his discretion, may allow certain deductions in order to reach a taxable paid-up capital figure. I am suggesting that in a range of those discretions, for instance, with respect to the good will of corporations and to certain investment portfolios they may have touching natural resource industries, they get special advantages.

Hon. Mr. White: Right. I cannot speak with a great deal of expertise on this matter. If your suggestion is that we should review the method by which we arrive at capital as defined for this tax, you may be entirely correct and it is something that I am certainly prepared to do. It has not been suggested, I think, by taxpayers or tax administrators or other interested parties that the definition was deficient. If my hon. friend thinks it is, then we are quite prepared to re-examine it.

Dealing momentarily with the idea of good will, if a corporation acquires another enterprise, let us say for \$100,000, and if the actual net worth as represented by the balance sheet and not including good will is only \$75,000, then in order to bring the acquired assets and liabilities into balance one must increase the good will shown on the balance sheet of the acquiring corporation by \$25,000.

When my hon. friend says that some large corporations have no good will, he may be thinking in a social sense. In other words, he and his colleagues may have some ill will towards these great private enterprises. That, I suppose, can be debated at another time.

The good will item is simply a balancing item. If there was no such transaction then, of course, the company would not have a

balancing figure to put on the asset side of its balance sheet. The amount of advertising, public relations, and so on, would not be quantified and would be shown at that nominal amount of \$1. It is not a tangible asset; it would not ordinarily enter into the capital of a firm.

Mr. Sargent: I cannot speak with a great deal of expertise on this matter, but I would like to know from the Minister how much revenue he expects to raise from this field on this vehicle this year?

Hon. Mr. White: We expect to raise \$26 million gross.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's remarks—this would seem to be a dialogue between those of the ilk of lawyers—and I say with respect that at Mr. Speaker's dinner last night the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said that a lot of times I do not know what I am talking about and do not understand myself. I agree, but—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, please, last evening really I was speaking in a facetious manner and I would never make such a statement, even if I did believe it, about any member of this House. It was made in a purely facetious manner and I hope the hon. member will accept it in the sense in which it was meant.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Prime Minister for his remarks. But I want to say that this field is very highly complex and complicated and I think it should be put at a level that even I can understand; so that all of us could talk in the same dialogue, on how much money do you hope to raise by this vehicle.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): The difficult we do immediately, the impossible takes a little longer.

Mr. Sargent: All right. I wanted to say that somewhere along the line that those of us who have been in business have had to meet a payroll. I do not know of anyone on the front bench who has ever tried to meet a payroll.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment. We are talking of raising money in this greatest economy in Canada where we are in trouble getting the money to do the job we want. I would like to ask the Minister why—in this great economy we have here, where you have

\$1,000 worth of tax for every \$1 million of paid up capital in your quotation?

On the other hand, we have a report in the paper this morning that one firm did multi-million dollars' worth of business this past year and paid no taxes. Somewhere along the line, I think, you must look at the overall picture of our economy insofar as we have the greatest gross national product here in the province.

We have, we are told, 90 per cent of our industrial capital controlled by the United States; I would like to suggest you tell me in a simple way why you cannot change this fact that you are charging \$1,000 for every \$1 million paid up capital? Why cannot any firm in Ontario that has American capital and outside capital pay double the tax that Canadian capital pays in this area of tax? In the area of \$1,000 for paid-up capital of \$1 million. Why cannot you say to an American firm, "you pay \$2,000." Then, instead of getting \$26 million, you get \$52 million and you could build four more lakefront projects for the city of Toronto.

We look at this thing, at the overall picture, and say the Minister is doing a pretty good job. But can you do a better job and show us why you cannot recognize the fact that American firms should be paying more of the economy than they are paying. I would like to hear the Minister's comment on that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Remember what happened to Walter Gordon.

Mr. Sargent: He was doing all right. He was a great Canadian.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He tried what you proposed and he failed.

Mr. Sargent: Maybe you fellows are more intelligent. I do not know.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me make one or two comments on this. There is no reason why we could not double the taxes on American corporations and cut the taxes on Canadian corporations in half or down to zero. But let me say that in the process you would certainly discourage foreign investment and the cost you would pay would no doubt be very heavy unemployment. Because who is going to come in here and have every nickel of profit phased away?

Mr. Sargent: You do not know that for a fact.

Hon. Mr. White: Now, wait! We have an unemployment rate in this province of 2.7 per cent. In order to provide tens of thousand of new jobs every year we have had to have an immense inflow of capital. If we were to discriminate against this outside capital we would be punishing ourselves, that is my belief.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: We can debate this at greater length if you wish. Pardon?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): How much actual outside capital have you got? How much of it is generated inside Canada?

Hon. Mr. White: The figure is readily arrived at in the DBS statistics because it is the difference between our total exports, including services, and our total imports. The difference there is the capital required to balance off the account. I have not got the figures in front of me but what I am saying is simply this. My hon. friend, who is a businessman, cautions us from time to time about killing the goose that laid the golden egg. There are a number of geese, some foreign and some domestic; the proposition that you apply in a general way must be applied to American corporations, British corporations, just as you yourself on occasion apply them to Ontario corporations.

May I make one more point before you do so. I should think, without having explored this with the experts, that the minute you applied a special tax on American corporations, very serious efforts would be made to avoid that tax by Ontario-izing the corporation in some highly technical and spurious fashion. Now I am sorry, I cannot really suggest the best ways in which this might be done, except that there might be different classes of stock—the majority of the less powerful classes owned by resident citizens thereby qualifying it as an Ontario corporation with the actual powerlines and the government class of stock being held elsewhere.

An hon. member: Do not think you can avoid the problem.

Hon. Mr. White: At any rate, please accept my assurance that when one tries to differentiate taxpayers on the basis of nationality or by some other test, one introduces a new complication and a new loophole through which that class of taxpayer would try to avoid paying the tax.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister is much more knowledgeable than I, but he has probably

studied the impact of such a tax on American investment. I do not suggest that I am right there; I suggest that there might be some modification. I do know that there are many parallels—in a sense, Mexico: if you once had a business there, you must have 51 per cent Mexican ownership. An American firm going to Mexico can only own 49 per cent of the industry or any operation down there. It would seem to me that there are many parallels in South America and around the world, that we are the people, Mr. Minister, who create the climate that they can invest in here.

Their gigantic corporations and their conglomerates have more money than the province of Ontario. They give us loans, making another eight or nine per cent on the money. You tell me to justify your case so that it would discourage all these attractions.

We have the variance on the money, they have given us loans, and we have the most buoyant economy in all the North American continent in this area of Toronto here. You tell me that this is going to discourage American location here, but I doubt very much if you are 100 per cent right. I suggest that there must be some other economies doing this, so why cannot we say: okay; let us get our chance to get off. For instance on February 30 Stelco announced that out of sales of \$559 million, it had the biggest year in its history—\$63 million profit last year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Good!

Mr. Sargent: Wait! A 45 per cent increase in profits; a 45 per cent increase in profits!

Mr. Pilkey: The workers could not get a dime.

Mr. Sargent: You know what is going to happen. The same day they announced this biggest profit in history, the 45 per cent increase in profit, they announced a 10 per cent increase in the price of steel across the market. The same day, again, the same day.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is what helped.

Mr. Sargent: Four other domestic mills announced a ten per cent increase in profit of steel across the board.

Hon. Mr. White: It is all very interesting, but what has it got to do with this?

Mr. Sargent: I am saying that here we have, Mr. Minister, a province trying to build schools and hospitals, and the Prime Minister does not say to Stelco—like John Fitzgerald

Kennedy said to the U.S. steel industry: you cannot increase steel prices. The Prime Minister did not phone down to Stelco and say: "No more increases in steel." You let them go merrily on their way when they have a \$63 million profit. Someone's got to run this store.

Mr. Chairman: Are you talking on section 1?

Mr. Sargent: I say this is the area for revenue, Mr. Chairman, not where a guy cannot pay his taxes on his home. This is the area where you must get money—through corporate taxes. The Minister is getting help from the Provincial Treasurer here; he says that the corporations are being taxed to the hilt. This is simply ridiculous. I would like to hear the Minister say why you cannot tax them more than you are taxing us.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. White: As a matter of fact, I think our tax rates here are very moderate and very equitable. We are setting our sights on even greater equity and Budget Paper B explains the long-term intentions of the Treasurer in order to bring about a most progressive tax structure. I do not think our corporations are being taxed to the hilt.

I think it would be very unwise to have discriminatory taxes with different rates applying against domestic and non-domestic taxpayers for a variety of reasons. It would discourage the import capital which we need at this point in our history, and it would be very difficult to administer. I just do not think it is a good way to do business.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): All right, you wait and see.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we appear to be discussing the principle of this bill rather than the matters involved in this section.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know what section you are talking about, Mr. Minister, I thought I could talk about the general picture of the corporate tax.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with amended section 1, and the particular aspect of that section with which we were having a discussion had to do with tax on capital. The discussion was about the increase of the tax to \$50 on capital and what constituted capital.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister advise, Mr. Chairman, if there is any corporate tax

on the area of banks, on reserves and deposits?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, there is, section 3, subsection 7 (a). No, excuse me!

Mr. J. Renwick: That is section 7.

Hon. Mr. White: I read it earlier when the hon. member was out of the room. Yes, there is. I guess I will let it go at that.

Mr. Chairman: Section 1, carried? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that clause 17 of subsection 5 of section 1 of Bill 83 be deleted.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale moves that clause 17 of subsection 5 of section 1 of Bill 83 be deleted.

Mr. J. Renwick: May I just speak briefly to this. I move the amendment for two reasons. One is that the Treasurer, in his Budget statement referring to these changes which are incorporated in this bill, referred to the increase in the paid up capital tax from one-twentieth to one-tenth of one per cent, made some other comments about it and then stated:

In view of these changes, this is an excellent time to abolish the place of business taxes. The abolition will be effective at the same time as the capital tax changes.

The net effect of the provision which I move the deletion of is to eliminate, in the one sense, the place of business tax, but to reimpose the tax under the paid-up capital tax provision. Therefore, these corporations which formerly did not pay any paid-up capital tax—because they have no paid-up capital in a technical sense—are now going to be subject to this \$5 tax.

The second reason why I move the amendment is because it is, as the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) has said, a nuisance tax. A nuisance tax which should not and need not be imposed on such corporations as an agricultural organization; a board of trade; a chamber of commerce; a charitable organization where all of the resources are devoted to charitable activities carried on by the organization itself—a corporation that was constituted exclusively for charitable purposes and fulfills certain other requirements; a corporation constituted exclusively for the purpose of carrying on or promoting scientific research; a corporation that was constituted exclusively for the purpose of

providing low cost housing accommodations for the aged; a labour organization or society or benevolent or fraternal benefit society or order, or club, society, or association organized and operated exclusively for social welfare and civic improvement, pleasure or recreation or for any other purpose except profit; a corporation incorporated or organized as a credit union or co-operative credit society; an institutional housing corporation, an institutional holding company or a limited dividend housing corporation within the meaning of those expressions as defined by The National Housing Act; and similar types of corporations, the main criteria of which—in most of the cases—is that no part of the income which was payable to or otherwise available for the personal benefit of any proprietor, member or shareholder thereof.

So, in that sense, Mr. Chairman, this is a nuisance tax and it is a tax imposed purely for information purposes on organizations which traditionally should be exempt from this kind of taxation.

Mr. Sargent: How much did you lose?

Mr. J. Renwick: Well they only are going to charge \$5 for each one of them but each one of these organizations has to file a return in order to pay the \$5. The number of dollars is relatively negligible; I am quite sure that the Minister is going to lose money.

Mr. Singer: It would cost \$10 each to programme the computers in respect to one company.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am sure it will. I think in this instance there is no great problem in the Minister agreeing that this nuisance tax could be removed. I do not think that there is any substance in the suggestion that a corporation constituted for the purpose of providing low cost housing accommodation is somehow or other going to become a taxable corporation and, therefore, omit to file any return which is required. I think that remark applies to many other of the classifications of corporations to which this tax is applied and I, therefore, urge that the House support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I hope that will not be done. I mentioned earlier that I am quite prepared to have this matter examined and perhaps bring in a change along these lines. I am not willing to do that until the matter has been very carefully gone into.

I offered a couple of reasons why we have

retained it to this point. I think it should be mentioned that we estimate there are less than 1,000 of these corporations because they must have share capital.

Now, I would urge the deputy leader of the NDP not to vote for his own amendment either, because if he does, and if we strike subsection 17 of section 5, we will be thrown back on subsection 1 or 1(a), and instead of paying the \$5 they will pay a very substantially increased tax.

I think that is not the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think the purpose of the drafting of the amendment is to point out the reasons why this tax should not be levied. I am not worried about the technicality of the language. It may possibly be that in the turgid prose available in this bill, the point which the Minister makes is quite correct. I do not necessarily accept it because it does provide specifically that the place-of-business tax is to be abolished.

This is the provision under which, having abolished it one place they purport to levy it in another place, and my guess is that the effect of the amendment is to leave in the clause which states that: "No tax will be payable under this section by this type of corporation". I would not swear to it, but I think the House has the substance of the amendment which I propose.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale has moved that clause 17 of subsection (5) of section 1 of Bill 83 be deleted. Those in favour of the motion will please rise.

Those opposed, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 40, the nays 53.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost and section 1, as amended, will form part of the bill.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Lawlor: Section 2 has to do with the wiping out of the place of business tax as such. I want to return to a question that is under this head which I asked earlier of the Minister and to which I did not feel any adequate reply was forthcoming.

Why did you do this thing to us? If you had gone that far, why then did you not move on to the deletion of the capital tax too, and go into the business tax field?

If I may quote the recommendations of the committee under this head: The committee under recommendation 27(3)—which confirms what Smith had to say about getting rid of both these kinds of taxes completely—went on to say:

We endorse the recommendation because the present method of computing capital and the place of business taxes is necessarily complex.

Again, when you are giving consideration to what we just voted on, the thinking that went into that sentence might be very much off the top of your head, because the fee should be payable whether or not the corporation is liable for corporate income tax.

It is the opinion of your committee that the revision of the structure of these taxes should be combined with a complete review of other minor taxes and filing fees presently levied. We see considerable advantage in requiring corporations to file only one composite return which would include the information and the tax presently required under The Corporations Information Act, the annual tax proposed above and any other filing.

Then you come down the page and the last sentence reads:

We note that a flat rate, fee or tax of \$65 for a corporation would yield approximately the same revenue as is now received from several existing taxes and fees.

This will obviate most of the difficulty which we have encountered, which we will continue to encounter and the move to strike out the place of business tax under section 2 is fine but the fact of the matter is that it did the job only in part. If I can elicit from the Minister the rationale for doing that, and not doing the other, in face of the considerable amount of thought and work that went into the committee's recommendations in this regard—taking the foliage off the tree—just why the Minister did not, why he does not now, consider doing something rather different from what he is doing in this section and this Act. But, more in line with a thing which has a far greater measure of efficiency, it does not produce the same revenue—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the hon. member would not agree that section 2 deals only with the repeal of a former section? His remarks are not in order with the repeal of a former section, that section no longer applies.

Mr. Lawlor: No, Mr. Chairman, I would argue that it has to do with the repeal of the place of business tax under section 6 of The Corporations Tax Act, which is also—that is fine, repealing that, but why did the Minister not also repeal the other form of taxation, bringing this tax under a completely distinct head, of which the Minister is well aware?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I covered this, I think, Mr. Chairman, but let me repeat; we have made this very much simpler by eliminating a place of business tax. We have only one return which embraces both corporate income tax and capital tax, I hope I am correct about that, yes, I am sure I am. We just have the one return, so it is a composite return. We hope that we will be able, at some future date, to incorporate the fees charged annually by the Provincial Secretary's office. This is complicated enough and it cannot be done immediately. We have eliminated the off-set which my hon. friend has mentioned. The \$65 flat figure would, I think, have produced the sum of money that we did receive from this source before, but now we are anticipating something like \$27 million gross. I have used \$27 million for this little arithmetic. About 90,000 corporate tax payers, so it averages out to \$300 each.

Now, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) mentioned in his earlier remarks that this was not a progressive tax because the rate remains the same. But in point of fact, it is progressive because there are two factors leading to the amount of the tax, and the capital is certainly very directly correlated with the ability of the corporation to pay. Is it fair to utilize the system we have here now, where one corporation, a small corporation, will pay the \$50 minimum, and the large corporation will pay thousands of dollars, or to levy the \$300 flat, even on the smallest corporations in this province? I think my hon. friend will agree that this is a more progressive method, and that I think answers the several points he raised.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

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

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this, in the statute, takes about 50 pages, and it would be almost impossible for the average person to grasp the whole significance of this next clause. Would the Minister spell out briefly what this means, very simply?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes I would be glad to. It means, very simply, that section 12, of the Act is repealed.

Mr. Sargent: Does the Minister know the answer to what I am asking?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, what is the question? I do not follow.

Mr. MacDonald: In a nut shell, what is section 12? If we can clarify the hon. member's question, maybe the Minister can clarify the answer.

Hon. Mr. White: Section 12 is just one short paragraph, actually. Section 12 reads:

There may be deducted from the total of the taxes payable by a corporation under sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, tax payable by that corporation under section 4.

Now this means very simply that if a corporation's income tax amounted to the same or exceeded the amount of the capital tax, that the capital tax was deducted from the income tax. We have eliminated that provision so that the capital tax is separate from and in addition to whatever corporate income tax may be payable by the corporation.

Mr. Chairman: Section 3. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in the Watkins report it says that many American firms do not pay any taxes in Ontario, corporate taxes. Would the Minister like to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. White: I am sorry I cannot deal with that without knowing the specifics. I am not aware of any unusual situation. The claim is made, of course, that goods and services being supplied from American branch plants to Canadian subsidiaries are overpriced thereby draining profit out. The federal government, I think, has been very vigorous in protecting against this particular loss of revenue.

We, ourselves, do reassessments to ensure that tax is not avoided or evaded in this fashion. I do not know if it was true at one time or not, but I think in recent years this has not been the case.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister relate into dollars what clause 3 means in increase in revenue?

Hon. Mr. White: In the absence of the repeal of this section we would have collected \$4.9 million in capital tax. With the

repeal of the section we will collect \$26 million approximately, gross. Certain other taxes will be reduced because of the offset, and we will end up with \$17 million increase net.

Mr. Lawlor: Just to explore that point a bit further. What happened, in effect, I would take it, was that the corporation income tax, by and large, would exceed on any computation, in most cases, the capital tax being levied and, therefore, no capital tax would be payable. That is what it would come to.

This being true, I would take it then that many large corporations with goodly profits in the province—the greater the profit the larger the income tax and, ergo, the less likelihood of paying the capital tax at all—that many corporations in this province did not pay the capital tax in any event under the old legislation. Can you give us any estimate of how many corporations never paid capital tax, and now will be obliged to pay a capital tax?

Hon. Mr. White: I do not think I can give the hon. member the number of corporations. I have informed the House about the amount of money involved, and I am sure we could determine the number for you if you wish. I do not have that information here at all.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Sargent: What is the position of the federal government insofar as this next clause is concerned; section 4, clause 1?

Hon. Mr. White: I have not had a comment from Mr. Benson on it.

Mr. Sargent: You are giving a concession here? What is their position on it? Are you giving a concession and the federal government is not?

Hon. Mr. White: Not to my knowledge, no.

Mr. Sargent: I did not ask that. What does this mean in dollars?

Hon. Mr. White: This amendment is similar in principle to the amendment under section 4 of the bill. If it were not for this amendment to subsection 1 of section 45 of the Act, a non-resident owned investment corporation would escape liability entirely under this Act. So this is to plug that loophole.

Mr. Sargent: If no tax is payable under section 4 by a corporation for a fiscal year during which it was a personal corporation,

why should they escape taxation at provincial level because they were a personal corporation?

Hon. Mr. White: If it were not for this amendment to subsection 1 of section 45 of the Act, a non-resident-owned investment corporation would escape liability entirely under this Act.

Mr. Lawlor: We are not talking about the same thing.

Hon. Mr. White: I am talking about section 5 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Section 4.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, you are on section 4!

Subsection 1 of section 42 previously provided that a personal corporation was not liable to income tax or capital tax. Such a corporation was, however, liable to a place of business tax of \$20 or \$50 depending on its paid-up capital.

In view of the repeal of the place of business tax, and in order to render such a corporation liable to a capital tax of \$50 under section 5 of the Act, it became necessary to amend subsection 1 of section 42 of the Act to remove the exemption from capital tax.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I know we are dealing with section 4, but the explanation in the margin of the bill with reference to sections 5, 6 and 7, state that they are complementary to section 4, and I presume that when it uses the numbers 5, 6 and 7, it refers to sections 5, 6 and 7 in Bill 83, and not to the original Corporations Tax Act.

Now, with reference to section 4, Mr. Chairman, I can understand why a personal corporation will not be paying corporate tax because it is taxed as an individual, as a person. I am rather at a loss to understand how the other three sections would be complementary to section 4, where one deals with non-resident-owned investment corporations as being tax exempt, that is, section 5 in this particular bill and another, section 6, deals with foreign owned corporations.

I ask why they should be exempt and how they happen to be complementary to section 4? Perhaps this may be what caused the hon. member for Grey-Bruce to rise and ask about foreign-owned corporations. The hon. Minister said he knows of no corpora-

tion that is evading the payment of tax but by section 6, which again as I say is supposed to be complementary to section 4, such corporations are specifically exempt.

Would the Minister please comment before we pass section 4, why foreign-owned corporations should be tax exempt and why non-resident-owned investment corporations should be tax exempt, and how they are complementary to section 4?

Hon. Mr. White: Several sections fall in the same category, and I would like to repeat the explanation provided under section 4.

Subsection 1 of section 42 previously provided that a personal corporation was not liable to income tax or capital tax. My hon. friend has made mention of that and has explained that he understands and agrees with that.

Such a corporation was, however, liable to a place-of-business tax. That tax was between \$20 and \$50 depending on its paid up capital. In view of the repeal—

Mr. Ben: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister please repeat that last statement?

Hon. Mr. White: The personal corporation was liable for the business tax which, of course, we are repealing as of the end of this month. Now, in order to retain the revenue that we have had from that source we are replacing the place-of-business tax with some capital tax.

Having expressed that inadequately in my own words, let me read this explanation again and perhaps that will clarify it:

Subsection 1 of section 42 previously provided that a personal corporation was not liable to income tax or capital tax.

Such a corporation was, however, liable to a place-of-business tax amounting to between \$20 and \$50 depending on its paid-up capital.

In view of the repeal of the place-of-business tax and in order to render such a corporation liable to a capital tax of \$50, under section 5 of the Act, it became necessary to amend subsection 1 of section 42 of the Act to remove the exemption from capital tax.

You will have noticed that five, six and seven are complementary, dealing with section 5 of the bill. This amendment is similar in principle to the amendment under section 4 of the bill which we have dealt with now.

If it were not for this amendment to subsection 1 of section 45 of the Act, a non-resident-owned investment corporation would escape liability entirely under this Act, and the same situation is true of a foreign business corporation.

Subsection 7—

Mr. Sargent: What is the thinking behind that?

Hon. Mr. White: We have had place-of-business tax from these four categories of corporation. We are doing away with the place-of-business tax. We do not want to dispense with the revenue and so we are levying a similar amount under the capital tax.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 4 form part of the bill? The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that Brazilian Light, Power and Traction Company would not be paying us any taxes here?

Hon. Mr. White: Sorry?

Mr. Ben: Am I to understand that Brazilian Light, Power and Traction—the proper title escapes me for the minute but I am sure the hon. Minister knows the corporation I am referring to—does it pay corporate tax to the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I would not have thought so. We will check and let you know.

Mr. Ben: Would that be an example of a foreign-owned corporation? A foreign business corporation?

Hon. Mr. White: I think not, but we are getting into a very complicated area. I am sorry I will just have to have some research done before I can answer it.

Mr. Ben: You refer in section 6 to subsection 1 of section 46 and there it defines what a foreign corporation is. If my interpretation is correct, Brazilian Light, Power and Traction—I think is the proper title of the company—pays no taxes in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: I cannot give you a definite answer, but my guess is that this company, which is a Brazilian corporation owned by Canadian shareholders, is not liable to tax so far as our Ontario corporation tax is concerned. Their assets are not here; their head office is not here.

The dividends paid to their shareholders, of course, would be taxable by the federal government and we would receive our proportion of this. By the way my tax administrators pointed out to me it is really not appropriate to discuss a particular corporation because of the secret nature of tax relationships.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, first of all, if I may continue on this, the Brazilian Light Power and Traction Co. is a Toronto-based company; its head office is in—

Mr. Sargent: Point of order!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce is raising a point of order in connection with the hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, where does a department head get the right to tell a member of the House what they can talk about in this House?

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order. The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: It certainly is a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Why can a department head tell me what I can talk about in this House?

Mr. Chairman: No department head has suggested this to the member.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister just said that here.

Hon. Mr. White: No, I am sorry. There is a little misunderstanding here.

The federal income tax people will not divulge the details of your income taxes. That is private and considered a very highly confidential matter. So if—

Mr. Sargent: I am not asking that.

Hon. Mr. White: Right. This is the point I was making, so the confidential aspect is not a suitable subject for discussion. The policies, the programmes, the statutes and so on, are.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, that is right. I did not properly phrase my question. What I should have asked was would the Brazilian Light, Power and Traction Co. be liable to pay taxes in this jurisdiction if it made a profit? I am not asking how much it is paying. Is Brazilian Light, Power and Traction Co. a foreign corporation within the meaning of this? In other words, is it exempt from paying corporation taxes in this province?

Hon. Mr. White: I simply do not know. I will be glad to inquire and I will be glad to attempt to inform the member later.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell the House then the yardstick used to tax American corporations *per se*, in Ontario and corporations—

Hon. Mr. White: The same as we use for Canadian.

Mr. Sargent: So the Canadians do not have any favoured treatment? The Americans have the same treatment that the Canadians do? So this is going to be your policy.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member?

Mr. Sargent: No wonder you are broke.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the comments I am going to make on section 5 apply equally well to section 6, so I will not have to repeat them.

I realize that only by indirection are we saying in these sections that no income tax will be paid by a corporation that is a non-resident-owned investment corporation. That definition of non-resident-owned investment corporation appears in the appropriate section of The Corporations Tax Act, which is section 45.

Similarly, in the case of a foreign business corporation—that a foreign business corporation, if it qualifies, pays no income tax under The Corporations Tax Act of Ontario if it meets the requirements set out in the definition in section 46.

Now I realize that all you are doing by these sections is removing the exemption from the paid-up capital tax so that you will derive the nominal revenue which you formerly derived from the place-of-business tax.

I am going to ask the Minister if he would give consideration in the next year to looking at the traditional exemptions which have been available for non-resident-owned investment corporations and for foreign business corporations? The philosophy and the theory behind their exemption is historic in many cases. I am going to suggest it may well be that the nominal tax is not an adequate tax in terms of the facilities which we provide for such corporations in the province of Ontario.

As I understand it, what we are talking

about is those corporations which qualify as foreign business corporations; they are corporations which have their head offices in the province of Ontario. They are, for income tax purposes, resident in the province of Ontario in the sense, in the language of the tax cases, the seat and control of the directing power of the corporation is located here. I believe that also to be the case in the portfolio type of company which qualifies as a non-resident-owned investment corporation. In traditional tax terms, we have the right to tax them on their income worldwide because they are resident here even though they do not, in a technical sense, carry on business in the province of Ontario, which is the other area which will permit us to tax for income tax purposes.

I am not, on the one hand, saying that they should be taxed at normal tax rates. But I am curious as to whether or not we are, by these nominal taxes, in fact collecting the revenue which we should collect because of the facilities which we provide for those companies in being here as resident companies, and having the benefit of this jurisdiction from which the direction and control of their business is carried on. I think there is a very good reason for the Minister in a new department looking at these matters in terms of their historic place in the tax scheme.

I recognize, of course, that this type of exemption appears in identical terms in the complementary provisions of the federal income tax and therefore it is not really a matter that can be dealt with in isolation by this Minister from the federal Income Tax Act without causing unnecessary divergence between the two statutes. So my comment simply is: Will the Minister look at this type of exemption from that viewpoint? Then, he can come to some definitive conclusion as to whether or not the nominal revenue which we derive is adequate to compensate the province for the facility and the environment within which they carry on the direction of very substantial portfolios of investment in the one case, and very substantial business operations through subsidiary companies outside Canada in the other case?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I certainly will look into it. As has been suggested, we follow the federal government in not applying income tax on non-resident owned companies. This is a means whereby a non-resident can hold his investments in Canada under certain conditions and it is pointed out that these investments are very mobile and

could be moved to another country very easily. I think those are the reasons, but I would be very glad to have the matter reconsidered.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my only comment to that comment is that there is an element of protection and financial facilities available within the province of Ontario that make it on balance, more convenient for them to be here. I think there is probably an additional number of dollars which they would be prepared to pay and still remain here for the purpose of managing their portfolios. That is the substance of my comment in both cases.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I am gratified the member points out that the good government here in Ontario makes this a very suitable place for people and for their capital.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is a glaring example of the immobility of this party. You cannot move with change. Here is a great area of revenue which the member has pointed out that you could bring into the hopper and test it and see what would happen if you taxed these people more. But, you cannot change with the times.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my only comment to the Minister of Revenue would be that I hope that those non-resident owned investment corporations which left the security of the Ontario market because of the number of financial disasters could, perhaps, because of the interest which the public has taken in endeavouring to cure the defects in the securities laws, in some way or other be attracted back into the province of Ontario.

Sections 5 and 6 agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. Lawlor: I will just say one word on this section. Section 7 is the one that brings the co-ops under the tax for the first time.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister—I do not know a great deal about co-operatives, but we are deluged with the propaganda from the equitable tax foundation about the taxation of co-operatives. I am always concerned, even in a detailed amending bill such as this, where I find there has been a change in the taxation position of co-operatives which have had a historic tax position as well.

I do not pretend, as I say, to understand

it all, but we all get the literature. We all know that it is subject to a very powerful propaganda operation, to destroy the co-operative movement in Canada through the use of the tax system. I would hope that the Minister, on this occasion, will assure us that this amendment is not part of the giving way by this government to that kind of pressure—and I do not think it is.

But I would like to have his confirmation of it, and perhaps on another occasion the Minister could state what the position of this government in the taxation field is at the present time in the whole question of the taxation of co-operatives.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, obviously, we are not gunning for the co-operatives by increasing the tax in the amount of \$42,000 when we are talking about an overall increase in taxes of \$181 million. We saw no reason why this particular tax should not be applied right across the board. This idea of uniformity and minimizing of exceptions or special provisions was one of the objectives of the Smith committee and the select committee.

We have accomplished that, we have turned up a little bit more money. It is not going to hurt anybody at all; it is not the beginning of a serious campaign against co-operatives.

Mr. J. Renwick: I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, to have that assurance from the Minister.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, what does it mean? Let us put it this way: Where a corporation is prescribed by regulation to certain exemptions that other corporations had until we passed the other sections of this Act—such specially reduced exemptions do not apply. Looking at the Act, section 58, subsection 1 has to do with Crown corporations of various kinds. My question really is: What kind of a Crown corporation is it for which you envisage—possibly bringing in a prescription whereby in effect they will have to pay this tax?

Hon. Mr. White: The prescribed corporations for purposes of section 58 of the Act are Air Canada, Bank of Canada, Canadian National Express Company, Canadian National Railway Company, Canadian National Railways Limited, Canadian National Telegraph Company, Canadian National Transportation Limited, Canadian Northern Quebec

Railway Company, Gray Coach, Great North-western Telegraph, Hoare Transport, Husband Transport, A. E. MacKenzie Company Limited, Midland Superior Express, the Minnesota-Ontario Bridge Company, the Northern Consolidated Holding Company Limited, Scobie's Transport Limited, Toronto-Peterborough Transport Company Limited.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9:

Hon. Mr. White: If I may. I move that subsection 3, of section 74 of the Act, as re-enacted by subsection 2 of section 9 of the bill, be amended by striking \$81 in the fourth line and substituting therefor \$300.

Mr. Chairman, we have been trying to minimize the expense and nuisance so far as taxpayers are concerned. Not long ago we altered upwards the maximum amount by which the frequency of sales tax payments were made. Until very recently if a vendor collected more than \$80 he was required to file monthly. We have now altered that upward to \$360. We are doing the same thing in this instance and in so doing we are increasing the number of corporations who file and pay taxes annually from \$30,000 to \$50,000 of the \$90,000 corporate taxpayers. This cuts our administrative expense internally also.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, that last clause, I missed that, would you please say it again.

Hon. Mr. White: In the past, if a corporation was liable for more than \$80 per year, they had to file quarterly. They had to send in \$15 every three months or whatever the amount was. Under this change the amount is raised to \$300, so now if a corporation has to pay \$250 annual tax, they may remit annually. Now this saves us under the new schedule of payment sending out a half a dozen sets of forms and having them complete them and return a half a dozen \$5 cheques.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the Minister's amendment carry? The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, under section 9 of the bill, this is the section that deals with the acceleration of payments so that the sixth payment is made within the fiscal year for which the tax is filed. Is that correct?

This is a one shot application as far as securing extra revenue then, is that correct? What would the amount be, would the Min-

ister tell me? Also, under previous arrangements where your final payment was not due until the second month following the end of the fiscal year, corporations were able to judge their tax and either reduce or increase the last payment as they saw fit, under this section then, you are asking tax to be paid before in fact the corporation has any idea of what profit is being made during that fiscal year. Are there any provisions then for interest on overpayments and the main thing is how much extra revenue for this one year will you derive from this acceleration of tax?

Hon. Mr. White: Well I think the amount was \$42 million. So far as the increased frequency is concerned it will be six payments instead of four, but if you had a corporation which had a year end of December 31, it would not be required, I think, to make its final payment for six weeks—I can see six but is it weeks or months?

At any rate I think your criticism should be levelled at the federal government because we give the taxpayer quite a lot more time than the federal government does in order to make that final payment.

Mr. Good: No, under this section you are following exactly in their footsteps. They require 11 payments made monthly to be made in December of the fiscal year, and you are now asking for your last payment in December of the fiscal year, that is, corporations whose calendar year will start actually March 31, so you are no better than they.

Hon. Mr. White: The first instalment will be due on or before the fifteenth day of the third month of the fiscal year in respect of which the tax is payable, and the remaining instalments repayable at regular 2-month intervals thereafter. So if the fiscal year ends in December the first payment is in March of the following year, the second payment is in May, July, September, November, and January 15, so we do require the final payment on January 15.

It was my understanding and my hon. friend may now correct me, that the federal final payment was coincident with the year end, but perhaps my memory is mistaken on that point.

Mr. Good: That is for corporations whose year starts after the fifteenth of March of this year but in subsequent years then, will the tax not still be finalized in the 11th month of that year, say the 11th month of the year of the firm? That is the way I interpret it, I could be wrong. Do you start in the—

Hon. Mr. White: Is it my turn to answer? A December company will make its sixth payment in January—January 15.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lake-shore.

Mr. Lawlor: What does it really come to? Is it not an acceleration all the way through by two months? As I read it it seems to be a greater acceleration than that.

Under the old Act, as you say, there were four instalments. The first one was the 15th day of the fifth month after the fiscal year. Then the next one would be the fifteenth day of the eighth month—three months later as they come through on the quarterly instalment basis.

Under the new section the first payment would be on the third month so you would catch up two months there, but the second instalment would be in the fifth month, instead of the eighth month, as in the other one, so you are accelerated by three months, and the third payment, which previously was in the 11th month is now the seventh month, now you see your four payments—it seems to run that way. Is my interpretation of this correct? Let us say the fiscal year coincides with the after the March 15th limitation here. In other words we are not taking a calendar year, we will run it from March 15 on—say a company was instituted as of the 15th of March, its fiscal year, does it accelerate to the extent that I am indicating, or is it a uniform acceleration?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, there is no short answer to that. I suppose one could sit down and compare the new bi-monthly schedule with the old quarterly schedule and I suppose one could affix some number of days. On the other hand if one takes the one time increase in revenue of \$42 million and computes that as a percentage of the new revenue expectation, that, I suppose, would be another way of judging the speed up. I suppose it would be an increase of about 15 per cent on that basis.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 9 as amended form part of the bill? Carried?

Section 9 agreed to.

On section 10:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I take it that section 10 is amended to strike out the rate of nine per cent per annum, that is for moneys late-owing and that section 11 is overpayment. One case: If I owe the government money I

have to pay in excess of nine per cent or the going rate; but if the government owes me money, they only pay me four per cent. In general, is this the position or what?

Hon. Mr. White: If the taxpayer overpays us because of a mistake or because of a deliberate action on his part, we pay less than the going rate. We do not want to have a high rate because we do not want people in effect depositing money to earn a high interest rate from us.

Conversely, we want to have the interest rate for late payment, high enough that they will not lean on us as their banker. Now the nine per cent which we are charging is, I think, a fairly reasonable amount when one considers prime bank interest rates. We simply do not want to become a form of banker for short term funds.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): You can get eight per cent on short term funds today. Eight per cent, as of this morning.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me rather sensible that if the province is able to raise money in this way, at five or six per cent, which is a lot less than you are paying your banks for your borrowed money, why not consider paying a higher rate of return to those who deposit money? It will save you in borrowing.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Getting it both ways.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, I think I would agree but this is not the function of the corporation tax branch. You would agree with me, of course, that our rate of interest charged on late filing should be more than the prime bank rate. I think we all agree on that aspect of it.

Mr. Sargent: It is a good Liberal idea though.

Hon. Mr. White: If you are suggesting that we should increase the amount from four per cent to six per cent or seven, in the hope that there may be some sum of money placed on deposit with us I do not think I could quarrel with you theoretically. I do not think it is the function of the corporations tax branch to do that. I think from a practical standpoint, there are other solutions to be found.

Mr. Deacon: But I certainly agree that we should pay a higher rate if we are late in our payments. But as far as prepayments are

concerned, perhaps some co-operation between your Revenue Department and the Treasurer would be very sensible in this regard.

Mr. Sargent: They do that in the municipalities. They have some intelligence there.

Section 10 agreed to.

Sections 1 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 83, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves the committee of the whole House rise and report a certain bill with certain amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a certain resolution and a certain bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 29th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND
CITIZENSHIP
(Continued)

On vote 1703.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, would the Minister on page 128 of the estimates, indicate how the grants of community agencies have been distributed? The item is \$24,500 and I have not been able to find them in the public accounts.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Yes, Mr. Chairman, research and grants totalled \$33,500. Is that the reference that the member is making? \$33,500 under the heading of research and grants in the estimates?

Mr. Burr: Just the first one, the grants to community agencies. The \$24,500.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes. The \$10,000 to the International Institute to Metropolitan To-

ronto; contribution of \$1,500 to International Services of London; \$3,000 to the Travellers' Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto; \$2,000 to the Ontario Welfare Council. A grant is provided for \$3,000 to establishing a pilot citizens information centre in Windsor; \$5,000 to the department of sociology, York University; and another item of \$9,000 for community conferences.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Then there would appear not to be particular research actually being done, or do you consider that the grants to these organizations to set up either pilot projects or to develop certain programmes in research as such?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Definitely, Mr. Chairman. The contribution of \$5,000 to the department of sociology, York University, is in fact research money for work that is being done there. I would say that insofar as many of the other organizations are concerned, we do work with them in both their active programmes and in the research aspect of their programmes.

Mr. Breithaupt: Tell me, Mr. Minister, what research you expect to have done at York under this programme?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The sum that we ask the Legislature to devote this year, \$5,000, is necessary to continue the research project undertaken in 1967-68 to assess the effectiveness of the citizenship branch's pilot project of teaching English to immigrant women with pre-school children. This work we commented on last year is being undertaken by Dr. Richmond of that department at that university.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): In this matter of research projects, Mr. Chairman, how are you co-operating with The Department of Education and The Department of Social and Family Services, both of which have branches that work in this area of community involvement, getting citizens interested? In these research projects, working with the universities, how are you co-ordinating your research projects in the areas of citizenship which, as I mentioned before, have a relationship to community projects, with the other departments?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Very closely with the other departments. Particularly involved in this area of mutual contact are Social and Family Services through the Ontario Welfare Council, which council we work very closely with in connection with the planning of our

first community conference in Windsor as well as other branches of government who are particularly interested in following through with us in this way—the Ontario Human Rights Commission, the Ontario Welfare Council, the youth and recreation branch of The Department of Education, which is the branch of government to which the member was making reference.

So there is very close liaison. We have just finished a conference in Brantford where all departments of government under the leadership of youth and recreation were called together to consider this whole question of co-ordination and liaison insofar as the citizenship programmes and our communities were concerned.

Mr. Deacon: Did you mention The Department of Agriculture and Food, and the athletic commissioner under The Department of Labour, in the co-ordination—

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Department of Agriculture and Food would come in through the capital grant programme insofar as community centres were concerned. The athletic commissioner would be involved, I suppose, in the recreational sense through the special awards in the form of equipment that are given to amateur sport groups. Both agriculture and labour, in this way, are more directly related perhaps to the recreational activities, insofar as our programme, as it is now defined, sees itself from the citizen involvement and the co-ordination of this type of programme.

I had to mention those two departments, but certainly, insofar as community activities are concerned in the light of their activities, they are there with their programme as well.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, there are a great many departments involved in this whole field of community activity and it needs perhaps more co-ordination than it has been receiving in the past.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think that is a very valid comment and I appreciate it being made. There are more departments or branches of government carrying on this type of activity or related activities than just this one. I appreciate the point.

Mr. Deacon: Yes, citizens do find it quite confusing.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I note on some information I have with respect to

immigration, that during the three years, 1965, 1966 and 1967 of the persons that came to Canada, approximately one-half were of Italian background. I would presume that the vast majority of these Italian people came to Ontario. I am wondering, in the light of the great increase in language training funds which are available this year, could the Minister give us some background information as to what proportion of these funds are being used within the Italian community which, of course, in Toronto is a substantial community?

I am wondering if he can further advise us as to the plans of the department for giving assistance to integrate within our society, persons of Italian background who have to learn English as a second language? What kind of effective action is in fact being taken?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, it is very difficult for us to break down our ethnic community and to show—in the amounts of money which are voted to us—how they are expended among particular groups. We treat all new arrivals the same way and so I think the hon. member would appreciate the difficulty, at this stage, of trying to separate various peoples insofar as their country of origin is concerned.

Our programme is the same for all new arrivals and we work through COSTI, through the International Institute, through our own adult programmes, through adult programmes sponsored by school boards—regardless of the country of origin to support the language training programme.

I think it is very important to understand that insofar as the language training programme is concerned, it is given against the background of the general theme of integration. I think the “in word” in this field now is “acculturation”, a synonym for integration. Here, we attempt to introduce people as part of the total citizenship preparation to the Canadian way of life and to community life. This is a good part of the language training programme.

I would not be in a position to break down our budget between various ethnic groups, but I can say that certainly the numbers of people who come from that particular country are considerable. There is a tremendous and very vital part of the population of Toronto made up of people with this background who all—along with all new arrivals—benefit from the programme of this department both in the language and citizenship classes.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to pursue this one point briefly. With this proportion, especially of Italian persons who have chosen to come to Canada, I am wondering if the Minister has any means within his department of attempting to assure that possibly the same proportion, within the classes, are studying the English language.

In other words, are the various groups to some—possibly even crude relationship with their percentage of the total immigration group, taking advantage proportionately of the programmes? One would think that if there was a disparity in an area of a certain group, then perhaps we are not making our facilities known to that group in a proper proportion.

To take the Italian example: I am just wondering if some one-half of our immigrants to this area are Italian, do the sizes of the classes and the numbers of persons taking advantage of the programmes relate in the same way? Are we apparently getting through to each group, at least, proportionately?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, this obviously might be an interesting activity to follow up on. That is, your question to satisfy ourselves on that particular line. The difficulty, and I remind you, in all this is that we have a programme for all new arrivals. Keep in mind also, Mr. Chairman, the voluntary nature of the programme. There is no compulsion for people to take these particular classes.

Part of the research project at the university to which I made reference was indeed to look into the difficulties we have encouraging housewives to come to classes like this—particularly in the light of their own views with respect to the time of day that married women go out.

We are attempting, by equipping ourselves with all possible information, to do everything we can to encourage people to take these classes for languages. This is the very important key to open the door to much of the integration programmes to which you have already made reference. I accept the comment in the spirit it is given; and it would be very interesting to take sort of an ethnic census of those who are in fact involved in some respects in the various classes.

This programme takes on many facets. I was very thrilled not long ago to go down to a factory where language classes were introduced right in the factory. The men were coming off their shift, going to the lunch room and taking classes right at their place of work. I would think that it would

be fair to say that the largest group there were in fact of Italian background.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I thought you were going to say that they came on speaking Italian and came off the line speaking English.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, we cannot take that credit. But certainly the interest, the eagerness of these people to be equipped by this language training was quite evident at those classes which I viewed.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a number of my colleagues have commended the Minister for a somewhat different approach to the work of the citizenship department as compared to that of his predecessor. I think he has rescued the department from being a pretty blatant agency of Tory propaganda among the new Canadians. I add my commendation too.

However, having said that, I want to suggest to the Minister that we may have reached the point when the whole concept of the work of the citizenship department should be broadened much beyond what it is now. It is still, for the most part, restricted to the field of meeting the needs of new Canadians. I would be the last person in the world to suggest that this is not a very important aspect of the job of citizenship.

But there are citizens' rights and needs that go beyond new Canadians. I think there is an invidious quality to a department that is set up to deal exclusively—or almost exclusively—with one group of people, particularly when the topic is citizenship.

My colleague, the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) raised the proposition that the whole Ontario Human Rights Code and its operation more logically falls within The Department of Citizenship than The Department of Labour. I am wondering whether or not the Minister could intercede with his colleagues and get the rationalization of this departmental setup. The Department of Labour is really a potpourri into which many things really are not part of labour, but have down through the years grown up or been shoved off on it. I think they should be rescued and put in with The Department of Citizenship. Surely, the whole Ontario Human Rights Code, protecting the rights of citizens is the legitimate and important thing that should be put in The Department of Citizenship.

I sketch that by way of review of some proposals we have been making during the estimates. I want now to go one step forward. I was rather interested in the Prime Minister's (Mr. Robarts) comment on the so-called bilingual districts that were envisaged in the B and B report.

As far as this government is concerned, it is going to be approached in a somewhat different way than was proposed in the B and B report. The Prime Minister indicated that he would be unhappy at the idea of delineating the district because you would create what might be described or come to be described as a French-Canadian ghetto, or hiving off French Canadians.

Quite frankly, I must say that I think that the reservation the Prime Minister has raised has some merits. It also raises problems as to how you phase out of an undesignated bilingual district; where the rights are going to be granted and assured, I presume we are moving towards that. How do you phase out from an area where these rights will be, in some fashion or other, guaranteed, into an area where there will be no such guarantee because the proportion of French-Canadian population has edged down until it is nothing, or only one or two per cent?

What I am asking the Minister is whether or not in his concept of the whole function of The Department of Citizenship, the idea of the human rights code, or the idea of the bilingual districts—since they too are going to be another mechanism for assuring citizens of their rights that are part and parcel of a bilingual country—should not more appropriately become part of The Department of Citizenship?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this comment. Perhaps it would be sufficient to say at this point that the whole concept of the broadening of the work of the citizenship branch is presently under pretty active review by government. Having said that, perhaps that is all I can say until such time as that review is completed. Any announcements which come as a result of that review must be made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A most illuminating statement.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer): Not bad, it will do!

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am sure any member of the Legislature will realize that matters such as these are policy decisions which have to be announced in their proper way.

The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside—if I have the riding correctly—and now the hon. member for York South, have raised, as others have, some very worthwhile questions with respect to the broad view of citizenship as it would be represented in the programme of the province. What we have been trying to do, certainly in the last little while, using the communications model as one, is to show that all of us in the Legislature are concerned about anyone who feels in any way disadvantaged in the citizenship concept.

We see as a very acute illustration of this, new people with their particular set of duties; and as the hon. member for York South said, all of us recognize these as special responsibilities. Now, he says, and we are all giving this some thought, what about everybody from this standpoint, and what about the whole broad outlook with respect to this programme when you think in terms of the broad terms of reference laid down by the very statute which encompasses this department.

Perhaps I could say at this stage that all of these matters are presently under review and we have made some very interesting observations along these lines ourselves as our contribution to this broad citizenship concept. What develops remains a matter of that type of discussion and consideration. I appreciate the comments.

Mr. MacDonald: I note with interest that the matter is under consideration, and I offer these suggestions to the Minister for nothing. If he does not implement them by 1971 the New Democratic government will.

Mr. Singer: The member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) says it cannot happen.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Would you like me to read you what the member for Riverdale says, page 1774?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): He is always dreaming, that member for York South.

Mr. Chairman, we have about \$1 million in this section of the Minister's estimates that he is asking for, about a quarter of a million dollars up from last year. I have always had a vague suspicion that this whole caper—I could be very wrong in this—but this whole operation is where you have a captive audience, where you can inculcate them with the Tory dogma because they are not too well versed in the things that go on.

Mr. MacDonald: "Acculturizing" is the word.

Mr. Sargent: That is a good word. He was using "culturism" as a synonym for "biculturalism". I can use the big words too, I guess. Was that "acculturism"?

Mr. Singer: I have the right page reference, 1774, or would you like me to read it to you again?

Mr. Sargent: I do think there is a great area of duplication here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1703?

Mr. Sargent: We had a good chairman a minute ago. Slow these guys down.

I do say that from where I sit, we do not hear too much about this \$1 million spent up in Owen Sound, I think there is a concentration of spending in the Toronto market and maybe rightly so if this is the market where the would-be Tories are. They want to—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1703, citizenship? Is the member talking about citizenship?

Mr. Sargent: Yes. We are talking about spending \$1 million on educating these people how to vote Tory. I would like the Minister to tell us why? What is the motivation for a person to take this language course that he is saying is available, and they get paid to take the course in education or under Manpower.

We have a great area of duplication. We have an exercise going on and I do not doubt for a moment that he will get a chance to get a shot at these people properly. He is going to give them the good treatment then. There is a good saturation potential there and I think this goes on.

Would the Minister advise? Does he get subsidies from Ottawa towards this? If so, what percentage?

Hon. Mr. Welch: In the teaching of English to adults, we recover from the government of Canada 50 per cent of the actual teaching costs of the actual salaries that we spend on this programme. In addition, we recover from The Department of the Secretary of State the full cost of text books.

Mr. Sargent: Could the Minister advise, under this citizenship branch, there must be some communication between the government and the applicant, the would-be user of this course. Is that right? Letters?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Oh yes. In fact—

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Pictures too!

Hon. Mr. Welch: In fact, there are some very interesting letters from the students who graduate from these classes.

Mr. Sargent: I did not ask the Minister that. But at the starting point there must be a letter from this Minister and the Prime Minister saying they are making this thing available. You know, a nice big gesture. Do you do that?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No.

Mr. Sargent: How is this launched?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now the member has mentioned it, perhaps we should look into that. That could be part of the acculturation process. Of course, many of these people work through the associations and societies that have grown up of people with like ethnic backgrounds. One of the big contact points and one very important in Toronto is the international institute with which group we work very closely.

Many of our people from Italy work through the COSTI organization. And so the influence goes out through this particular group.

I think the point I would like to make, and I want to emphasize this, Mr. Chairman, is that we co-operate with many volunteer groups in this programme. Our main job, we think, is through the language specialists we have to work with volunteers with respect to the teaching programme. Many of these programmes are operated as evening classes by boards of education and I am sure the board in Owen Sound would have a class or two, depending on the need in that area.

This is the type of programme which does develop. As we go through this, we work very closely with the federal government's Department of Citizenship, as I indicated earlier, because they, through their federal Department of Manpower and Immigration, come in contact immediately with these people on their arrival to assist them in their settling in in this country; at that time they would make known to them—because, after all, the government of Canada is a part of this language programme—the language training possibilities which are available.

Earlier, under Manpower and Immigration there was an opportunity offered. To the credit of our director of citizenship for the province, Mr. Colombo, Ottawa at one stage designated the acquisition of language as one

of the skills for which compensation would be paid. There has been some modification but just for the sake of our discussion today, it was possible earlier for a man to come quickly into the programme and actually be paid while he was learning. Here, once again, is a useful tool in order to help him to integrate into the rest of Ontario and Canadian life.

There are many ways in which the services of this department are, in fact, made known in this co-operative spirit which exists between this department and other departments of this government and with those branches of the federal government which are just as interested and just as concerned in this programme as we are here.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1703? The hon. member for Port Arthur had been trying to get the floor—

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, we have ethnic ghettos at the Lakehead. I do not say that in any bad sense of the term at all, but from the point of view that we have groups of people of the same ethnic origin who simply gather together. Socially, they are almost always together and their big barrier, of course, is that they do not speak the English language.

I know people who have been in this country for 40 years and still cannot speak English, except maybe hello-goodbye. Obviously, these people are at a disadvantage for any employment opportunities. In Port Arthur, for example, we call one area there Little Finland, because we have about 10,000 people of Finnish background who live there, as the Minister, I am sure knows. In Fort William, we have 9,000 or 10,000 people of Ukrainian background. They do, primarily, stick together and I think that language is their big problem.

I just wonder to what extent this department reaches out to those people? Obviously, a lot of them are not aware that they could learn the English language at very little expense. I think perhaps a lot of them would like to learn English but have never done so and are at the point of saying, "well, it is good enough for my children and my descendants." I wonder whether the department does a job of salesmanship with this kind of people?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair criticism with respect to any information-type programme. All I can say is that we try our best to make the programmes that are

available known to as many people as we can. I would think any school board in any community would certainly include that type of programme in their adult education programme or night school, whatever they still call it.

I can only say that as part of our continuing attempt to make these facilities and this programme available to people, we would be only too happy to send further information to the various ethnic clubs in the riding of the hon. member or anywhere.

We have these little kits as well, Mr. Chairman; the language bulletins of government services in 13 languages as I mentioned the other day, including English and French. They are part of the information programme, and written in these various languages in the hope of introducing government work and government services to the people.

I think it is always fair criticism in any programme dealing with people that perhaps we can always do better; we can always do more to advertise these services and these facilities that are available for our people. I would hope that perhaps, having raised the question, we might now solicit the support of the hon. member in making that sort of thing known.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, there is another point that occurs to me on this. Besides the employment point and the fact that a lot of these people are really excluded from community activity because of the language barrier, there is another very important point that I think, perhaps, I realized more during the last provincial election campaign than I did at any other time.

It is this. All political parties, I think, will have a few key people in a given ethnic district, who speak English as well as the language of that ethnic group; let us say Italian, Finnish or Ukrainian. Now what happens? Because these people do not understand the English language and cannot follow the advertisement of various political programmes, they go to their friend who does speak English and that friend actually controls their vote.

If you are going to talk about citizenship, the one great right that we all have—to participate in government once every four years as far as the province is concerned—they have really forfeited to someone else, because they do not speak the language. This bothers me a great deal. I daresay I got a lot of votes this way.

You know; you know the right people who have a lot of influence in a district and—let us tell it like it is—you go to that person and convince them that you are the one. They will take care of, maybe, several hundred people who will vote merely because Mrs. So-and-So said that was the right person.

This is just how serious this language problem is. This is why I suggest, at this time, that the Minister and his department step up their programmes of salesmanship to reach these people and make them understand how important it is that they understand the English language.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister have any comments?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I want to be quite fair; there have been two speakers from this group. The hon. member for Thunder Bay has been trying to get the floor.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. About a year ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! The Chairman has pointed out that the last two speakers have been from the Liberal party. It is only fair that we recognize one from the New Democratic Party. I will do everything possible to see that seven Liberals speak as opposed to five NDPs, which is in perfect proportion. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, about a year ago I asked the Provincial Secretary during his estimates if his department was giving any thought to reviewing the conditions under which a person can vote in this province. I was quickly told by the Provincial Secretary and, in questioning, the Minister of Municipal Affairs that if he made any significant changes in the voting laws in the province he would, in some way, disenfranchise 180,000 people. I drew his attention to the fact that you had to be a Canadian citizen to run on a school board, but it was not necessary to be a Canadian citizen to vote in other elections.

It seemed to me to be highly irregular that we should have one set of values for one political office and another set of values for another political office. I was wondering if there were any on-going consultations with a view to revising the election laws and the

requirement for citizenship at the municipal and the provincial levels.

It seems to me that it is not necessary for anybody who is interested in the Canadian way of life to spend five years in the country before he can become enfranchised. I think that it should be possible for this department to come up with a more realistic set of laws for somebody who really wants to take an active part in what is going on in the political life in our province at all levels. I think it is unfair that you should ask him to prove himself over a period of five years, in a good many cases, before he is given an opportunity. If he does not come from the British Isles or a British Commonwealth country we deny him that right for a period of five years.

This seems to be very, very unfair. I was wondering why you would not, after having admitted somebody into the province and into Canada, have them pass a test as to their knowledge of the country. Once the authorities, whoever they may be—whether it be your department or your counterpart at the federal level—have satisfied themselves that these people are familiar enough with the language and conversant enough with our laws, why should they not be given ample opportunity to express their opinion with regard to what is going on in the political scene much earlier than a five-year period? I was hoping that the Provincial Secretary would comment on that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This matter the hon. member mentions was raised a year ago and we have two or three points wrapped up in the comments.

The first, of course, we have to appreciate is that the government of Canada confers the status of citizen of Canada on those who apply and qualify.

Then there is the question of the basis of the franchise which is, really I think, the point which was raised earlier. As I understand The Legislative Assembly Act or the election law of the province, you must be a Canadian citizen—

Mr. Singer: No, British subject—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am sorry, I am really quoting the amended Act—

Mr. Singer: The amended Act is not before the House.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps the member for Downsview will let the Minister answer. Then he might comment on the Minister's answer at an appropriate time.

What I am trying to say is that all Canadian citizens are deemed by the Act to be British subjects and therefore, there is some reference now to British subjects in the Act.

What I really wanted to simplify was that Canada, the government of Canada, changed that, as I understand their Act, and said: "Canadian citizen or other British subject". As I understand the draft Election Act that came before the Legislature, from the select committee, they used the same wording.

It would seem to me that if we are going to talk about the basis of who has the vote, that is where we should hope there might be some expression of the opinion of the Legislature through the report of the select committee on The Election Act.

I have been reading in the papers recently that, I think it is, the federal member for Scarborough—or one of the Scarborough ridings—has a private bill before the House of Commons now to eliminate this distinction and to treat all newcomers to Canada the same way and to make Canadian citizenship the sole basis.

Mr. MacDonald: I hope their private bill has a better fate than ours.

Hon. Mr. Welch: As far as I am concerned, I am the first to agree with the hon. member that there is some inconsistency on this subject within our own legislation, with the school board legislation about which the hon. member for York South is quite familiar, providing that only a Canadian citizen can sit on the school board of the province. In the other legislation we still have the British subject in this favoured position.

All I can say is that I would hope that as we consider the election law, particularly the new one that is before us, that might be the opportunity that we, as members, would have in expressing our opinion with respect to that basis.

I want to point out one other thing. As you know, to get our status of citizen—this goes back to the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight). Before anyone can vote in this country they have to be, in fact, a Canadian citizen if they come from these other countries, and as part of their application for citizenship they have to have some proficiency in the English language.

I certainly am one who would want to dissociate myself from any concept that new people vote in blocks according to how some boss might tell them how to vote. I have more respect for the individuality of these

people who exercise pretty keen judgment on their own.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Call it a theory of the Liberal Party.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Certainly that is my approach with any new people with whom I come in contact. If anybody says he can deliver a certain number of votes, I would hold him in the greatest of suspicion.

Mr. Sargent: Just like the unions—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Perhaps we could sum up by simply saying this, that I think the comment made by the hon. member places the matter before the House, and perhaps the place for that to be expressed further is at the time of the consideration of the new election legislation which will be before this Legislature.

Mr. Knight: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order. The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Knight: I would make it clear to the members of the House that I would not go out and solicit block votes. I am suggesting that this is happening, regardless of who the candidate may be, as a reality—maybe not a desirable one and certainly not as a reflection on these people—but if I did not understand the language of the county. We all do it anyway. We consult with other people as to who we should vote for. But when you cannot even understand the speeches and you do not even know what is written on the paper, you are going to go to somebody you rely on to tell you who to vote for.

I am saying this is a disadvantage to these people. Certainly, I would have more advantage in deciding who I am going to vote for because I understand all these speeches better than a person who does not understand the language. But I want to make it absolutely clear that I would not condone the candidate soliciting block votes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Speaking to this point of order, Mr. Chairman, how many people cannot speak English and yet, are citizens?

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member was speaking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I think the points have been made. The hon. member for Downsview may have the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, this morning in the private bills committee there was a private bill from the city of Toronto which dealt with a new procedure for by-election and the council for that municipality. And they repeated the qualifications presently in The Election Act. Much to the embarrassment of a colleague of this hon. Minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), who was there, when the qualification "British subject" came up, the Minister of Municipal Affairs had to say: "Well, something is happening, we are not quite sure what it is."

I do not blame anyone other than the government in this regard, because they repeat—the solicitor for the city of Toronto—repeats the qualification still contained in The Election Act. One would have thought that this Minister would have been eager and anxious to do this far in advance of waiting for any report of any select committee.

In fact, what the Minister said—and I suspect it is not really binding—he threw out as a side suggestion that hopefully some day soon the House is going to consider the select committee's report. There has been no indication from anyone on the government side. I do not know whether the Provincial Secretary is qualified to give it or not, but there has been no indication from anyone on the government side that this is anything more than another report that can, perhaps, sit on the shelf for days or months or years and perhaps never really be considered in the form in which it is presented.

I would hope the Minister has the power and the authority to say that the government is going to bring in a bill somewhat in the form recommended by the select committee. If that is so, I would commend them for it. But I suspect he has not that power and he has not that authority. I would like to hear it from him if he has been commissioned to do that by his leader, because we do not really know. The fact is, as recently as this morning, Mr. Chairman, we passed a bill out

of the private bills committee that referred to voting qualifications in terms of only being a British subject. And there was no effort to change it.

An amendment was suggested and the Minister said: "Well, we can't really do it." The Minister of Municipal Affairs admitted that an education bill had gotten through by accident, changing it.

Let me relate the discussion that took place in our select committee. An amendment was moved—interestingly enough—by the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) saying that the words "British citizen" be deleted and the words "Canadian citizen" be substituted. At this point, some of the government members on that committee said: "Oh, this is a terrible thing, let us compromise as we always do and let us use this resounding phrase: 'a Canadian citizen or other British subject'."

So, half a loaf being better than none, those of us who thought that the suggestion made by the member for Kenora had substantial merit—but perhaps would have difficulty in getting the whole thing through all in one fell swoop and causing this great revolution in the province of Ontario—accepted this compromise.

So, the unanimous report of the committee reads: any person of voting age, a Canadian citizen or other British subject who has a residence qualification—and so on. Mr. Chairman, how long is it going to be before it comes to pass, if, as recently as this morning, the government of Ontario was unable to speak in this fashion. We have a Department of Citizenship, Minister of Citizenship, our own flag, our own anthem, and on and on and on. We also have the Minister concentrating in 13 languages to spread the message of Canadian citizenship. Why does he not call it Canadian citizenship in our own statutes and be done with it? Do not wait for the final deliberations. Let us show a little initiative and a little imagination and be proud that we are Canadians.

It being 6.00 of the clock, the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Welch, concluded	2789
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2829

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1969

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP (Concluded)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1703, citizenship. The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like for a few minutes to direct the attention of the Minister (Mr. Welch) back to the question of citizenship. He spoke in answer to the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) before the recess for supper, but there is a very great feeling among the newcomers to Canada that the five-year wait for citizenship is far too long.

I quite realize that this is a federal matter but I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he thinks it possible that this government, or this Legislature, might make representations to the federal government in respect to this matter.

A lot of people who come here look upon the five-year period as just too extended. They learn the language. They make up their minds that they are going to stay in Canada and make this their native country. They feel that once they have a working knowledge of the language and have determined they are going to stay here, that they should be allowed then to apply for citizenship even though the five-year term has not expired. They think that at the end of two years, three years, or whatever it may be, they should be allowed to make this application, to enter the full privilege of citizenship, to vote and to participate in the future of the country.

So I would urge, Mr. Chairman, through you, to the Minister, that some representation might be made from provincial governments to the federal government in this respect—that is the shortening of the term for citizenship. There is no reason why, because our forefathers said five years, that in this day and age we should not say two years, three years, or as soon as the person may be ready.

We have coming into this country great numbers of very industrious new Canadians. I know in my own area we have great numbers of Italians, people who have made a great contribution already to the building of that part of Metropolitan Toronto. And this is true of the other cities because so many of these immigrants are in construction. They are buying their homes, they are settling down and raising families, they are building their schools, they are part and parcel of the community—as a matter of fact in many areas they are the community, and they feel that they have a right to determine the direction which that community ought to take.

So I would urge upon the Minister that this be done, that this kind of representation be made.

The second thing I would like to raise with the Minister is something a little different. There is a growing body of opinion among these people that even though the federal government might refuse to act, provincially and municipally some new arrangement should be made so that they could vote after a time lag, a certain number of years spent in the country. After they have decided to stay here, after they have become property owners, or whatever the situation may be, they should be allowed to vote even without that citizenship—if the federal government will not move.

Personally I think that citizenship is important, but there is a growing body of opinion, and I bring it to the House tonight, that even though federally citizenship should not be allowed before five years are up, the vote might be arranged at these lower levels of government—provincially and municipally—after a shorter time.

I attended a meeting last Sunday morning, Mr. Chairman, called by a committee of Italian Canadians. Some of them have been here for some time, some not so long, but that meeting was called specifically to air this problem. They invited members of the various levels of government. I was there as one of those representatives. Federal members were there too, and municipal.

This was their cry—that they wanted this kind of consideration. They are quite willing

that they should get citizenship and wait for it, provided the time was shortened. But they also said that if that is not possible then they would like considered this whole idea of municipal and provincial voting, with certain limitations, even before the citizenship came. One student who has been here for three years spoke, and put the case very well where he said, in effect:

I have come here, I am in the midst of my university course, I am interested in politics, I would very much like to participate at this stage actively in the government of this nation, because I like Canada. I plan to stay here. This is my home. Italy is no longer my home in the sense that I have no intention of going back there to live. I am settling here. I am a Canadian. I would very much like to apply for my citizenship now.

His English is good; he is being educated; he is a thoughtful person; he determined that he is going to stay here, and participate and build Canada. This was a case of a young man. There were several like that in the audience who could express themselves very, very well and yet they have to wait several more years, in some cases, before they can even apply for citizenship. They felt that this is an injustice.

So I convey to you tonight, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister through you, this desire of a growing body of our population that some real change should take place in this whole field of citizenship. I would urge upon the Minister two things, the two things I have outlined: One, that representations be made in a realistic and powerful way to the federal government that the time for application for citizenship be changed so that the time factor be shortened; and two, that real consideration should be given to this whole idea of how these people can participate at the municipal and provincial level, even though the federal government refuses to act in this field.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1703, the hon. member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on the matter of immigration, but since the member did rise and mention it, perhaps I ought to pass a few comments on this subject. Perhaps I am in a better position to do so than most, as aside from Charles Cash, presently serving in the federal House, I think I am the only European-born member who is sitting occupying elected office in this country. Hav-

ing been born out of the jurisdiction, born out of Canada, I have some idea of what acquiring—

Hon. J. H. White (Minister of Revenue): I am foreign-born also.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Where were you born?

Mr. Ben: I apologize, I forgot.

Mr. Singer: Where?

An hon. member: In America, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ben: Well, I was referring to other than any English-speaking country.

Mr. Singer: In Alabama?

Mr. Ben: Many people feel that a country which imposes a waiting period of five years, or the like, before one can acquire citizenship, is imposing a penalty on those that immigrate into that particular country. That is one way of looking at it, and perhaps, in some quarters, a justifiable way of looking at it. However, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member for Yorkview, that there is another side to the picture, and that is, any country does not want a person to hastily take on to himself the decision of renouncing the citizenship of the country of his birth. And in many cases it is necessary.

An hon. member: It is a matter of choice.

Mr. Ben: It is his choice, but I think it is wise that a person should not be permitted to make it too hastily. Again, the echo came from over there, it is his choice. Too many people are motivated by their first impressions.

I happen to know many people who came here intending to make this their home, and after they got here they expressed an intention of so doing because, if the hon. member for Yorkview will recall, at one time you had to file a declaration of intention of becoming a citizen. I know many of those who came here, filed those declarations, and then changed their minds. I have to be frank, Mr. Chairman, and point out that an overwhelming majority of those who changed their minds did not in essence change it that much. They were using Canada as a stepping stone to going into the United States of America. I would say that about 90 per cent of them were doing that.

So, although I agree with the hon. member for Yorkview that there should be some

scheme worked out where these people who have quickly adapted themselves to our habits, our customs and our traditions, and have familiarized themselves with our language, should be able to participate actively in politics, but I just do not feel that the answer to it is conferring rights of citizenship upon these people at an earlier date. I rather suspect that if they went to a testing office and they were asked who is the Prime Minister of Canada and a man said, "John Robarts", he would pass.

Mr. Young: You have to have your standards.

Mr. Ben: There should be some scheme worked out. I do not think that citizenship is the criterion.

If I may say a few words, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the point raised by my colleague for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight). I do so just to allay his fears that perhaps these new Canadians have a familiarity with the English language that is not as good as it should be, and may not be as well informed on political issues as those who read the English papers adequately. We are fortunate that this government, the governments of the different provinces and the government of Canada have unpaid help in acclimatizing these people to their new country, to this Canada of ours, and that unpaid help is the Canadian ethnic press, which acts as a sort of transit camp for the traditions of those who come into this country.

I do not know how many new Canadian publications there are, but I note that in the public accounts, for the last fiscal year reported, this department spent some \$51,000 for new Canadian publications. These perform a great service to this country because they do translate the items that are most newsworthy into the languages of new citizens coming to our shores. Roughly, I would say that there are close to 50 of these publications distributed in Ontario, and that they have a weekly circulation of between 700,000 and one million issues in I do not know how many tongues.

Some of the larger ethnic groups have more than one. The Italians for a long time had only one publication, *Couriere Italiano*. A new Canadian, Mr. Malvisi came in and founded a new one, *Giornale de Toronto*, and pretty soon I think his was exceeding the circulation of the one that had been found earlier. The Ukrainians in Toronto have four publications. The only group that I can recall, offhand, that does not have a publica-

tion of its own is the Maltese, and I think that is maybe because they come from an island where English was the first if not the second language, and I think I am correct that they do not have a local publication in Maltese.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): *Maltese Herald*.

Mr. Ben: They do, do they. In English or Maltese?

An hon. member: Both.

Mr. Ben: In both. Then that covers practically everyone and I am happy to hear that they do have a publication of their own.

So I am not too concerned that these people are not well informed. I think that generally speaking—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member for Port Arthur says you are dreaming—

Mr. Ben: I did not hear him say that.

Mr. Stokes: That is what he told me.

Mr. Ben: Well then, you were dreaming when he told you that because I did not hear him tell you that either.

Mr. Stokes: That is what he told me.

Mr. Ben: He is a mind reader over there.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ben: He felt that the department here could do more to bring to these people the issues that pertain at any election time. I thought that was the gist of his argument, that the government was not doing enough.

I think perhaps more support should be coming from this government to those newspapers in the way of grants for the publication of educational articles. At the present time they publish ads which translate many of the rules and regulations that come into force—for instance, building codes and safety rules and regulations would no doubt be printed in Italian in the Italian newspapers and that is laudable—but I think more money should be given to have these newspapers print articles that would help these people adapt themselves to their environment that much earlier.

The Minister pointed out that there are certain associations or institutions in the province that do help these people. He mentioned the International Institute of Metropolitan Toronto, and I note that in the last

fiscal year, it received \$16,000 from this particular department. I do believe that it also received a grant from The Department of Education. I am not positive of that but I rather suspect it did. I note that COSTI, the Italian community educational centre, did receive \$13,977, and in checking The Department of Education estimates, I found that it received an additional \$8,000 from there.

But I have not been able to find two very worthy organizations in the city of Toronto mentioned in either this Minister's estimates or in the estimates of The Department of Education, and I refer to the University Settlement on Grange Street and the St. Christopher's House. Perhaps the University Settlement may be receiving its funds indirectly from the University of Toronto, I cannot say. Nevertheless, they still, if they do receive such funds, go to Metro Toronto and the city of Toronto for funds to help to operate this settlement house. As far as—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Do you want to give a credit line to the man who conceived and helped build the settlement house.

Mr. Ben: I would be very happy to do that; yes, I would indeed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman).

Mr. Ben: I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I believe giving credit where credit is due, and when it comes to a discussion of the new Canadian groups in this city, I must say that credit goes to the hon. Minister of Correctional Services. He seldom avoids accepting an invitation to honour a gathering of these new Canadians with his presence. I have to make the same statement to the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) who once held the portfolio that the hon. Minister of Citizenship and the Provincial Secretary now holds, and in all fairness I must say that as the Minister of Citizenship, this present holder of that office does not stint in lending his presence to these gatherings to make these people feel at home.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I believe in giving credit where credit is due and this particular Minister and the others seem to know very well the background of these people, and I compliment them on it. The fact is, there still is not a grant in these estimates for St. Christopher's House which is in the riding of the

hon. Minister of Correctional Services. And I would ask, why not? This particular settlement serves, you might say, 90 per cent of the Portuguese in the city of Toronto, and I would say that 90 per cent of the Portuguese in the province are centred in the city of Toronto. I just cannot understand why there is not a grant for them mentioned here.

As I say, I cannot see the University Settlement mentioned or St. Christopher's House. And I would like to ask the hon. Minister why there are no provisions either in his estimates or in the estimates of the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), and I might say I also looked at the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services and there are no grants there either. Surely there must be some reason why you do not support these worthy institutions. Would the Minister please answer that?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): I am not able to speak, Mr. Chairman, as far as other departments are concerned. It was the thought and the approach of this department that in supporting the work of, say the international institute in its multi-ethnic approach, that perhaps we were in some way getting ourselves involved in the overall work. I am not familiar, very frankly, with the programme of St. Christopher's House or the University Settlement. I would be very happy to take a look at it as it relates to the activities of this particular department and to meet with whatever other Ministers may be involved directly or indirectly with this work, but particularly from the standpoint mentioned by the hon. member as to the programmes there and how we might be helpful in some way even within the existing programmes of language training. I would be very happy, now that I have had the comments of the hon. member, to take a look into it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, is this vote 1703 on citizenship?

Mr. Chairman: Has the hon. member for Humber finished his remarks?

Mr. Ben: Not quite, not quite.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. Minister would just wait a moment?

Mr. Ben: Again I appreciate the Minister's desire to be progressive in this particular matter.

If I may offer another suggestion to him, I think the Minister is well familiar with the number of ethnic halls scattered throughout the length and breadth of this province, and I think that they also serve a very great purpose in adapting the newcomers into our environment, helping them to become politically acute—if that makes some members happy—helping them to learn the language, helping them learn our customs, our habits and traditions. I think that those who do run classes in these buildings should receive either an abatement in their taxes to the degree that they use these buildings for educational purposes, or should receive grants in lieu of taxes in proportion to the moneys expended for educational purposes.

Educational purposes may not just be reading, writing and arithmetic; they could be cultural activities where people meet and get an idea of what the culture of their fellow Canadians is like, because that is also an education in itself. I would appreciate it if the Minister could give consideration to giving some relief to these people who do run cultural and educational activities in their premises, because all this goes to make a more beautiful mosaic of what we call Canada.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. Lawrence: I have a very important matter, Mr. Chairman, as this is vote 1703 under citizenship. I wonder if it would be in order to introduce some very important young citizens of the province. Some of the members of the St. George Young Progressive Conservatives are in the gallery.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure the committee is glad to welcome our visitors this evening.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister could advise me what liaison there is between Trade and Development and its services, and transportation and communication or recreation in his department. They have an immigration branch, as I understand it. Would the Minister advise me:

1. What liaison is there between their services available to people outside our country and our province, and the Minister's department when they come in here?

2. Does he have any feedback at all in connection with the services provided by Trade and Development?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am glad this question was asked because it helps to illustrate in a very real way the type of co-ordination we seek in this overall programme. The work of immigration, insofar as this government is concerned, comes under the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) as mentioned, and their particular function is one of recruitment for special skills needed insofar as this province and its development are concerned. We work with them in much the same way that we have these meetings with the federal Department of Immigration and Manpower—or Manpower and Immigration, whatever the order should be—in the hopes that as they arrive and as they start their life in this province, we would be following up with them and working with them as much as we can.

I cannot speak definitely for that branch of government except to say that they work through the various trade offices which are maintained throughout the world, at locations which are noted, and as I say they have their special programme of recruitment, I think insofar as they are related to industrial needs and skills.

Mr. Bullbrook: Most respectfully to the Minister, platitudes are acceptable but not at this time of night.

Could he tell me, in answer to my question, what direct liaison exists between his department and the other?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I know that the member for Sarnia did not attempt to have selective hearing but I thought that was what I was doing when I was answering. I was not extending platitudes, I was attempting very honestly to answer his question. I will repeat my answer. We meet monthly with the officials of this department. We are in very close contact with all of their activities, particularly as they would relate to our general programme of integration. We meet with this department as we do with the officials of The Department of Manpower and Immigration, who have the broader immigration responsibilities insofar as the country is concerned. There is very close liaison and co-ordination.

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. Minister used the word "platitude." I did not mean to be unduly offensive; I was just suggesting, for example, that there was a degree of self aggrandisement in the attitude of liaison.

I am wondering if the hon. Minister can tell me what members of his department meet

with what members of The Department of Trade and Development in connection with these programmes.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The director and the assistant director of citizenship, and the two liaison officers of the department who are stationed here in Toronto.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, under this vote, on language training, are there any funds in this allocated to the training of the House in the French language, or is that under the civil service vote?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There are no funds in this vote for that.

Mr. Paterson: Not anywhere in your department?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No.

Vote 1703 agreed to.

On vote 1704:

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

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, the whole ball of wax insofar as the Queen's Printer is concerned covers probably \$1 million or \$2 million; we cannot ever assess what is involved here. In this particular vote we are talking about \$300,000. But it is an amazing thing to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have in the press all day reports about Ottawa, the trouble down there, the scandals that the auditors—

Mr. Singer: Criticism.

Mr. Sargent: —have uncovered down there, and it is an amazing thing to me that never in the history of this province have the auditors come up with anything which would be critical of the operation of the government.

Mr. Singer: That is a very good question. And do not throw your hands up because you are not angels, not a single one of you.

Mr. Sargent: It is pretty hard to believe that those things can happen in an intelligent society, but we are broadminded enough to know that these things can happen, and they do happen, at the federal level. They have a system that will scrutinize the books and will level with the public and say, "these things are not right." But you people try to con us into believing that nothing ever happens over there.

Mr. Singer: That is the point.

Mr. Sargent: And the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) sits there and he shakes his head and he smiles, and he will say, "We got by another year with our estimates." You are up tomorrow are you not? We will get a shot at you pretty soon. But I think the Treasury bench should be ashamed of the fact that they will not level with the people of Ontario and say, "We have an auditors branch that does a job, not for the Tory party, but for the people of Ontario." I would like the Minister to tell me, in the administration of his office, have the auditors ever brought to you any irregularities in the operation of your branch?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There are no springs, no water, in the basement of the Queen's Printer's building here in Toronto. You can think that one over. Insofar as the Queen's Printer's operation is concerned, I am advised that the only problem that has been brought to our attention was a shortage of five cents in connection with the operation of the *Ontario Gazette*.

Mr. Sargent: This is a good example of—
Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: If they can get an intelligent guy like this Minister to go along like that, what the hell happens to the rest of us? It shows what a snow job is going on here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): He is worth calling an Aberdonian.

Mr. Sargent: We will assume then that we do not need any auditors at all. Nothing is ever wrong. And you are saying, as a Minister of the Crown—you are telling me, sir—that to your knowledge, on your honour, you have never had any irregularities brought to you at all, as far as the Queen's Printer's branch, or any aspect of your branch, is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that the fact that the auditor, in examining the books in all branches of this department, has brought in a clean bill of health, is not evidence of the fact that we do not need an auditor. It is just evidence of the fact that there is proper and efficient administration. This is a good department about which, to raise this question, because there is a tremendous amount of revenue produced by this

department. When you think of the companies branch and the registrar general's branch, to name only two—and this branch too, the sale of publications—there is a tremendous amount of revenue for the province here. A continual audit is going on on a regular basis.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And just a nickel short, imagine that.

Mr. Sargent: Going back as little as five years ago, your department was the most scandalous branch in the history of government here in Ontario. We had a crime report based around your department.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): We are talking about the estimates for next year.

Mr. Sargent: That is all right, Mr. Minister. Getting to the Queen's Printer, and this department—

Mr. Singer: This is why he worries.

Mr. Sargent: I am involved in the printing business, I know something about this business, and never to my knowledge have I ever had a chance to get any business from the Queen's Printer in my part of Ontario. I do not suggest that I would want any, being a conflict of interest, but I was mayor of Owen Sound for a number of years, and I never had five cents of printing in my life from Owen Sound, because it does not work that way. I would like to suggest, though, that I ought to have a chance to refuse any of this business. But I would like to know how much decentralization of bids there is for printing these millions of dollars worth of material that you are spending money on here—the complete waste of thousands and thousands of dollars of stuff we get on our desks that we never read. I think we must get at least hundreds of pounds of mail each year that none of us ever looks at. This is a matter of record. The best filing cabinet we have is our waste basket.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Every one of the Ministers has his own little empire. They are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on promotion and what have you. So I suggest that there is something radically wrong when you have a centralization of all this printing in the city of Toronto, so that I do not have a chance to bid, and no one up our way has a chance to bid. I would like to know how you would assess who gets all this gravy.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think we should comment on this, Mr. Chairman. The operation of this particular branch of this department really does not function the way the member has mentioned. Let us talk about the purchasing of printing. If it is estimated that the cost of any particular requisition or need will be under \$1,000 we have a very systematic sharing of this printing throughout the whole province of Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): On what basis?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am just coming to that now. In this province, anyone who is in the printing business can go on the list of the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Singer: How?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): How do they do that?

Hon. Mr. Welch: They simply write a letter.

Mr. Singer: Who writes the letter?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Just a minute. They simply write a letter to the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Singer: That does you no good.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Perhaps the hon. members would permit the Provincial Secretary to give an explanation, and then they may heckle or talk or discuss whichever matter they wish to do.

Hon. Mr. Welch: They simply write a letter to the Queen's Printer, and in correspondence with him, share with him some list of the type of equipment that they have in order to be categorized for the type of printing they can do. And on a regular basis, and it is there for anyone to see, Queen's Printer's work is shared throughout the entire province. I think in fairness to the members who made the interjections, there was a time that the Queen's Printer wanted, along with the letter from the printer himself, a letter from the member of Parliament on that area.

Mr. Singer: How long ago?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can assure the member that that has been discontinued for two years, and it is not required now to have the member of Parliament write a letter in connection with it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am very fascinated, really, by this remark. I suppose the Minister is just within the time limit.

Since I have been on the committee on public accounts, we did have the Queen's Printer in, and we asked him how one got on the list. He hemmed and hawed a bit and finally he said, because he is an honest man, "Well, if a member writes we put the name on the list." We said, "Why? Why is it necessary that my good friend, the member for Grey-Bruce, should have to write a letter about a printer who wants to have an opportunity"—and this is all it is—"an opportunity to tender on public business?" The Queen's Printer scratched his head and he said, "Well, it has always been done that way and that is the only way it is going to be done." Now, I am interested to hear the Provincial Secretary say it has been changed.

Hon. Mr. Welch: For the last two years.

Mr. Singer: For two years. Why was it ever done in the other way and why is it being changed now?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, the explanation that was given to me when I first became Minister of this department—and I asked the very same question—was the fact that the Queen's Printer does not have a great staff of inspectors and people to travel around the province. In order to have some evidence with respect to the establishment itself, and the fact that it was a business operation in some part of Ontario—simply as a matter of assisting him in identifying it—they asked the member; it did not matter who the member was, the member in the area where the business was located—for some type of letter saying, "John Jones does run this business in my riding". However, as of two years ago, it was felt in consultation—and I might say in consultation with me—that if this was to be interpreted in any way other than that, then simply let the printers write in and go on the list because no one (and I want this to be quite clear) no one in this province need be off the Queen's Printer's list; they need only indicate to the Queen's Printer that they want to go on his list; that is all they have to do.

Mr. Singer: Then could the Minister tell me why there is not public advertising of tenders? Why does there have to be a list, unless there is some system of preference? Surely if a printing contract is wanted and we have to print nine million copies of this document—

Hon. Mr. Welch: That would not go on the list.

Mr. Singer: Well, why not?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Because that would be assumed—

Mr. Singer: Why do we not just call for public tenders?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I will tell you why.

Mr. Singer: I wish the Minister would because, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister has said is that a list is maintained which establishes a system of preference. Sure it is. Now tell us why he has to have the list at all?

Hon. Mr. Welch: We want to point out the fact—and the hon. member for Grey-Bruce who spoke illustrated one of the great problems that might come if in fact you grouped or bulked a lot of this together and bid—we wondered whether or not there would be a fair distribution of the printing for this government. So you take these particular smaller orders—of which I am told there could be at least 7,000 in any fiscal year—and where they are estimated to cost less than \$1,000 they are shared on a very—

Mr. Sargent: What about the big orders?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —I will come to that—on a very fair basis throughout everybody in the province who is on the Queen's Printer's list.

Mr. Sargent: But it does not work that way.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now, if their estimated—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The list is open for examination at any time. Anybody who is shaking his head here tonight—the list is open for anybody to see it any time, where these small orders are going.

Mr. Singer: Will the Minister table it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There is no problem; it comes out quarterly. As to where this printing goes, it is in the book.

Mr. Singer: Why does the Minister not table the list?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): It is in the public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not have any list.

Mr. Singer: No, of course not—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I will send the hon. member the last quarterly list I have here, if he wants to take a look at it.

Mr. Singer: Send us the full list.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It comes out every month. It is there for this very reason, that you can take a look and examine it.

However, let me go back to the \$1,000. Anything that is estimated to be \$1,000 has to go out for public tender, and that is the division that is made in the Queen's Printer, and there is the procedure open for it. If it is under \$1,000, it is distributed in accordance with those who have registered with the Queen's Printer, who are further categorized on the type of equipment they have. The orders go out and are rotated in a very fair distribution throughout this province. If it is estimated to be over \$1,000, it is public tender.

Mr. Kerr: You cannot have it better than that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in every department we have these fantastically beautifully bound books that come in here with a big art overlay job—

Hon. Mr. Welch: By tender. Anything over \$1,000—

Mr. Sargent: No, this is not the case.

Mr. Singer: You just said "imagine" and I think that was the proof.

Mr. Sargent: In the majority of cases, Mr. Chairman, these big jobs that come in, like the board of education jobs, with the big overlay in colour, those are not tender jobs, those are special presentations by the artists to the government. And a bill of goods is sold to the department on those. I have been in this printing business a long time and you cannot tell me those are not special deals. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this department here is the least one we should complain about in this area. I say that respectfully but I would like the Minister to tell me that if the auditors did come to him with a great discrepancy in this area, who would hear about it? Would the Opposition hear about it? Certainly not.

Mr. Kerr: What great overlays?

Mr. Sargent: The government says to me tonight for the press—there is nobody here, but for the press—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nobody? Are those people up there nobody?

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry. They say there is a five-cent discrepancy in the accounting of

this province. Now, how naive can you expect the people of Ontario to be, in view of your past performance?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sargent: The Treasurer is not the watchdog.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am not, but I have as much right to rise on a point of order as the hon. member has, or anyone in this assembly. On a point of order, I think it is appropriate to ask the hon. member whether he is challenging the veracity, the honesty and the adequate performance of the provincial auditor.

Mr. Sargent: I am certainly challenging the fact that you will not allow an independent audit of the affairs of this province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Another point of order, Mr. Chairman; the point of order is this, that the provincial auditor is a servant of this Legislature, he is not a servant of the government.

Mr. Ben: He admitted in this House that he did not audit the books. All we can do is take your word for it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Any discussions in connection with the provincial auditor will be kept for the provincial auditor's vote.

Mr. Lewis: I fear apoplexy in the House, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell us who—

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: —who puts out The Department of Lands and Forests publication, the annual report?

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Shulman: Nobody said it was a point of order.

An hon. member: It is a way to get into the debate.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. Minister completing the answers to certain questions?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member for Scarborough West posed a question and—

Mr. Chairman: He had directed a question to the hon. Minister; I believe he wanted an answer.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but if it is felt that the member was on his feet—

Mr. Chairman: Well, I had recognized the hon. member for Scarborough before the hon. member for Grey-Bruce had risen.

Mr. Lewis: Well then, could I—

Mr. Sargent: I was in the middle of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman: All right, I am sorry, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce had not completed his questions. I did not realize that.

Mr. Sargent: It is very important to the conduct of this House, Mr. Chairman, that the Provincial Treasurer has put himself into this debate by very pointedly defending the provincial auditor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will always defend the provincial auditor.

Mr. Chairman: That is out of order we are not dealing with the provincial auditor's department.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you let him have the time to lay a charge I want to reply to it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was not laying a charge.

Mr. Chairman: We had been discussing the provincial auditor and all remarks are out of order.

Mr. Sargent: I want to challenge this Minister, Mr. Chairman, on the fact that he will not allow an independent audit of the books of this province—

Mr. Chairman: Your remarks are out of order.

Mr. Sargent: What are you afraid of then?

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with vote 1704, the Queen's Printer, not the provincial auditor.

Vote 1704, the hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, last year the Provincial Secretary kindly explained to us the procedures of these accounts under \$1,000—these printing jobs of less than \$1,000—and he has explained just now the equitable distribution of these around all the printers who wish to be on the list, but what concerns me this year and concerned me last year was, what sort of check is there to be sure that we are getting proper

value for this printing? After all, we are not in the business of subsidizing the printing industry in the province. We are interested in getting the best value in printing and you may recall that last year, the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) and myself raised examples of our Christmas card bills being well out of line; we both learned well from last year, to go to other than a Queen's Printer and we got our cards then, this year, for considerably less or equivalent value.

Is there someone independent who is familiar with printing costs and really knows this thoroughly, who is checking on the cost of this printing—and it is not going out to tenders, because we are not interested, as I mentioned before, in subsidizing the printing industry. We want to be sure there is an independent check on these smaller jobs, totalling probably \$7 million, that is giving us good value for the printing. What is the method of independently checking these smaller jobs of printing?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, on the staff of the Queen's Printer there are three qualified estimators and it is on the basis of their examination of the order that comes from the particular department of government requiring printing, that an assessment is made with respect to the under or over \$1,000 and they are quite qualified and competent in estimating. Having made a decision, they send it out on the basis of this list and whoever's turn it may be and then this work is given to this particular firm.

I think in fairness that if the printing order was to come back with any wide difference insofar as the estimation is concerned, then of course, the printer would be contacted and asked for some explanation. And I think in fairness, if the explanation was not satisfactory he might well be removed from the list—

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty I had last year, and which the hon. member for Waterloo North had, was that the actual printing bill that we got and estimated—at least the Queen's Printer obviously thought the printer was giving good value—was about double what we were able to get the job done for elsewhere and this is our concern. Do we have new estimates now?

Mr. Chairman: I believe the hon. Minister is going to provide an answer.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If you want an answer, there has been no change in the estimators.

Mr. Deacon: I do hope they are taking a course on estimating.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I think there are a few things we ought to get straight here and that is, that the printing of this government is used to subsidize the ward chests of the Tory party and there are no two ways about it.

There is one of the hon. members who is subsidizing the Tory party by paying those outrageous prices for printing to the Queen's Printer; then part of it goes into the Tory ward chest; and this has been known for a long time. Look at the reports that come out: Who designed these fancy covers? Why should there have to be gold lettering on a report on the teaching of religion in schools? Why should there have to be hard covers on 90 per cent of these publications, when they only end up in the incinerator anyway, as an hon. member pointed out? Sure, we look at them and read them for one session or two and some reports we have to keep on our shelves for 10 or 15 years because they are never considered after they are printed and are still sitting on our shelves.

But who orders these hard covers on them? Who jacks up the prices 10 or 15 per cent and then sends the Tory bag man here to get a cut of the money to put in your chest?

Now, do not act innocent because we all know that goes on and that is why we objected to your resisting an independent audit of the activities of this government. All he does is accept the figures you give him and he adds them up and he says, "By jove, you have made a nickel error in your addition." Now that is just a bunch of malarkey. If you think you are shoving that down the throats of the taxpayers you have got another think coming. They are not that gullible. That baloney that you are trying to shove down their throats smells and they will not swallow it. So do not try to make out you have got a halo on your head and say that you cut out this business of having a letter come from a member before you can get him on the list. We know that they can put him on the list and then they just list and fall down while they are waiting to get some work out of it.

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

Mr. Ben: Do not feed us that baloney, as I say. You know we just regurgitate. What we want to know is why you spend so much on printing in this government? We want to know, as was asked by the hon. member who just sat down, are we getting value for our money? For instance how many pencils has the department bought and what do they do

with the pencils, do they use them in the normal way, do they still use pencils or do they use ballpoint? Not once has this provincial auditor come up with any sensible answers. As a matter of fact he admits he does not audit, he adds up figures that you give him and that is all.

So do not give us that. You know every time a new Minister comes in here, we are supposed to accept that in two years there is going to be a bull coming from the Vatican making him a saint. We do not buy that either.

Mr. Singer: Even if he gives audiences.

Mr. Ben: Even if he gives audiences. Now, just do not sit up and appear over-virtuous; do not tell us about water in the bottom of the Queen's Printer building. Ask the Minister of Public Works—he is not here now—but he will tell you some of his buildings are sitting on underground streams. They did not bother to tell us—you know they only put down a foundation. I sat on municipal council when they found they had, I think it was Mud Stream or something running down through the complex—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mud Creek. Get it right.

Mr. Ben: What is it?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mud Creek.

Mr. Ben: Mud Creek—well, it is in the hon. member's riding, I think, so he ought to know. So they are having trouble with water in their basements too.

Who is it that decides whether there is going to be a hard cover on a report or a soft cover; whether there is going to be gold printing or just plain ordinary Tory blue printing? Tell us, who decides this? Who decides how much you are going to spend on a publication?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I want to get quite straight. Baloney or no baloney, depending on a value judgment, there are enough members in this House that know that the charges made by the hon. member just are not true.

To suggest in this House—and I have listened and if the hon. member will just listen—to suggest in the House that on the basis of the rotational system in the Queen's Printer office, only supporters of the Progressive Conservative Party get printing is absolute falsehood. It is a scandalous statement

to make because you know it is not true. There are members who represent ridings for other political parties who know very well that there is absolutely no consideration given with respect to the political affiliation or the political colour of the printer or the area from which he operates. Let us get that straight. That sort of—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order.

Mr. Ben: He is convicting himself—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ben: —convicting himself. Only the rotating list, he did not make that statement about the others.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce is attempting to—

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister has made a very wide-reaching statement. I challenge him to furnish that list in the House of the people who had—

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order.

Mr. Sargent: It is a point of order. He is making—

Mr. Chairman: No point of order. That is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: —a list of the people who had business last year with the province—

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

Mr. Sargent: —on those big contracts.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have already told the hon. member for Downsview I will table the list.

Mr. Sargent: I do not want the list, I want the money you spent and who with.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is on the list.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The printer and the amount that he got and where he is; it is all on the list, it is all there to be examined. There is nothing to hide—

Mr. Ben: You bring the books of Espie Printing here; those are the books we want to see and a few others that I could name who do your work, the Tory candidates' work, at cut rate prices because of the printing they get.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order or does he wish to enter the debate?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, my point of order is, how do—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Burr: My point of order is: How do you get into a debate when people keep jumping up in between, and when you have been up for half an hour?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the hon. member, the only way you will get in is if the rest of the committee gives a little bit of attention to the Chair, so he can find out which member rises first, and then the Chairman will recognize him. The hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, if I might just clear up one other point, the hon. member attempts to draw some attention to the distinction which I have made in my former statement between the under \$1,000 and the over \$1,000. I said specifically the under \$1,000 to show the distinction of the work throughout the province because I had already said earlier that if the cost is estimated over \$1,000, it is on tender, and therefore this is open and available for members to see the tenders with respect to this type of printing.

Mr. Sargent: It does not work that way at all.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, my first question of the Minister is: What percentage of government printing is handled by, or sanctioned by, the Queen's Printer?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am in no position to answer that question, I really do not know.

Mr. Sargent: Each Minister makes his own decision.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, the system that I described, the method of acquisition of printing through the Queen's Printer, is that we really perform a function as an agent for those departments of government and those commissions who ask the Queen's Printer to purchase this printing for them. As to the percentage of total government printing which is done, I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I can only account for that which is handled by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman: The Department of Education is one department that does quite a bit of its own arrangements for printing, and the questions that I want to ask the Minister are: Why is not this Queen's Printer, whose work I thought until tonight was so commendable, not given wider jurisdiction? Why do not all of the departments get him to handle their work because, if he is as good as we are given to believe, he could save the government a great deal of money?

Just to give you one example, I drew to the attention of the House some time ago this little document—you can hardly see it; it is less than one-eighth of an inch thick, not very big, has 28 pages and only about 12 pages of print. There are 11 completely blank pages in it, and without your glasses you could not possibly read the title page. This costs \$1.20 per copy for 5,000 copies.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is the document?

Mr. Burr: This is the College of Art Report for September, 1968.

Mr. Lewis: Part of the self aggrandisement policy.

Mr. Burr: An acquaintance of mine went to one of the top printers in the country to ask what this would cost and the answer was 74 cents. So for an order of \$6,000, it would be \$5,995. Actually, this printer would have done the job and have been happy to do it for \$3,705.

An hon. member: And still make a profit?

Mr. Burr: And still make a profit, yes. So, Mr. Chairman, my question of the Minister is: could not the Queen's Printer supervise the work of all the departments and in that way save us a great deal of money?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1704, Queen's Printer. We have had a New Democratic member so we will have a Liberal member. It will even them off.

Mr. Singer: I will gladly yield, Mr. Chairman. I will gladly yield to the Minister if he wants to answer the last member's speech.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I certainly do want to answer it.

Mr. Singer: I do not want to lose my place after him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question raised by the member for Sandwich-Riverside, I cannot speak in connection with the particular document. We would have to check our records to find out whether or not that order was placed through the Queen's Printer.

An hon. member: You ought to be able to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It does not necessarily follow that if the Queen's Printer's name is not on the document that we have them printed. It is only for those official documents that are tabled in the House, I think, that—

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, I asked the question in the House and this was printed, I think, by a Toronto printer named Cate.

Mr. Singer: Oho, we know about him.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, as you know, the Queen's Printer does no printing himself. Cate could well have printed some material for the Queen's Printer. In other words, the Queen's Printer only places printing.

The important point here is that in order to specifically find out I would have to have the Queen's Printer check the order forms to see whether or not that order was placed through the Queen's Printer or not.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): The point is using the name under false pretences.

Hon. Mr. Welch: But his name does not appear on it. The Queen's Printer's name is not on that document. The point is that there are a number of commissions and departments of this government who in fact put all their printing requirements through the Queen's Printer and the Queen's Printer uses the procedures to which I have made reference. I cannot give an explanation for this, because I do not know whether the department ordered it themselves or whether it was placed through the Queen's Printer. I can check that and I can report directly on that specific question to the hon. member.

I think it is important to know that the service which the Queen's Printer provides is there, as a central clearing house for the acquisition of printing and stationery needs of the departments of government.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am very fascinated by the answer of the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: I am very sorry to have missed your continuation. Is yours on the same point?

Mr. Singer: Exactly on the same point.

Mr. Chairman: Would you yield to the member for Sandwich-Riverside?

Mr. Singer: All right, I will yield to the member.

Mr. Burr: Would the Minister take up the matter with the Cabinet of having all of these publications directed through the Queen's Printer?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be very glad to have the whole procedure reviewed.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview. Order please!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the answer of the hon. Minister that the Queen's Printer is a sort of central collection agency.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I did not say that.

Mr. Singer: What was your phrase? Clearing house—central clearing house?

I thought we had established a while back, a year or two ago, the thought that there was some merit in having a central purchasing agency? Now that does not come under the Provincial Secretary, it comes under the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell).

There was a pretty substantial criticism in the *Financial Post* about the malfunctioning of the central purchasing agency, and there was a suggestion that has never been answered, that the Cabinet Ministers would not let it work. Now one would have thought from listening to the Provincial Secretary that the Queen's Printer supposedly was going to do the same function. Apparently it is not so, because from all the complaints that have been heard tonight from my colleagues and the members of the NDP the facts just belie this kind of a general statement. The fact is the charge has been made, and it has not been answered, that the function of printing, as run by this government, is a method of passing out patronage to friends of the Conservative Party in the province of Ontario.

Now there have been numerous examples. We talked about the provincial auditor a few moments ago. In this report of the provincial auditor, his report of 1967-68, which is the most recent one we have, on page 22, paragraph 4, he says this, and this is one of

the very few criticisms he levies at the government:

The Treasury Department have purchased about 10,000 sets of the report on the Ontario Committee on Taxation at a cost of \$91,271. I do not know who printed it, but apparently it was printed through the good offices of the province of Ontario. Arrangements were made with the Queen's Printer to sell these reports at a price of \$15 per set. At March 31, 1968, approximately 7,000 sets were still on hand. It is doubtful if these will be disposed of, as the demand for this report has not been as great as had been anticipated.

In very polite language, this is as strong a condemnation as has ever emerged from the auditor of Ontario against government about this kind of waste.

Now it has been here since this report has been published, and no Minister of the Crown, least of all the Provincial Secretary, who is responsible for the Queen's Printer, has ever bothered to stand in his place to answer it. I wonder why?

Mr. Chairman, on the fourth floor of this building—my colleague from Manitoulin and I have been relegated to the fourth floor at the moment, and, in our solitary splendour, along with the page boys, this is where our office is—every day, as we wend our way upwards into the nether reaches of the building, we pass by stacks and stacks and stacks of undistributed pamphlets, relating to the great words of wisdom in relation to the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference. They are in French, and they are in English.

Mr. Chairman: Well, could the member suggest whether—

Mr. Singer: Yes, I would suggest that they are government publications. They were printed by the Queen's Printer. No one has yet been able to figure out how you distribute them, how you use them, why the waste took place, who got the money, and what the purpose was or who had the responsibility for doing this. Now I think the time has come when this Minister, who is responsible for the Queen's Printer, has got to get up and give the public an answer to the charge made by the auditor. Tell us why there are bundles and bundles and bundles of pamphlets up on the fourth floor that nobody pays any attention to? Pamphlets that were ordered, that sit there, and will sit there until somebody throws them out. Why

do you waste hundreds of thousands of dollars of the public money through the offices of this department?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I would like to detail an answer to this question, but there is apparently a misunderstanding. Other than the publication of the *Ontario Gazette*, I am not asking for five cents from this Legislature for printing. I am not asking for any money for printing except as it might have reference to the *Ontario Gazette*. The function of the Queen's Printer is, as I have already mentioned, one of a central agency, that provides a procedure for other departments and commissions to order printing. They pay for their printing, and so the questions about any particular publication, as to its distribution, and as to its—

Mr. Singer: You are passing the buck again.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —as to its cost, should be directed to those who have ordered the printing. The question that has been raised with respect to central purchasing is a very relevant question, and I am glad it was asked, because this is a central purchasing function which the Queen's Printer performs. Discussions are now under way with the Minister under whom central services and central purchasing come, as to the procedures which might be taken to incorporate this purchasing function as part of central purchasing function.

Mr. Sargent: That was said five years ago.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, this has been a phased-in programme, and so much of it can work into time. This phase is part of the discussion, so what the hon. member mentions is a very legitimate point, and this is the type of function which will no doubt, through some discussion, be incorporated in the central purchasing programme.

Mr. Singer: All right. Then, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me which of his colleagues, if it is not himself, is the responsible member to answer the charge made by the auditor on page 22, item 4, of his last annual report? If it is not he, who then?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The Minister under whom—

Mr. Singer: The Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The department who ordered the printing.

Mr. Singer: I see. Can the Minister tell me who is the Minister responsible for the hundreds of thousands of pamphlets that sit on the fourth floor, in French and English, containing a great information about the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not know, I would have to see the publication.

Mr. Singer: Well, why do you not go up and look? And see who wastes our money?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): I realize that the hon. Minister, through the Queen's Printer, cannot be responsible for the quantity ordered by the various departments. But is not the function of the Queen's Printer to at least be a watchdog on the price charged for printing? You have explained to us what, on the surface, appears quite a foolproof system. Under \$1,000, you put it out on a rotation basis. Over \$1,000, you put it out on tender. The hon. member for York Centre and myself know that you are not getting value for jobs under \$1,000, because there is no check on cost. We both complained about our bills last year and, without much hesitation, they cut them in half. That is fine. Now, if your 7,000 jobs under \$1,000 represent \$7 million, as my hon. colleague from York Centre said, you could well be getting that somewhere else for \$3.5 million. So this is a point on your small jobs.

Now, let us look at this business of letting your jobs over \$1,000 out for tender. There are various ways of tendering. I would like to know, first of all, are your tenders let by invitation—are all people on your list notified of the jobs, and specifications sent out?

Hon. Mr. Welch: In the class of print shop that can handle the job?

Mr. Good: In the class of print shop. Are these the same class of print shops that are on your large list?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, you see, the print shops are all categorized. I think there are at least four, depending upon the type of equipment and the type of work which the shop can do. When the order comes in for a particular type of work—I cannot give you an example since I do not understand the jargon of printing—that perhaps may require a special colour job and special art work, there may be a certain number on the list that can do this. Then there is an invitation to bid

among those who are in the classification which have the technical know-how and the equipment to do the particular job which we have been asked to look after.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, could I ask further? Who decides how many firms are invited to bid, and who makes the decision as to from what groups these firms will be invited? Will there be two, four, six or a dozen sets of specifications sent out on each printing job of over \$1,000?

Hon. Mr. Welch: A lot depends on the particular job, Mr. Chairman, and, once the job is analyzed with the type of printer who can handle it, then everybody in this classification who can do this is invited to bid or quote on the job, on the basis of the specification. What I would like to say, and I hope that members would accept this invitation as we are very concerned about this—all you have to do is to walk over to the Queen's Printer operation, name the job that has been done, and we can show you exactly what has gone on. It is there for you to see. That is, if you want to see it. It might be easier to ask questions in the House with innuendoes than to actually go over to the Queen's Printer and really see the system. It is wide open for anyone to see at any time. Please go over.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I did not suggest that the hon. member did. I simply say that I am talking in a general way since this vote has been called for discussion in the House. Just go over and see the whole operation. Pick out any job, see who was invited to tender, see what the prices were. It is wide open. It is an open shop over at the Queen's Printer any time.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, come on. It has been going on for 20 years.

Mr. Good: One further question, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister say the printers who are invited to tender on the over \$1,000 jobs, are in fact among the same printers who were on the list which you offered to table earlier this evening?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Every firm that we have is categorized within these four categories.

Mr. Shulman: I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. You are going to table a list of all printers. Will this tabling also show which are the invitational printers?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, I think perhaps the hon. member has misunderstood. I was

asked whether I would table the allocation of printing on the rotational list. It will be on the basis of the actual business that was purchased. It will not be any great list of printers. It will be actual printing purchased, and from whom, and the amounts—and this was the list I was referring to.

Mr. Shulman: Well, then, may I ask the Minister, will he supply a list of the printers—a total list of the printers?

In fact, I would like two lists—the list of those that are eligible to have dished out to them the under-\$1,000 jobs, the ones which presumably are spread out across the province. All I am asking for is a list of—

Hon. Mr. Welch: You want a list of all these printers registered with the Queen's Printer?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, and the amount of business they received last year. And secondly, a second list showing the printers who are eligible for invitations for these special over-\$1,000 invitation bids. Will you supply that to us?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No problem.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Chairman, I cannot readily accept all of the innuendoes that have been expressed from the other side of the House concerning the way the rotation of printing of the items of under \$1,000 is concerned. I happen to have been in the printing business at one point, and I would say from experience, Mr. Chairman, that the appraisers, the estimators rather, in the Queen's Printer's office are very efficient. As a matter of fact, in my own particular riding at the present time, I might explain to some of the members who are not familiar with the printing business, as far as doing business with the Queen's Printer is concerned, many of the requests or purchase orders that are sent to the printers have the actual price already established. It is not even for tender, and it is so low that many of the printers in my area are turning it down because they cannot make any money at it.

Some of these printers are friends of mine—I would say are supporters, if you want to call them government supporters—and there is certainly no pork barrel there; they are turning the business away because it is a losing proposition. I would like to clarify this point, Mr. Chairman, that I think these estimators are doing a very good job and I

would say that they are certainly a watchdog for the public purse.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in this regard I think that over the years in the industry, it is known that if you are not of the right stripe you do not get the business—

An hon. member: Oh yes, absolutely right.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, how else can we think of it, 25 years of this arrogance you have over there? We all think the same way. I say, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister agrees to go this route to open the books up and show us, I think this is great. I think you are digging yourself a great big hole there. I suggest to you that if you are sincere in this regard, this is going to take a lot of manhours to find and do a good job of it, because we are going to take the works, the different jobs that have been done and get competitive jobs and find out exactly what did go on; but it is going to cost some money. Are you willing to put up some money that we can pay for the staff to do this?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, it is not going to cost the people of Ontario—

Mr. Sargent: Will you give us staff to do this?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have undertaken to produce these lists and that is no problem. I wish he would go over and take a look at the operation. Really, I am quite serious, why do you not go over and take a look at it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has got his dark glasses on; he cannot see.

Mr. Sargent: The lists are nothing until you have the working competitive prices on the job and the quantity and the run and the different specifications on the job.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is all there in the records.

Mr. Sargent: All right, then we will have to get the competitive bids on the job to see what has been going on, and we need staff to do it. If you are sincere you should give us staff to do it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We should do it like Mitch Hepburn and Tommy Douglas used to do it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for Grey-Bruce would permit a question? I would like to give him a question.

Mr. Sargent: Certainly I will answer—

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Winkler: Inasmuch as the member for Grey-Bruce has been previously in the printing business, I would like to ask him if he did any work for the government?

Mr. Sargent: I would be glad to answer. I have never had five cents of the business from the government in my life, not five cents.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West. Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: That is not the point—

Mr. Winkler: Yes it is, it is the point.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Winkler: I will do a little investigation and I will find out.

Mr. Sargent: You are so wrong.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

An hon. member: That may be a point in favour of the government.

Mr. Peacock: I was just trying to get my voice in above the uproar, Mr. Chairman. I do not think I can succeed as long as the hon. members from that part of the country engage one another. Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is concerning the Queen's Printer—the use of that name is an assumption by the government that is completely unwarranted. It is a completely misleading phrase—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Queen does not really do the printing.

Mr. Peacock: It is an arrogation to the government of responsibility and discretion and authority which it does not exercise in any way at all.

Under the branch known as the Queen's Printer in this government we have no control whatsoever over the expenditure of public funds on printing in this province. In the meetings of the public accounts committee before which The Department of Education was called some weeks ago to discuss its printing expenditures, we found that of the

total of \$480,000 expended on printing in 1967-68, about \$30,000 in all was accounted for directly by the Queen's Printer. The publications that were issued on behalf of The Department of Education by the Queen's Printer were the housekeeping matters, the statutes of the department, the regulations, Mr. Chairman.

But when it came to the expensive items, the glossy items, the promotional items—like the college of art report, the report of the committee on aims in education, the Hall-Dennis report, when it came to the speeches of the Prime Minister of Ontario about the use of French in high schools in this province or about Confederation, these items were handed out to a select few printers which received very substantial proportions of the total expenditure on printing by that department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will the hon. member tell us how they did it in Saskatchewan under the CCF?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the Queen's Printer exercised absolutely no review whatsoever over the extravagances that The Department of Education perpetrated on the taxpayers of this province in its handing out to Davis Printing Limited—and I am sure there is no connection between the Davis Printing Company Limited and the Minister of Education and University Affairs—over \$60,000 in that year; the Westprint Company, \$83,000; the Mights Directories firm, a name that cropped up in an earlier estimate, over \$11,000; the Bruce Henderson firm, \$22,000, and so on—all amounts that were substantially larger than any of the amounts handled by the Queen's Printer on behalf of The Department of Education. These were the items, Mr. Chairman, that appeared without copy on many of the pages, in full colour with the most complete and extravagant art work that I think many members of this House have ever seen. Certainly, I have seen only one or two instances of this kind of printing in private industry, but very, very many instances in the guise of the report on the college of art dispute and the Hall-Dennis report from this government.

We do not have in this branch of the Provincial Secretary's department, the Queen's Printer's office, in fact a central government printing office, which takes the requisitions from the various departments and tenders them out and says to the proposers of the printing who are bidding on the jobs, "These are the standards or the guidelines within

which you must work and within which you must produce your printing".

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, we get a range of printing costs when it comes to the production of Ministers' annual reports to this Legislature, varying anywhere from items that cost less than \$2 a copy to the instance of The Department of Highways annual report which, I believe, costs over \$14 a copy. Many of the annual reports contain very large photographs of the Ministers, lots of white space exposing a few lines of copy. They are four-colour productions, some containing very little information in proportion to the total outlay of paper and colour and art work, on behalf of the political position of that Minister and his department and often of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). In The Department of Education, I am sure, had we had a Queen's Printer worthy of the name, there would not have been the production of printed material under the auspices of The Department of Education in the name of the Prime Minister and the name of the Minister of Education, which had nothing whatsoever to do with the educational activities of this government in the school system of this province. It was material which was solely for the political advancement of the Minister and the Prime Minister of this province. We would not have had that kind of material produced had there been a Queen's Printer who had set down the guidelines as to the quality of printing that was to be produced for this government when it came to annual reports, special reports and all other printing aside from the publication of the statutes and the regulations.

If one looks at the library holdings in this Legislative library of publications of the government of Canada or the government of the United States, one will see the plainest and simplest covers and the compact presentation of data without any embellishment whatsoever. So it is possible today to purchase from the general printing office of the United States government or from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics or the Queen's Printer in Ottawa full information, annual reports, copies of the most extensive studies for 50 cents or 75 cents or \$1 a copy. Not the kind of cost that the taxpayer of Ontario is bearing for the printing of government Ministers' annual reports to the extent of \$4.96 in Agriculture, \$5.17 for the civil service commission, Mr. Chairman, \$4.19 for The Department of Education, \$4 for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), over \$14 for the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), \$7.61 for the

Minister of Lands and Forests' (Mr. Brunelle's) annual report, \$7.51 for the Minister of Public Works' report, and \$4.90 for the report of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968. No revenue was raised for these publications. The total of the cost of these publications was entirely borne out of the Treasury of this government. So that in the department of the Queen's Printer we do not have either a central procurement and printing facility nor any vestige of control over the kinds of extravagant printing that many Ministers of this government have engaged in for their own advancement.

The second thing I want to say about the operations of the Queen's Printer's branch, Mr. Chairman, is that it could be, but it is not now and has not been, a major resource and research facility for people of this province. Since the Queen's Printer does not have control over the issuing of annual reports and other special surveys by the various departments of government, it is not in a position to make available to the depository libraries and the university libraries of this province copies of those reports as soon as they become available.

In my own community of Windsor, the public library's reference section endeavoured for several months to obtain through the Queen's Printer's office, copies of the Rand report on labour relations in this province and failed to obtain those copies because it had misdirected its enquiry. The report of the Royal commission on labour disputes headed by Mr. Rand was issued in the name of the commission, it was not handled by the Queen's Printer's office.

Similarly with many other major reports of interest to the public of this province, they cannot be obtained by writing to the Queen's Printer of this province. The Queen's Printer does not issue any kind of index or catalogue of publications of this government and therefore the depository libraries and the university libraries and the industrial, trade union, consumer and farm organizations who wish to keep up with the publications of this government find themselves calling from department to department and office to office to find out where they can obtain a recent and important publication of this government.

And it is, I think, time the Provincial Secretary took it upon himself to start publishing such a catalogue of all the publications of this government, the annual reports, the special studies, commission documents, the proceedings of those commissions and various

committees of this House, along with the routine statutory and regulatory items that are now handled by the Queen's Printer, and make sure that they are in the hands of the depository libraries and university libraries so that students and other researchers have access to them as soon as they are distributed in this Legislature and not several months later.

I find as a private member I am often called upon to supply people in the university and in the public libraries in Windsor with copies of such reports. Because extra copies are afforded to members of the Legislature, it has often been within means to fill those requests. But they often come to me only after these people have found it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain these documents through the Queen's Printer's office.

So I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Queen's Printer in this province really should take on the functions of such an office and catalogue the publications of this government once it has within its control the publication of all of the government printing of this province.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, may I comment briefly on both major points raised by the hon. member? I will start with the last point he was making. I do not think anyone would argue with him on the necessity of some type of general index list. If the hon. member will recall, I was talking earlier about the negotiations or the discussions which are presently under way insofar as the phasing in of the Queen's Printer's operation is concerned, insofar as it is a central purchasing function with the overall central purchasing function which was announced by the Treasurer some time ago, to become ultimately within the purview of the responsibilities of the Minister of Public Works.

At the time of that announcement, there was some recognition of a division here between the functions which are represented now under the Queen's Printer. There was the Queen's Printer, which was one of the acquisition of printing and stationery supplies, and there was this publications branch, handling the availability of government publications. And ultimately as we develop this programme, we are looking forward to the time when we will have what is called a "Queen's Publisher". The responsibilities of the publisher will be much along the lines incorporated in the latter point made by the hon. member. We hope to have not only the index and the catalogue, which I might point

out here we have already started to work on. There will be a central store of some kind where people can go in and actually see and buy these publications. I thank the member for raising the point. It is one of these things which we are working on.

To go back to the first point, may I simply say this in connection with the first point: I have no way of disputing the facts which the hon. member raised, nor would it be my intention to do so. He was at the public accounts committee and he has had this breakdown of printing. All I can say is that perhaps it is a little unfair to criticize the Queen's Printer as such, with respect to the standard or the cost of the printing which is not placed through him. I can only say as the Minister responsible to this House for the Queen's Printer, that any aspects of the publication or the printing needs of this department placed through the Queen's Printer have been subject to the type of scrutiny to which the member made reference with respect to the invitation to bid and everything else. Now, from then on the member's point is such that he is making his point with respect to that printing by that particular department or indeed any department which is not placed through, or requisitioned through, the office of the Queen's Printer.

So with those comments and with particular emphasis on the latter part, I can assure the hon. member that we are busily engaged in attempting to develop some of the general guidelines under the office of Queen's Publisher, to which he has made reference.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the comments of the member for Windsor West, I think, are of quality and very timely, and I am glad the Minister is in agreement with the principle involved. But even so, Mr. Chairman, involved as we are with a magnitude of maybe \$7 million to \$10 million of expenditures yearly in the operation of this exercise here, there is a law on the books of the land that anyone or group of people in business who would conspire to raise prices or to fix prices, is guilty of an indictable offence and subject to a jail term or heavy fine. This is a matter of law and I know that the Minister and all of this House think that law, somewhere along the line, should be exercised. In this area we are talking about now, are spending about \$10 million. The most important commodity in printing is paper and today we have in this province the biggest cartel monopoly in paper.

If you buy paper today, you are paying the same rate from every single paper outfit.

There are no competitive bids in paper. They are all the same price. Now, I think in the operation of your department, as a member of the government, you would be guilty of dereliction in your job or in your duty, if you would not investigate the fact that we do have tight monopoly-type of control in the price of paper. If you look back over the years when Westinghouse and General Electric were caught conspiring to fix prices, that cost the municipalities in this province many, many hundreds of millions of dollars because of the fact that they conspired to fix prices—

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member indicate the relevance of his remarks to the Queen's Printer's office?

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member please indicate—

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Will the hon. member please indicate the relevancy of his remarks regarding combines, and so on, to the Queen's Printer's office?

Mr. Sargent: Well, you do not have to take anything in your orange juice to find out what I am talking about. But I am telling you that the most important commodity we have in Canada today is paper and we have a cartel monopoly in paper.

Mr. Chairman: That has nothing to do with the Queen's Printer—

Mr. Sargent: It certainly has—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: —and if this government does not take steps to block this monopoly and cartel in paper—

Mr. Chairman: That has nothing to do with vote 1704—nothing whatsoever.

Mr. Sargent: It certainly has and I disagree with you very much.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Sargent: I am not finished yet.

Mr. Ben: On a point—

Mr. Chairman: All right, all right.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, sir. The Queen's Printer is responsible for the spending of the taxpayers' money on printing which

involves the purchase of paper on which the print goes. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce tried to indicate to the Minister that there is a monopoly in the supply of paper. He enquired of the Minister, "Was the Minister cognizant of this and is he taking pains to see that the taxpayers' money is not frivolously spent because of these combines in the supplying of paper?"

Mr. Winkler: That is federal law. Tell him to take it to his—

Mr. Ben: It may be federal—monopoly may be federal law, but it is the responsibility of this government to see that the business of this monopoly does not cost us money.

Mr. Kerr: How would you do that?

Mr. Chairman: On the point of order, the Chairman is fully aware—

Mr. Winkler: Take it to Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman: —is fully aware of the significance of the hon. member's remarks. The hon. member pointed out that there was a cartel, or a monopoly, or a combine in operation in connection with paper. This is surely a matter for the federal authorities and it has nothing whatsoever to do with the operation of the office of the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Ben: Well he should buy from—

Mr. Chairman: It should be presumed that he does.

Mr. Sargent: May I speak to your ruling?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: In speaking to your ruling. If you want to buy anything today, you and I, as representatives of the people, should be able to get the best dollar's-worth of value for that purchase. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that we are paying through the nose. We are paying twice what we should be paying for paper because of this monopoly and, if we close our eyes to it, then we are only a party to this breaking of the law.

We have the biggest stick in the province of Ontario to save this \$10 million which we are spending. We will not be a party to this price fixing. The Minister should make a decision and tell the House that he will not go along down the line to say that we will be a sitting duck for these people.

I think that one person, one Minister who knows what he is talking about, should stop this. It is in every area of our economy now. This is a game and somewhere the govern-

ment should get into the act and say the people should get a square deal for their dollar. A comment from the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes. Mr. Chairman, may I simply say, in reply to the hon. member, that I think that if there is any evidence of this type of activity, there is a way to direct a complaint on this price to Ottawa for investigation.

As a matter of information, quite relevant to the question which the hon. member has raised, today the Queen's Printer opened five tenders for over two million sheets of paper and each had a different price quoted. I invite the member to go over tomorrow morning and investigate the tenders with respect to that paper.

Mr. Sargent: These were not the kind produced by the paper houses?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have no further evidence to go on. It just happened today that there was a bulk tender for two million sheets of paper. There was a significant difference in the prices of the tenders.

I ask you to go over and investigate; see the invitation to tender; see the tenders; do anything you like—see the difference in the price.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for—

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is not to speak against the possibility of there being a monopoly. I do not know. I do have evidence—

Mr. Sargent: I am telling you there is.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside, unless the hon. member is still on the point of order.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two suggestions to make. The first is that in the future the name of the printer be put on all these publications and—

Hon. Mr. White: What for?

Mr. Burr: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. White: What for?

Mr. Burr: So that we know who printed it. Any book or any other publication that you ever read always has the name of the printer.

Mr. B. Newman: Maybe he is ashamed of his work.

Mr. Burr: If you look at the estimates themselves, you will find that they are printed and published by the Queen's Printer. Any man who is proud of his work will put his name on it.

Mr. Lewis: Is there a Frank Fogg, by the way?

Mr. Burr: First, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the printer should have his name on it.

Second, if it is authorized by the Queen's Printer, then that should be stated.

Third, there should be a union label on it and—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Union label again.

Mr. Burr: —and the fourth suggestion is that, following the practice of many other departments perhaps, or other—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Minister's picture?

Mr. Burr: —jurisdictions—no. They should—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Incidentally, where is the union label on the Brown Camp brochure? How about it?

Mr. Lewis: —keep it in your portfolio and carry it around with you.

Mr. Burr: —they should put down somewhere, the number of copies that have been printed—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Burr: —as they did very neatly put down in this one; a five and a ten, that is the way it is usually done.

Hon. Mr. White: The socialist mind at work.

Mr. Burr: Inasmuch as the Minister of Correctional Services is interested in this subject, I would like to refer him back to November 26, when I asked the Prime Minister how many copies of this Confederation of Tomorrow booklet had been published. He said 77,000 and the cost was \$70,000. Then I asked him if he was aware that about 70,000 copies were sitting in the hall on the fourth floor, to which he replied: "No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that and I very much doubt that it is so." I asked him if he would check on it and he said he would be very glad to do so. So far I have not had any report.

Mr. Ben: You would not be surprised—

Mr. Burr: This is November 26. I went up immediately and checked on it and I was wrong, Mr. Chairman. The Prime Minister is not going to expose me; I had better confess.

I thought there were 70,000 but there were only 60,000 booklets. The other cartons that I thought contained 10,000 more, actually contained 60,000 envelopes—specially adorned envelopes that can be used for no other purpose because they match the booklets.

So there were 60,000 booklets and 60,000 envelopes and my report from my scouts up on the fourth floor tonight, confirms that most of them are still up there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member were a public-spirited citizen, he would go out and sell them.

Mr. Ben: You cannot give them away. How can we sell them?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: And if the Minister authorizing any publication—that is, any of the 22 or 24 Ministers, however many there are—if they knew how many thousand were being published, they would think twice before ordering an inordinate amount. Because this one—this college of art one—if you remember when I asked about it, there were still 2,000, or was it 3,000 left out of the 5,000, representing a very great waste of money, in addition to the extravagant printing in the first place.

Mr. Lewis: The point perhaps need not be belaboured, but it is worth summarizing. I think the Minister would agree on some of the things that have emerged. There is an obvious extravagance in the publication of departmental annual reports.

It is unconscionable that annual reports should cost between \$7 and \$12.

Members of this House who know anything about printing costs will know that that is simply not a legitimate cost and one which cannot be justified in any economic terms, let alone in terms of the substance of the reports.

My colleague from Windsor West makes a very good analogy when he speaks of the United States printing office and of the Queen's Printer in Ottawa and of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. They have at least adopted a format which does not pilfer public funds in the process of publishing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nobody reads their reports.

Mr. Lewis: Now, Mr. Chairman, there has therefore emerged an obvious squandering of money—a fairly substantial squandering of money—in the area of annual reports from government departments. If one takes a careful look at the cost of those reports as itemized before the public accounts committee, one could well make the assumption that some \$50,000 might have been saved in a more scrupulous management of the printing of those reports.

It has also been demonstrated, Mr. Chairman, that there is very, very considerable irresponsibility in the quantity that are ordered and in their subsequent distribution. Again, another unconscionable irresponsibility on the part of the government, because this is not the kind of thing that one treats in quite so cavalier a way. These are things over which one has a very easy and legitimate control, providing the processes are effective.

It has also been demonstrated that a very large number of the reports themselves are self-aggrandisement documents for the Minister's concern, lavishly idolizing their benefactors, which is true very often of The Department of Education. Perhaps the adulation is more grievous in that area than in any other at least in the context of the report, but it is evidenced in other Cabinet Ministers as well. However, the documents themselves cannot in any sense be justified in modern context of report and again run into the tens of thousands of dollars of wasted public funds.

Now there is no particular reason, Mr. Chairman, for this orgy of self-indulgence. I suspect that no one in Cabinet and perhaps it is time for this Minister to do it, because he does it amiably and he does it well—that no one in Cabinet has taken a pretty hard look at the way in which the Ministers run wild, as their own personages are enhanced by departmental reports, by all the documents which come out in their name, and by which they emblazon their photographs in prominent place—albeit some of them are moderately attractive human beings, and I do not begrudge them their photographs. But that notwithstanding, Mr. Chairman, what one is saying, that emerges from the context of the evening—particularly the analysis of the member for Windsor West—is that you have in a variety of areas, flagrant abuse of public money—not premeditated, nothing sinister about it, just totally irresponsible, in the context of government.

If one has a Queen's Printer—pretends to a Queen's Printer—then one at least has the

resource, one has the facility where one is able to screen the irresponsibility, and to separate those who lavish their own affections in the public view, from those who recognize that it is the substance with which we are dealing, and that the substance alone is worthy of publication and no more than that.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that a pretty close analysis of it, quite apart from the individual documents, but what is being stored in this building and elsewhere, would indicate that the several hundreds of thousands of dollars that are talked about are unquestionably valid. Whether it is the rotating list for those jobs that cost less than \$1,000—for which I gather there were many millions of dollars expended, some of it unwisely; whether it is the departmental reports; whether it is the individual reports; whether it is the various publications that come into our homes; members are flooded with publications which, in terms of their production, verge on the theatre of the absurd.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would think that what we are really talking about are very vast sums. I do not think it is wrong to suggest that one could save \$1 million or \$2 million a year if one took a pretty intensive and rigorous look at the money which is being spent on printing.

Now let me tie it in, Mr. Chairman. Having said that, let me point out that the session commenced with the Budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer and that in the middle of the Budget speech from the Provincial Treasurer there—with much reluctance and great displays of regret and compassion—the Provincial Treasurer indicated serious public cut-backs in crucial social areas for lack of revenue. Just to put a very appropriate tag to it, Mr. Chairman, one of those areas—the Minister of Social and Family Services is in the House—was a conscious cut-back on the part of Cabinet of an increase from 70 per cent to 80 per cent in the maintenance subsidy for homes for the aged.

Now, we are not debating homes for the aged. I know the Cabinet view of how you look after the aged. I am prepared to accept the inadequacy there, but that 10 per cent shift, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, that statement is completely wrong. It was not cut back.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I concede, I concede. I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that an analysis of the figures for maintenance

in that area in this year's estimates shows the amount of money required could be covered by the irresponsibility in printing engaged in by this government. It would have been possible to effect what is, in fact, a pretty significant social programme had this area been more scrupulously attended to. It is very hard to make these things mesh because the fat in government, and again it is not a calculated or conspiratorial fat, but the fat in government is something that accumulates and unless it is taken hold of in a fairly vigorous way it runs out of control.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, then, that one need only emphasize that there are programmes delayed by this government which could be implemented by the very simple facility of using the Queen's Printer as, if you will, a centre for the scrutiny of all government printing in the province. But all of it, you will find, sir, will be a contribution rather greater than these exercises in self-indulgence which definitely characterize printing.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber, I believe, was up before the hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, now that the Minister has taken the trouble to learn, perhaps he might also give consideration to all government printing being of a standard size. Why should you have to change the whole format year after year for each department?

The Minister sitting next to you there has not put out a report similar in size since I have been here. I do not think he has put out two reports that looked alike in form. Why? What are you trying to do, show how artistic you are? There are some of us—I have two boxes downstairs, I was going to bring them up here for effect and dump them here, but I decided it was a little heavy—there are some of us who store these reports and we keep them for reference so we can refer back. They are every shape and size and even these cabinets that you make to attach on the wall for the individual members on which they can store the reports, are useless. You give us reports which are too high or too tall to fit on these shelves. So, you are defeating your own purpose. Why? Who are you trying to impress? Or are you just trying to throw away money?

Surely, you could get some uniformity into this business. Now just give some consideration so that next year every report that comes out, can be the standard size. The public accounts seem to come out standard size from year to year, why can you not do this with

other printing? I might point out that one way of knowing if this government is going to do anything about a particular topic, is by looking at the report. If it is a hard cover you know they expect it to sit on a shelf for 10 or 15 years before they do anything.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I know that the hon. Minister is just as anxious as we are on this side to centralize printing and eliminate some of the problems that were mentioned, particularly by the members for Sandwich-Riverside and Windsor West, such matters as even the legislative library not having the reports that are issued by the department.

I would like to know whether—since the Provincial Treasurer made the Budget speech 13 months ago—some extra directive or power has been granted to his department to bring together all the government printing, other than this discussion about a change in name or new name being created, like Queen's Publisher.

Surely there has been something done in these 13 months since he announced the centralization toward actually getting it into effect. I would like to also know in regard to that, have any departments put through an increased amount of their work to your knowledge, or all their work now, in response to that government direction or the Treasurer's announced direction?

Hon. Mr. Welch: With respect to those aspects of central purchasing which would affect printing and stationery supplies, there have been a series of meetings—certainly meetings in which we have been involved because of the Queen's Printer. There was the question of a central store for the acquisition of the stationery supplies themselves, and also for printing. We have been very much a part of these meetings and, in fact, there is more to the central purchasing programme than just printing. Some of these other matters have had attention perhaps before this. But we are currently involved in these meetings.

With respect to the printing requisitions or the printing needs of other departments, I think you would have to ask each department as to their budget in that regard. I am sure as it develops along the line, you will get that information.

Mr. Deacon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. The next matter

is: We were told last year about a very modern new printing machine that The Department of Public Works acquired and we learned in public accounts about the printing shop of The Department of Education. Other departmental printing facilities, I am sure, are available. Do these departments bid on the jobs or are they asked to bid on jobs by the Queen's Printer? Or is all the work done outside? If these printing departments have spare press time, are you making use of that spare press time by having them do printing jobs?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am not familiar with the amount of work that goes through the Public Works printing equipment. I can say that we do not direct any printing from our department to the government departments. We go to all the printing shops outside at the moment.

Mr. Deacon: Why would you not make use of that printing facility if it has free time?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be very happy to look into this particular matter. I think a lot would depend on the type of equipment and type of work they might be able to do. But we would be very happy to take a look at it from the standpoint of satisfying the query which you have raised.

Mr. Sargent: You mean you have not looked into it yet?

Mr. Deacon: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, rather strange, if it was brought to our attention that we could make use of it as members, that the Queen's Printer, which is the central depot supposedly for all the printing in the government, would not, now that we are going to centralization. A rather strange statement from the Minister.

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

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have one question I would like to put to the Minister. The Queen's Printer so far, in Ontario, has not really been a Queen's Printer in the real sense of the word. He has been an agent who lets contracts for printing. He was not personally involved in printing on behalf of the government. I am wondering if we have not reached the stage where that should be considered. I recognize that you have got a different flow of printing needs and, therefore, it may well be that if we were to establish a Queen's Printer in the sense that they have at Ottawa, we might not be able to meet all of our needs. Undoubt-

edly, there still would be some work that would have to be let out, but at least a fairly significant body of government printing could be done through its own printing plant and I suspect considerable savings could be achieved. May I ask the Minister whether or not the government has given any thought to this?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Earlier tonight the question was raised with respect to the incorporation of the purchasing function, so to speak, of this department in the central purchasing procedures of government, which have already been announced, and the creation under a heading "Queen's Publisher", of those functions of drawing together government publications and making them available for sale, and perhaps some technical advice regarding basic standards. I merely repeat those things.

With respect to the amount of printing which the government would actually do as opposed to having printing done by printing establishments throughout the province, I cannot report any negotiations in this regard, because I am not familiar with any studies that are going on in that particular area.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, as I interpret what the Minister said earlier, and I do not ask him to repeat it, it is conceivable that the present function of the Queen's Printer might be absorbed in good part, or perhaps wholly, by the central purchasing agency. That would flow rather logically from my concept of a central purchasing agency. The field would then be left clear for a Queen's Printer in the real sense—a publishing house with somebody heading it, who would handle such of the publications as the size of the plant that you established would permit. I repeat, you might be able to achieve considerable savings.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I appreciate having your view. The question is: Whether or not even under that organization, the Queen's Printer or Publisher, whatever he may be called, would actually do any printing himself, and establish a great printing organization himself, or still continue as is the custom now of letting out the work?

Mr. MacDonald: My suggestion is merely that that should be considered. I do not want to get into an argument with our friends down at Ryerson Press which does the printing of *Hansard*, but in most Parliaments where *Hansard* is handled in the kind of fashion that it is handled, for example at Ottawa, it can be done only if you have an

operation which is really completely under your control. Certainly *Hansard*, as we sit longer and longer—and it looks as though we are going to be sitting longer and longer—is going to become one main job. And it is given top priority by the Queen's Printer when the House or when the Parliament is actually sitting. However, I leave it as a thought for the Minister to pursue.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for York South rose, I was rising at the same time on almost the same vein, but not quite. What I was going to suggest is: that the government set up a control printing bureau as an operation that obviously would not handle all our printing, and would not be a Queen's Printer in the true sense, but would act as a control on price. That is, it would bid on government contracts in order to keep the other private bidders in line. For instance the city of Toronto does a lot of its own paving. It keeps a paving crew to bid on its own contracts. It does not get them all, and sometimes it will even take a job at a loss, just to keep the other people in line when they get out of line.

We are talking here about monopolies. About the paper monopoly, for instance. We know that there are paper monopolies, with price fixing. The fact that prices are different does not mean a thing. It was established, by an investigation, I think, of this government, that there was price fixing in salt, in the use of salt to melt snow, that certain companies have exclusive rights in one area, and other companies in another area, and still others in another area. Other companies would bid but they would always make sure that they bid outrageously high. In other instances, you get fixed prices. When I was on council, I found that cement was always coming in at the same price. The Lake Ontario Cement Company, the Canada Cement and the St. Lawrence Cement always bid exactly the same price. I tried to break it up by picking one company and giving them a contract. And I would say that we would keep on giving one company the contract until other companies got other prices. But they would not do it. Lightbulbs came the same way. It was amazing how the prices would come in so similar. Then, when you raise a little dust about it, you find out that the contract prices vary. But if you add them up, you will find out the same thing prevails. Company A gets about 15 per cent, company B gets about 15 per cent, company C, etc., so the variation in

price on any particular contract does not mean a thing.

I still suggest that perhaps the Minister ought to give consideration to the government setting up a printing bureau, which could be used to control prices, and they would bid on some of them. I am not suggesting for one minute that the printing bureau should go into the business of printing *Hansard*. It should not tie itself down to any particular job, but be free to bid as contracts arise, one time on this type of printing, another time on another type of printing, and to throw in bids to keep the independent bidders on a competitive level.

Vote 1704 agreed to.

On vote 1705:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, in June of last year the Minister replied to certain questions raised by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and by the leader of this party about the birth certificates which were acquired by Mr. James Earl Ray. In replying to those questions, the Minister said he had "asked his deputy registrar general to review all these procedures once again, to satisfy me as to the adequacy of the precautions to be taken, such precautions to be consistent with the service which we must continue to give to the public requesting this type of information in the legitimate way they do." My question is simple: Has this review been made, has the Minister been advised of the results of the review and what are the conclusions of it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Following the questions in the House to which the hon. member makes reference, I asked the deputy registrar general if those procedures would be reviewed. He assures me that they were, and as far as our department was concerned, and in consultation with his counterparts throughout Canada, and in all the other provinces—to compare the various systems that were used there with our own—we were satisfied after this type of consultation and these meetings, that the procedures which we were following really were, in fact, consistent with the responsibilities which we really had to facilitate the acquisition of the certificates, these registrations by those who were legitimately entitled to them.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1705. The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, the matter of data processing is a relatively small item under the registrar general, only \$3,700. I think if you total it up for the whole 18 departments, or 20 departments, you will find that about \$7 million is spent on data processing. What I would like to know is, in your department do you do all your own work? Do you work for other departments, or do other departments do work for you?

Hon. Mr. Welch: We do all our own work within the department, we send no work out and we do no other work for any other departments.

Mr. Burr: Does that mean that some of the equipment is idle a considerable part of the time?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, that is not the case.

Mr. Burr: It is working almost all the time?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, it is engaged full time. On top of the regular work that is conducted there are certain national indices which are returned to the equipment when it is not in other use, to produce some related work which we do in the tabulation of overall registration. So in fact I think it is fair to say that the equipment is used exclusively by the registrar general's department for work in that department.

Mr. Burr: It works kind of an eight-hour day, does it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: A regular day.

Mr. Burr: Do you mean a regular member's day, or regular computer's day?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I do not think it could possibly be used that much.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister a letter that I have received from my own community concerning unwed mothers, and wonder if the Minister could advise me as to what action has been taken by his department, and I will read the pertinent portions of the letter.

It seems rather cruel to urge—

this is referring now to unwed mothers:

—them to register their illegitimate babies in their own names when there is an outside chance that the father of the child will marry the mother. I would recommend an

amendment to The Vital Statistics Act, to make it possible for a mother, in this category, to be given the privilege of a temporary registration and to have the option of changing and finalizing the registration at the conclusion of one year following the initial registration or date of birth.

May I ask of the Minister if he has followed through with this suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, the procedure now under the Act which we are discussing, is that in those circumstances, the mother, being an unmarried woman, would normally register the name of the child in her own surname. There are those who have expressed the wish that they should be allowed to register the name of the child in the surname of the father. And, with the consent of this man, as I understand it, such registration is permitted. The difficulty comes in if, in fact, there is no subsequent marriage with that particular man. Then there is some concern on the part of the lady who wants that name off, and although there is some procedure to provide for this, the original record is still there. What the deputy registrar general has attempted to do in these circumstances is to deal with all the divisional registrars throughout Ontario and suggest that they should caution women in these circumstances, and really suggest to them that they may well want to register the child in their own surname; then on the marriage of the mother, through The Legitimation Act the records can be amended correctly and then we carry on.

Now, as to providing some temporary basis where they have a period of so many months during which they elect which surname to use, in my opinion this might cause a great deal of confusion. It seems to me perhaps more orderly to follow this other procedure and have The Legitimation Act take care of the situation on the subsequent marriage. That would be my recommendation.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1705. The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if I might return for a moment to the James Earl Ray issue that was raised by my colleague. I judge from the Minister's reply that after examining the procedures in other provinces, you came to the conclusion that ours was as efficient as anywhere else and you could not see any means for substantially improving it. That still does not meet the particular point that caused considerable furor at that time. Do

you conclude that it is the risk of the game so to speak, that there may be a fraudulent presentation of data and therefore there may be, not a false birth certificate—I remember the Minister's very insistent point that there is no such thing as a false birth certificate—but a certificate given after a fraudulent presentation of information? Did you come across any ways and means by which you can check against this periodic presentation of fraudulent material?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The problem is really a practical one. We have, I understand today, about 18,000 requests a day.

Mr. MacDonald: It was 1,200 a year ago. You are really getting up in one year.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can tell you why, too. The new passport regulations, for instance, have really brought with them an increase for birth certificates. Of course when we get nearer to school opening it is just phenomenal, the number of requests we get. Now, you see, what we are faced with there, as a public office, is attempting to get people who are entitled to these certificates to get these certificates as quickly as possible for their legitimate use. The more procedures and red tape we put into the matter, the more we slow up the great majority of people, who really want to get their certificates. The registrars, when they met, thought perhaps the only effective way to stop people not going to get their own certificate was perhaps to increase the fee. But I could not see charging everybody an extra fee just to catch a few people and maybe discourage them; in fact I really did not know how that would discourage people if they really wanted to get something for this purpose.

The other thing to keep in mind is that the amount of information which the deputy registrar general and his officials want is really very insignificant. In other words, you have to know your mother's maiden name and you have to know information about your father and so on. In other words you would have to be fairly clever to get all of the background. For instance, somebody other than me who wanted to get my birth certificate, or somebody who wanted to use my birth certificate, would need to have quite a bit of information about me and my mother and father and so on. All I am trying to point out is the fact that we cannot deny that this man was in possession of this birth certificate which, as the member points out, was a correct registration of the record. But what we had to do for the sake of service to the public

was to waive introducing more procedural steps to check the few, if any—and you would have no way of knowing how many—against the general need to expedite the issuance of these certificates to people.

Mr. MacDonald: In short, it is a risk we have to live with.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would think that is a pretty fair way of summing it up.

Vote 1705 agreed to.

On vote 1706:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: The question of item 13, postage, is rather puzzling. In 1967, the postage amounted to \$664,000; 1968, \$745,000, and in the estimates for 1969, \$175,000. There must be some simple explanation. What is it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, in the reorganization of responsibilities, the bulk of mailing became part of the central service function of The Department of Public Works, and the only moneys that we are asking for now are the postage for those who actually use the facilities of this building, that is, the members of the Legislature and those departments that function out of here. All other government mailing is done through the Public Works department now, for which these other amounts—the difference to which the member makes reference—would be voted in that vote.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is all Opposition mailings, is it?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three items in here I would like to raise briefly with the Minister. One of them I had marked when I prepared these estimates a week or two ago, and that was to enlist the support of the Minister to have somebody start revising the rules of this House, since the Speaker's vote comes under the Minister. However, we had a little explosion a week or so ago, and I understand we may have broken through that log jam, so we can let that matter rest for the time being.

I was interested, if I may go back briefly for a moment to the public accounts, to note that in the listing of the money spent in the last provincial election, overall figures are given for each of the returning officers. Is a breakdown of any one of those figures available upon request? For example, as I look at it here, I find that in my own riding of York South the amount spent was \$41,162.15. Is a breakdown of that expenditure available?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Does the member mean the chief election officer?

Mr. MacDonald: No, it is the returning officer. What was spent by the government in the operation of the election, not what was spent by the candidates themselves.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I really do not know that I can answer the question, except I imagine this should be available through the chief election officer. I would have to get that for the hon. member; I do not know what breakdown might be available for this, but I assume since they are expenditures of public money there must be some evidence of it, although I would not know. You see, the money for an election is not voted through the estimates, it comes as a special warrant.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Minister raises another rather interesting point. The chief electoral officer is under his department and yet, if the Minister is correct, when I am quoting from the public accounts I am over in the Attorney General's department. The rationale of this escapes me.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The chief electoral officer and the Clerk of the House are here, insofar as their staff requirements and the moneys that are necessary for this Legislature to vote for the functioning of these offices and the employees there. Insofar as the moneys that are necessary for the running of an election, this is done by special warrant and I think this is why they have to be placed under the Attorney General. I am sorry I have no further explanation than that, except that as far as accountability is concerned, I would have to check with the chief electoral officer as to what detailed information is available and I would be glad to report that to the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: If the Minister would. I realize now I am in the wrong department. This is purely for the chief electoral officer in his continuing activity. The actual expenditure for the election is over in the Attorney General's department, and if any further query is needed, we can do it at that time.

But since the Minister has indicated he will be so kind as to look into what breakdown is available, it strikes me that there are two general areas on which the public has some legitimate right to information. One is the fixed amounts that are spelled out in the regulations promulgated before each election—so much for this, so much for that, so much for the next thing—and then there are other undesignated expenditures. And if that kind

of a breakdown is available, I would appreciate it.

A final point, going down into sessional and other requirements. May I ask the Minister what the procedure is now with regard to appropriations for Royal commissions, select committees, and so on? In the third or fourth last item, under sessional and other requirements that go on to page 131, I notice \$100,000 for committee fees. I presume that is select committee fees?

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, yes. Now, am I right that the normal expenditures for Royal commissions or investigations of that nature are handled in each department or are they handled in the Attorney General's department?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, in the Attorney General's department.

Mr. MacDonald: Royal commissions?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, Royal commissions.

Mr. MacDonald: In a broad sense sometimes they are called inquiries, and things of that nature?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The amount here is for committee fees, principally the select committees.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this probably is a very unpopular subject with the government and a very popular subject with the backbenchers, but somewhere along the line I think the Minister in charge of the department and now the Provincial Secretary, due to the fact the Prime Minister has not the courage nor the political decency to acknowledge that we have—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Can the member not think of better words?

Mr. Sargent: Well, how do I say things like this? We talk about these things in caucus; we talk about these things in the cloakrooms in the back, and we find out that everybody in the Treasury is looked after except the guys in the backbenches. I think it is time we asked a pointed question, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister: What is going to be done about sessional indemnities here? If the Minister does not have an answer, I will proceed further.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am in no position to answer a question like that, Mr. Chairman. I

am asking the Legislature to vote for us moneys sufficient to pay indemnities at the current rate.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should apologize to the House for being so arrogant as to say that we should have more money as backbenchers, as members of the Opposition. But I think that somewhere along the line we must face up to the fact that—

Hon. Mr. Welch: You get the same as the rest of us.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think that is quite true. We do not have all the amenities and the plush offices you have, the treatment you get, the expense accounts you have, all the courtesies you have. We are treated like second-rate people here. Whether you know it or not, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister—and I am not one to deny that because I have a great respect for you—I do not think we should be asked to come in here as directors of a \$3.5-billion corporation to work for less than \$2 an hour. Tonight is a good example. I am not a good example of attendance here; I know many of you are devoted people much more than I and should talk about this, but I am the kind of black sheep who will say this. I will get hell for what I am doing from my leader, probably, anyway—and I am saying this as a private individual.

I have a clipping today from the Niagara Falls paper, which says,

“We are going to pay our assessors \$20,000—32 assessors \$20,000.

The hon. member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) had a clipping from the paper saying a janitor, a custodial officer, is paid \$11,500—\$3,500 more than a member of Parliament gets.

An hon. member: That was a building superintendent.

Mr. Sargent: Was that a building superintendent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was not custodial.

Mr. Sargent: Maybe he has more talent than a lot of us have but the thing is that somewhere along the line I think that—The Chair says that the Provincial Treasurer could speak on this; he owes us the courtesy to tell us our position in this regard, or shall I proceed?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Better proceed.

Mr. Sargent: Well, we will take it then, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in flogging this thing. It is embarrassing probably for those of us who have to sit here. We are begging for the money. I just think it is a lack of political guts that you cannot face up to the fact that you do owe it to the people who keep you in that front row, who make you look the big shots that you are, that you can live on the fat of the land, the expense accounts you have, direct the great amount of budgets you do—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would suggest to the hon. member that on item 6, I believe he is referring to, of vote 1706—indemnities and allowances to members, including mileage—any discussion regarding increasing those would be more properly directed to the Prime Minister rather than to this Minister.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Chairman: Questions about—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I will take the alternative tack. If we cannot talk about increasing, may we talk about decreasing then, because it is an insult to each one of us to ask us first of all to put ourselves in a position where those of us who live outside of this city have got to the point where we never get a chance to be with our families; we have to keep two homes; it costs me about \$600 or \$700 a month to live at the hotel down here. I do not think that is out of the way when I am entertaining people all the time from my riding and trying to live on the scale a would-be Cabinet Minister would want to live on. I think that we have so many inequities here that there is no use me trying to shame the government; they do not have any shame left in them. Look around this Chamber tonight. You will not see too many people saying I am wrong, Mr. Chairman. So I think we will leave it that way. If I have put up a bad case for the backbenchers here it is not going to help me a hell of a lot because I am in trouble with income tax all the time anyway. I think that somewhere along the line the people of this province do not want us to be treated the way you are treating us and I will leave it that way.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Provincial Secretary if any consideration is being given to the travelling of the members. Some of us who live a great distance away from this place have a great deal of responsibility on weekends when we go home to look after our

constituents. It is the only time that we can see them. When you have to spend 12 hours in a train, get in on Saturday morning and come out Sunday night and spend another 12 hours and be tired when you are back at your job, it seems to me that there should be some further consideration given to those members from northern Ontario who live a great distance away from here. Since the session meets six to seven months of the year I think that the hon. Minister should give consideration to at least making some better travel arrangements for those of us who live a great distance from this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, at the moment the amount which is requested is the statutory amount to cover matters. I appreciate the comments which have been made. If you will recall last year we made some change with respect to being able to draw on the travelling portion of it on some regular basis rather than having to wait until the end of March.

Mr. Peacock: It simply means you do not have to go to the bank.

Hon. Mr. Welch: But the point was that there was some modification in this. I will be glad to draw the member's comments to the attention of the Prime Minister when he returns and I appreciate the fact that you have made them.

Mr. Sargent: On this item regarding *Hansard*.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, would the member mind if the same point was followed up?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West—or do you want to speak on it?

Mr. Lewis: If I may, it is on the same point, Mr. Chairman. The member for Grey-Bruce is entirely right, it is a hell of an invidious position for members of the House to have to be placed in, when they have the indemnities and the expense allowances and travelling grants up under the Provincial Secretary's estimates, to have to discuss things which by their implication mean enhancement of one's own economic means. I think that most members in this House resent the invidiousness of that position, and resent it pretty bitterly because there is no reason in the world why at this hour of the night, at the eleventh hour of your estimates, we have to take on some of the fairly sore facts. And there are one or two which are fairly compelling, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is not aware of it.

There are members of this Legislature going into very serious personal debt. There are members of this Legislature who have an enormous economic burden, which is entirely unfair to ask them to assume. There are members of this Legislature who, in travel costs alone, are snowed under by the economic factors which impinge upon them. There are members of this Legislature who would even contemplate not running again because of the financial duress under which they are presently placed, and I dare say that they are not members confined to any one given political party.

I am not in that position, Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows that; I am not in any of those areas so I think that I can speak fairly freely and frankly on it to him. I think that it is simply wrong in a legislative assembly, that there is no reason in the world why certain members in the various political parties, certainly in the back bench of the government party, and proliferating through the other two parties in this House, should have to be placed in that position. I think that merits some pretty serious government thought.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is not the government in the same position?

Mr. Lewis: Certainly the government is in the same position—not the Cabinet, I think, not quite the same position—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Talking about invidious—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, the government members are in the invidious position, I am sure—I am not privy to these things—of having to raise it in a certain restless frustration at caucus and then wondering whatever happens to it thereafter. I am simply saying, Mr. Chairman, that surely the Minister feels there is some validity for an independent group or tribunal to take this whole difficult subject of members' indemnities and expenses and all the other things right out of the legislative arena altogether, and to do the kind of comparative study which would cause the members of the Legislature to feel that they were not being compromised in this kind of discussion and that some kind of equitable level of income is being set comparable to that which is received in the civil service or in private industry.

The member for Grey-Bruce and other members of the House have introduced anomalies on income level which strike one as laughable at times, as slightly humorous, but they can be produced from any area of the society. One has heard in the rumour

mills of the halls that the Prime Minister has, in effect, had a study made of senior civil servants' salaries and that that study would extend to what members of the Legislature should appropriately receive. But none of that is made privy to the members of the House, none of us have any knowledge publicly of what is being done in this area. And in our frequent, and I think quite legitimate, request for an independent group—be it a jurist or someone else—to take a look at the economic position of the members of the Legislature, nothing has ever come of it.

No one here has argued that they would oppose a decrease if such a group found that they could legitimately substantiate the need for it. No one has argued that the income levels and expense levels and travelling expense levels would necessarily go up if it could otherwise be substantiated. What one is really saying is: Why need the members of this House year after year be subjected to the frank embarrassment, to the obvious invidious position of having to state a case which would inevitably be misconstrued in the public mind?

In the province of Nova Scotia, not so long ago, a public study was made, an independent private study, and it was called the Report of the Royal Commission on Election Expenses and Associated Matters. One of the associated matters was the level of indemnity and expense allowances of members. I will not go into the precise figures, but if the figures of this report were extrapolated and pro-rated in terms of the length of the Ontario sitting and the work of the members here, the members in Nova Scotia would, for two months' work, be receiving what members of this House are expected to receive for six or seven months. That is the relationship that this committee suggested when it came down with a salary proposal for the members of that House.

But I am not arguing the rights or wrongs of that, I am just indicating, Mr. Chairman, that here you have a government which felt that they could set up a Royal commission to take away from the members of the House the embarrassment of having to deal with these things, and put it in the hands of an independent tribunal, not subject to any political or other person, and give a decision. We ask the Minister, we ask the Treasurer and we ask the Prime Minister that at least they allow the Cabinet to vouchsafe to us what their plans are in this regard.

No one is screeching for a change in rates at this point. One is simply saying that there are legitimate circumstances now for

the government to at least tell us what it has in mind, if anything, or at least to undertake the kind of analysis which would set the matter at rest once and for all. I hope that has not transgressed the proprieties of this very delicate matter.

The members of this House—many members of this House—are in the same position as the member for Grey-Bruce. I have had an occasional record of absenteeism, of which one does not speak proudly. But there are many members of this House—and I think in my own part that accounts for my own room much of the time—who work very hard and very long and very devotedly for a political cause; not a political cause in the doctrinaire sense of their own social philosophy, but in the service of constituents and in the service of the Legislature.

They should at least merit from government something other than the contempt implicit in a refusal to level with us collectively — of all parties — what your intentions are, whether or not you have an independent group, what one might expect, rather than relegating us to this position of having to, in a humiliating way, raise it at this point in the estimates.

I do not go further than that, Mr. Chairman, because I have only spoken about this Minister. I ask him now that when one raises this kind of point with him, that he take it seriously and does not let it simply lie.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to repeat what the hon. member for Scarborough West has said, because I think he has generally put the case. I just want to underline one aspect of it.

There is unconscionable delay and mystery about what goes on and this, I think, is the kind of thing that should be eliminated. I do not know how private the negotiations were between the leaders of the House, but as far back as last November or December, I asked the Prime Minister privately, if he would consider the proposition of setting up an independent triubunal, because we all know, from all sides of the House, that there has been discussion of the level of the indemnity and we are in an invidious position. The Prime Minister said he was considering it.

Now three months have gone by. Nobody knows, and from my tapping in on the grapevine in the hallways, the government members know less than even some of us know, which quite frankly, I think is a little silly.

I do not know why we do not deal with it out in the open.

Let me leave the indemnity and move on to the appropriation. I have only one major area of protest and, again, it stems from the delays. Last year when we agreed on the appropriations for each of the parties and the new arrangement, instead of all of us being sort of children of the Speaker, and being the benefactor of appropriations that went originally to him, the Prime Minister agreed that it could be reviewed at the end of the year. Well, certain proposals have been made and we are at the end of the year.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, just how serious it is. As most members know, we are in the process of getting into new quarters up in the third floor over in the corner. We simply cannot give information to The Department of Public Works—to finalize the arrangements so we can go in—with regard to telephones, because we do not know what our staff is going to be next year. April 1 is upon us—a new year. We do not know what the appropriation is; we do not know how many secretaries we may have, therefore we cannot tell Public Works how many telephones there are going to be and where they should be put in.

All this, it seems to me, is the result of the delays which, I suggest, should not characterize our handling of these affairs.

Finally I come to the travel problem for those who live at a great distance from Queen's Park. I know that the government was considering this a year ago. I know that the Prime Minister was wrestling with it and I know some of the problems that were making him hesitate.

But hesitating with problems is not going to remove them. They are still going to be there. One year later we still have no solution to the question of how those members who live at great distances from Queen's Park can be given something beyond the amounts that would go to members who live close to Queen's Park. Whether it is going to be by air fare, or whether it is going to be by 30 trips per year, rather than 15 trips a year, or what, I do not know. But we have been talking about it for a solid year. Who is wrestling with the problem—or is anybody really wrestling with the problem?

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: The only reason I rise to underline, or to back up, what the hon. member for Scarborough West has said, is that I know that these matters are being

considered, but the delay is an unconscionable one. It is frustrating the orderly handling of the arrangements of the offices, certainly in our instance, and I can only speak personally of the details there.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1706. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: On the *Hansard* reporting, item in the amount of \$225,000. The last account we have was \$124,000; it is up \$100,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A lot of words.

Mr. Sargent: Yes. Up \$100,000, or about 50 per cent, in two years since 1967-1968.

Would the Minister advise if *Hansard* is a tender deal?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: *Hansard* is a contract which is under the jurisdiction of the Speaker. I assume that the extra moneys that are being voted for *Hansard* is because of the longer sessions.

We are talking about an item which costs about \$18 a page and the longer the session and the more detail of course—

Mr. Sargent: You did not get my point. Is this a low tender deal? Does Ryerson Press have the contract to print it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I cannot say more than this. It is a contract which is negotiated by the Speaker, as far as the recording of the debates and the discussions in this House is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Imagine the poor proofreader having to read all those speeches.

Mr. Sargent: I see the former Speaker there. Maybe he could—

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): It is negotiated by the Speaker. He gave you the right answer.

Mr. Sargent: But is it a bid deal?

Mr. Morrow: No, it is not a bid deal.

Mr. Chairman, the Speaker's Office has looked into this at length as the years have gone by. They have negotiated with various printers to get the best price that they could, and the best price they could get, after looking into several printing establishments, was with Ryerson Press. So they went ahead and negotiated a contract with them.

This has been renewed from year to year, taking into consideration the number of copies that are used from year to year and that the price per page increases accordingly as costs go up. The Speaker's Office feel as if they are getting an exceptionally good deal from the present printing establishment.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you kept always telling me I was out of order. I am telling you you are out of order.

The thing is that—

Mr. Morrow: I am telling what is being done—

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, he says that the prices go up each year, but I think it should be a competitive arrangement deal each year—that they must meet competition each year.

I mean, you cannot just give them holus-bolus, carte blanche, in a deal like this, because it is \$250,000 you are throwing for some pretty junky paper. It is a cheap book there and it is a big contract. It should be renegotiated each year.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Provincial Secretary if he could tell us among how many members of the House, item 5, \$439,000, is to be distributed? Is it among all of the members of the House, or only those who are private members?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Just the private members.

Mr. Peacock: That works out to approximately \$4,000 per member, is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes.

Mr. Peacock: And that amount is to cover secretarial, research, office equipment and supplies, maintenance, postage, printing and so on. Now a number of members have already spoken to a prior and somewhat delicate matter, but I think on this item, Mr. Chairman, we do not need to have the same reservations about speaking out about the inadequacy of the amount that the Provincial Secretary is asking us to vote.

I do not think that the members of this House need to feel hesitant about suggesting directly to the Provincial Secretary and the Treasury Board that this is a hopelessly inadequate amount if private members of the House are to fulfill their duties as private members. An amount of \$4,000 per member

simply cannot cover the expenditure that is required for all the services that the Provincial Secretary has chosen to include under this item. It cannot even come close to covering the expenditure on the very first service that he has listed, that of secretarial help. As a description of the kind of service that I understand is provided to most private members it is completely misleading. It is anything but secretarial in nature and I suggest to the Provincial Secretary that he should omit that item altogether and bring in some other form of description for that kind of stenographic or typing service that is available to most private members of the House; or else he should bring in his request for the amount which is sufficient to provide proper secretarial service for each private member of the House.

The Prime Minister, from time to time, has spoken of the position of a private member of this House as being something akin to that of an ombudsman. Very well, let us just accept that definition for a moment, Mr. Chairman. Let us forget about the legislative responsibilities of members of this House; let us deal with their role as case workers in their constituencies. The amount of \$4,000, if it were paid directly to each member of the House for secretarial service alone, to handle what we call in this group—and perhaps other members also use the expression—case work, the work that is brought to members by their constituents, would not come close to providing the full-time secretarial service that members require. That would mean that members would not be making the dozen of phone calls per case that they must make in order to expedite and complete the investigation of the problem that the constituent brings to them. It would provide the service in terms of correspondence that members would like to carry out, whereas at the moment we must sort through the correspondence that reaches us and put to one side the form letters to be answered by form letters—which may well be appropriate, but nonetheless, it is indicative to the person corresponding with the member of just how badly off we are in terms of these services.

Failing the provision of adequate amounts under this vote, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Provincial Secretary that there are only two other ways in which private members can possibly bring the necessary resources to their support. These are simply by canvassing, as I am sure some members have done in the past and still do, canvassing individuals in their riding associations and outside their riding associations for contri-

butions in the form of grants or loans to help them meet this kind of expense, making appeals to such individuals that, "since you have contributed in some way either financially or personally to the election of the member or even though you have not contributed directly financially or personally to the election of the member, because you are a public-spirited citizen and you want to ensure the viability of the political process in this province, I ask you to assist me financially in sustaining my position as a member of the Legislature."

I know that this has been done by members of the Legislature and I know that in one or two instances it is being done now, that members must make appeals to their acquaintances within their own political organizations in order that they can provide for themselves the services that are necessary to maintain an essential but non-partisan service to the constituents that they represent.

Mr. Chairman, the alternative if we do not achieve some improvement in services to private members is simply a reversion to the old system where members completely rely on the particular machinery that is available to them within their associations in working out some of the problems that are brought to them, the kind of political machinery that was in place and worked rather well before the introduction of a non-partisan civil service and the selection of civil servants by examination and so on; and a system which we will never get back to, thank goodness, but one which in those days was a means by which members served their constituents. It is no longer a valid, moral or technically acceptable way for a member to carry out his responsibilities.

Since that must be rejected, and failing any government response to the appeals of private members, then I think we will continue to have to rely upon the generosity of many private citizens in sustaining the efforts of members in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. members would realize this is a matter of government policy. I am not in any position to make any announcement with respect to change. I have come to the Legislature on the basis of the statutes to ask the money to fulfill the statutes, the statutory obligations which we have—the requirement or the sum of money of \$439,000 for the operation of item 5. I think I would draw your attention again to the comments of the hon. member for York South, where originally this was worked out by the leaders, and

I assume that any change would be worked out by the leaders in the same way that this amount was arrived at. I have no alternative now, in presenting my estimates to the House, than to ask for the amounts which are presently provided for in the statute, and also which are the subject matter of the agreement. If there is any change in those then obviously they can make application in the regular way, but I am in no position to discuss the impossible.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: The Minister is just the middle man.

Mr. Deacon: In connection with the matter of expenditures by the members to serve their constituents, as has been mentioned before, and in all other matters of related expenses, it seems appropriate for us now, and the government to consider now, changing the method from what has been perhaps appropriate in the past.

In the former days the sessions were limited in scope and the involvement of the members was much more limited, and perhaps then it was possible to make a flat amount estimate of what was needed and limit people to that amount. But in this time, when we now require for our normal income tax return details of our expenditures and vouchers for any other category of work we are involved in, where we now require of the civil servants in work they do putting in vouchers—and they are not restricted each year to a certain trip or a certain amount for the carrying out of the work of the government—why we should not have our own affairs managed in a similar way where we do not restrict the members; we make a reasonable estimate of what amounts will be required, but require that the members put in vouchers for their expenses. A man living close to Toronto, such as I in my position, does not have nearly the demands or need for expenses that someone living up in Fort Frances has. The need to get the cost of their going back to their ridings, to serve their ridings, are such that they should be not restricted by an arbitrary legislative amount.

I suggest that the agreement should be considered on the basis of publishing, as we do in the case of the public accounts; we have the publication of amounts of how much people have spent for travel expenses. Why do we not publish at the end of the year how much the members have spent, and put in vouchers for, and been reimbursed for, and their expenditures in carrying out their work? I think publication and disclosure of the amounts spent will do a great deal to allevi-

ate any concern on the part of the public as to abuse of this type of control—or lack of control, they might say. We feel it is sufficient to be sure we have control in the case of the civil service; why not ourselves?

I do not think it is appropriate any more for us to work on a flat amount of tax-exempt allowance. I do not feel the public gets any feeling of assurance that this money has been properly expended. And I think in this way, if we do change our policy, we should take off the ceiling, leave it to the member's own conscience and to the fact that what they spend is made public in the accounts of this province at the end of the year.

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

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to return for a moment to the appropriation to each of the parties within the House, and the operation of their offices, because there is one aspect, I now recall, and this is the appropriate place it should be raised.

The Minister has indicated that the details of it are now in the process of being examined. I think proposals have been advanced, certainly by each of the Opposition parties, and the Prime Minister has indicated they will be looked at in the first instance by the Whips, and then presumably they will come up to the *troika* meeting of the leaders for some final decision. At least, that has been the past procedure. I do not want to deal with the detail, but I want to deal with the principle. Now, I shall attempt to keep what may appear to be partisan aspects of this in a very low tone. Originally, the provision of moneys for Opposition parties, or for the party offices, was because the Prime Minister and everybody acknowledged that the Opposition were at something of a disadvantage in terms of available research facilities. Theoretically we all have access to the civil service, we all have to a certain degree, but there are obvious limitations on the extent to which an Opposition member can go and get research and things done by government departments; and there are not as many limitations for a government member. Certainly for a Cabinet Minister there are none.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All you have to do is ask the Minister, he does it all for you.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore the original provision of this money was to redress this imbalance. Now, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, until the consideration of these estimates a year ago I did not know what

the other parties were getting, and I did not care, as long as we were getting enough to operate efficiently. But last year the now Minister of Revenue—

Mr. Winkler: If you want to be tolerable you need more money, I can tell you.

Mr. MacDonald: I shall not pursue that, Mr. Chairman, I did not get the import of the interjection. But last year the now Minister of Revenue interjected and in his characteristic way contended, without any documentation at all, that the money that was being made available to the New Democratic Party was being used for the provincial office, and the provincial office was being run here. It was a typical smear and I will call it that bluntly. And only because of that provocation I said, "Okay, what is each party getting?" And I was very fascinated to discover the information.

The Liberals are getting \$4,000 per member, which is the basic formula, plus \$6000 for the leader's office a total of \$118,000. We were getting \$4,000 per member for the 20, a total of \$80,000 plus \$6,000 for the leader's office which is \$86,000. The Conservatives were getting the equivalent amount, \$204,000—equivalent to the two Opposition parties. Now, how you figure that out I just do not know; quite frankly I have not been able to find out, because, as was contended for the private members, we have got to do a bit more analysis. There are 69 Conservatives. One is the Speaker, and he is provided for in a certain way. There are 23, I think, in the Cabinet. That takes you down to 45. But even if we operated on the 45, four times 45 is \$180,000. Where is the \$204,000? I submit that even the 45 is not a defensible proposition, because six of the Conservative members have offices in the various commissions that they sit on, OWRC, racing commission, Hydro, and so on. There are really 39 Conservative members, so on the basis that we are operating, it should be four times 39. In fact, it is four times 51.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): We still have to use the research facilities, obviously.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): You have the civil service.

Mr. MacDonald: You have the research facilities of all of your department, and—

Mr. Trotter: All your PR boys.

Mr. MacDonald: All I am saying, Mr. Chairman—and I said that I do not wish to

get into a partisan argument, because quite frankly until that bitter partisanship was interjected last year I did not know what the other parties were getting and I did not care. But now, I do care, because I think that this, too, should be brought out so that everybody can see it and lay it right on the table. The fact of the matter Mr. Chairman, is that while the government should be commended for doing as much as any other government in this country in terms of providing these moneys, and more than most, it is still inadequate.

The point I want to make is, that the objective of creating a better balance, so that the Opposition parties would not have to cope with a government which has all those resources, has certainly not been achieved at all. The imbalance is as great, if not greater than it was before. Because the government members, despite the fact that there are not as many of them who are entitled to it as backbenchers, are getting as much as the two Opposition parties put together.

There is a principle involved in this and I draw it to the attention of the Minister. I have already drawn it to the attention of the Prime Minister, and I think in the course of our working out the details of the new appropriation that some of these principles, if there are underlying principles, should be brought right out into the open.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1706? The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out too, that the 39 non-Cabinet members of the government have not the same requirements as the members of the Opposition. They have their case work. We have our case work. But we also have to be prepared to speak almost every day. We have to do a great amount of research—at least, we would like to. We have very little time to do it and when the appropriations are being divided, that should be one of the major considerations. So that even if we could get equality I think we would be satisfied, but we are not getting equality even and, in all fairness, we should really get more.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I can be brief because I can say this: I can say that I want to associate myself without reservation to everything that was said by the member for Windsor West because he expresses through you, Mr. Chairman, to the

Provincial Secretary, exactly the position I have taken since I have come into this House.

It is absolutely unconscionable to think that we can do the job that we are supposed to do for \$4,000. Really, as you go down this list it is amazing to me, I had not taken the time to look at it before, the word "secretarial" is an absolute misnomer; the word "secretary" implies to me, some liaison between myself as a personality and the people whom I serve. What we have are stenographers. That is really the word. But I do not want to get into semantics with you.

I think the Provincial Secretary takes a just position in connection with this. This is a unique vote, I would suggest, among all the estimates in that, really, he is not the author of this. I doubt very much really, Mr. Chairman, whether he has much to say about it. But knowing him personally and respecting him as I do, I ask him this: Be my advocate if you would, please, be my advocate with your Cabinet colleagues because I made a speech in this House—I think it was in December—and spent 15 minutes on this very subject. I came here from a law practice where I had four secretaries, and I am blessed in this respect. I would suggest three-quarters of my work is done through my law office in Sarnia, but that should not have to be. Why should my colleague in Ottawa have better disposition of services to the people whom he serves than I? I am not interested in amenities. I do not want that. I do not care one whit whether you put me in a room 8x4 with no window, but I do want proper secretarial service, because I am an ombudsman. That is exactly what the member for Windsor West said and exactly what the Prime Minister agrees with but this business of a *troika*, an agreement—there is no *troika*, it is a unilateral decision made by one man. And really it is made reasonably. I think he makes a sincere attempt, and I think I have said this before. There is a sincere attempt to upgrade our facilities here. But the sincere attempt does not exemplify it, Mr. Chairman, and to you, Provincial Secretary, does not exemplify itself in this expenditure of \$439,000. This should be doubled, I suggest, and I doubt whether that would be a realistic amount.

I close in saying to the Provincial Secretary, through you Mr. Chairman, please be my advocate and the advocate of the people who sit behind you and need the same type of service that I so badly need.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have two very brief thoughts as I listen to this discussion.

One of the very real problems, I suspect—if I can be forgiven for suggesting it—is that the Cabinet members, the Treasury Board, having within their purview all the prerogatives of their office, find it very difficult to both comprehend and to identify with some of the difficulties of backbench members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you not think we were backbenchers?

Mr. Lewis: Well, I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Correctional Services has found it necessary to chuckle through various parts of the debate, to make—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was a backbencher without any aid, without any research facilities—but I was not chuckling.

Mr. Lewis: He has to make a variety of asides, I do not know why. This is the kind of defence mechanism that is always employed, and I do not particularly see why it has to be employed on this occasion. But the Minister of Correctional Services, as a Minister of the Crown, I am quite sure, functions with a full-time secretary. And I am quite certain he functions with certain ancillary staff on a full-time basis, and no one in this entire legislative assembly would deny him the right to so function. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, all that one asks of the Treasury Board is why they deny individual members of this Legislature to so function. Are our positions so much less worthy? Must the status of individual members be so much more demeaned in comparison with Treasury Board? I think not sir, I think not. I think the Treasury Board has what they must have—sometimes perhaps a little more—so be it, those are the trappings of power. But I see no reason in the world why the people with whom they are associated in this legislative assembly cannot have even the minimal that is required to do a decent job. The minimal is a sum of money sufficient to provide what you have indicated in this vote—the secretarial work, the research work, the supplies, the equipment, the postage and so on. On that, you put a figure of \$4,000.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what it is for the government members, but I know that for our party—and I suspect for the other Opposition party—it works out to not a secretary, not even a stenographer, but a dicta-typist for three or four members. Let me make my point this way, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Provincial Secretary. I challenge him to rise in his seat at this point in time, and turn around and identify for people on

this side of the House, three or four members behind him who can function legitimately, effectively and usefully as MPPs with one dicta-typist, very little research and by no means adequate equipment. Which of your members are the three or four? Can you name them for us? Can you identify them for us? Do you not think that that this a legitimate question to ask? And we rest our case there, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I propose to you, and to the House, that this is a matter that can certainly receive consideration. In the words of the hon. member for York South, it has been considered already by the three leaders—the *troika*, if that is the appropriate word to use—and dealt with at that time. If it has turned out to be quite inadequate, it is quite possible to review again. But the hon. member for Riverdale shakes his head.

Mr. J. Renwick: It has been under review for something like three months.

Mr. MacDonald: And it should have been finished.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me pursue this, Mr. Chairman. All right, it has been under review as you say. It has been under review in this House tonight, very extensively and quite appropriately. That is the prerogative of a private member. But may I propose that you vote what is being asked for here now and may I suggest again, that the leaders will likely be consulted if and when—hopefully soon—some estimate of what has been required has been developed? If an agreement can be reached by some reasonable means, then the process is very simple. The Provincial Secretary will submit a request to Treasury Board for an approval of funds to augment what is in this Budget. Now I simply suggest to you that you vote the Provincial Secretary what he is asking for here now. I am quite confident this can be dealt with in due course.

Mr. Ben: What will you do when the Provincial Secretary asks you for supplementary funds?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: May I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if a consortium of agreement has been reached by the Prime Minister and leaders of the other two parties, it becomes pretty routine, I think.

Mr. Lewis: Only a man who borrows Deutschmarks talks about a consortium of agreement.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Not to labour this too long, Mr. Chairman, I do have two questions to ask. I would like to ask first who sits on the Treasury Board?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Who sits on the Treasury Board?

An hon. member: It is out of order.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Out of order? Treasury Board—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think it is pertinent to the matter under discussion.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Citizenship, is it the Treasury Board that can alter this amount? Who can alter this amount, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think, Mr. Chairman, the point the Treasurer is making is that the Legislature can vote this amount. Then, if it is necessary to increase the vote, the procedure is to apply to the Treasury Board—

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask then, when the Minister applies to Treasury Board what Minister he is applying to?

All right, Mr. Chairman, I will accept the Treasurer's comments inasmuch as he seems to have recognized that we are in a desperate need on this side of the House. I was simply trying to find out in whose hands this fate rested so that I might keep a watchful eye.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Because, Mr. Chairman, I wrote a personal note one day to a person whom I consider a senior member of Cabinet and he said, "I will discuss it with the Speaker, I think it comes under his department." I assumed this gentleman would be on the Treasury Board and that was my purpose, Mr. Chairman, in trying to find out which Ministers I should be lobbying.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question as well, on the comments. Actually the member rose when he made these comments, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps you did not see him behind your right shoulder there. I believe the member for Muskoka rose and said "We will have to depend on government research." This is something that I would like to have access to,

Mr. Chairman. I have never clearly understood—

Mr. Boyer: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I made no such remark. The hon. member clearly misunderstood what I did say. *Hansard* will show what I did say.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, because research naturally is a part of our function as critics, would it be appropriate to ask the Minister if government research is available to members of the opposite side of the House, such as the—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I must apologise, would the member repeat the question?

Mrs. M. Renwick: I believe, Mr. Chairman, I worded it this way: Is government research available to members on this side of the House?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well, I assume, Mr. Chairman, that there were some comments being made by the member for Muskoka and I heard his interjection. I think what he was saying was that he relies on the research facilities which are provided for this caucus through its caucus offices. That is not government research, that is the caucus research. As far as government research is concerned, the member for York South has already mentioned that all members of this Legislature can consult with all of the civil servants of the various departments to obtain whatever other information they need. And if that is government research then that is available to all members of the Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: But much of it is inter-departmental and not available.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Well that may be, but I just want to draw that distinction.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Some of it is.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, from the Minister's remarks, I presume he concludes that from the appropriation, we must provide for ourselves, a research person. One person for that job for 20 members is really not enough. We do not take part, Mr. Chairman, in the government switchboard, so therefore we must also, out of our appropriation, provide a switchboard operator. One switchboard operator is not really enough, inasmuch as we sit two evenings a week, and the switchboard operator has lunch hours. And when we provide these amenities, which all of us share in, and assistance to our leader whom we feel deserves all the assistance we can

possibly provide for him in the province, we end up, as one of the members mentioned earlier, sharing one secretary between three members of Parliament.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if any of the Cabinet Ministers on the other side have ever tried to do a half decent job with one-third of a secretary.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which third?

Mrs. M. Renwick: But it is about ten hours a week.

I do not know what I said that was so humorous, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to say that many of these speeches that I am asked to make at riding associations are placed before me in this fashion, Mr. Chairman: What is it like to be a lady member in a gentlemen's club or what is it like to be a lady member of Parliament? We do not have all that many.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now you sound like Judy LaMarsh.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we all have a little joke or two tucked up our sleeves when we are speaking to riding associations. If the audience is cold we warm them up with a little comment. My favourite comment — and I must say I am getting embarrassed at using it—is: ‘Well, first of all, ladies and gentlemen, I work at Queen's Park with the volume of mail I know many of you send me, with one-third of a secretary.’ Mr. Chairman, if I had an ordinary position—and I have worked all my adult life but for about ten years—and the company could not provide me with one secretary for the work that I had to do, I would not stay, and I think we are really asking something that is intolerable when we ask members on this side of the House—

An hon. member: Don't stay.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the efforts of Mr. Alan Eagelson and Mr. George Peck who have a great deal in common, I intend to stay in the legislative assembly as long as the people of Scarborough Centre will re-elect me.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, this is a perennial for me. I must put on the record again what I have said in other years. I remember talking to the late Harry Nixon when I was first elected ten years ago and I said that no man has a right to refuse to answer a letter for any man. We should reply, naturally, when we get corre-

spondence from people. They are looking for an answer. Harry Nixon said, ‘You won't be here too long before you will get over that.’

I tried hard not to get beyond that but I find it easier to drop letters into a basket rather than have to reply to them, because we just do not have the staff here. Fortunately, I have a full-time secretary who does most of my political correspondence at home. As I have said before, I write my letters here in longhand and send them to Chippawa. My secretary types them and sends them back to me in a day or so, and then I sign them and send them back to Chippawa or Niagara Falls. This has been going on for quite a few years.

Mr. Lewis: There must be an easier way. Is that what you would do if you ever came to power?

Mr. Bukator: The fact remains that this girl gets paid more in wages than the government pays me for working here, and the days I put in here. Her gross take is greater than the \$8,000 that you give me in wages and she earns every cent of it.

I have private offices in both Niagara Falls and Chippawa.

Mrs. M. Renwick: You need to if you are a member on this side of the House.

Mr. Bukator: I have been accustomed to doing business in a private office where I can concentrate and call people and not be bothered. I recall not too long ago talking to a member of a department of the government when four or five of my colleagues came into that particular new quarter that I am established in now. Naturally they are a happy lot after dinner, and I said to the man that I was talking to, ‘Four or five of my drunken political friends have come in and I am sorry I have lost track of what we were talking about.’

Well, it was not quite that bad, but this is the type of privacy we have now. I find it much easier to sit here after the House closes till 11 and 12 o'clock at night doing some of the work that I have to do because the three who are housed in with me do not like working evenings. I find that I can get a lot of work out of the way. This day alone some 55 letters that I signed went out of my office downstairs. I said it a year ago and I say it to you now, we have a big business to look after: the province. We are entitled to a private office and a secretary; that is not asking too much. I personally recall the Prime Minister saying in this

House not too long ago "we can put it back to what it was," and sure enough, it was not what it was today. I am happy with what I have, but we do need more help. We need more secretarial staff to help us get this correspondence out.

I have one petition from a group of people from the village where I come from and I think each one of them is entitled to a reply, even though they signed a petition. I intend to do just that. There has to be at least 400 letters go out of that office and I have been waiting for an opportunity for one of our pool—because they have been moved in and out of their offices too, the secretaries—to get to the position where they can take care of this correspondence properly.

Mr. Lewis: What about the humane society—

Mr. Bukator: I am not talking about the humane society, although I have my share of those also. The difference between my correspondents and the humane society—for the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart)—I reply to the people who write to me, they were not form letters.

I believe people are entitled to just that kind of a reply. And I think this government owes me that kind of staff, to take care of the constituents that we all represent. Until we receive that kind of treatment here, I am not going to be at all content.

I say, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the members who are here, that things are better

than they were, but they are not good enough for the type of business we are operating. Therefore, I want to get on the record again what I said in other years—that this is not the way to run the province's affairs.

Vote 1706 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will do some Budget Debate and then go into the private members' hour at noon.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.35 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, March 28, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Friday, March 28, 1969

Tabling statistics on traffic collisions, Mr. Haskett	2833
Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Worton, first reading	2833
Chairmanship of the OWRC, statement by Mr. Robarts	2833
Modular co-ordination system, statement by Mr. Connell	2834
Residential property tax rebates, statement by Mr. Yaremko	2835
Rent subsidy premium, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Sargent	2835
Welfare housing, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mrs. M. Renwick	2836
Crown wards Peggy and Valerie, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mrs. M. Renwick	2837
Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts	2842
Bilingualism of Queen's Park guides and security guards, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Knight	2842
Federal-provincial sharing programme re mental hospitals, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Shulman	2842
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Sargent	2843
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Sargent, agreed to	2848
On notice of motion No. 23, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Carruthers, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ben, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. T. P. Reid.....	2848
Motion to adjourn, Mr. MacNaughton, agreed to	2858
Appendix	2858
Erratum	2861

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1969

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors with us in the Legislature. I am sure the hon. members would want to extend a welcome to our visitors this morning.

In the east gallery we have students from the Brockton High School of Toronto, and from the Brantford Collegiate Institute and Vocational School, Brantford.

A little later in the morning we will have in the west gallery students from the Central Peel Secondary School of Brampton.

Petitions.

Presenting reports. The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I table the statistics on traffic collisions in Ontario in 1968, as compiled by my department from police reports.

Although the number of deaths was somewhat lower than in the previous year, the other figures are up. This leaves scant ground for satisfaction with this unhappy report. I present it as perspective for the consideration of traffic matters by the House.

It will be noted that the title of the statistical report is no longer "Accident Facts". This year it refers to traffic collisions. I believe the use of the word "accident" has become symbolic of the perverse attitude that accepts these happenings as inevitable and in so doing perpetuates the problem.

Most collisions are caused by human carelessness and irresponsibility. Therefore, my department is dropping the use of the word "accident" wherever possible, and I ask that hon. members also consider this change in terminology in the interests of encouraging commonsense attitudes toward traffic safety.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills. The hon. member for Wellington South.

THE DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Speaker, very briefly this bill is to extend the time limit of when a husband is responsible to his wife for the care of his children.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day the hon. the Prime Minister has a statement.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should like to inform you and the hon. members, of the retirement of an eminent senior public servant.

A few weeks ago, the chairman of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, Dr. James A. Vance, indicated his wish to be relieved of his heavy duties as the chairman of this important commission. Dr. Vance agreed to continue in office while a review of the functions of the commission was undertaken.

As I announced to the House on Thursday, March 13, the Ontario Water Resources Commission:

Will be responsible for the holding of public hearings, resolving disputes, considering rate structures wherever the public interest is involved in matters of water management and pollution abatement. . . . The commission and all its quasi-judicial and policy-making functions will continue as it has done in the past. But that portion of the staff of the water resources commission—the technical aspect of it; the people who are doing the surveys and planning the plants and operating them, in many cases, because more and more are they coming into the operation of these plants across the province—will be brought into the department.

In its new role, the commission will be responsible for all aspects of the development of broad policies covering water supply and pollution abatement. In doing so, it will be necessary for it to work closely with the various agencies, including of course the governmental agencies, developing plans for regional development.

In due course, Mr. Speaker, legislation to effect this course of events will be brought before the House.

Now that the broad outlines of the revised role of the commission have been defined, and in consultation with Dr. Vance, it is appropriate to accede to his request. Accordingly, I wish to announce that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Vance effective April 1, 1969.

The contribution of Dr. Vance to this province has been substantial and is well known to all hon. members. He was a member of the water resources and supply committee, which preceded the establishment of the Ontario Water Resources Commission. When the commission was established in 1956, Dr. Vance became a member of this body. Indeed, he and I were fellow commissioners for a time. Following the death of A. M. Snider, the first chairman of the commission, in 1964, Dr. Vance succeeded to this position. This followed a distinguished career as senior partner in an eminent firm of consulting engineers in Woodstock.

Dr. Vance's attainments in his profession are recognized throughout the world. Utilizing his expertise, he has guided the development of the technical staff of the Ontario Water Resources Commission which today is recognized as one of the most advanced groups in its field.

Under his chairmanship, the Ontario Water Resources Commission has achieved spectacular results in the field of water supply and pollution abatement. As two very large examples, I need only refer to the Lake Huron water supply pipeline and the recently announced water and sewage project for Peel county. Dr. Vance may be justifiably proud of the positive and constructive role he and the commission have played in the growth and development of Ontario. The beneficial effect of Dr. Vance's work as chairman of the commission will have a continuing and salutary influence on the lives of the people of Ontario for many years to come.

So, on behalf, sir, of the government of Ontario, I wish to thank Dr. Vance for his service to the people of Ontario and to express my personal appreciation of my long association with him and the advice that he has given the government. On behalf of all of us in this House, I should like to say to him: We will continue the important work for which you have laid so sound a foundation.

The new chairman of the Ontario Water Resources Commission will be Mr. Donald J.

Collins, who leaves his present appointment as chairman of the civil service commission and Deputy Minister of The Department of Civil Service. He will assume his new position on April 1, 1969.

Mr. Collins brings to the water resources commission a broad background of administrative expertise in public service. His knowledge and experience will further strengthen the commission in its new and expanded role of involving the people of Ontario more fully in the decision-making process which will result in the greater protection and enhancement of our environment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Works, I believe has a statement.

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement here that I think will be of interest to all members, but may be more particularly of interest to the member for Halton East (Mr. Snow) and, possibly, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. MacKenzie). Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to advise the members of this House that effective March 31, 1969 my department will adopt the modular co-ordination system in the design and construction of Department of Public Works projects.

Modular co-ordination is a term given to the process of standardizing the dimensions of building components so as to reduce the variety of sizes in which components are manufactured and thus facilitate the assembly of components on the building site.

Dimensional standardization, based upon the standard four inch building module is a prerequisite to co-ordination. It is an important means of increasing productivity and efficiency in the manufacture and use of building equipment.

The adoption of modular co-ordination by the building industry is one of the specific objectives of the federal government's BEAM programme, whose overall objective is to increase productivity and efficiency in the manufacture and use of building equipment, accessories and materials.

For the past two years the staff of public works have been training for this procedure and we have phased it into our design groups.

Shortly, we expect to be calling tenders for an addition, and interior alterations, to the court house in Kenora. The drawings and specifications for the project were prepared by our staff on the modular system. This was

considerably more difficult than for a new building, but it did give us the assurance that our staff were capable of efficiently adopting the system for all projects.

As of March 31, we will also require all of our associate architects on Provincial projects to produce their drawings on this system.

You may be aware that, effective the same date, the federal Department of Public Works recently announced a similar policy.

We are continually striving for new and improved procedures for the economical and judicious spending of our construction dollars and we are, at all times, ready to work with all aspects of the construction industry in improving our skills and systems in this industry which is so vital to the economy and growth of the Province.

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker I would like to congratulate the Minister on his very progressive steps in this matter. I am sure that the province will benefit greatly economically from his very progressive approach to building construction.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): When it is overdue, then they suggest it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Social and Family Services has a statement.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement in connection with recovery of residential property tax rebates. I have made an intensive assessment of the impact of recovery. This review has included consideration of the effects upon recipients and the meaning to them of the recovery procedures initiated.

We have concluded that in consideration of all aspects of this question that it is in the best interests of the recipients that we should not recover the payments that were made to and received by them, in good faith.

I am therefore pleased to say that I have obtained approval for appropriate amendments which will provide that payments under The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act are not recoverable from recipients of family benefits and general welfare assistance. Where recovery has been made in whole or in part, it is our intention that appropriate adjustments will be made. I am sure that this decision will be welcomed by all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, as you know our programmes of financial assistance are designed to cover a variety of circumstances where provision of essential needs of persons, for one reason or

another, is not available or is inadequate. Indeed, the package of social services and maintenance and other allowances and benefits is within this province amongst the best anywhere. Although these programmes are extensive and cover the great majority of situations of need, from time to time there evolves a particular group of persons who are in a situation where it is difficult or impossible to obtain the necessary benefits from existing arrangements.

I am keenly aware of the plight of certain persons who are receiving care in a hospital for chronic patients and who have no private resources to use for personal needs. I am pleased to say again that I have obtained approval from the gentlemen on my immediate right for appropriate amendments in order to provide for the payment of a comfort allowance up to \$15 per month to those who are patients in hospitals for chronic care, and who of course qualify under the needs tests. We feel that this new provision will bring some comfort and some of the amenities of life to those who are in the unfortunate position of suffering from long term illness and disability.

Mr. Speaker, although the gifts are not of my own making only, it is nice to be Santa Claus.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a question of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Trade and Development.

Pending a favourable reply from Ottawa wherein the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will share the cost of rent subsidy premium, will the Minister guarantee that all cities in Ontario will have equal treatment with the city of Toronto?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Subject to our receiving a reply from Ottawa to the effect that the federal government will participate in the operating costs of a scheme similar to the rent certificate plan—introduced by the government of Ontario some years ago—and subject to the establishment of terms and conditions for such a scheme acceptable to the government of Ontario, it could be implemented in any Ontario municipality.

I would, however, draw to the attention of the hon. members that the implementation of such a scheme in any municipality is dependent upon there being established need and effective demand for rent-to-income accommodation and the availability of suitable, privately owned accommodation at a realistic rental rate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has questions from a few days ago. Does he wish to answer them at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have no answers.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford has a question to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): A question to the Minister of Justice:

Is the Minister aware that a Mr. Joseph Viner of 14 Major Street, Toronto, appeared before Judge R. K. Hirtle in Court "K", old city hall, on March 24, on a traffic offence and was refused by the judge the option to make an affirmation instead of an oath, and consequently lost his case because he was unable to plead?

Second part: is not mandatory for judges acting in Ontario courts to accept an affirmation when the person to be sworn in refuses to take an oath under section 18(1) of The Evidence Act?

And the third part: if so, will the Minister instruct Judge Hirtle to reopen Mr. Viner's case so that he may have a court hearing in the proper manner?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I received the question a short time ago. I would like to check the facts, and certainly shall then have an answer for the hon. member.

I would say definitely, as to the question about affirming instead of swearing, this is permitted, I know. I would want to check the facts surrounding the case so that I shall be able to give a proper answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has questions to the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, might I ask you to give me the number of that outstanding question?

Mr. Speaker: Question 981.

Mrs. M. Renwick: A question of the Minister of Social and Family Services: are welfare administrators in Metro Toronto encour-

aged or allowed to seek the co-operation of the Ontario Housing Corporation in their attempt to house welfare recipients; or do they rely solely on the Metro welfare housing department on George Street where, it is my understanding, it is limited to landlords who will take welfare recipients as tenants at welfare rates for shelter?

Question 2, Mr. Speaker: what is policy with regard to welfare administrators trying to cope with emergency housing cases, such as evictions. Are they allowed or encouraged to work with the OHC on these cases, or are the administrators to rely on the one-family hostel in Toronto, on Dundas Street, where husbands are not allowed to stay with their families?

Question 3: why are husbands not allowed to stay with their families in the family hostel on Dundas Street? Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling I asked that question previously.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet answered it.

Mr. Speaker: May I say I am trying desperately to find the question, and I do not appear to have one with that number on it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The question was asked, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. M. Renwick: About March 24, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I do not have that question.

Mrs. M. Renwick: No, it was asked. That would be why you would not have it, Mr. Speaker. It was asked on March 24, and the Minister is replying today to that question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I replied, but I ended my reply at that time by saying I would be pleased to obtain the information and answer the question at a later date. Now I have the full answer:

1. The welfare offices of the welfare department of Metro Toronto seek housing for people and the welfare offices of The Department of Social and Family Services are often engaged in the same task. Both provincial and municipal welfare officers work in close co-operation with the Ontario Housing Corporation and receive excellent help from that source in many cases.

2. Where persons are threatened with eviction from housing, the municipality makes every effort to forestall eviction so far as the legislation allows. If eviction takes place, the family may be placed in other rented accommodation, or may go into an Ontario housing

unit. In some cases the family goes to the family hostel on Dundas Street for a comparatively short time until housing can be found for them.

3. The family hostel is emergency shelter and is not equipped for full private-family living. There are only bathrooms, for example, for women and children, and the presence of men would be inappropriate. For these reasons the husbands do not stay with the family. The separation, however, is temporary and the families are reunited in appropriate housing as soon as possible.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Perhaps the hon. member would place the question and then I would see.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Would the Minister undertake to make some contact with the Coxwell and Queen welfare office, where I have been told that they are not to contact OHC unless they are down to a seven-day eviction for a family.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will take that matter up.

There is question 1024 from the member.

Mr. Speaker: Question 1024, dated March 26.

Mrs. M. Renwick: If it has been asked, Mr. Speaker, I do not have it here. Has it been asked?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No.

Mr. Speaker: According to my information the question has been asked.

If the hon. member does not have it there, I could send this one up to her for her use at the moment.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The number again?

Mr. Speaker: Number 1024.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I have it, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Are Crown wards Peggy and Valerie, former foster children with the Timbrell family, still together; and are they adopted or still foster children and wards of the Crown?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, Peggy and Valerie are still Crown wards. They are

living with different families of relatives and have regular contact with each other.

Mr. Speaker: Question 1011, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre to the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that question is no longer applicable.

Mr. Speaker: Question 1013, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre to the same Minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have not received that.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Minister have that question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I have not. That completes all the questions I have, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I also have question number 1014 by the same hon. member to the same Minister.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, 1013 is no longer pertinent due to the Minister's statement this morning.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): The Renwick rebates!

Mr. Speaker: What about question number 1014?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Question 1014, Mr. Speaker, is no longer pertinent due to the Minister's statement this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Question 1015; the same hon. member to the same hon. Minister.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I presume the same comments apply?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the same comments apply to question 1015.

Mr. Speaker: Question 1043, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre; a question of the hon. Minister of Health.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: will the Minister take steps to make sure that the emergency key to drugs in the dispensary of the Brockville psychiatric hospital is placed with the senior medical staff person at the hospital instead of the switchboard?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be unreasonable to ask the hon. member to put all of the questions. All of her questions have relationship to the same matter.

Mr. Speaker: Well, perhaps the hon. member would put the remainder of her questions to this Minister?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask your opinion on this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the question be put on the order paper, because I believe it more rightly belongs there—the entire series of questions.

Mr. Speaker: I have a series of five questions by the hon. member to the same Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are related to the same thing; they should all be on the order paper.

Mrs. M. Renwick: They are not necessarily related questions in all of these cases. I would have been glad to have put this second question, along with the other one. But the others, regarding the staffing of the hospital, Mr. Speaker, if I might say, do not really bear any relationship to the question of the control of drugs at the hospital.

May I receive permission, Mr. Speaker, to deliver the questions as they were delivered to the Minister? Except that I would have been glad to add the question of the dispensary in other hospitals along with the one which the Minister has.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we could deal with this by citing the numbers of the questions. Question number 1039: does the hon. Minister care to answer that question or take it as notice?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that it be put on the order paper where I think it more rightly belongs.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, question 1039 has not been asked. May I have the floor to ask the question?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I believe the hon. member may ask the question properly.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Question of the Minister of Health: How many doctor vacancies were there at the Brockville psychiatric hospital at the time of Dr. Mullner's testimony to the standing committee on health, March 6, 1969?

How many doctors' positions have been

filled since that date and for how long had these vacancies been in existence?

How many of these doctor positions were filled by transfers from other hospitals, and if so, from which hospitals?

For how long have the three doctor vacancies, the Minister spoke of yesterday, been vacant?

How long is it since the Brockville psychiatric hospital had its full complement of medical staff?

How many doctor vacancies have occurred since the present superintendent, Dr. Miller, came on staff?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this question be put on the order paper where it more properly belongs.

Mr. Speaker: I might say that the question had been placed before Mr. Speaker and the question was permitted. However, I believe that it would more properly be placed on the order paper and in that event the question should not have been put.

We will now put the question on the order paper at the request of the hon. Minister.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. Is it appropriate for me to ask you what would decide whether a question should go on the order paper? All of this information was divulged yesterday in an exhibit at the hearing, with which the members of the committee were not provided. Therefore, the information is in the hands of The Department of Health.

Mr. Speaker: I can only say that the question had been cleared through Mr. Speaker's office. Perhaps the hon. Minister would reply to that question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this is a lengthy question having pertinence to the operation of one particular hospital in our system. I am quite prepared to put all the information on the order paper. It will find its way, therefore, to the public record and will be available to every member of the House.

I think that this is far better than trying to answer it in this manner. This could take up a very great deal of the House's time and it was, as the hon. member has already pointed out to, dealt with fairly thoroughly yesterday, although the "exhibits", which the hon. member chose to term them, were not put in the hands of every member.

In this way the information from the exhibits will be put before the entire House.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the circumstances it would seem to me then that the question should properly be on the order paper.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask, through you to the Minister of Health, are these exhibits public so that a member of the House can go and read them and view them? I would assume they are.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. The exhibits, as they are rather loosely termed—indeed this kind of language is foreign to me and the standing committee—were a memoranda which passed between the hospital and the department, inter-departmental material, and I do not necessarily agree that they are public property.

I do not know myself what is in them because I have not read them, but I will extract the necessary information to answer the hon. member's question when it appears on the order paper. It will then appear, I repeat, in the public records of this House.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Speaker, I would draw this to your attention, and I would request that the hon. Minister and the Speaker, examine what I think is a very remarkable situation.

We have a meeting of a standing committee. It is a public meeting and material is submitted as evidence. Now the Minister of Health comes in and says that the evidence that was submitted was not public evidence—that he is going to, in effect, go through it and choose what of that evidence will ultimately be made public.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh no, Mr. Speaker! On a point of order!

The hon. member is putting words in my mouth. This is absolutely not what I said.

The material presented before the standing committee yesterday was extracted from memoranda that passed between the hospital and the department and all of the content of these memoranda need not necessarily have been presented to this committee yesterday. Those parts of it that were presented to the committee will reappear.

I do not know why, sir, we have to waste the time of the House and the cost of *Hansard*, which we heard last night was exorbitant, in reproducing all this.

Every member who was present at the standing committee yesterday heard the answers to these questions. We are quite prepared to reproduce them and put them in writing, but they will have to be extracted

from the memoranda from which they were taken. There will be no alteration of them; there may be some change in semantics, because I cannot remember the exact words which Dr. Miller used.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. What comes through to me from the Minister—what the Minister is saying is that the procedure yesterday in the standing committee was in complete opposition to that of the committee at its meeting two or three weeks ago. No record of the evidence given was taken down and the information which was submitted to that committee was subject to some form of selection before it appeared before the committee. No opportunity was given to the committee to get a full and complete disclosure of the matters that were supposedly given in evidence at that inquiry.

Now it has much larger ramifications than the question of whether or not this should or should not be on the order paper. It goes right to the root of whether or not an inquiry before one of the standing committees of this Legislature should be done partly under oath, partly with the benefit of counsel to carry our cross examination, or when it suits the Minister's purposes, that the matter only be dealt with by a representative of his staff coming before that committee—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order. The hon. member—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. J. Renwick: If the hon. Minister will sit down—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. Minister has risen on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is talking about something of which he has no personal knowledge.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you want to rewrite the rules again here?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister had risen on a point of order during the hon. member's remarks.

Mr. J. Renwick: I was speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I may say that the hon. member for Riverdale was discussing the matter and making many statements. Whether it constitutes a point of order or not—in so far as he was making a great many statements—I believe that hon. Minister should be permitted to rise on a point of order at this point.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I rose on the same point of order, I have been commenting on the same point of order. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is now not up to the Minister to stand up on some other point of order. He can get up when he wants to, Mr. Speaker, but not on this point of order.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member for Riverdale has made remarks that are not in order, surely it is the privilege of the hon. Minister to rise on a point of order?

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to have you rule me out of order when I have completed the point of order that I want to make.

Mr. Speaker: I was trying to listen very carefully to the hon. member for Riverdale and I did not observe that he was out of order so perhaps if he has a few remarks to complete his point he would proceed.

Mr. J. Renwick: My point in very brief summary, Mr. Speaker, is that the point of order arose on a question of whether or not questions admitted by the Speaker, and put to the Minister, should now go on the order paper. That is the first change which has taken place.

It is now apparent from the reply of the Minister and the discussion of that question, that the Minister has in fact said that matters that went before the standing committee of the Legislature yesterday were carefully selected items out of various memoranda which were submitted. I am simply saying that the Minister should answer the question. I asked a further question as to whether or not the standing committee should conduct an inquiry on one basis one day and on another basis on the second day of the same hearing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am sure it must be perfectly obvious to you, as it must be to every hon. member of the House that the hon. member was not in the standing committee yesterday and therefore does not know whereof he speaks, at least at first hand.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh yes, I know everything is nonsense unless the hon. member dredges it up, but let me point this out. The standing committee meeting yesterday had no relationship — except perchance — to the matter that was discussed before. When the evidence was taken previously, under oath, this was done at the direction of this assembly, and they were given certain restricted, limited powers and responsibilities. These were completed.

The meeting yesterday was a regular meeting of the standing committee of health to which Dr. Miller was invited. Dr. Miller came but did not give his evidence, he answered the questions that were put by various members, and he made a statement pertinent to certain other statements that had been made previously in the standing committee.

I repeat to you, sir, that there was no selected material. Dr. Miller's material was unknown to any of us in The Department of Health. Dr. Miller, as the director of that hospital was given complete freedom to speak of what he believed was right and proper and certain of his material did come from memoranda that had passed between him and the department—memoranda which I repeat, sir, I have not yet personally seen. But because all these questions which are being put by the hon. member for Scarborough Centre were answered as I recall it yesterday, I am quite prepared to get the answers again as nearly accurate as possible since no record was taken—

Mr. MacDonald: Why?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because we do not usually take records, as the hon. member well knows.

Mr. MacDonald: They put one witness under oath and others they do not.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, could I have an opportunity to tell the House without this—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has the floor, although I must say he is speaking somewhat apart from the point of order.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): So was the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Speaker: That is quite correct. They were both somewhat out of order.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Let us get on with the business of the day.

Mr. Speaker: As soon as the hon. Minister concludes his remarks we will do that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The material will be put before the House, sir, and the only proper way to answer this great series of questions which were answered in the standing committee—I know why she is asking them again, sir, but I am too much of a gentleman to put it on the public record. I am quite prepared to put the answers in a gentlemanly fashion on the public record as soon as the question appears on the order paper.

Mr. J. Renwick: There is no public record yet—

Mr. Speaker: It appears to me that in any event the hon. Minister is not in a position to answer these questions today. If I may be permitted I will discuss the entire matter with Mr. Speaker upon his return (Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair) and he will rule then on whether or not the question should be placed upon the order paper, if this is agreeable to the House.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, may I speak to that point of order?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre was on her feet first.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Correctional Services says: "Margaret, you are nagging". I am not nagging, Mr. Speaker, but I find it very difficult to be quiet when I feel any sort of injustice is being perpetrated.

The standing committee which the hon. Minister of Health was speaking about—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What has this got to with it?

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think there is no point of order, with respect to the hon. member. I think the situation has been fully discussed. I have suggested to the committee that I will discuss the entire matter with Mr. Speaker upon his return and he will direct the House as to his decision as to whether or not this should go on the order paper. If not, then the hon. Minister may undertake to take it as notice and provide the answer. However, I do not believe that I should make a decision on it this morning, and I ask the House to permit me to discuss it with Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Then, Mr. Speaker, would you clearly define to me which questions you are ruling out this morning?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member is not clear about my handling of the situation at the moment, I think perhaps we would permit her one question.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like some guidance, Mr. Speaker, as to the balance of my questions that are on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: I was just going to deal with them.

We dealt with question 1039 in the last few moments. Now we come to question 1040. Is it the feeling of the hon. Minister that this question deals with the same matters and should be handled in the same way as I have suggested?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have questions 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043; all are relevant to the matters that were discussed in standing committee yesterday, all pertinent to the Brockville hospital situation. I would therefore ask, sir, that the entire series of questions be put on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: In going over those questions—1039 to 1042, I believe—I concur that they all deal with the same matter. I will discuss the entire group of questions with Mr. Speaker on his return.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, you have left me no alternative but to rise on a point of order.

Yesterday at the committee I asked a question regarding doctor-staff ratio.

Mr. Speaker: What is your point of order in connection with?

Mrs. M. Renwick: The point of order is in connection with the Minister's last statement. He insists that we are not talking about exhibits, Mr. Speaker; and Dr. Miller himself said: "Here are four exhibits".

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is not on a point of order. I have dealt with this matter as I see fit to deal with it this morning. I suggested the hon. member could ask for clarification on my decision but she is certainly not talking about my decision. I know of no other way to handle it this morning until Mr. Speaker rules on it. Therefore, if the hon. member has any further submissions to make to Mr. Speaker on his return, she may do so.

Mrs. M. Renwick: May I have a question, Mr. Speaker? May I ask you a question?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Do I have some right to refute what I have listened to here, which I feel is in error?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may refute it at some time other than this.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I tried to get the floor before, on a very brief point in regard to the question raised by the member for Scarborough Centre.

I am a member of that standing committee. First of all, let me say that the question that was posed this morning requires statistical information which in my opinion—

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order, please! I would point out to the hon. member that I have made a decision as to how I see this matter should be handled. There will be no further discussion on that particular point.

The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) has a question for the hon. Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), who is not present.

There was a question from the hon. member for Humber to the hon. Minister of Health. This is question 667.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): That is going way back.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister does not have the answer to that question.

Mr. Ben: Well, if he has not got the answer, I will not ask it of him now. I do not want to embarrass the dear boy.

Tut, tut; No. 667—and we are in the thousands now.

Mr. Speaker: I do not appear to have any further questions on hand.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Before the orders of the day, I would like to table the answers to questions 19, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36 and 37 on the order paper. (See Appendix, page 2858)

Then I was asked a question by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight); he asked me a supplementary question concerning bilingualism of Queen's Park guides and security guards. He asked if I was prepared to indicate the ethnic origin of bilingual

guides and security guards and whether bilingualism qualifies them for higher salaries.

I would point out to the House that the Ontario Human Rights Code does not permit the question as to anyone's ethnic background in his application for employment in the civil service of the province and, therefore, we do not have a record of the ethnic background of these bilingual people.

As far as a higher salary for bilingualism is concerned, it is not the policy of the government to have a pay differential for bilingualism. That is a characteristic that can be taken into account when fitness for any particular job is being considered. I suppose one could say that this non-payment for bilingualism should apply in the translation service where people are employed to do precisely that, to translate, but as a matter of policy we do not have a pay differential for bilingualism.

Then the hon. member for High Park asked me what the government was doing, what steps the province was taking to collect the \$41 million owing to Ontario by the federal government for health aids under the federal-provincial sharing programme and, in part, dating back to 1957 for mental hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, we are unable to take any action to collect this money. In fact, the situation is that the federal government says it will pay \$2,000 per bed for hospital beds, then it puts a ceiling on the total amount it will pay. We have constructed a great many hospital beds in this province upon which no federal grant has been paid, because the federal government simply has not voted enough money to pay the \$2,000 per bed on the number of beds we have constructed in this province.

We cannot take any action to collect the money in the first place, we cannot sue the federal government; and in the second place the money has not been voted, so there is nothing there. It is simply a question of an arbitrary limit being placed on the total amount that the federal government seems to be prepared to give to the construction of hospitals, at least in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The sixth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in rising to launch the Budget Debate from this side of the House, I think of the fellow who was speaking to a Rotary Club in Chicago at noon one day, and he said: "I am surprised to see so many people who have nothing to do at noon in Chicago." I think I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find so many people who have nothing to do on Friday morning at 11.30 of the clock in the Legislature, because nothing ever happens or comes out of our submissions to the government. But, being perfectly fair, we have had an example today of action on the part of the government from submissions of the Opposition over the years. We do thank the government for throwing a few bones to the people of Ontario and acknowledging that possibly, through this system of democracy, we are part of the democratic principles.

An hon. member: They did not throw us much last year.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, on the threshold of the Liberal convention today in Hamilton, that the very important announcements, which we are very much in favour of, come as a very planned promotion to steal space in the papers for the weekend from the big goings-on in Hamilton today.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): You mean Judy is going to run?

Mr. Sargent: I did not say that, Mr. Minister, but I do think this is a planned operation. In business, we call this leverage, and we have leverage in action here. You know that on the very day our leader was on television in reply to the Budget, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development launched a big spending programme on the Lakeshore involving \$50 million of our hard-earned money; that completely stole the front page news. These things are planned on the part of the big public relations staff the government has to keep itself in the forefront, and using public funds to do so.

We have a bachelor in our party named Jack Spence. One day Jack asked a girl with a million dollars to marry him, and she said no. Jack said he thought she would say no. She said, "Well, why did you ask me then?" And Jack said, "I just wanted to see what it felt like to lose a million dollars." That is the position we are in here in this House. We wonder what we are doing here, but we are hard at it on the part of our people.

Mr. Speaker, in launching this party's attack on the current Budget demands from the pockets of Ontario citizens, ordinarily one might shoot with a rifle. But there are so many targets here we can even use a shotgun or a machine gun in areas such as school consolidation, skyrocketing tax rates, \$35,000 salaries for school administrators, regional government, assessment takeovers—you name it.

I suggest to you that one time the Prime Minister went out to the airport on a trouble shooting mission in Ontario, and the pilot said, "Where to, boss?" The Premier answered, "Any place, I'm in trouble all over."

That is about it, Mr. Speaker. In Ontario, in 1969, not only is John Parmenter Roberts in trouble, but hundreds of municipalities are wondering just where they went wrong, why they have suddenly lost the right to govern themselves. It is a long, long history, but we are well along the road to central government. We have a form of police state coming into our spectrum. If we do not stop this steamroller soon, we will be heading right down the road to socialism, and the boys on our left here will be in the driver's seat.

It is a shocking thing that we have in Ontario, the home of free enterprise, the most dynamic economy in all North America, that in this province it has become a fact, it is a matter of record, that we are centralizing the whole of government into too few hands and people have lost their economy and now all our operation will be controlled from a central point.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a reason behind this whole piece, and it is simply a plan where a firmly entrenched bureaucracy, 25 years in power, feels it is not responsible to the people any more. I say with considered judgment that collectively that House has looted and drained the treasury of the people of this province in the same manner as the directors of the finance companies looted and drained the treasury there, using the assets of that caper to build up their own empire.

The final steps in this drive are in the hopper now to take that last step to even control the taxation at local level. Now we all know this government controls by commission, not responsible to the people. In every segment of our lives, hospital, police, law enforcement, power, hydro, you name it, it is a complete spectrum run by people who are not elected, not responsible to anyone; they are run by political hacks appointed by loyalty to this Conservative

Party, and they are not responsible to the people.

We tell you this repeatedly and most of you agree with it, and nothing is done about it. I suggest to this government that it is digging its own grave and somewhere along the line when the people are informed, Mr. Speaker, the people will be right and the truth will out and we will have possibly a more democratic return to government by the people and for all the people.

It was revealed on December 10, 1968 in a story by Donald Newman in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, when this very responsible journalist revealed, on a front-page, five-column story, Mr. Speaker, that this province keeps two sets of books, that the Treasurer keeps two sets of books—one set to produce to the electorate before an election and one set to go to Ottawa with when you are looking for money.

Now, the Minister of Mines is usually intelligent; I have great respect for his intelligence, but he doubts these things could happen. Now, if he thinks they are wrong, maybe the reporter was wrong and maybe the government should take action against the reporter. But I will read a segment of this report by Donald Newman, **ONTARIO'S NET DEBT RISES \$107 MILLION:**

Ontario operated \$150 million in the red during the fiscal year ended March 31, increasing the province's per capita debt to \$203.79 per person.

However, the deficit—\$149,748,000—was about \$55 million less than the shortfall Provincial Treasurer Charles MacNaughton predicted when he brought down his Budget for the 1968 fiscal year in the spring of 1967.

At that time, he predicted a deficit of \$162 million on 'ordinary' expenditures exclusive of money set aside for the province's sinking fund. Subsequent spending estimates revealed that the government had budgeted \$43 million for the fund.

However, the report released by the government yesterday lumped the sinking fund expenditures and the operating deficit together—creating the appearance of a government miscalculation of only \$12 million.

And here is the guts of what I am trying to say, when he says:

The two systems of reporting the fiscal position of the province are apparently political. In 1967 the Conservatives were facing an election and, seeking to keep

the projected deficit within manageable proportions, they bisected the operational deficit from the sinking fund requirements.

Now, however, attempting to pry more of the revenue collected in income tax from the federal government, Ontario is putting its worst fiscal face forward in an effort to appear hard pressed.

So we have a respected journalist saying that you keep two sets of books, that you do juggle the books for your own purposes. And if I think there is an indictment against a would-be ethical and well handled operation—certainly if anyone did that in business—I think they would be very severely dealt with by the income tax people. We have examples in the auditor's report, the same year, where the gross debt of the province increased 25 per cent in one year, increasing the debt to \$3.5 billion of a total debt position. The moneys owned by Hydro, the interest costs are a half a million a day and the interest owed by the province in the neighbourhood of a million a day. So, we have quite a healthy package every day, about a million and a half dollars a day in interest on the debt they have created.

So, in the past 30 days, Mr. Speaker, we here have seen the hon. Treasurer get up and read off a two-hour presentation on his answer to the financial nightmare that he said Ontario was facing. So he has a "plug the holes" budget. It reminds me of the Prime Minister being captain of a leaky old boat, he is running around busy patching the boat so much, to keep afloat, that he cannot steer the boat, and this is about the situation today.

Basically, the budget did not provide any tax relief for the taxpayer who is having a tough time running to standstill, and this is another shot at the average man, a tax play on liquor, cigarettes, meals, hotel rooms, but hands off the big business boys, the banks and the insurance companies.

We had a submission by the Minister of Revenue yesterday on corporation taxes. In all burgeoning economy of this great province, he hopes to raise about \$26 million in corporation taxes, a mere bagatelle. We have the sister province of British Columbia here and they are running fullpage ads in *Time* magazine and it says "Come to B.C. to operate where we have a balanced budget with increased benefits for all British Columbia citizens but no increase in taxes", they are operating on a pay-as-you-go plan and they are debt free.

We are debt free to the extent that we owe \$3.5 billion and last year you increased our debenture debt 25 per cent. You know, you all know that you were close to bankruptcy less than six weeks ago, regardless of what he tells you, about what portion of the gross national product that we have going for us in this province.

We have a situation in this province, Mr. Speaker, where I think the Prime Minister has lost the will to govern. I think he is just going through the motions and as soon as he can get out of this business, the better. At least that is his attitude. He has no concern at this point for the economy of the province in that he has—he knows that we are facing, the economists tell us we are facing inflation, inflationary trends, but the Prime Minister is so busy looking after the basic issues he cannot look after the very important ones of what is going on in the province.

As I said last night: at the end of February, the Steel Company of Canada announced an increase of 45 per cent of the net profit. A net profit this year of \$65 million, on gross sales of \$560 million, so they have the greatest year in their history, a 45 per cent increase in profit in the Steel Company of Canada. The very same day, Mr. Speaker—those of you who are business men, and those of you in the construction business—I am not knocking profits at all, I like to see profits, but the very same day, the day they announced this increase of 45 per cent or \$65 million profit, they announced an across the board increase in the price of steel. A ten per cent increase in the price of steel the very same day that they announced a \$65 million profit.

The situation is this, Mr. Speaker, the very same day, also, the other four domestic steel mills in this province announced a ten per cent increase in the price of steel. So, for those of you who are still awake, I am trying to build for you a picture of the economy of this province, of just what is going on and who is running the store.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Get another shovel.

Mr. Sargent: You need a shovel to dish out the stuff going on here. You need a big power shovel.

The most important thing about this increase of 45 per cent or \$65 million is a case in point from Stelco. In two months' time, the labour contracts are coming up for renewal, and the first ones to complain will be the steel companies who will say, "What right has labour to ask for more money?" I say to

you, "What right have they not to ask for a greater share of the profits? They were part of the creation of it. And I say again, that it is time we had in this province a man who has the stature of John Fitzgerald Kennedy who said to the United States Steel Company, when they brought out their steel increase which was affecting their economy there—and this steel increase is affecting our economy because schools, hospitals, everything we do in this province, is geared to the price of steel. It is time that we had a man who will pick up the phone and say: "This is the Prime Minister of Ontario calling," and say to Stelco, "I am telling you that your price rise of ten per cent cannot go into effect; you must revert and hold the line." It could be that he has not the power to do that, but he should work with Mr. Benson in Ottawa to see that this thing is brought about to keep our economy—

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): Or Pierre Trudeau.

Mr. Sargent: Or Pierre Trudeau, that is right—to do something for the people of this province to keep our economy healthy. So I suggest in my submission to you that we have great lack of leadership in the most important areas. I am sure these announcements that came into the House today are greatly because of the efforts of the Opposition here and in the New Democratic Party. I do not think you would do anything unless you were forced to do so by public opinion.

Further along the line, in view of the double taxation we have in this province now in force, in a positive way it is time we worked out a new tax system in this province on the principle that the province has the first right in taxation. The federal government now makes allowances for municipal taxes. I think it is time that we made all taxes payable to the province, and make the following all deductible items: mortgage payments on your home; your real estate taxes; gasoline taxes; cigarette taxes; liquor taxes—they should all be deductible, and the residual paid to the federal government. In other economies this the way they operate. But we are continually being taxed—sales tax, gasoline tax, the highest gasoline tax on the whole North American continent; we are paying 17 cents a gallon in taxation. The highest in North America.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Nova Scotia just went from 19 to 21.

Mr. Sargent: I did not know that, but at this point I do think that we are the highest.

Mr. Winkler: It is 21 cents in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Sargent: I did not know that.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Another Tory province too.

Mr. Sargent: I think that somewhere along the line we need to give equity, we need to stop this double taxation system we have, Mr. Speaker, and give the small man in this province a decent break.

Now, what I would like to say before I get to the have-not areas of this province, with which I and the member for Grey South are very concerned—because we are 49th and 51st on the totem pole on the economy in this province insofar as many things are concerned. Income, lack of facilities for education, and so on—I would like to suggest to you that we have responsibility somewhere along the line to break the cartels and the combines and the price-fixing going on in Ontario today.

Last night in the estimates of the Provincial Secretary, we found that we were talking about \$7 million of printing. A big cost of this industry in printing is the cost of newsprint, the cost of paper. I think I am as knowledgeable as anyone about the printing business since I have been in that business all my life. We have, in this area, a complete monopoly where four or five paper companies control the price of paper; if you want to buy a ton of paper from one company you pay the same price from all the companies. They have identical pricing.

We have, as most of you know, a law on the books of this country—and this is a shocking thing because every member of government is in collaboration with this—a law on the books which says that no firms, no business people can collaborate to fix prices. If you do it is an indictable offence; you go to jail or you pay heavy fines. It is a shocking thing that in 50 years in this province not one single person has ever gone to jail. The heaviest penalty they ever got from this government, when they were fixing prices on highways, was a three-months' sentence—the only time they could not bid on prices. That is the way they treat them.

But we acknowledge that if someone breaks the law, steals a loaf of bread, if someone gets too much to drink, they go to jail. But if you are in the right area of business, if you are the big operators, you can break the law every day in the week. You can steal

from millions of people because you have price-fixing. It is an eerie area of the economy. I stand here, talking to eight members of the government and I am wondering what I am doing—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Come on over here, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: —I am wondering what I am doing when I say, here is an area where the law is being broken 365 days a year, by thousands and thousands of people, and you say, "so what are you going to do about it?" I tell the Prime Minister—he says, "What are you going to do about these things?" He laughs because he is in power. Well, this is what causes socialism. It ruins our free enterprise system because we have not got—

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to say to the hon. member that even with all the evils of the free enterprise system, I would rather have our system than his system. I like the freedom of choice, not to be told what I am going to do by big brother. No one ever pushes me around, Freddy, and God bless you, I hope they will never push you around either.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): They have got socialism—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, you have got good socialists.

Mr. Pilkey: No you have got socialism for the rich—\$600 million given by the federal government in grants and subsidies to industry.

Mr. Young: Go on down and talk to Trudeau.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you have got some pretty rich socialists there too, in your party. But I am wondering, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I have got six minutes left here. The only thing we do is to hope we will catch some press and that something will be brought about. Nothing happens until you have aroused public opinion.

I see a boy there wearing a Liberal handkerchief in his pocket, bright red. I think he is like the 70 or 80 successful businessmen. It must make you wonder what goes on when giant corporations can connive to cheat and break the law. You find ways in the Attorney General's office to punish people for doing

small things, but big boys can get away with this and the galleries are empty. These things go on—go on for ever.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the area of newsprint, is one I know about. In the area of steel, it just happened recently—I quoted Stelco, two cases in point. I met a member of the Cabinet yesterday after I spoke on monopolies, combines, price fixing. He is in a pretty business. He said: "I would like to have got up to support you, because what you said is right." I said: "Your parties are breaking the law too." He said: "What can I do about it?"

So we have people there who think, but they do not do anything. The Minister of Tourism there, he knows this is right. I think if I were in that Cabinet—your Treasury Board, I would go up to those meetings of the Cabinet and I would raise some hell until something was done about it.

Believe me, we do things in our caucus and we have disorganized things too. But we at least come up with some consensus of opinion. Somewhere along the line I think that if all of us collectively would get aroused about cheating on the part of the big boys, then something would evolve. If these laws are not right—if they are allowed to cheat and fix prices and cheat the public—then let us change the laws. Let us take them off the books.

Mr. Pilkey: That is socialism.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): These big boys prefer free enterprise.

Mr. Sargent: Well, somewhere along the line we think that our function here is to translate ideas into action. I know that I can tell you that in 1971, when we are in the government, we are going to do these things. But if you want to do something towards it, you had better get talking over there.

Mr. Young: The federal Liberals are not doing a thing—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, up our way we have some pretty bad roads, as you all know. In the spring time, when the frost is breaking up and the roads are impassable, the odd time you see a sign which says: "Take care which rut you choose because you will be in it for the next 50 miles."

Well, we are watching progressively the goings-on of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Education and we think that they are digging a great big grave for themselves. In fact, I think they are the

best two things that ever happened to the Liberal party, those two men there.

The fact is that I was in Chicago one time, on a Saturday afternoon—speaking of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, of the intelligent answers he gives you. I 'phoned up this industry in Chicago and, on a Saturday afternoon, I asked the fellow that answered the 'phone, "Do you know anything about the business?" He said, "Buddy, when I said 'hello' I told you all I know." I think when you ask some of the members of the government some questions, you get that kind of intelligence.

I want to ask the House, Mr. Speaker—glad to have you back again—I want to ask the House in the two minutes I have left here just how does a very ineffectual backbencher, who is a member of the Chicago gang, just how does this completely naive and nice choir boy, how does he ever get the chance to make multi-million dollar decisions on behalf of millions of people? When we watch this operation over here and the far-reaching effects that it has on the lives of our people, I wonder about the thinking of a government that can take a man completely unschooled, unversed in such a fantastically complicated and technical job and put him as a key man to make those decisions.

I am wondering about the thinking of a government, of a leader who will do things like that, because of geography or political expediency.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): He is the best they have with no talent.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I think if he is the best they have, they are in a very sorry, sorry mess.

An hon. member: Which one are you talking about?

Mr. Sargent: I want to say, insofar as regional government is concerned, Mr. Speaker, this Minister over here, in the question of the Chinguacousy deal out there—you are talking about people—he was quoting 56,000 people and the official had him right. He said, "I am sorry, sir, it is \$556,000."

He was only 5,000 per cent wrong.

This is a man who would spend \$80 million; they had a \$80 million water project in part of the deal. This is what is going on. We here, as representatives of the taxpayers, of the 56,000 people I represent, I have to countenance and say, "that is good business."

I say that insofar as his approach to regional government, Mr. Speaker, he can talk about it. The government can talk about it. I say stay out of Grey-Bruce. This is a programme, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province must have a vote on, a right to say what their future shall have.

In closing at this juncture, I think of the story about the two old maids who had two fine cats. These cats were very fine specimens. They would not let them outside to mingle with the ordinary variety of cats.

One day, one of the old maids got married and so, after the wedding, leaving on her wedding trip, she told the other old maid that she would send her a telegram from New York. So true to her word, the dear soul, she sent a wire back from New York, to the other sister and she said, "I do not care what you do with your cat, but let mine out!"

I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you could catch that, it is kind of sharp.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That lost something, for the benefit of *Hansard*.

Mr. Sargent: You must have lost something.

I do not care what you do with your plan on regional government. I suggest to you—

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think you left something out.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think I did. Things are kind of slow today.

We do not care what you do with your regional government programme, as long as you stay out of our area where the people will have a right to vote on this referendum themselves.

I see that it is 12.00 o'clock; I adjourn the debate.

Mr. Sargent moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to introduce a group of students from Robert Wesley college, Rochester, New York.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Private member's notice of motion No. 23, by Mr. Bukator:

RESOLUTION: That The Workmen's Compensation Act should be broadened so as

to include injuries and incapacities sustained off the job and that the increased cover be financed by the savings accruing from investigators not having to determine whether an employee was, or was not, actually working on the job at the time the injury or incapacity was sustained.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution standing in my name.

I have listened with interest to my colleague for the last half hour. There were some interjections and I suspect that there will be others while I speak on a subject that has been very close to my heart for many years.

When I put this resolution on the order paper to be discussed here, I was hoping it would not hit a Friday because the attendance in this House usually is not what it ought to be. I do not find it too interesting to speak to so many empty chairs on both sides of the House and I am sure that what I have to say on any issue is not often read by members of this House in *Hansard* as there are many other important things to do. I felt possibly that I might get through to someone with a most serious problem.

For ten years I have sat in this House and talked about workmen's compensation and the shortcomings of that department. I may say that I am very much impressed with the Chairman, Mr. Legge. I believe he is trying to do a job for us. If there are shortcomings and if there are inadequacies in this Workmen's Compensation Board Act, it is very simply that they can always refer to the Legislature and say, "You members of the Legislature ought to bring in better laws and we naturally will be governed by them."

Not too long ago, I met a citizen in my riding who had a cast on his arm and I asked about his injury. I intended to touch a little more broadly on that a little later on in my remarks. I have had a feeling for years that the workmen's compensation board could save a lot of money if they were to pay compensation to an individual whether he was hurt on or off the job. I have had a feeling that the government spends many manhours and many dollars, Mr. Speaker, trying to find out whether the injured claimant through the workmen's compensation board was injured on the job. They investigate, they meet with the officials of the plant, they meet with union representatives, and they discuss their problems with them. In many instances people who were not hurt on the job try to collect compensation, and in some cases do.

In other areas, where they were hurt on the job, Mr. Speaker, they find themselves having to prove to the workmen's compensation board that they were hurt on the job and that it was a legitimate claim; and after many, many weeks they start to collect some money. Their families, their creditors, the mortgage they owe on their homes are not being paid because the money is not coming in. So I investigated; and I hate to go to our friends to the south of us; I think we are capable in Canada of drawing laws to govern our people as well as, if not better than they can. I think we are as capable as they are to look after the problems of the constituents that we represent and yet I felt that I should write to New York state to find out what benefits the employees get if they are hurt off the job.

I find that they have something that we ought to take a good look at. I believe that some of you may say that it will require a lot of legal entanglement and therefore the legal bill will be great. I do not speak of that at all and I hope no one gets the impression that we need any more lawyers involved in workmen's compensation cases than we have now. I do believe that if an individual is hurt on the job, or where he is hurt at home, or whether he is hurt through some accident somewhere, the compensation should be immediately paid to that man. This makes sense to me, and I think that it makes sense to you if you bear with me until I read of the New York state off-the-job disability benefits programme. They have the workmen's compensation board there also and I would like to quote some of the statements that they make in a pamphlet that I received.

The disability benefit law supplements the benefit provided by the workmen's compensation law which gives aid to those injured on the job. The disability benefit law provides for those injured or disabled off the job. The question is: What are disability benefits? Disability benefits are temporary cash benefits payable to eligible wage earners when disabled by an off-the-job injury, or illness. Supplementing the workmen's compensation law, the disability law assures protection for the wage-earner by providing for weekly cash benefits to replace, in part, wages lost due to injuries or illnesses that do not arise out of or in the course of his employment. Disability benefits are also provided to an unemployed claimant to replace unemployment insurance benefit lost because of illness or injury. Off the job injury—

to tell you about; a man with tendons severed near the palm of his hand while carrying a TV set; he slipped and fell, the sharp edge cut through the flesh severing the tendons. The accident happened on his day off; a fortunate man indeed. The disability benefit law that is in effect in New York state, supplementing the workmen's compensation law, provides weekly cash income that will keep the claimant and his family in funds until he is well enough to go back to work. Where do you suppose this man would have been financially if he had been injured under similar circumstances off the job in Canada? He just would have been out of luck. There would not have been any income simply because he was hurt while doing something at home on a day off. Yet in New York state, compensation is paid to that man.

I wish to carry this a little further. This man was sitting in a restaurant with a cast on his hand and I enquired, naturally, like any politician—you never miss an opportunity to speak to a constituent—I enquired what happened, and he said that he was carrying a chassis of a TV set into his home; he slipped, fell and cut the tendons in two fingers, severed them to the bone. He did go back, sir, to his construction job in New York state, compensation was immediately paid, supplemented by a good agreement with their union which paid him an additional \$35 a week. This is negotiable in both countries and I realize that.

He found that even though he was hurt off the job, he could go and honestly say what happened and start collecting benefits immediately to maintain himself and his family. I found that it was such a good proposition that this appealed to me to the point where I thought I ought to bring it before the hon. gentlemen of this House. With fair amount of discussion on this issue and commonsense and reasoning, there is no reason why our statutes cannot be amended to give this kind of protection to all people who are being covered by workmen's compensation; and I know where that money comes from. You might ask, "Where will the money come from?" We have talked in this House the last few days about the American industries which have come into Canada. My colleague just spoke of one industry alone that made some \$65 million in one year. You know how the money is collected for compensation purposes.

Naturally a small percentage of the wages not paid by the employee—and I know that

I have made reference to the man I started

the employees make this money—is paid out of the company side of their profits, and so they pay some six per cent or five per cent, whatever the tariff is based on, or the amount of accidents in that particular industry.

Now, I say that if they can make this kind of money, and they can give that type of protection to their employees in New York state, companies who have subsidiaries on this side of the river dealing with the same kind of human beings, can surely pay it on this side of the river also. I find no difference; it is the same group of directors, the same group of investors, industrialists, who do business in New York state who also do business in Canada. I would think that if they can do it for their folks on the other side of the river, why cannot they provide the same kind of protection for our employees on this side of the river? They owe that to us; we are entitled to that much protection. I do not see any reason why the Legislature, since the Prime Minister is back—and I would like him to listen with some thought of what I say—and a very good morning, by the way. You have treated the citizens of the province very well this morning; you have given some concessions that we—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Not just this morning. For some years.

Mr. Bukator: Well now, that is debatable.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now you have spoiled it.

Mr. Bukator: However, I think—I am sorry the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) is not here; he is a very reasonable man in my opinion, and the Workmen's Compensation Board comes under the department—the coverage can be extended for injuries off the job at not too much expense, simply because of the investigations alone of the Workmen's Compensation Board. The cost to them could be put to giving benefits to their employees, and I do not think it will be that much greater. People who work in this country, people who know that they have a family to maintain, people who find themselves in the position where if they are injured today off the job and have no means of revenue whatsoever because immediately they are not working—many of them are not in the position that they have money in the bank, and they find themselves losing their homes. I have known of cases where this has happened; they find themselves accumulating debts that take years to pay off. I would think that this

would take a little bit of a problem off their shoulders.

I say the second source of financing could be the saving of dollars and manhours of the staff of the Workmen's Compensation Board, which is now being wasted in investigating whether the claimant was truly injured on the job. The most important thing—the peace of mind and the knowledge that his family will be properly provided for during the period of his recovery from his injury—would well compensate this government and all people of the province for their efforts on behalf of the injured claimant.

I hope my words have not fallen on deaf ears; I hope the Minister of Labour takes a good look at this. I would like to say one more thing before I close in connection with this and many problems in this House.

I have been in some of the States since I was elected to this House, and I have found that if an Opposition member brings in a bill—whether it be by a private member or the leader of the Opposition—if that bill makes sense, it goes to a committee with only a few amendments. They bring that bill back, and regardless of which particular member brings that bill in, it becomes law.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): See how much attention you are getting?

Mr. Bukator: Oh, he is a good man. He is doing a fairly good job, and I am sure he will look into this matter for me. One of our members here—I am sorry he is not in his seat—is costing the province many hundreds of dollars at \$18 a page, bringing in bills on every issue and talking on every issue. Most of it I do not agree with, but once in a while he may come in with a bill that is good. If he does, I think this government ought to immediately pick that bill up and make a statute for the province of Ontario. That would make all of the people happy.

I know that I will hear this speech before I get through here this afternoon—I might even get a bit of a compliment—but I do not know why we have to say, and naturally I am surmising, what could happen. This is good, but it does not go far enough; maybe another time with amendments, with additions and deletions, and we will give you what you want.

Even if that comes in another year, it is better than nothing at all. I look to this government to take another look at this resolution with favour and bring in the statutes that will cover the off-the-job injured claimant.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham is next on the list.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Niagara Falls, and one must have a certain degree of sympathy for his proposal. But it would require examination of the whole field of assistance, both welfare and that involved through The Workmen's Compensation Act.

He has referred to certain legislation in the United States, and I will refer to this a little later in my remarks. There are certain ramifications which limit that programme.

The resolution proposes to extend the benefits of The Workmen's Compensation Act to include injuries and incapacities sustained off the job. Mr. Speaker, this is an entirely new concept of assistance and, if practical at all, I would say it should be established under a completely different plan and should be related to the welfare field. It would simply be another form of welfare assistance or coverage, which at the present time—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: Certainly it is another form of welfare assistance. This is being provided at the present time through various programmes of welfare and assistance; also it is available through private insurance companies, if you wish to join.

Mr. Sargent: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand; every time I get up to address this assembly, they always ask me who writes the speech. The odd thing about it is that I write all my own speeches.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: It is very difficult to understand how the hon. member can propose that compensation be provided for off-job injuries when, at the present time, the cost of benefits provided by the Workmen's Compensation Board is borne by industry, which in no way is responsible for such injuries. The cost must be borne by party or parties responsible for the injuries sustained—it may be the individual himself—and the financial loss can either be recovered through other forms in insurance, as certainly should be the case where injuries are sustained as a result of motor accidents. It must be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that the Workmen's Compensation Board is not a welfare agency.

May I illustrate my point by referring to a

case recorded in the Action Line of the *Telegram* yesterday. This is a gentleman from West Hill who slipped and broke his leg while he was on his way to work at the Hydro project at Pickering. He is going to be off work for three months, and the Workmen's Compensation Board claims that he is not entitled to benefits because the injuries did not occur while he was working. Now the answer that Action Line gives to that is the same that I wish to affirm today:

There are already such protections, even if most people, including yourself, do not think about them. The basic one is, of course, welfare. And when a person is disabled through sickness or injury, welfare keeps the family going. We are also getting very close to a guaranteed annual income, where every family will be entitled to a certain amount of money regardless of the earnings of the breadwinner. You could not get compensation because the accident was not related to your work. Just because your employer pays you extra to cover the distance of travel to and from work does not mean you are under his control. So, no compensation.

The Workmen's Compensation Act makes it mandatory for all employers to protect their employees through coverage under the Act. The employee contributes nothing to the coverage and, therefore, it is ridiculous to suggest that an employer should bear the cost of injuries or incapacities for which he had no direct or indirect responsibility.

According to statistics published by the National Safety Council, accidents occurring at work represent one-fifth of the total accident picture. In other words, for every accident occurring at work, four occur off the job.

If we assume that the resolution involves the paying of benefits on the same scale or basis as benefits under The Workmen's Compensation Act, then the resulting cost of benefits for off-job compensation would be staggering.

Benefit payments made under The Workmen's Compensation Act in 1968 were in excess of \$100 million. By simply multiplying this figure by four, we come up with a figure of \$400 million as the cost of compensation for off-job claims on the same basis that workmen's compensation benefits are paid.

It is recognized that, generally speaking, much of the motor vehicle accident cost would be withdrawn from this amount, but the home accident cost and the cost of accidents occurring in public places would keep

the cost of such a resolution much in excess of the cost of work injuries.

The resolution indicates that the financing of the benefits designated in the resolution should come from a saving in investigation. The total cost of all investigations, other than correspondence involved during the year 1968, was \$285,000. Considering the very large number of accident occurring outside of work, and the method by which the hon. member suggests the programme be financed, the feasibility of this financing is certainly open to question.

There are two states in the United States—and the hon. member referred to New York State—having disability benefit laws. In each case the law prescribes the extent of contribution of the workman to the coverage afforded, and in each case the benefits are low.

The use of the law is limited due to other types of coverage being available which have a better benefit picture. The net result is that the employee is actually paying the cost of the coverage.

There is no precedent known, Mr. Speaker, by which the cost of off-the-job accidents is made the financial responsibility of the employer and, therefore, I regret that I must urge all members to oppose the resolution.

Under the original Act of 1910—Workmen's Compensation Act—there was no redress for the victim or his dependents if the accident was caused through his own negligence or the negligence of a fellow employee.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Board is many things. It is a system of adjudication, and it is an administrative tribunal providing impartial hearings in all cases appealed to it. It is an insurance company, and as well a trust company providing lifetime pensions. It is an educational institution responsible for the operation of some nine safety associations in an effort to cut down the number of accidents, and it is a hospital and rehabilitation centre. It is a \$120-million business—a round-the-year enterprise employing some 1,400 people.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not a charitable organization or form of welfare administration in any sense, nor should it be. The basic principle governing the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board is that it exists as a collective liability for the employers and benefits without litigation for the workers. I regret that I must oppose the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution, I do so with mixed feelings. First of all, I would like to commend the member for Niagara Falls for the principle involved in this resolution, and say to him that we regret very much that, in its present form, this party cannot support it.

The principle of coverage, regardless of how a person is injured or how he is incapacitated, as I say is to be commended. But we forget what the main purpose of the Workmen's Compensation Board is supposed to be—that is to compensate workers for injuries suffered on a job. Now, if we are going to change that, we must change the principle that the board was founded on.

There is no doubt that we, as legislators, have a duty and a responsibility to the workers of Ontario and to the people of Ontario to provide an adequate and sufficient income to ensure that they do not suffer financially because of injury, whether it is on the job or off the job. And should the member for Niagara Falls bring forth a resolution to that effect, I can assure him of the wholehearted support of this party. However, we cannot, as I say, support a change in The Workmen's Compensation Act, to do so.

Under the present system of workmen's compensation, industry is responsible to compensate a worker for an injury or an incapacity suffered through his employment. No one has been more critical of the Workmen's Compensation Board than myself. However, my criticisms have always been that The Workmen's Compensation Act and the Workmen's Compensation Board do not live up to the principles that are embodied in the Act.

Industry has the responsibility and the obligation to provide compensation, and it has always been our feeling that they have not lived up to their responsibility; they have not lived up to their obligation. And if anything is done with The Workmen's Compensation Act, it should be strengthened to make sure that industry does live up to its obligation. We do not believe that adequate compensation is provided, and until it is, The Workmen's Compensation Act and the Workmen's Compensation Board, in their carrying out of the principles of the Act, are not performing the services for which they were originally brought forward.

The member for Niagara Falls has said that the savings accrued by taking the investigators out of the field, by eliminating the need for investigation, would pay for the cost of providing compensation for those who are hurt

off the job. Well, I must agree with the government's spokesman when he says that \$285,000 just will not do that. But \$285,000 will do something else, it will change the investigation system from a system of disproving the worker, to a system of aiding the worker and proving his claim. The total investigation system of the Workmen's Compensation Board is geared to a system of proving the worker wrong, to a system of disproving claims, to a system of finding mistakes in the statements of witnesses, and to a system of saving money for the board.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and to this House that this should not be the job of an investigator. The investigator's job should be to prove the man right, to aid the worker in preparing his claim for presentation to the board. To aid the worker in presenting his case to the board, and to aid the worker in any way necessary to prove that he has a justifiable claim. And only as a secondary part of his job, a very minor part of his job, should he be even concerned with the small percentage of fraudulent claims that come before the board.

Instead of that, we have a system that degrades the worker in many cases, puts him in a position where he is almost sorry that he applied for a claim because he feels as if he is getting something that does not belong to him. I believe that the \$285,000 should not be used to eliminate investigators, it should be used to strengthen the investigation team so they serve a useful purpose.

To go on, Mr. Speaker, I would say that adequate investigation would not only aid the worker in his fight—and in many cases that is the only word you can use, fight—to have his claim allowed. It would increase the number of claims that are allowed. It would decrease the number of claims that are thrown out on the basis of one letter, or one witness, who, in many cases, is unreliable. Because of the poor investigation system, the witness is not shown as unreliable, but the claimant is shown, unjustifiably, as being fraudulent.

The number of claims allowed would increase and, as that increase took place, the number of people who are hurt on the job and are forced to seek public welfare for their compensation would decrease. Every one of us in Ontario would benefit from that.

If the member's resolution had been brought forth in the form that we believe it should have been brought forth, it would have eliminated any need in this province for Medicare. It would have eliminated any need for supplementary accident benefits, or sickness

and health benefits. It would have eliminated the need for any hospital coverage. It would have eliminated this so-called guaranteed annual income that the government speaks of—and then, in the same breath, mentions the figure of \$1,500 which, in our opinion is not an income, it is a pittance. It is something to salve their conscience; something to go forward in the next election with, to say, "Look what we are doing for the people of Ontario."

The government spokesman, Mr. Speaker, has mentioned the fact that for every accident that happens on the job there are four off the job. We feel that because of this fact the government has not only a responsibility, they have an immediate obligation to provide benefits to those who are hurt off the job. These people are hurt in the public sector of life, as the member for Niagara Falls says, they are in the position many times where they will lose their homes, where the families will have to be split up, because of an injury that happened off the job. The government has a responsibility to those people to insure that they do not suffer dire financial circumstances because of that injury. The government has an obligation to make sure that what a man has on the day of his injury, he still has the day he goes back to work. He should lose nothing because of his injury.

Should the member for Niagara Falls at any future date embody those principles in his resolution, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we, on this side, will not only support it, we will wholeheartedly support it.

I must agree with the government spokesman that industry does not have this obligation. Industry has one obligation and that is to provide for the workers who are hurt on the job. They do not have any obligation outside of that, and I can only reiterate what I say over and over and over again—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Is that NDP policy? That is a new line.

Mr. Jackson: The government has the responsibility to provide for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, with the strengthening, rather than the weakening, of the investigation system, I feel, for the first time since The Workmen's Compensation Act in 1915—since the board came into being—that perhaps we will start to work towards the motto of the board: "Justice humanely and speedily rendered."

Mr. Speaker, I say we cannot support this resolution, but we do support any resolution and any member who will stand

up in this House and bring forward legislation that will improve the wellbeing of the people of Ontario, not necessarily any one segment of the population.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution of the hon. member for Niagara Falls, I do so with complete amazement at the trend this resolution has taken in this House.

I can forgive the hon. member for Durham, he is a reactionary of the first order, a Tory true-blue. As a matter of fact, he is so reactionary that he probably makes the John Birch Society look like anarchists in their reform movement—if I may use that expression.

But listening to the statements that were made by the hon. member for Timiskaming cast a complete new light on the attitude of the NDP in this particular Legislature. To say that industry has no obligation to the workman beyond compensating him for injuries received on the job is just complete unadulterated hogwash as far as we, the Liberal Party, are concerned.

Industry's obligation never ends to the citizens of this province. I dare say that the hon. member for Timiskaming would probably try to convince us that the workmen pay no income tax—that only industry pays income tax, because they are the ones who remit it to the government, even though it is out of the pay envelopes of the workmen.

Not only that, he also said on behalf of the NDP that if you cannot give the workmen a whole loaf of bread, let them starve. Well, we just do not quite go along with that philosophy. We, on many occasions, have spoken in support of a guaranteed annual minimum wage. A resolution to that effect got us nowhere. For the hon. member for Timiskaming to say that if the hon. member for Niagara Falls had worded his resolution either this way or that way, he would have solved the problem is again unadulterated nonsense, because we keep bringing up resolutions in this House—both the party I represent, the Liberal Party, and his own party—and we get nowhere.

Passing resolutions in this House while you are in the Opposition does not get us as far as the hon. member for Timiskaming would lead us to believe. We try to enlighten the government and that is all we can do with resolutions. Sometimes we succeed, sometimes we do not, but we try.

The Liberal Party has been advocating a

guaranteed annual minimum income for all people who labour in this province, not just those who pay dues to the bosses of the NDP. Because we consider everybody is a workman and they do not have to have a union card to be entitled to the protection that this government gives when it comes to illness and adversities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: They do not quite disagree with that. We advocated disability insurance—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Are you against the guys with union cards?

Mr. Ben: —insurance to fill the gap between The Workmen's Compensation Act and The Unemployment Insurance Act.

At the present time if you are a workman and you are injured on the job, you are compensated—or at least, there is a provision for you to receive compensation. If you are unemployed, but are employable, then you receive benefits from the federal government under The Unemployment Insurance Act. But there has been a gap in the centre involving those that had been injured off the job. Having been injured off the job and not in the course of their employment, they cannot collect workmen's compensation benefits. And, having been injured and not being employable—that is not being able to hold a job because of their injury—they cannot collect unemployment insurance. These are the people that we want to protect.

Frankly, you did not have a resolution. I had a resolution which the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Gisborn) spoke on in the Throne debate, even though my resolution has been on the order paper—the resolution was in my name last year.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Oh, we have had resolutions on this for the last ten years.

Mr. Ben: You are confusing resolutions with revolutions. All right, so as far as we are concerned everybody who is injured ought to be compensated. You have to pay your taxes. You have to feed your family. You have to clothe your family. You have to pay your rent or your mortgage payments whether you are working or you are not working and, if you are disabled, and cannot raise the money, society should come to your aid. That is our philosophy.

Simply because this reactionary society across from us will not cover you, does it

mean that we are going to say, "Well, we will not take a half a loaf"? We tried to convince this government to bring in guaranteed annual minimum wages but they have not budged. We have tried to convince this government that they ought to have disability insurance to cover that gap that I mentioned between people covered by Workmen's Compensation and those that are covered by Unemployment Insurance, but this government has not budged.

So the hon. member for Niagara Falls has brought in a resolution which he watered down, to his deep regret himself, that he feels might be acceptable to this hard hearted government so that at least they will be able to extend the workmen's compensation benefits to that degree, and the party to our left turns it down.

Now I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what is so sacred or so sacrosanct about the Workmen's Compensation Board Act? Why can we not amend it? After all, we just had a commission on The Workmen's Compensation Act suggesting a whole series of amendments. They did not object that it had to be amended then. Why can we not amend it again? Does it involve that much of our time here to amend it to give additional benefits, small as they may be Mr. Speaker, but surely we are not going to deny them any improvements simply on the grounds that they are small. If we cannot give them a loaf big enough to feed them satisfactorily, we are not going to deny them a half a loaf. That is not our policy.

I am rather surprised by the trend this debate has taken. I support the resolution of the member for Niagara Falls. Sure it does not go as far as perhaps the member for Timiskaming would like it. Sure, it does not even go as far as the member personally would like. He has spoken on many occasions and expressed his feelings but having been unable to get the benefits that should go to everybody in this province, that is, protection against adversities both by unemployment or ill health, we are trying to get the next best thing we can.

As a matter of fact, we will even admit that it is not even the next best thing, it is probably the third best thing because we have already given two other alternatives.

Mr. MacDonald: —having regurgitated our speeches you are now in the process of interpreting a Liberal resolution.

Mr. Ben: Well, you have to look at the Bible in Genesis there, it says, written by

the NDP. I mean everything has been regurgitated.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is just chaos.

Mr. Ben: You know, nothing came before the NDP. They are like the Russians. They even invented light. That is how it happened. He got up there—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall when I started but I know that my time is getting short. I just want to end by saying this, I support the resolution of the hon. member for Niagara Falls, and so does the Liberal Party. We desire that it be wider than it is but we are trying to bring up something that would be a compromise, and be acceptable to this government; a step towards our ultimate desire of a guaranteed annual minimum income with disability insurance for everybody.

Failing that, we have to try to get what we can. We do not believe that industry's obligation ends when they compensate a person injured, in the course of their employment because anything that industry has, has been produced by the sweat and intelligence of all the people of this province, whether they hold a union card or not. So they owe an obligation to everybody in this province and everybody in this country and we are not going to accept anything less than that. So, my time being up now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to go on record that our party supports this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before us—the question of an injured workman being compensated for injury sustained off the job—in my opinion The Workmen's Compensation Board Act is not the vehicle to provide that kind of compensation or benefit. I think that the member for Niagara Falls is just a little naive and the Liberal Party if they think this could be the vehicle.

Let me tell you what he is really talking about. He is really talking about a maintenance of income plan and it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that such a plan could be incorporated in a Medicare guaranteed annual income plan and may be The Workmen's Compensation Board Act could be incorporated in that overall benefit plan.

An hon. member: You are backtracking.

Mr. Pilkey: I am not backtracking one bit. I want to just indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there is a problem for people who are injured outside of the Workmen's Compensation Board authority. I would suggest along with the member for Timiskaming that industry alone cannot support the number of people that are incapacitated off the job if they were going to use the Workmen's Compensation Board as a criteria because there are too many workers in this province for that, outside of the Workmen's Compensation Board. One such worker, I want to talk about here just for a moment.

A Mr. Alfred Gabor of 533 Glengarry Avenue, here in the city of Toronto. Mr. Gabor was an employee of the Toronto-Dominion Bank at the Toronto-Dominion Centre. Now he is an exclusion as I understand if from the Workmen's Compensation Board coverage. He is an exclusion, as are many thousands of other workers in this province. He worked on a delivery van for the Toronto-Dominion Bank and he worked there for some five months.

But during the very cold period this winter, for approximately a week, when we had zero weather, he became sick. He reported to the nurse of that centre and he was referred to a urology clinic. First of all, he was told to report for X-rays and a urine analysis. This was a Wednesday—a week that Thursday, he was to report. He went to his employer on Thursday morning and reported that he was to report to the clinic and his foreman said that there was no use for him to take his coat off and they asked him to resign. He refused to resign and they fired him.

Now when he did report to the clinic—I might point out that he had not lost any time during the five months of his employment—he claims that the reason for his condition was the coldness in the van. Therefore he should have been eligible for compensation, but seeing that he was an exclusion he could not get compensation. In addition to that, the Toronto-Dominion Bank fired this employee.

Now he was seven weeks in Toronto Western hospital. He had an operation. Last week he was released. He has no benefits whatsoever.

I think this is what my colleague from Niagara Falls is talking about. Here is an employee that had an off-the-job illness—or in this case on-the-job, but not an inclusion in the Workmen's Compensation Board—and was

denied a benefit under the compensation Act. And his employer had no sickness and accident benefits to cover this employee's sickness, or injury; at least, this is what I am given to understand. This chap's wife is working and provides their total income, as I understand it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): You are arguing at cross purposes.

Mr. Pilkey: No we are not arguing at cross purposes at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is suggesting he should be included in workmen's compensation.

Mr. Pilkey: His wife earns \$60 a week and this is their total income.

Now this party can support a question of maintenance of income, there is no question about that. I recall the member for Durham saying that there are no plans of that type—at least that is the impression that I received—that there were no plans of this type in which the cost was borne by industry.

Let me say to this House that there are many plans in the province of Ontario that cover employees for off-the-job injuries or sickness and the cost is fully borne by industry. There are many plans, and I think that if you would go into the big industries of this province you would find all the workers covered in the auto industries, steel, and other industries, the premiums to cover the benefits for those workers are paid 100 per cent by the corporation.

This is not something new that the member for Niagara Falls is suggesting. We have many precedents in this province.

I make this observation in terms of this employee, who has no income now and can make no contribution really to his family. It seems to me, if we are going to preserve some dignity and decency for the people of this province, we ought to provide a vehicle that would give these people benefits to maintain their present economic standard of living. Until we provide the necessary plans and vehicles to do that kind of job, then I do not think that we have fulfilled our obligations to the many people of this province.

I want to make just a couple of further brief comments. First of all, I am not too sure that the New York system should be applied here in Ontario, because it is a highly legalistic procedure. The total cost of the New York system is twice as high as we

have here in the province of Ontario, and has meagre benefits in terms of our system. I want also to point out that our present Workmen's Compensation Act is going in that direction under our appeal system. The government ought to be taking a very strong look at that, or we are going to have lawyers continually handling these types of cases, and I do not think it was really designed for that.

The other comment that I wanted to make was that the very principle initially of The Workmen's Compensation Act for employees was that we were to take care of loss of earnings. But we find now that the employee can be given the status of a temporary disability, and we find his compensation or benefits reduced to 50 or 25 per cent. So there has been a deviation from the principle of loss of earnings to one of the principle of degree of disability.

I think that this whole thing is wrong. If an employee has a loss of earnings, he cannot perform light work—and this is what many doctors say, that he is fit for light work, and he cannot perform that work—then the compensation board reduced his benefit level. I think it is about time that we get back to the principle that was enunciated at the very beginning; that was that the benefit level should be related to the loss of earnings and not to degree of disability.

Mr. T. P. Reid: On a point of order. I believe the hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Speaker: No, I do not believe that the hon. member's time is up. The hon. member would normally have about ten minutes. He has not had that time yet.

The hon. member for Rainy River has indicated to me that he would like to speak, but I would point out that his name was not on the list given to me originally.

Mr. Pilkey: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Rainy River wishes to make a comment, I would not want to deter him.

I want to conclude by saying this. It may not be relative to the resolution that is before us, but I want to make this comment because there has been a great hue and cry across this province about the loss of man-hours in terms of strikes. I want to point out to this House that there are twice as many manhours lost because of accidents as related to manhours lost because of strikes. And, if we want to really do something in terms of employment in this province, then we ought to set up a preventative measure

that would curtail the accident incidence here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: There are about two minutes available to the hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will try and be brief.

Mr. Speaker: Two minutes please.

Mr. T. P. Reid: In rising to support the resolution of the member for Niagara Falls, I would just like to preface my very few remarks, Mr. Speaker, by mentioning a tendency that I see more and more in this House every day, and it is one which I personally deplore. That tendency, sir, is for the party of the left, the New Democratic Party, to more and more bring into this Legislature the problems of the citizens of Ontario. This is our function, surely, but the part of this that I deplore, sir, is the fact that these people's names are paraded in this Legislature, and get into the public press. Now, I have had very many comments on the fact that people who contact me with their problems—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not speaking to the resolution.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, I would say, sir, that this is the tendency; these problems can be brought to the attention of the government without parading these people's personal problems and their names—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order, he is not speaking to the resolution.

Mr. T. P. Reid: In supporting this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out two things especially to the members of the left. First of all I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Oshawa for bailing out his party from the box that the member for Timiskaming had put them in. But I would just like to suggest that they read the resolution.

The New York plan provides that these be temporary benefits, for a very temporary period from an accident that happens in the home, where a worker is away from his job for a very short time, a period of one week or two weeks. This would supplement his income, provide him with some income, while he is off work and until he can return to work. As the member for Humber has

pointed out, this is only part of what we, as Liberals, would like to see done with the welfare and compensation system in this province, but we have been unsuccessful in our attempts to enlighten our friends on the other side, and we offer this resolution as a temporary stopgap to patch up an existing loophole in the present structure.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will consider matters on the order paper and the private members' hour will be resumed.

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

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock p.m.

APPENDIX

19. *Mr. Shulman*—Enquiry of the Provincial Secretary—1. How many brands of spirituous liquors manufactured by Hiram-Walker Gooderham Worts are carried by the Liquor Control Board of Ontario? 2. How many imported brands sold by Hiram-Walker Gooderham Worts are carried by the Liquor Control Board? 3. What is the total dollar value of the above purchased by the Liquor Control Board in 1968?

Answers:

1. 27.
2. 54.
3. \$42,067,829.53.

29. *Mr. Ben*—Enquiry of the Minister of Health—(1) In Paragraph 679 of the Report on the Pollution of Air, Soil and Water in the townships of Dunn, Moulton and Sherbrooke in Haldimand County, the statement is made that the Committee and counsel viewed the film "Air of Death" officially in the CBC studio on Thursday, February 22nd, 1967, at 10.30 a.m. Will the Minister of Health take this opportunity to correct the record in the light of this obvious error, since the film was not shown to the public until eight months after this date? (2) What criteria were used to determine the "recognized and accepted scientists" referred to in paragraph 43 of the Report? (3) Is there a professional or other peer group ranking to justify the subjective selection of "persons known for their interest and reputation" and those "recognized as experts in a general discipline", according to paragraph 44 of the Report? (4) What were the "special arrangements" under which additional consulting experts appeared before the Commission (para. 46)? (5) To what extent was the Counsel for the local Air Pollution Committee, Mr. Geoffrey Brooks, of Welland, assisted from public funds by way of mailing and typing costs, legal service, etc. (para 53)? (6) Since the publication of the Hall Report, has Mr. Drysinger, the sulphur dioxide specialist of The Department of Mines, or any other technically competent person, visited

the automatic testing station adjacent to former Reeve Siddall's home in Sherbrooke township, or the candle recorders in the immediate area? Has he made a report to the Government and will the Minister table this report? (7) Is the Minister prepared to accept the reasoning behind the statement of Dr. Lawther (para. 102) that the main concern is what the individual is breathing and not what is emitted from power stations or industrial stacks? Does this not imply an abdication of long-term control? (8) Does the Minister still accept the proposition in paragraph 129 of the Report that "in this Port Maitland study, we are dealing only with the effects of inorganic fluorides, and these only on a quantitative time basis, which may result in a demonstrable effect of chronic fluorosis? There are no organic fluorides involved, nor is there any possibility of acute fluorosis being a factor." (9) Will the Minister undertake to table the answers to these questions before March 18th, 1969?

Answers:

1. The date mentioned in the report is an error, but any correction would be a matter for the committee of enquiry to make. This committee was disbanded after the report was produced.

2-5. As the committee no longer exists, it is not possible to provide answers to these questions.

6. Four automatic fluoride recorders, two automatic sulphur dioxide recorders, the candle recorders for fluoride and sulphur dioxide and the particulate sampling devices are maintained regularly by the air pollution control service. One automatic sulphur dioxide recorder is maintained by The Department of Mines.

7. Dr. Lawther's statement that the main concern is for the air that the individuals are breathing, is accepted. The Ontario air pollution control programme is directed to securing or maintaining an air quality compatible with good health and well-being of the residents of Ontario. Our programme is directed

toward elimination of emissions of pollutants into the atmosphere.

8. The whole of paragraph 129 should be read in its entirety.

I would agree that there is no significant risk of acute fluorosis or health hazard from organic fluorides.

9. This question does not apply.

30. *Mr. Singer*—Enquiry of the Minister of Municipal Affairs—1. How many complaints has The Department of Municipal Affairs received to date concerning the refusal of landlords to pay to tenants the rebates provided by the provisions of The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968? 2. What has been the disposition of these complaints? 3. How many of these complaints have not yet been processed? 4. How soon is it anticipated the balance of these complaints will be dealt with? 5. (a) Have any Justices of the Peace in Metropolitan Toronto or anywhere else in the Province of Ontario been instructed not to accept informations concerning offences alleged to have taken place under the provisions of this Act unless the acceptance of such informations is first approved by the department? (b) If so, on what authority? (c) If not, why should a Mr. Stephens of the department have so advised an inquiring solicitor on February 20th, 1969? 6. (a) Is it correct that no charges can be laid alleging breaches of this Act after June 30th, 1969? (b) If so, on what basis? (c) If not, why would a Mr. Stephens of the department have so advised an inquiring solicitor on February 20th, 1969?

Answers:

1. To date approximately 4,500.
2. To date approximately 1,500.
3. The balance are in the course of processing.
4. It is anticipated that the balance will be dealt with within the next six weeks.
5. (a) (b) No instructions have been issued by this department to justices of the peace in Metropolitan Toronto or elsewhere.
- (c) Mr. Stephen did not advise the enquiring solicitor that the department had issued any instructions to justices of the peace.
6. (a) Yes, the hon. member is correct in his assumption that no charges can be laid after June 30, 1969 for failure to comply with subsection 2 of section 4 of The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968 in respect of the 1968 reduction of taxes.
- (b) The basis for this is subsection 2 of section 693 of the Criminal Code (Canada)

which provides that "no proceedings shall be instituted more than six months after the time when the subject matter of the proceedings arose".

(c) Mr. Stephen provided the enquiring solicitor with the correct information.

31. *Mr. Shulman*—Enquiry of the member for Haldimand-Norfolk—When may I inspect the minutes of the Niagara Parks Commission?

Answer:

A visit of the Committee on Commissions to the Niagara Parks Commission is anticipated in the near future, at which time the minutes of the meeting referred to by the hon. member for High Park will be made available.

32. *Mr. T. P. Reid* (Rainy River)—Enquiry of the Minister of Tourism and Information—1. Who is Arnold Olsen? 2. What department is he with? 3. Why was the picture taken by Karsh instead of either a Tourism or Lands and Forests' photographer which appeared in the *Saturday Review* of February 15, 1969?

4. How much did the photograph cost? 5. Who was responsible for the writing of the advertisement? 6. How much did the total advertisement cost? 7. Will the same advertisement be run again in the same magazine or any other publication? 8. Why is he depicted wearing a Lands and Forests' uniform, and yet the public is asked to write him c/o The Department of Tourism and Information?

Answers:

1. Arnold Olsen is a conservation officer.
2. He is employed by The Department of Lands and Forests.
3. His picture was taken by Karsh because we sought out the best possible portrait photographer for this series of advertisements, because the name Karsh itself has prestige and marketing value, and because the ad series was aimed at an influential, high-income market.
4. Karsh was paid \$1,500 per photograph for all reproduction rights.
5. The advertisement was written by the James Lovick advertising agency.
6. The insertion cost of the ad in the *Saturday Review*, February 15, was \$9,411.60. Production costs of the ad were \$716.
7. The same advertisement had been used twice previously, once in the *New Yorker* magazine and once in the *Saturday Review*. It may possibly be used once more, but this has not been decided.

8. The public is asked to write to my department because we maintain an information branch for the mailing of the literature on Ontario tourism.

35. *Mr. Ben*—Enquiry of the Minister of Health—1. Under reporting procedures of The Air Pollution Control Act and any other powers vested in him to receive such information, by Statute or Order in Council, what information has the Minister of Health acquired relating to the production and manufacture in Ontario of any of the following substances: (1) Cholinesterase inhibitors of the group known as G-agents: Sarin, Soman, Tabun; (2) V-agents having formulae $P-RO-R=O-SC_2H_4NR_2$ where the symbols refer to single and double valency bonds respectively; (3) 2, 4-D (Defoliant); (4) 2, 4, 5-T (Defoliant); (5) Picloram (Defoliant); (6) Cacodylic acid (Defoliant); (7) CS (Riot control agent); (8) Mace (Riot control agent); (9) CN (Riot control agent); (10) DM (Riot control agent with high arsenic content). 2. Is the Minister familiar with the Mulley proposals for revising the Geneva Protocol with respect to micro-biological agents? If not, will he so familiarize himself, with a view to ensuring Provincial awareness and responsibility in the whole area of chemical-biological warfare manufactures? 3. Has a chemical-biological warfare-agent factory been established anywhere in Ontario? 4. In the light of the opinion of Professor Henry Miller, Vice-Chancellor of Newcastle University, England, that doctors who work on chemical-biological warfare research are in violation of their ethical code and their Hippocratic Oath; and should surrender their status as physicians and withdraw from the Medical Register; will the Minister give a clear-cut statement on his views in this matter, before this \$400 million U.S. industry moves into Ontario, if, indeed it has not already done so?

Answers:

1. (1) (2) I am not aware that any of these chemical warfare agents (nerve gases) are manufactured in Ontario; (3) (4) 2, 4-D and 2, 5-T are both well known herbicides, which I believe have been manufactured intermittently in Ontario—UniRoyal, Elmira, Ont. (formerly Naugatuck Chemicals); (5) (6) It is my understanding that these are manufactured in the USA and used in Ontario for agricultural purposes; (7) (8) (9) (10) To the best of my knowledge, these are not manufactured in Ontario. They have been imported and used as riot control agents.

2. We have no knowledge of the Mulley

proposals for revising the Geneva Protocol. To our knowledge the production of chemical biological warfare agents is the concern of the Defence Research Board under The Department of National Defence. The board has an experimental station at Suffield, Alberta.

3. The air pollution control service has not received an application for a certificate of approval to construct such a plant, nor has it discussed such a proposed plant with anyone. Trade and development and labour also report no knowledge.

4. Those physicians who choose to engage in research on chemical biological warfare agents may do so in keeping with their own conscience. The Hippocratic Oath is not binding on physicians other than as a guide of conduct. I am not familiar with the \$400 million industry that is said to have moved, or be ready to move, into Ontario.

36. *Mr. Ben*—Enquiry of the Minister of Health—Will the Minister of Health report to the House on the danger of andromeda-toxin contaminated honey in Ontario, following the experience of poisonings in Washington State where bees had been kept near mountain laurel, sheep laurel, rhododendron and azalea family plants? Have any cases been brought to his attention?

Answer:

No cases have been brought to the attention of this department. As far as can be determined, no illnesses of this nature have ever been reported in Ontario or in Canada.

The possibility of poisoning by andromeda-toxin-contaminated honey is considered to be extremely remote.

37. *Mr. Shulman*—Enquiry of the Prime Minister—1. Were Dr. J. K. Reynolds (Chief Executive Officer in the Prime Minister's Office) and members of his family occupying the guest house at Upper Canada Village during the May 18, 1968, holiday weekend? 2. Did they have a supply of firecrackers and detonate them up against the guest house? 3. Was this the cause of the fire in these premises? 4. What was the cost of repairing the buildings, and what amount was received, if any, from the insurance coverage? 5. Did the Fire Marshal or his officials make an inspection of the premises and the damage? 6. Did the Fire Marshal or his officials prepare a report subsequently? 7. Was it sent to the Commission? 8. Was General Manager Peacock requested or persuaded by Dr. J. K. Reynolds to cover up this report? 9. Why did

the General Manager or other official withhold such report from members of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission until forced to produce it by demand of the Commission members? 10. Will the Prime Minister table this report? 11. If not, why? 12. Will the Prime Minister inform the House fully of all the circumstances and explain why the incident is not mentioned, for the information of members of the Assembly, in the current annual report of the Commission for the year ending December 31, 1968?

Answers:

- 1. Yes.
- 2. Dr. Reynolds' eight-year-old son did detonate some firecrackers on the adjoining lawn and in the vicinity of the residence.
- 3. The confidential report of the assistant chief, fire investigation section, office of the fire marshal states: "Our investigator, after conducting a thorough physical examination, is reporting the cause of the fire as accidental and possibly caused by children playing with firecrackers".
- 4. \$3,950; \$3,250.
- 5. Yes.
- 6. Yes.
- 7. Yes. The report referred to above, dated June 19, 1968, was received in the commission's Morrisburg office on June 24, 1968.
- 8. No.
- 9. The report was not withheld. It was discussed at the commission meeting in June, shortly after receipt of the fire marshal's report.
- 10. Yes.

11. I do so herewith.

Gentlemen:

An investigator from this office investigated a fire at the above location that involved a two-storey frame and brick constructed dwelling house, fully serviced, and the following summary is compiled from our investigator's report:

Our investigator visited the scene of the loss and established that the fire had originated at the lower portion of the outside north wall of the house. Since an addition has been added to the building, the north wall was now located inside the addition. The fire spread up inside the wall and into the roof over the second storey. Our investigator found extensive charring at the top of the foundation some 2½ feet above ground level where the exposed end of a 4-inch by 4-inch timber was located. The fire was unable to spread up the inside of the wall, due to it being lined with brick, therefore, it progressed along the wooden sill and then spread up the inside of the wall.

Our investigator, after conducting a thorough physical examination, is reporting the cause of the fire as accidental and possibly caused by children playing with firecrackers.

If any further information of value is learned, a further report will be forwarded.

This concludes the investigation.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Alan C. Williams,
Assistant Chief,
Fire Investigation Section.

12. I am informed that the item was judged to be of insufficient consequence or interest to be mentioned in the annual report.

ERRATUM
(Friday, March 21, 1969)

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
Contents	8	Change to read: Day nursery units, questions to Mr. Yarenko, Mrs. M. Renwick 2570



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, March 31, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Monday, March 31, 1969

Tabling report, advisory committee on pollution control, Mr. Simonett	2865
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, first reading	2865
Public Vehicles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haskett, first reading	2867
Energy Act, 1968-1969, bill intituled, Mr. Simonett, first reading	2867
Gasoline Handling Act, 1968-1969, bill intituled, Mr. Simonett, first reading	2867
Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, first reading	2867
Commemorating entrance of Newfoundland into Confederation, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald	2868
Niagara regional government, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Nixon	2870
Financial dealings with Germany, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent	2870
Bank interest rates, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent	2870
Placing of governmental insurance, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Shulman	2871
OMSIP and OMA fees, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman	2872
Discharge of pickle liquor, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	2872
Third readings	2872
Conservation Authorities Act, 1968, bill to amend, reported	2872
Borough of East York, bill respecting, reported	2877
County of Welland, bill respecting, reported	2877
City of Windsor, bill respecting, reported	2877
University of Windsor, bill respecting, reported	2878
Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading	2878
Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading	2880
Heritage Foundation Act, 1967, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, second reading	2884
St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, second reading	2886
Homes for Special Care Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	2887
Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	2887
Nursing Homes Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	2887
Pesticides Act, 1957, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	2889
Department of Health, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading	2890
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Sargent, agreed to	2890
On notice of motion No. 25, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Gilbertson, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Jackson, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. MacDonald	2891
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	2902
Erratum	2902

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1969

The House met today at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests in the east gallery this afternoon are students from St. Ambrose Separate School in Toronto; and in the west gallery we have students from St. Andrew's Junior High School in Willowdale and from the Adult Education Centre, McGill Street, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the interim report on the control of DDT use in the province of Ontario by the advisory committee on pollution control.

This report follows from investigations and enquiries made during 1968 by the committee of Deputy Ministers who have met regularly to co-ordinate the government's pollution abatement programmes.

Monitoring studies on fish and wildlife were initiated several years ago and the preliminary results of these investigations were presented to the advisory committee early in 1968. These results referred mainly to studies undertaken in the Muskoka Lakes where measurable quantities of DDT were found in fish obtained from these waters.

The committee decided upon a threefold attack on this problem. Firstly, extensive study of the subject was undertaken. Secondly, monitoring and research were continued. Thirdly, it was decided to reduce the usage of DDT in Ontario by such means as were available to the committee, without waiting for the final results of the study.

Since the committee commenced its study, the use of DDT in Ontario has been reduced. Commencing with the 1968 field season, The Department of Health has not issued permits for the commercial application of DDT in the Muskoka Lakes system. No permits were issued for the aerial spraying of DDT during 1968 for biting-insect control and the various committees of The Department of Agriculture and Food have altered their recom-

mendations to reduce the use of DDT in agriculture.

In 1966, The Department of Lands and Forests discontinued the use of DDT for the control of mosquitoes and black flies in provincial parks. In 1968, the department discontinued the use of DDT in all of its projects and primarily the protection of the forest against destructive insects.

Enquiries made during 1968 by the committee failed to disclose any evidence of human health being affected by the use of DDT in Ontario. Similarly, the committee has received no evidence of fish being adversely affected in any Ontario waters. Consequently, the committee does not recommend a ban on the use of this pesticide, but, recognizing its persistent qualities, recommends strict control over its continued use.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister whether a copy of that report is going to be made available to each member?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have copies for all the members. If they would like them we will see that they get them. I think we have issued some to the press, but we have additional copies if members would like them.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 100 amendments in all. Seventy of these are changes in penalties. Taken together, these amendments constitute an overhaul of the entire system of deterrents in our provincial traffic law.

The new penalties will be simpler to administer; they will have greater consistency; they include certain innovations; and they are calculated to be more realistic in the

light of present-day conditions. They draw a sharper distinction between offences that are more serious—involving wilful wrong-doing or posing a serious threat to public safety—and those that are relatively minor. For some offences the options of suspensions and jail terms will be removed because they are inappropriate or, in practice, not effective. For other offences these options will be added. The fines for serious offences will be substantially more severe.

In consideration of such extensive changes, I ask that the House place them in the perspective of their purpose and their need.

Their purpose is the achievement of greater traffic safety through the use of a more effective set of deterrents. The penalties of the past for serious traffic offences have tended to be too mild. A Toronto judge has commented that:

The major reason for this is that virtually all legislators and judges drive automobiles, and think that there-but-for-the-grace-of-God . . . Thus we see mild traffic laws and penalties, for example, of \$50 for careless driving where a child was killed.

When the need for strong deterrents is examined, it will be indisputable that a great many motorists show a shocking disrespect for the laws of traffic. Our society has been far too tolerant of the person who breaks traffic laws; all too often the lawbreaker is given more sympathy than the victim of his carelessness or irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am fed up with the concern that is repeatedly expressed for the person who is convicted of driving offences. I am fed up with the attitude that shrugs off traffic laws. One thousand, five hundred and eighty-six persons were killed by traffic collisions in Ontario last year, and most of them died because a driver was irresponsible. The 71,000 persons injured in collisions suffered those injuries, in most cases, because a driver was irresponsible.

Those are the persons I am concerned about—not the irresponsible drivers but their victims; and the families of the victims.

The ultimate purpose of traffic laws is to save lives and prevent injuries, not to wink at people who think they have the right to break the law and thereby endanger the lives and health of themselves, their families and other users of the road. I am confident that the people of Ontario in 1969 recognize the growing urgency of solutions to the toll of collisions; that they have the enlightened self-interest to support stronger deterrents.

If we really want safety, we have to be willing to accept the price of personal responsibility and restraint. If we are not willing to pay that price, then we are endorsing Russian roulette on the highway and we are just giving lip-service to safety.

The amendments I propose today are not a total solution, but they should play an important part in the achievement of greater safety.

In fatal collisions, the statistics for 1968 show that the most common driving error was excessive speed. Year after year, speeding is both one of the most common offences and one of those that causes the most deaths and suffering.

Therefore I propose an innovation that will establish a more meaningful deterrent: a penalty that reflects the fact that the greater the speed over the maximum, the greater the danger to life and the more irresponsible is the driver. Fines for speeding will be on a sliding scale, based on the number of miles per hour over the legal maximum. Some courts have followed this principle in the past, but usually within the range of \$5 to \$50. The amendment will establish a uniform practice, with fines ranging from \$2 to \$5 for each mile per hour over the maximum, so that convictions for extreme speeding could result in much more severe penalties.

The same kind of sliding scale of fines is proposed for the overloading of commercial vehicles. The present fines of up to \$50 are too low to be a deterrent and our studies have shown that in many cases they do not come close to offsetting the economic advantage of exceeding the legal limits for loads. These limits are important for purposes of safety, road maintenance and equity of fees. Therefore the amendment will establish a sliding scale of fines for overloading that could amount in extreme cases to thousands of dollars.

Many penalties now are minimal for first offence, more severe for the second and still more severe for subsequent offences. I propose to remove this principle from the Act entirely. The theory has much to commend it, but it does not work. In practice, because of procedural complications, prosecutors usually avoid the use of the provisions for second and subsequent offences. Therefore the minimal range of first-offence penalties applies in most cases. The removal of provision for second and subsequent offences, in conjunction with the adjustment of the severity of penalties to suit the conditions of today, will

result in a system that is both more practical and more effective.

I would like to draw attention to a few of the most important penalty changes.

For careless driving—one of the most serious driving offences in the Act—the minimum will be raised from \$10 to \$100, with the maximum remaining at \$500. In addition, the amendment will increase the discretionary jail term from three months to six months and will provide that this may be in addition to and not instead of, the fine. The discretionary period of suspension remains, with a maximum of two years.

The same range of increased penalties will be applied to several other serious offences: for example, the offences of racing, failure to remain at the scene of a collision and operating a motor vehicle when the vehicle permit is under suspension.

A further group of serious offences that relate to manufacturing and selling, which now carry penalties that are in some cases as low as a \$5 minimum, will be increased to a \$100 minimum and a \$500 maximum.

Another important change in the Act concerns powers of arrest. In the section listing the offences for which police officers may arrest without a warrant I propose deleting three offences which seem inappropriate: concerning the position of licence plates on vehicles, notification of change in vehicle ownership and notification of change of address. I am proposing also that two new offences be added to the list: failing to remain at the scene of a collision and the failure of a driver to properly identify himself to a police constable.

The latter change is part of a significant group of amendments that are designed to facilitate reasonable enforcement in the public interest. In the past, a driver has been required by law to produce his driver's licence at the demand of a police constable. But if he failed to do so, or if he displayed it so quickly that it could not be read, the constable had no power to act. The officer could find himself in a position that he could not ascertain the name of a driver he wished to charge and therefore could not lay a charge.

The proposed amendment will require a person to identify himself, and if he fails to do so to the satisfaction of a police constable the constable can arrest him without a warrant.

The McRuer Report said, and I quote:

The necessities of the cases would appear to be met if the power of arrest without a

warrant were restricted to those cases in which the driver of a motor vehicle, without showing reasonable cause, does not properly identify himself and the owner of the vehicle, and those cases in which the driver does not appear to have any legal right to have the vehicle on the highway.

I invite consideration of this large number of amendments in a spirit of determination to escalate our efforts for greater safety in traffic.

THE PUBLIC VEHICLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Haskett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Vehicles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for increasing the minimum fine from \$20 to \$50.

THE ENERGY ACT, 1968-1969

Hon. Mr. Simonett moves first reading of bill intituled, The Energy Act, 1968-1969.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this revision is to make administration of the Act more effective in the light of the experience gained under the present Act, thus improving the safety aspects of the production and storage of gas and oil and the transmission, distribution and use of gas, fuel oil and propane as defined in the Act.

THE GASOLINE HANDLING ACT, 1968-1969

Hon. Mr. Simonett moves first reading of bill intituled, The Gasoline Handling Act, 1968-1969.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this revision is to make the administration of this Act more effective in the light of the experience gained under the present Act, thus improving the safety aspects of the handling of gasoline and associated products.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Simonett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in section 1 the definitions are brought in line with the corresponding definitions in The Energy Act, 1968-1969.

In section 2, subsection 7 of this bill, the amendment is complementary and will bring a new section, 25(a), into line with the exceptions mentioned in section 15(3) of the Act.

In section 3 the amendment is designed to enable the board to control unreasonable inflation of the rate.

Sections 4, 9 and 10 are designed to complement The Expropriations Act, 1968-1969.

The new provision of section 5 implements a recommendation of the McRuer report. It requires the board to send a copy of its report to each of the parties on reference to it of an application for a licence to drill a gas well in a designated gas storage area. The new provision also gives a right of appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

New provisions of section 6 will give the board additional discretionary powers when dealing with an application for the joining of interests in a spacing unit, field or fuel.

The provision in section 7 is new; and it is self-explanatory.

In section 8 the name of the department mentioned is brought up to date.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister has a statement.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to remind the members of the House that this is the 20th anniversary of the entrance of Newfoundland into our Confederation. Members might be interested in knowing that I have sent a telegram to Mr. Smallwood on—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is the Premier declaring today "Joey Smallwood Day?"

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —on behalf of the people of this province, because Mr. Smallwood's contribution in bringing Newfoundland into Confederation was undoubtedly greater than any other single individual. I think his province has benefited by this association and the rest of Canada has as well.

As far as Mr. Smallwood is concerned, I have known him and have met with him over the years at many conferences—always, I hope, with pleasure on both sides. Members will recall he played a very active part in the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference

here in Toronto. He is always able to enliven the proceedings, and when they perhaps begin to get just a little dull and ponderous for the listening audience he manages to throw in some remark that changes the general tenor of the discussion.

I would extend to him my personal congratulations on this momentous occasion.

I do not know whether he has called a leadership convention, or indicated that perhaps he may not be leading his party in that province in the future, but certainly I think the people of Newfoundland will always be very grateful to him. I have a feeling it will be purely his decision and no one else's when he decides his course has been run.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a feeling the Prime Minister is right.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In any event, it is a happy occasion for us to extend congratulations to the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to associate myself with the words of greetings and congratulations expressed by the Premier.

I sometimes feel that the Premier's interest in Newfoundland and the Premier thereof has been whetted by the fact that they have been salmon fishing together, as much as by their discussions at the federal-provincial conferences.

Perhaps members would be interested to know that I too have sent the Premier a telegram of congratulations—I am working on an invitation to go fishing myself.

I had a chance to talk with Mr. Smallwood in Ottawa just a few weeks ago about some of the history leading up to their entry into Confederation. He said that the old slogan in the period when Confederation was being considered first in the 1860's and then in the 1890's, was as follows: "Come near at your peril, Canadian wolf!"

It is an indication of the attitudes that he almost single handedly overcame in the campaign of 1948 leading to the decision that brought Newfoundland into Confederation.

Those days were, of course, very important ones, both for Newfoundland and for the rest of us as citizens of Canada. I think more than anything else, we are aware, at the conferences, of the contribution that Mr. Smallwood makes when he emphasizes the tremendous differences, the disparities, between the region over which he has some responsibility and our own.

One statement that he made that impressed me, and I know it impressed the other members who were also at that conference. He said that if Ontario were to tax at the same rate as Newfoundland taxed her citizens we would have an additional \$600 million in our revenues. It is an indication of the different level of life and involvement that is necessary in that particular part of Canada and the challenge it presents to all of us when we concern ourselves with these regional disparities.

I am delighted to join with the Premier in offering our greetings and congratulations to Newfoundland.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition. I shall not usurp the right of the Prime Minister to reply to the validity of the application of Newfoundland's tax rate to Ontario and the figures that Joey came up with. He is a wonderful fellow. He can, in a constitutional conference, off the top of his head, suddenly transform the province into a bilingual province. How meaningful it is I do not know!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): His statistics are wrong too!

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

At least, as Joey Smallwood has so often said, he is the only father of Confederation who is around at this point; and I suppose for that reason, if for no other, some attention should be paid to him.

You might be interested to know, Mr. Speaker—I do not know whether this story is apocryphal or not—but I understand that when the new Confederation building was erected in St. John's that the telephone number given to the building was accepted by everybody in numbers until somebody examined it on one occasion and discovered that the numbers equated "JOEY". I suspect that it is not inaccurate in its reflection of the dominance of Newfoundland during Joey's regime.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Highways has a statement.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I should like to draw the attention of the hon. members of the House to the new edition of the northern Ontario map, copies of which have been placed on the members' desks. This map was revised to include new highway mileage, and major highway projects under way in northern Ontario. It also depicts his-

toric points of interest in the north, and indicates by symbols, hunting and fishing areas, the location of camping facilities, mining areas, pulp mills, power generating stations, airports, seaplane bases and hospitals. In addition, there are listings of daily newspapers and radio stations in the north, as well as the Ontario Provincial Police district headquarters. A handy mileage chart with the distance between larger cities in the United States and many Ontario centres is also provided. All in all, I think members would agree that it is much more than just a map. It is a useful brochure that should help stimulate tourist travel in the north. The new map is now ready for distribution, free of charge, through The Department of Highways offices, and from The Department of Tourism and Information distribution centres.

Mr. Speaker: On Friday, when the chairman of the committee of the whole House was relieving Mr. Speaker so that he might attend the meeting of the Speakers of Canadian Parliaments, which is held annually, a question arose with respect to the use of the order paper and the use of the oral question. The chairman advised the House that he would refer it to Mr. Speaker, which he has done, and we have had the opportunity of consulting the rules and precedents of the House. I have merely this comment to make with respect to it.

As has been explained on many occasions in the House, the only questions contemplated by our rules are the written questions which appear on the notice paper. The putting of oral questions before the orders of the day on private notice is a practice of long standing, which has the authority of precedent and approval by the House, and the procedure on such questions has also been well established by practice and precedent. When Mr. Speaker, or the Minister to whom the question is directed, is of the opinion that the question is not a proper one to be answered orally before the orders of the day, the Speaker or the Minister, as the case may be, may require that the question be placed by the Clerk on the notice paper as a written question.

This may be for any number of reasons, such as that the answer is too voluminous or too statistical to be given orally or that the subject matter is not sufficiently urgent. The discretion of a Minister in this regard is analogous to the discretion given him by rule 37 (c) under which he may, in the case of a written question when the answer would require any statements of facts or records or statistics of a lengthy or voluminous nature,

or other material which in the opinion of the Minister should be made the subject of a return, instead of answering the question may require that a motion be made for a return.

Now, I would think that we would continue to follow our practice in the House, which actually was followed on Friday in the House here. The hon. leader of the Opposition has a question.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister received new information regarding regional government in the Niagara area which will require a delay in the introduction of legislation for regional government there—although he indicated on January 23, reported in the Niagara Falls *Evening Review* of March 1, that the regional legislation would be brought in before the Easter recess.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any new information. I would say that the consultations which are being undertaken are perhaps taking a little longer than we anticipated, but I would hope that we would be in a position to introduce legislation a week or so after we return after the Easter recess.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have questions, but neither of the Ministers responsible for the reply is here.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps, if they should come in before the end of the question period, we will go back to them. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has questions of the Premier.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A question to the hon. Prime Minister. Is the Premier ready at this time to divulge the background of the financial dealings made with Germany recently?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been discussed in the House, and it has been answered by the hon. Treasurer on several occasions, and I would refer the hon. member, in chronological order, to page 1393, page 1989 and page 2005 where this information was put before the House.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last time the Prime Minister talked to the House on this subject he said he would be giving information to the House. I thought maybe he would level with us.

A question to the Prime Minister. Would the Premier advise why, as the Prime Minister of Ontario, he is not taking steps to curb

bank interest rates which are continually on the increase?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there is a very simple answer. Under our constitution it is a matter which lies entirely within the purview of the federal government, and I do not think they would appreciate my interference, nor do I think it would have much effect. The whole question of banking is a national matter, and properly so, falls to the federal government.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister agree that he thinks he has influence in Ottawa on other matters? Why could he not do something on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in the field of financial affairs, you have to form your own opinion as to what my influence is in Ottawa.

Mr. Sargent: We have that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would simply say that I would very much doubt that my interference, or the interference of any province, in this particular area would be particularly welcome. On the other hand we have been crying in the wilderness for a greater degree of fiscal co-operation in this country if we are to be able to formulate national fiscal policies that would be meaningful. We have been asking for this for some considerable time. In the last few months we have seen some slight breakthrough. We think, perhaps, our point of view is beginning to be understood but I do not think it is understood completely yet. But we would be pleased—

Mr. Sargent: Like Medicare, for instance.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Quite. We would be happy to co-operate with the federal government in those areas in which our activities have an effect on money markets, and thus on the interest rate. On the other hand, I must come back to the point that I made. Constitutionally, it is a function of the federal government; I agree that it should be, and I do not think the provinces should be able to interfere in this other than through, as I say, consultation. But if we are to have national policies, and particularly in the area of monetary matters, then, of course, the responsibility must lie with the national government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question from the other day for the Treasurer, and a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question of the Provincial Treasurer, sir. But, before placing my question, I would like to raise a point of order in connection with this question, sir. No one wishes to prolong the question period unnecessarily, and everyone agrees with the remarks that the hon. Treasurer made last week that it would be preferable to have many of these questions answered by writing to the responsible Minister.

I wish to point out to you, sir, that a letter was written to the hon. Treasurer about the matter in today's question, some seven months ago, and as he has not yet answered, it is unfortunately necessary to place this question in the House. Furthermore, sir, I wish to remind you that on July 17, 1968, in this House—on page 5905 of *Hansard* it was recorded—I first pointed out that this Minister will not answer his letters.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Why did the member not mail it?

Mr. Shulman: It was mailed; he received it. The question is as follows, sir. Has the Minister had an opportunity to look into the complaints about the placing of governmental insurance, which was forwarded to him by Mr. Leslie E. Mackay, a general insurance agent practising in Listowel, Ontario?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, my file showed no record of the receipt of a communication of this nature from Mr. Mackay, and I do not recall one. It is possible, of course, and I say this in all fairness and honesty to the hon. member, that it has been received and misplaced, in which case I would extend apologies to Mr. Mackay and to the hon. member. But I can tell you, we have turned our files inside out, and I cannot locate it.

Mr. Shulman: It was sent last August.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We will continue the pursuit of the question. Possibly we were not looking under the right alphabetical order. Did it come in from the hon. member, may I ask him that question?

Mr. Shulman: From Mr. Mackay.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It came from Mr. Mackay? We will continue our search.

As far as insurance commissions are concerned, payments are made to licensed agents outside Metropolitan Toronto. To qualify, the agent must be a member of the Ontario

Insurance Association, and the affiliated local association in his community or district. The agent, of course, must be licensed by the appropriate government body. From then on, payment is made on a rotational basis once every three years to all agents in the province who qualify, as I have mentioned, to ensure that over the course of the three-year period they will receive a commission representing a share of the commission accruing on premiums placed on government facilities.

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds like featherbedding to me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is the policy that is followed and I think in general that would be the only answer I could give, Mr. Speaker, even when I do turn up the letter, which I shall endeavour to do.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Treasurer accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: As Mr. Mackay is a licensed agent—licence No. J209, the province of Ontario—and sent \$25 to the Treasurer of Ontario, would this not be sufficient to get his share of the cream?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, we pursued this matter with the Ontario Insurance Agents' Association. It would appear that he has not been a member of the Ontario Insurance Agents' Association since September 30, 1963. He is recorded as being a member from October 1, 1962 to September 30, 1963, a period of just under a year, but not since that time.

If the hon. member will recall—I will repeat what I said—to qualify, an agent must be a member of the Ontario Insurance Agents' Association and the affiliated local association in his community or district.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister explain the reason for that rule?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Only to say, Mr. Speaker, that this was worked out with the insurance companies, the insurance advisory committee, some time ago. It has been functioning very well over a period of years.

Up until now we have had no particular reason to believe that it is not acceptable to the agents, I suppose, except when someone for some reason misses his commission, and this is probably such a case. It was set up to ensure, as I have said, as fair a basis as possible—on a rotational basis every three

years—and agents who qualify, as I have mentioned, will participate in these commissions.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, perhaps this explains the need for self-insurance in this province.

I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: Has OMSIP agreed to pay the new schedule of fees planned to begin tomorrow by the Ontario Medical Association?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, we have not reached such an agreement yet. If and when we do, I am sure this House will be advised of it.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question? Does that mean that as of tomorrow the increased fee must be paid by the public?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is a certain percentage of the profession who still bill the people for the difference in the fee. I suppose they will continue to do as they have been doing in the past, but at the present time we cannot pay more than the fee permitted under our Act, and we have not yet decided to bring in an amendment to that Act.

Mr. Shulman: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the government does decide to pay the fees now issued by the Ontario Medical Association, will that mean that the charge made to the public for OMSIP will have to be raised?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would have to look at that because I really could not answer the question without seeing what the total ramification might be.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management:

Has the OWRC given permission to the Steel Company of Canada to dispose of waste acid from its No. 1 pickle line into Hamilton Bay?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Water Resources Commission has permitted the Steel Company of Canada to discharge pickle liquor from the No. 1 pickle line to a lagoon system through which the acidity is reduced to an acceptable level. It is understood that development is under way to convert this line to a process in which spent acid is regenerated for reuse.

Mr. Speaker: Was the hon. member on his feet for a supplementary question?

Mr. Deans: I was going to ask a supplementary, but I will let it go at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 23, An Act to amend The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act.

Bill 24, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill 64, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Clerk of the House: The 7th order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT, 1968

House in committee on Bill 89, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1968.

On section 1:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, this is the section that extends the authority of the Act to include Indian reserves, I believe, and I am particularly interested in what the Minister has in mind. There are several reserves covering fairly large areas that are presently surrounded by conservation authorities, but up until now have had no part to play in the work of the authority.

Would it be in the Minister's mind that the representative, either elected or appointed by the band council, will become a part of the conservation authority in the areas where it would apply? Or is it going to be only a financial involvement in which the government of Canada will be required to pay at least a part of the costs, or has agreed to pay a part of the costs of the work on behalf of the lands the Indians hold and would be benefited by the work?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, as I understand, it would be upon request of the Indian band. Now, as to financial implication, I am sorry I cannot explain that. I have never heard at any time that the dominion government was coming in on any financial

arrangement with the conservation authorities.

Mr. Nixon: But the Minister would be prepared to accept representation on conservation authorities from Indian reserves without the requirement that any funds from Indian sources be a part of that representation?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: Good!

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, on section 2, dealing with the transfer of authority from the local municipalities to a regional government municipality, I am concerned here with the function of the regional council as it would relate to the duties now carried on by the local municipalities, especially as it would affect a two-tier system of government. In the secondary or lower tier system, I understand that they would have no say as to who would represent them, but this would be done by the regional council.

Under the previous Act, it says that a person representing a municipality must be a resident of the municipality. Would this mean then that any resident of the large region could, in fact, be a representative of the smaller, lower tier municipality on a conservation?

Also, I am not clear, and I do not think it is spelled out in the amendment, what effect this would have on the apportionment of cost for the lower tier municipality. I wonder if this has been checked out with The Department of Municipal Affairs in their proposal for regional government, how this will affect the proportionment of costs to the lower tiered municipalities within the region that would be subjected on them, by the regional council. Could the Minister answer these questions?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think this is more to protect representation when an area comes under a regional government, instead of bringing the membership down to a municipality or a regional government which might be considered as a municipality. We are trying to protect the smaller municipalities within this region.

As to cost, it will be appropriated as they have been previously where there is a municipality or part of a municipality left. If it all comes under one region and the total govern-

ment is there, of course it would be the region we were dealing with. But where there are two tiers, costs would be appropriated the same as they are today.

Mr. Good: This is exactly my point, Mr. Chairman. Under this new amendment, the regional council or the regional government will have all the authorities previously delegated to the local municipality. Under the original Act, the local municipality was responsible for the appointment of representation from the municipality under the sections dealing with costs, section 25 under the original Act, after determining the approximate maintenance costs for the succeeding years. The costs were proportioned out and this was all done through the representative of the local municipality as it affected that municipality. My point is this, are the costs going to be related in proportion to the whole region, or are they still going to be delegated out and the responsibility taken from the individual lower-tiered municipalities of the region? If they are, I think they should have some say in it. Otherwise, you are going to run into the same problem you are now running into in the smaller municipalities and the county school board costs.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think that it would depend on the form of region that is being set up and you would make your decisions after that. But that is not our intention with this bill. Our intention is that we might keep representation in the rural municipalities, or if there are two stages, of course, costs would be apportioned the same as they are today. In fact, under The Metro Toronto Conservation Act, if you would look at that, you would see how that has worked out and worked very well.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, the way I read this section (b) of the amended bill under clause 2, the regional government could appoint representatives from anywhere within the region. They could all come from the city or they could all come from the rural areas. Previously, the small areas were protected under the old Act, the person had to be a resident of the municipality from which he was appointed. I do not think there is that protection under this.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right, there is not.

Mr. Good: There is not?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Good: They all come from the city? Do you not think that there should be some

direction given as to what areas of the region the appointment should come from? In what areas of the region the appointments should be made?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would think that under regional government you will have representation throughout the region. I cannot see why they would all come from one locality. I know as far as the government appointees are concerned, they will be considered over the whole region. I think the same would apply locally.

Mr. Good: I do not think there should be any government appointments, but that is another matter.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 2 stand?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Following this point, Mr. Chairman, the amendments to The Conservation Authorities Act as presented here are necessary in regard to the development of regional government. But you have to be explicit. You have heard the question from the hon. member previously in regard to the two-tier system and the representations.

What is going to be the situation if we come up in the province with one or more one-tier regional systems? Then the problem that he presents on representation will be magnified, you could have your representation all from one central core of an urban municipality. I think you will have to give some attention to that because it is a great possibility we will have one or more one-tier regional governments in the province.

Another point I would like to make and I was disturbed about the results of the annual meeting of the Hamilton District Conservation Authority which took place in the first week of February. There was quite a furore there about the method of the appointing of executives. Now as I understand it the procedures for appointing the executive are well laid out in The Conservation Authorities Act. Why they are confused about it, I do not know, except that they are ignoring the terms of the present Act and were playing politics. I do not know; but the fact is that they were moving motions in this meeting to review the procedures of electing the executive members. When they were told by the present chairman that the Act provided the procedures, they then proceeded to move notices of motion to review the whole procedure of electing executives at the next meeting.

I would hope that the director of the conservation authorities is cognizant of the mis-

understanding there and sends copies of the Act and regulations to all the members in the Hamilton district region so that we do not have this apparent lack of confidence in that very important conservation authority. The press story indicated that there was not the kind of correlation and co-ordination that is necessary to really make an important body of that type function properly.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, this protection for representation from all areas was given in the original Act and has now been destroyed. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is in the House; would he like to comment what his thoughts are on this matter of representation from lower tiers in the proposed regional government set-up?

Mr. Nixon: I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be glad to do that.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): While the Minister is considering his answer, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make a few remarks in connection with clause 2?

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with Bill 89, section 2, of An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act. The hon. member for Waterloo North wondered whether the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs cared to comment upon the representation in a two-tier form of municipal government.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I am sure that the Minister of Energy and Resources Management has already answered the question but I would think—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This was put in specifically as I understand it, with the Niagara peninsula in mind. I think any of the students of regional government would feel that one of the things that a region can and should do best is a regional park system. Now it so happens in the Niagara peninsula that the conservation authority and the proposed regional municipality are nearly "coterminus" and it therefore seemed appropriate that rather than have a regional park system you had it already in the conservation authority. This would, in fact, become a regional matter and that is why the representation would be put at that level.

Mr. Good: To repeat my question, Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the bill gives the regional council the authority for all appointments, which means that they could appoint anyone from within the region. So,

in effect, they would be licenced to appoint members from any one locality to the regional conservation authority which, in that particular case that you have mentioned, would include two complete counties.

Under the old Act protection was given so that your local small municipalities made the appointment. What protections are you prepared to put in this bill so there is representation from all areas of the region? The Minister of Energy and Resources Management said none.

• **Hon. Mr. McKeough:** I think if you are going to have that kind of protection then you are saying it is not a regional responsibility. Because if you are talking about a regional responsibility, it is conceivable—I do not imagine it would ever happen—that a regional council might decide in their wisdom to appoint from one municipality. But presumably, in making their appointments, one would hope—and that is the basis of a regional municipality—that they would not necessarily look at where the people are from or what particular locale they came from, but they would look to find the best people that they could appoint to represent on the authority from the region.

Mr. Good: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the authority should come under the regional council. If the regional council is representative of the region, the conservation authority should be run by the regional council and you have no need for a conservation authority.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, there is a problem there because all authorities will not come under one region. Conservation authorities are set up on a watershed. Now a region might be a part or all of an authority, but in many cases it will not cover the whole authority, so this is just the area that is covered by the region.

We do not anticipate any trouble with this. In fact, conservation authorities have been a form of regional government. They have covered a large area, a watershed over the years. You will get, in some areas where there are conservation authorities, a majority of the members on that board who are in the built up areas because some of the smaller townships are not too concerned and they are the headwaters of these authorities. We have not had many problems along this line as far as representation is concerned.

• **Mr. Good:** No, because your old Act gave them representation—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well I do not think there will be any problem here.

Mr. Good:—and your amendment is taking it away.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot see that there will be any problem, because a region in itself in most cases, perhaps outside of Niagara, will be a very small part of an authority.

Take the Ottawa region, for instance, that is going to be on the Mississippi or the Rideau, a very small part of either one of those authorities, although it is a region, within Ottawa, Carleton and that area.

Mr. Good: Well once again you are taking the responsibilities away from the people in the smaller communities.

Mr. Chairman: On section 2, the hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, my objection to the clause is that since the Minister of Municipal Affairs has indicated that it is framed with a particular part of the province in mind—the Niagara peninsula—it may well preclude the establishment of conservation authorities, which the clause envisages in other parts of the province, once a regional government structure has been established.

In the case of my own community, the municipality of the city of Windsor would form a very substantial portion of any regional structure established in southwestern Ontario but a component of that prospective regional structure which in the past has opposed participation in a conservation authority.

At a meeting last fall, I believe it was in Windsor, which a large number of representatives of municipalities in Essex county attended to discuss the establishment of a conservation authority, the city of Windsor was not represented. Although the meeting of those representatives of the Essex county municipalities decided not to proceed with the establishment of an authority, there is no doubt that the absence of Windsor had considerable bearing on that decision not to proceed.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Do not count on that.

Mr. Peacock: Under the provisions of this clause it could well come about that the city of Windsor, as the major component of a regional structure for that part of the province, could impede, or block altogether, the establishment of a conservation authority. I

would suggest to the Minister that he consider the amendment of clause 2 in the seventh line of paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 3(a) as amended by clause 2 of the bill, to delete the word "may" replacing it with the word "shall". Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I have not had time to write out that suggestion as an amendment to the clause, but I would like to propose it.

I would also like to suggest that not only would the clause be perfected by this amendment but that it would be further strengthened by an indication in it that the representatives not only number the same total to which the local municipalities would have otherwise been entitled had this amendment not been introduced, but that those representatives would come from the same local municipalities that they would otherwise have represented had not this amendment been passed. So that the regional municipality under this paragraph would be required—not permitted solely—to appoint representatives in the same number and to appoint those representatives from the local municipalities who would otherwise be entitled to participate in the meeting to establish or enlarge a conservation authority.

Since I have not got that all set out in writing, Mr. Chairman, I cannot move it as an amendment at the moment but I would like the Minister to—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think we feel that we would sooner leave the word "may" there. You are speaking about Windsor which at the present time does not happen to be under a conservation authority, but when we think of conservation authorities that reach from Ottawa as far north as Denbigh—some hundreds of miles—to say to those people up there that we say that we "shall" appoint somebody when they are not too concerned whether they have someone on there or not to drive 85 or 100 miles to meetings—this is why we would like it left as "may".

I would think if any of those northern municipalities on that very long watershed wanted a representative there, that the people down in the populated area of the authority would be very happy to have a representative look at the problems that they might have in that area. But, we could create hardship in some cases, especially where there are large conservation authorities and we have several in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Peacock: Surely that is a pretty thin argument, Mr. Chairman, for not insisting on representation from all parts of the regional

government structure, that representatives would have to travel a considerable distance where a large geographical area was covered by a conservation authority. Let us not move into that on the premise that it is going to cause hardship on account of the mileage separating the representatives of the local municipalities from the location at which the meetings under this clause would be set up. If that is the only objection, the only reason the Minister has to offer why the permissive nature of the clause should be maintained here rather than changed to one of straight requirement for representation from all parts of the authority, then we should ask him to stand it down and not proceed with it.

Surely here is a piece of legislation setting out, for the first time, I think in any piece of legislation that has come before this House, a function and responsibility of a regional government which will have general application wherever a conservation authority can be appropriately established or enlarged where an authority already exists. We must ensure that there is participation by all components of the new regional structure.

We must not allow a situation to develop under such a clause where a regional municipal authority will be able to arrogate to itself the kind of discretion and authority which the Minister I think, in his answer a moment ago, suggested it well could take unto itself. If people find it a bit difficult or hazardous on some of those northern roads to make it to a meeting, then those that are able to get to it will simply proceed and do as they wish without respect for the feelings or views of those that have not made it to the meeting.

I think the Minister's answer makes it imperative that we have a much stronger wording in the clause and one that will require the regional municipality to take into account the views of all parts of the regional government district. The only way that can be done is by the instruction, through this clause, to the regional municipality that it invites to the meeting to establish or enlarge a conservation authority—all of those representatives that the separate local municipalities would otherwise have been entitled to and representatives resident in those municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I know that you can appoint members. If you put "shall" in there, you can appoint them, but that does not necessarily mean that you can make these appointees attend meetings. This happens in many cases where people are

appointed by the municipalities. For some reason they do not turn up at any meetings so that they do not add to the authority, or they do not represent the municipality in which they live. Evidently, they are not too interested, so if you run into a municipality where the head people are not too concerned with conservation, I think we should appoint somebody from some place else that will represent them on the watershed. We deal with the watershed, and this happens in so many cases.

In fact, even with our government employees in some areas, we wrote last September asking if someone would serve as a government representative and we have not heard from some of them yet. They do not seem to be too concerned in some areas at this particular time. So we feel it is better to do it this way, where people are appointed, people who are interested and concerned with conservation.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, one point further on this very subject. Now, under your present Act it says that the cost will be "apportioned", or it says, "shall be apportioned to the benefiting municipalities". This is for cost of maintenance or cost of work in that area. So you are asking now, when you are not considering your method of cost, that your cost not be borne by your regional government, the cost will still be borne by the small second tier of government on a regional area.

Consider your Niagara region as an example. Your costs are going to be proportioned down into the smaller, local boroughs and municipalities of the region. Now, your Act specifically says that they shall be apportioned, yet you are asking that, in all likelihood, they would be without representation on the authority. This just is not the way the thing should be resolved. If the people are expected, and can have the cost of their maintenance and the cost of further operation apportioned to them then on an assessment basis, they should be given the absolute right to have representation on the authority. For you to say that the regional government will set who represents the authority, and then your Act says who is going to pay for it, there is a great discrepancy there in the line of thinking in my estimation.

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

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, on this point, I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain

the alternative to the word "may" if you say that you want this to be left with the option that they may appoint representatives to establish a regional conservation authority.

If you do not do that, how do you get one established? You have to have representation. They have to be appointed, to establish an authority. If you do not get someone at the meeting you do not get the authority established. So, if you say now that they may appoint, and they decide that there is no one to appoint, how are they going to establish the authority to get the thing off the ground?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we are having any problems here about establishing authorities. I think I said before, an authority could be a regional government, several townships, or two or three regional governments. Of course, it seems to me that where we have regional government we can have representation—elected representation—throughout the region. They may appoint people who are interested in conservation.

I cannot see where we are going to have any problems at all. In fact, talking to conservation authorities, they are quite satisfied with the bill. They think it is workable. We think it is workable, and I cannot see yet where we would have any problems.

Sections 2 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 89 reported.

BOROUGH OF EAST YORK

House in committee on Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the borough of East York.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill Pr16 reported.

COUNTY OF WELLAND

House in committee on Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill Pr31 reported.

CITY OF WINDSOR

House in committee on Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill Pr33 reported.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

House in committee on Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the University of Windsor.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill Pr35 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill 76, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am interested with respect to developments under this amendment to The Pension Benefits Act, to review with the Minister some of the situations which resulted from the Dufferin retirement plan, upon which, I understand, this bill may well have been based.

There was a meeting with the Ontario pension commissioner, Mr. Bentley, held by Mr. David E. Hastings, a solicitor of Guelph, Ontario, with respect to obtaining the approval of the pension commission to withdraw certain pension contributions from this plan. Apparently a meeting was held, and I would like to quote to the House certain paragraphs from the letter which Mr. Hastings had written originally to the member for Wellington South:

To refresh your memory, The Department of National Revenue has agreed to permit those employees who wish to withdraw their pension contributions from this registered plan, to do so on a once and only election basis.

However, the Ontario Pension Commission has ruled that such withdrawal of

pension contributions may be made only up to December 31, 1964. But from January 1, 1965, all their pension contributions are locked in and they must continue in the plan and continue to make contributions.

We challenge this ruling as The Ontario Pension Benefits Act, 1965, makes no provision for such ruling, either in the Act itself or in the regulations under the Act.

Moreover, Mr. Bentley said that this was the policy set up by the commission and that they had obtained some legal opinion to support it. However, he did say that a bill was being submitted to the Legislature to cover this situation.

Under section 21 of the Act, which is the only applicable section, reference is made to the locking-in of contributions only for an employee who is 45 years of age and who has been in the employ for 10 years, or has been a member of the plan for 10 years and it does not refer to any other employees.

It was on this basis, and under this section, that we had been proceeding up to the time of receiving Mr. Bentley's ruling. As we understand it there is only one member of the Legislature who is a member of the commission and that is, Mr. Kerr, the member for Halton West. Our legal opinion is that the commission does not have the power to refuse to approve this withdrawal from the plan under the Act or its regulations and that this is strictly an autocratic decision without authority. If the power was there, there would be no reason for a bill being put before the Legislature, to validate something that the commission has already been doing.

However, I would be interested if you were able to check into this matter, whatever manner you see fit, to see if you can ascertain how the commission can interpret the Act to rule that pension contributions of those under 45 years of age, who continue in employ are locked in.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested in hearing from the hon. Minister as to the correctness or otherwise of the comments made by Mr. Hastings in his letter. And even more so, I would be interested in hearing from the hon. Treasurer as to the approach which the pension commission has taken apparently to cause this sort of development of decisions for the withdrawal of various funds without apparently having the legislative authority to do so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West. Perhaps the Minister would wait until the end of the comments.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, we in this group support the amendment, because obviously it confirms by statute what ought to have been in the original Act: a prohibition against the withdrawal of employees' contributions where they had not achieved the minimum vesting requirements of the original Act, ten years service or the attainment of 45 years of age.

It is a fairly innocuous amendment, but it closes what might well have become a very serious loophole in the administration of the Act and in the guaranteeing of fully paid up vested pension benefits on behalf of the employees participating in the registered pension plans.

I would suggest to the Treasurer that in bringing in this amendment to cover this particular deficiency in the original Act—and one which quite rightly has to this point been closed by regulation or by by-law of the commission itself—he might well have considered a number of other major changes to the Act itself which, of course, I will not undertake to discuss at this point, knowing how much I would incur your displeasure, Mr. Speaker, in putting myself out of order. I would like to take those matters up with the Treasurer when we come to the vote for the Ontario Pension Commission, when he returns to the House with his estimates. I want to make it clear that we in this group do support the amendment in that it provides that, after January 1, 1965, employees' contributions are not just savings; that they are going to be put to one side, out of their pay envelope and earn some interest; that they are there to be used for the purchase of pensions when they reach the eligible age for retirement under the plans that have been registered with the pension commission.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak? The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on the same point to that raised by the member for Kitchener, we support the bill as it is, but I am concerned to make certain that it is not the intention of the Treasurer to make this retroactive, because there are persons who have operated under the assumption—and unions who have operated under the assumption—that it was possible for an employee to withdraw his contributions prior

to attaining the age of 45 years or the attainment of ten years of service.

I would like to have an assurance from the Minister. While we support the bill I would like to be certain that it is not made retroactive to affect the rights of persons who believed that they did have this right to withdraw until the fulfilment of the two conditions.

Mr. Speaker: Any other member?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hastings brought this to my attention. He was representing the Dufferin retirement plan. I discussed this problem with the Minister personally, and I think this is Mr. Hastings' concern as to whether it is going to be retroactive. I would like his view on that too.

Mr. Speaker: Any other member? The hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can do no better to clarify the matter than to read a paragraph, found on page 3 of the 5th annual report of the Pension Commission of Ontario, that I tabled in this Legislature about a week ago. But in any case I will read it for the record.

During 1968 some employers filed with the commission, amendments which would permit members of the pension plans while remaining in employment, to withdraw their contributions from the plan, in which case, the employee would forego any entitlements that have accrued to him for service up to the date he withdrew from the plan.

The commission is prepared, since the Act is not retroactive in any way, to accept an amendment to a plan permitting withdrawal by the employee of contributions made under the plan for service prior to January 1, 1965, the effective date of the legislation, with corresponding loss of pension benefits for that period of service.

However, the commission cannot accept an amendment permitting the withdrawal of contributions made after the January 1 1965, while the employee remains in the employ of the employer.

Since this amendment contravenes the necessary implication of section 21 of the Act: that employees upon attaining the age of 45 years or the ten years of service will have established their entitlement to benefits for service after the January 1, 1965, as part of the benefits comprised in the deferred life annuity.

Now the reason, of course, for proposing the amendment that is before us for second reading today is simply, that while this was always the intent and the spirit of the legislation—and hon. members of the Legislature, who were in the House at the time the initial bill was dealt with, will recall that it was always the intention and spirit of the legislation that that be so—it turns out, Mr. Speaker, that there is some doubt about that particular section of the Act. The purpose of this amendment is to clarify it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TAX REDUCTION ACT, 1968

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 81, An Act to amend The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I think the members of the House would support, with much more enthusiasm, An Act to amend The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968, that merely said that this Act is hereby repealed. I am just at a loss to understand why at this stage the government is trying to patch up something that it has said in its white paper is no good.

If it was any good why was it announced that it is going to abandon it a year from now. Why prolong the agony? Why spend another \$150 million of the taxpayers' money that is going to serve no useful purpose? It has satisfied no one, it has caused grief, it has set up a new administrative machine which functions inefficiently.

The Minister, in an answer that was tabled to a question of mine a few days ago, admitted that there are some 4,500 complaints, most of which have not yet been processed; hopefully they would be processed within six weeks; hopefully they would be processed before the provisions of The Summary Convictions Act come to bear and stop convictions under the old Act. As you know, from December 31, Mr. Speaker, there can be no further convictions.

Interestingly enough, the Minister, in a note that he sent to me after I had asked him a question of whether or not justices of the peace had been instructed to refuse to accept complaints until they had been approved by the department—I hope the Attorney General is paying a little attention—the Minister said, no, there were no such instruc-

tions. But the chief justice of the peace in Ontario instructed all the people who work under him that that was to be the procedure.

This came as a great shock to me, Mr. Speaker. I just wonder what right the chief justice of the peace has to issue such instructions to the justices of the peace. And what right, that having been done, does The Department of Municipal Affairs have to join in this way of avoiding the law?

Now obviously this Act does not work; obviously the prosecution sections do not work; obviously there is great dissatisfaction. And what does the Minister do? He brings in this namby-pamby, apparently useless, series of small bookkeeping amendments to enact which his Treasurer says they are going to abandon. Just one more \$150 million, just one more year of grief, and we are going to give it up anyway.

Why not be brave, Mr. Speaker? Why not withdraw this Act and bring in a simple repealing Act? Why not take that \$150 million and use it to reduce the tax burden on the people of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker, I can see no point in these amendments. They are a little bit of house-keeping. They are still going to allow the Governor of Michigan—he used to be the Governor of Michigan, I think he has been taken into the United States Cabinet—to maintain his summer residence over here and get a tax benefit from the people of Ontario. I am sure he needs it very desperately. He would not be induced to keep his summer residence here unless he got this tax rebate from all the good citizens of the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The whole Grand Bend crowd.

Mr. Singer: Yes, they are worried about that. I am sure the people who live in government-assisted housing throughout the province of Ontario could make more use of assistance that could be made available out of this \$150 million than the Governor of Michigan or the former Governor of Michigan.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, while there is nothing in this bill that moves us violently to oppose it, as an amendment, we say to the Minister as strongly as we can put this, that they made a serious mistake a year ago by bringing in these amendments which are minor in effect and serve no useful purpose. They are continuing that mistake for another year. They have admitted publicly that it was a mistake, so why not let it go once and for all? Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Minister

through you, be brave and repeal the Act right now.

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

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I find in the bill something of worth, unlike the member for Downsview. That is the sections which finally indicate recognition by this government that tenants, whatever their circumstances, ought to be treated equally, tenants in Ontario Housing Corporation units as well as tenants in privately-owned accommodation. The government found itself in one of the most ridiculous administrative positions that I think it has managed to fall into for some time in endeavouring, under section 8 of the prior bill, to exclude from receiving the rebate as many people as it possibly could who were tenants of its own Ontario Housing Corporation.

Back in December, 1968, during question period, when members were seeking information as to how the provisions of section 8 could be carried out in respect to tenants of Ontario Housing Corporation, the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) explained that tenants of full-recovery projects are paying a rental rate which is substantially less than the rent charged for comparable property in private ownership, and therefore the rebate is not applicable. The Minister said this on December 3, Mr. Speaker, at a time when no regulations had been drawn by either the Minister of Trade and Development, on behalf of the Ontario Housing Corporation, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Through the whole piece, from the time of the announcement that the residential property tax reduction would be made available to the citizens of this province but not to the tenants of the government's own housing, the government insisted that it knew which of its tenants would qualify for the rebate and which would not. Even though the Minister of Trade and Development, in answer to other questions, revealed that surveys were being undertaken to determine how many of Ontario Housing Corporation tenants were paying what could be considered a market rent or a rent which was the equivalent of that paid for similar private accommodation—the only means by which OHC tenants could qualify for the tax rebate.

The answers of the Minister of Trade and Development indicated that this would be a very, very small proportion of Ontario Housing Corporation tenants. In fact, when I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs at a later date about the advertising of the rebate and

the text of the pamphlet which his department had prepared for distribution to virtually every household in the province, the Minister said: "This is a negligible proposition of our population and we did not bother about it in the preparation of this material."

Mr. Speaker, when it finally became apparent that the government could not administer section 8 of the Act, they abandoned it. On January 2, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Trade and Development held a press conference in which they announced that finally, after struggling through this endeavour to establish the regulation based on the survey which, I assume, has not succeeded in establishing comparable market rents or comparable rents in private accommodation to those paid by tenants of Ontario Housing Corporation, with great fanfare they announced their beneficence to these tenants—that finally they would get the rebate.

Then what did we find? We found the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) following through with a claim for over-payment against the very large number of tenants of Ontario Housing Corporation who thought at last they were going to enjoy, along with tenants in private accommodation, the same reduction in shelter costs.

But it was not to be so for that period of time until we had from the Minister of Municipal Affairs an opinion last week or the week before that he did not view the property tax rebate as income, as taxable income. In the light of that, his colleague recently announced that The Department of Social and Family Services would cease their efforts to collect over-payments on account of the rebate being paid to families on social assistance, many of whom are occupants of Ontario Housing Corporation.

So we have, I hope at this point, Mr. Speaker, nailed down the entitlement of all these people, the tenants of the Ontario Housing Corporation, those of them who are on assistance from the family benefits branch or on disability pensions of The Department of Social and Family Services, and those tenants, as well, who are in private accommodation. That leaves us with only one group, which I would like to speak to the Minister about—those senior citizens occupying units in municipal or Ontario Housing Corporation projects where, I believe, an amount of \$25 per unit has been paid to the municipality in lieu of full payment of taxes. I want to ask the Minister if, in this bill, the senior citizens occupying the senior citizen units will be

afforded the same entitlement to the rebate as those occupying family units of the Ontario Housing Corporation or its local authorities where their rents are on a full-recovery basis or on a rent geared to income scale.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They were separately assessed.

Mr. Peacock:—and where the housing corporation pays the equivalent of the full taxes that the city would levy on those properties were they in private hands.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The answer is yes, if they were separately assessed.

Mr. Peacock: If the senior citizens' units are separately assessed, which proportion of the rebate will be paid? The full amount for that particular part of the city, which in Windsor's case is \$65.30, or the \$25 portion which is the amount paid to the municipality in lieu of taxes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These are the ones that are fixed at \$25?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister would make note of that, so that we can conclude this bill.

Mr. Peacock: Fine. That was my last point, Mr. Speaker—to raise that question with him.

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

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill—An Act to amend The Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1968—of course is to correct some of the inequities that existed in the original Act, I would like to speak first to two of these specifically that had to do with tenants of Ontario Housing Corporation, and also tenants of properties held by the Crown in the right of Canada, tenants of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

These people had been paying full rents for their properties. The Crown was making payments equal to property tax to the municipalities, and due to the ambiguities of the original Act some municipalities refunded to CMHC the portions of the property tax relating to these CMHC apartment buildings.

My reading of this amendment does not include legislation to return to these people their rebate for the year 1968. I would hope the Minister would correct me if I am wrong on that. I think this amendment takes care of the legislation necessary to make it legal

for Ontario Housing Corporation to get their rebate back, but I do not think it covers those people who are resident of Crown property in the right of Canada—CMHC—for the year 1968, so if the Minister would comment on that.

Further, the principle relates to the reduction of rebate so that only 50 per cent would be the maximum amount. I think that principle should be enlarged so that no one could collect taxes on a second property.

The Minister will probably say that this is impossible to enforce. Well, OMSIP does not let you collect from another insurance company if they make payments, and I do not think this bill should permit rebates to be collected on more than one residence in the province of Ontario.

I would welcome the Minister's comments on the first part of my presentation.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this bill before the Minister? The hon. Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, let me answer just a couple of the questions which have been put to me first.

The people who were referred to by the member for Windsor West will receive the full reduction. We are ascertaining the actual amount for Windsor and we will get that for you. I do not have it here just at the moment.

If the hon. member for Waterloo North refers to subsection 2 of section 6 of the bill he will find that this looks after it in that it is deemed to come into effect on June 13, 1968, which is the date the original bill was passed. I think that looks after his problem.

I know that the hon. member for Downsview would want to be brought up to date on his query of several weeks ago.

Mr. Singer: Yes, sir, if the information is changed, give us the latest.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, you would want the up-to-date information. I think when we reported to you the last time—which was perhaps at the end of February—we had received complaints from some 4,500 people. That has now grown into 4,700 in the last three weeks. Complaints processed and the files closed amount to 2,900, so there is a balance in process of 1,800.

We would hope that these would be finalized so far as we are concerned by the end of the month, by the end of April.

With respect to those 1,800 which are hanging fire, all landlords have been contacted at least once and a letter has gone to the tenants asking whether they have received their entitlement, and are they prepared to swear out an information. So there are only 1,800 which we are dealing with at the present time.

We imagine that a good proportion of these will be settled, or have perhaps been settled already, and we are not aware of it. So I would draw to the member's attention that we have received some 4,700 complaints which I think represent something in the neighbourhood of one-tenth of one per cent, which is not very substantial.

Mr. Singer: It is substantial to the people who have to complain.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is correct, but I think we have to try to keep into perspective—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That is closer to one per cent than one-tenth of one per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The one-tenth of one per cent refers to the people. I am sorry, I have misled the member. If he asked me for an estimate of what number will finally end up in court, our estimate now would be in the neighbourhood of about 500, which would be one-tenth of one per cent of all the tenanted properties.

Mr. Singer: Of the 4,700 that is one per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right. I am sorry I meant 500—4,700 of which perhaps 500 may end up in court.

I think the reasons for these amendments have been explained and I do not propose to deal with the principle of last year's bill which the hon. member for Downsview started to deal with. The purpose of continuing the bill is the same as it was last year and that is—

Mr. Singer: What was the purpose of abandoning it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no intention, if the hon. member will bear with me. The purpose of last year's legislation was to reduce the property taxes and this is precisely what was done. I think I gave members of the House a sampling of municipalities across the province last year. Houses in many municipalities are assessed at about \$4,000—

that is the average assessment—but taking the—

Mr. Sargent: The government overtaxed and they are giving them their own money back.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But taking the average assessment in all these municipalities, members will find that with one or two exceptions on the average house the net taxes were actually reduced in 1958. This was the purpose of the bill—to reduce the burden of property taxation, and to do it in a way which got at the regressivity of the tax system. This was done, and there is no intention of discarding this particular method of reducing that regressivity, or of discarding this method of reducing property taxes until a better way is available for us to do it. Such a way was not available last year.

I think on my remarks on second reading I indicated last year that if there had been a vehicle of personal income tax available to us then—we had some control over the forms—we could do many things as the Treasurer has pointed out several times since.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will permit a question?

Does the statement he just made imply that he looked into the possibility of having this done by the federal collection agency on the basis of the federal-provincial tax collection agreement, and they said it could not be done?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They said they were not prepared to do it. In any kind of deductions, as I understand it, they want a considerable amount of warning; of leave time to prepare for them and—

Mr. Nixon: They could have done it this year if the government had asked them to do it last year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This was not available to us last year and I doubt whether it would have been available this year.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I disagree with that. It would be available this year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But through our own vehicle we will be able to do this.

Mr. Singer: Well, what warning is enough warning?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the member would have to ask the people who—

Mr. Singer: Surely the Minister asked them?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —who make the agreements, that specific question. I have taken it that it would not be possible through the federal legislation.

Mr. Nixon: But the government did not ask that specific question—how much warning they needed so that they could have done it this year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If I asked it, I have not got it available for the member now.

Mr. Singer: It is rather vital, so the Minister does not know.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this has reduced the burden of real estate taxes which it was set out to do. I think the amendments this year clarify certain matters and I just cannot help but feel, Mr. Speaker, this year, as I did last year, that the crabbing which comes from opposite is generated by the fact that we kept an election promise, as we always do.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a point of clarification on my question? The Minister answered my question by referring to subsection 2 or clause 2, stating that this would come into effect.

Now, that section does not cover Crown property in the right of Canada. Crown property in right of Canada is covered under the next section which did not come into effect until January 1, 1969. So in effect then, people of CMHC housing of last year will not receive their rebate. This was my point and I do not think you answered me.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will check that.

Mr. Good: Would he please?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister answer a question for me?

Mr. Speaker: If it is a point of clarification arising out of the Minister's statement.

Mr. Sargent: Yes it is.

Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the method of operation this year will be the same as last year insofar as the distribution of the moneys?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise or clarify me on this point. In view of the costly experiment that is—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order now. He asked a question, he received an answer. He is now making a statement.

Mr. Sargent: I did not gain an answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Well, what are we here for, just to hear you give "out of order" rulings and—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order. He will take his seat. If he wishes to rise to a point of order later he may do so.

Mr. Sargent: I rise on a point of order now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will resume his seat while Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

Mr. Sargent: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out how he is going to do it this year.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will realize that this is a debate on the principles and not on how things are to be done. The hon. member—

Mr. Sargent: Right. He said he would answer a question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will have the opportunity to find it out when this is dealt with in committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO HERITAGE FOUNDATION ACT, 1967

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information) moves second reading of Bill 91, An Act to amend The Ontario Heritage Foundation Act, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a question in regard to this bill.

As I understand it there were some \$500,000, I believe, initially deposited or credited to the Ontario Heritage Foundation. Is this true? And \$50,000 of that was put in the current account for use during last year. The intent is that we will operate off the interest on the \$450,000. Now, I want to ask the Minister in all fairness, how much does

he expect he will be able to purchase in the way of recreational land or land of scenic interest or objects of scenic interest, with the interest on \$450,000? It seems to me, as I look at it, that nothing of any consequence could possibly be purchased with the amount of money that you will get in interest on a yearly basis. I would like the Minister to clarify that for me, if he would.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other comments by members with respect to this? The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question on this particular bill.

Does this give the Minister any opportunity to take steps which will allow the provincial government to be responsible for the preservation of historical sites, of monuments and particularly, of buildings? It seems to me that these are being very quickly destroyed across the province and I understand that at the present time it is up to the municipality to put through a bylaw in order to maintain or preserve a building in that particular area.

This is of particular importance to my area where I have seen a number of buildings, 75 and 100 years old, disappear in the last two or three years. I think this bill is a most important piece of legislation if we can indeed somehow, preserve the very few pieces of architecture of a pre-Confederation period that are left in this province. I think this would be one of the most important steps that the Minister could take to preserve the history of this jurisdiction.

But I am wondering to what extent there is some kind of power to stop the destruction of buildings of historical interest, particularly when these buildings become financially significant. And, of course, we are going through a period now where really, no building which was built 75 or 100 years ago is really in a presentable state for present use, as the Minister well knows. The plumbing is gone and all the insides of the building have been destroyed; the company or the individual who owns the building wants to unload it, and naturally he wants to get his price. In any case, he has no interest in history whatsoever. I am just wondering to what extent this bill will have the teeth to actually take part in the preservation of the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has the floor if no member wishes to speak.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question: it is not the intention of the foundation to acquire land for recreational use. I think, when I answered a question the other day in the House from the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), I indicated that the amendment that is put forward in this bill is to make it clear that the foundation can accept gifts which might be in this category. I think I said at that time, that any land being acquired for recreational purposes would be presumably acquired by The Department of Public Works or The Department of Lands and Forests who operate the parks system in the province. So briefly, I would simply answer the hon. member that the \$450,000 of capital funds or the interest from it, would not—no matter what the amount would be—be used by the foundation to acquire lands for recreational use. The purpose of this is to make it clear to those who may be donating land and buildings to the province—say, in the case, for instance, of the Jalna House, to which is added some five acres of land that the land not required for setting the building on, can be accepted by the foundation. I hope that answers the hon. member's question.

Mr. Deans: Could I just ask a question for clarification?

In the event that someone wanted the Ontario Heritage Foundation to take over a piece of land, to purchase it in other words, what would they have to do? You would not do the purchasing. Would you look the land over, determine whether or not it was suitable and then recommend to The Department of Lands and Forests or some other department that they ought to purchase it? Would this be the procedure? I am trying to find out how you would go about getting a piece under the jurisdiction of Ontario Heritage Foundation, that was not offered free and gratis.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If someone approached the foundation, Mr. Speaker, with the enquiry as to whether the foundation would purchase land of only recreational or—

Mr. Deans: Historical and recreational!

Hon. Mr. Auld: If it were recreational the foundation would, I think, say, "We are not interested." If it is of an historical nature then the foundation might be interested. If it was a question of whether it were entirely recreational or partly recreational and partly historical, if it was a question in the prospective donor's mind, that it might be

considered recreational, he would still with this amendment, be able to make the gift to the foundation.

Is there any statutory provision in the province to prevent the destruction of historical buildings? Presently there is none. There was an attempt, I believe, by the city of Kingston some years ago, by bylaw under The Planning Act to provide waiting periods. This was found to be outside the provisions of The Planning Act. The foundation are discussing with the Municipal Affairs people at the present time, the possibility of some amendment to The Municipal Act at least to provide a waiting period so that the people who might be interested in preserving such a building would have an opportunity to act. But the correct answer to the hon. member's question is that at the present time there is no statutory authority to prevent the destruction of buildings.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask a question, Mr. Speaker, to clarify what the Minister has just said. Is there any way by which this Act could be beholden upon people who own buildings from 75 to 100 years old, simply to inform this foundation, so that you might say, there would be an almost automatic hold put on just by the fact that a period had to elapse whereby the foundation was informed. I say this with some passion, because, just in the last few weeks, one of the finest buildings in eastern Ontario was destroyed, almost overnight; and we have lost, once again, another monument to the—

Mr. Nixon: What was that?

Mr. Pitman: It was a building in Peterborough, which was actually in the hands of a credit union, and this building on Brock Street was regarded as really a fine piece of architecture.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has been given the floor to ask a question of clarification. He is now expanding into a statement in respect to matters which I do not think are proper at this time.

Mr. Pitman: Although I must say that the leader of the Opposition was the reason for my digression, I apologize. May I just simply ask the question, is there any way by which this foundation could act in the kind of an operation to receive information, even though it had no actual legal right either to make any suggestions or advice, or to take action to put any legal hold on that structure?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the foundation already has done this on a number of occasions. I would hope, as the years go by and the work of the foundation becomes better known around the province, that this will happen more often. I have looked in my file today; I thought that I had with me a letter in connection with a home in Perth, the owner of which is concerned about its eventual demise, and who is proposing to give it to the foundation on her passing, so that she would have life tenancy. And this is the case in several other proposals and submissions that have been made to the foundation. It is our hope that this will happen more often.

Mr. Sargent: Could the Minister—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has not taken part in this debate and he is not entitled to ask a question now. As a matter of fact, there should be no questions after the Minister's reply to the others or we might just as well be in the committee of the whole House or standing committee. From now on, therefore, the Minister's statement—unless I am otherwise directed by the House—when the Minister has made his closing statement, that will be the end of the debate on the second reading of bills. That was the procedure that we were following; it worked very well except that there were some reasonably good questions asked by members who had participated in the debate earlier and I thought they were entitled to have clarification.

Mr. Sargent: This was going to be a good one, too.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure, coming from the hon. member. But as he had not participated in the debate he could not ask for clarification of any questions he had asked. If the hon. member had wished to get in on this procedure, he should have engaged in the original debate. Then he would have been in the same position as the other hon. members.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PARKS COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moves second reading of Bill 99, An Act to amend The St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOMES FOR SPECIAL CARE ACT, 1964

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): moves second reading of Bill 93, An Act to amend The Homes for Special Care Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PHARMACY ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 94, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE NURSING HOMES ACT, 1966

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 95, An Act to amend The Nursing Homes Act, 1966.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question with regard to the first section of this bill, the principle.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We are getting into the same situation as last time. I would be the last one to stand in the way of questions or debate of any sort, but you know what happens every time that you permit this to proceed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader is quite correct, and it is a fact that first of all, clause-by-clause consideration of the bill is not appropriate at this stage. Secondly, the hon. member is presumably not directing himself to a question of principle. Now, if the hon. member has a matter of principle arising out of that section, he should deal with it as such and not as a clause-by-clause consideration. The hon. member for Wentworth now has the floor to engage in this debate on principle only.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this particular bill there appears to be at least two principles in the three sections, and I want to direct myself to the principle of the first section. The principle of this section says that the Minister can order the relocation of residents of nursing homes that are presently unlicensed. What I want to suggest to the Minister is that until such time as he goes ahead with a programme of providing suitable nursing home accommodation in this province, we will not have any place to put these people. What I ask the Minister, in

this particular instance, is whether or not this is an indication that the Minister is now prepared to initiate a clear-cut, aggressive programme of building nursing homes in order to facilitate those people who, out of necessity, will be moved from the nursing homes that are presently unlicensed.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this bill?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few brief comments on Bill 95. The department is presently engaged in upgrading the standards of nursing homes throughout the Province of Ontario, as set out under The Nursing Homes Act of 1966. As I understand it, the department is going to pursue this policy and will pursue it until all nursing homes in the province meet the standards as set out under that Act, as I mentioned before. I believe the nursing homes in the province at the moment are given a period of grace in which to do this. They are notified of the areas where they have to make changes in order to come up to the standards set out in The Nursing Homes Act. Then they have to indicate whether they are, in fact, willing and prepared to make that type of expenditure. If they are not willing and prepared to make it, their licence is forfeited and they give up all right to take in people under a nursing home situation.

The amendment, as I understand it, is—and I would like clarification on this, Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly sure what is meant here—means that anyone who has previously been in a nursing home—will not be allowed to stay in that nursing home if the home happens to be unlicensed. Or does it simply mean that anyone who does stay in such a nursing home, that happens to be unlicensed, is not eligible for any government assistance of any type? I would like clarification on that point.

The other point that I would like to raise with the Minister is, it says that the Minister shall assist in finding appropriate alternative accommodation. I am wondering in what way? Is this to be financial assistance, or is this to be by way of pointing out to the patient that there are certain vacancies in other nursing homes which happen to be licensed under the Act? I would like to have clarification on those points, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if I might point out the fact that the explanatory notes in this bill do not apply as they are supposed. It points out, in

explanatory note section 2, a general penalty is provided when, in actual fact, this is related to section 1, clause 11(a). It points out that section 3, the proposed amendment authorizes regulations to be made, when in actual fact this appears to apply to section 2. I wonder if this bill is properly drawn up?

Mr. Speaker: I would suppose the hon. Minister might wish to comment on that when he replies to the other questions which have been asked.

Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this before the Minister? The hon. Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wentworth points up the fact that in his view there are not enough nursing homes. I am pleased to advise him that there is a tremendously great upsurge of interest in the provision of high-quality nursing homes, homes that are being provided specifically for this purpose—architecturally provided with a view to serving the function of nursing homes. This is a very interesting programme that is going on in the province. We have already had three very large groups of people from outside the province, representative of substantial financial resources, and all expressed most active interest in this. I do not think we need to worry now so much about the lack of good accommodation.

But it would be unfair to leave the impression that there is a likelihood of many of the homes that are now in operation losing their licence because they are not seeking to come up to standards. There has been a very great response to the programme that we originated two years ago. Some of the homes are just so situated and so constructed that they cannot come up to the standard necessary. In those cases many of these people are willing to relinquish or are acceptive of the fact that they cannot get a nursing home licence, but will look after people who do not need the standard of accommodation, or standard of care, or the standard of protection necessary in the case of the nursing home patient.

I am sure the hon. members would realize that the nursing home patient, not able to move usually of their own volition, we have to think of a higher standard of safety than we would in the case of people more able to move about on their own.

Mr. Gaunt: Would the alternative be the residential home?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They can be a residential home and, of course, they are outside of the scope of The Nursing Homes Act.

11(a); I would say, with respect, sir, that I am quite confident the bill is well drawn. It was drawn by good lawyers. Far be it from me to criticize a sister profession, but I am sure the legislative counsel—

Mr. Nixon: The Minister should get a good lawyer!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have them, we have a lot of them. But this is a penalty clause, and I have to say, as members will remember when the bill came in, I had quite a discussion with one hon. member of the Opposition who pointed out to me that we had not provided a general penalty clause. I was assured then that we did not need it. Now I realize we do need it and here it is. But this has not strict reference to the first clause to which the hon. member referred it.

In the case of the argument brought up, or the points brought up by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, this is, of course, part of our programme of upgrading homes. Some of the homes cannot possibly achieve licences, they cannot meet the standards. Either by their own desire, or they refuse to accept the standards and, therefore, reject licensing. Or we have at some time to enforce the law and at some point will say: "Now, we have given you every opportunity and long enough time, you are not making progress, so you cannot be given a licence."

We have to do this in the case of a few homes, but relatively few. It is part of our programme in upgrading since the provincial licensing came in and this was, of course, one of the important reasons for the licensing programme coming in. As I have already pointed out, those homes that cannot achieve the standards can become boarding homes or residential-care facilities.

Now, if one had been in a home that either loses its licence or accepts the fact that it cannot reach the standards, and that person insists on remaining there, well, of course, we cannot bodily remove him. But there is no responsibility under the law any longer. We point out quite clearly that this is not a licensed boarding home, and the operator cannot hold himself or herself out as a licensed nursing home operator.

If the patients are eligible for assistance in any measure, or through any department of government then, of course, they cannot stay there and we would have to move them or withdraw the support.

What does it mean: "The Minister shall assist"? If they are eligible for financial assistance, of course, this is automatic, but it actually means that we shall point out to them where other accommodation is necessary, and we shall do all in our power to assist them in being removed to that accommodation, unless they themselves decree otherwise.

Mr. Gaunt: On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Having advised the House that we would return to the proper way of dealing with these matters, and that once the Minister had spoken the debate would be ended, I will rule the hon. member out of order. I suggest he might get his answer in committee or otherwise.

Mr. Deans: Might I ask you, sir, for a ruling on whether or not the explanatory notes apply?

Mr. Speaker: I beg your pardon, I should have advised the hon. member that the Clerk, under whose jurisdiction these matters of printing come, advises me that there is an error in the numbering of the explanatory notes. But since they do not form part of the bill, they do not affect the bill itself. I beg the hon. member's pardon, the Clerk did give me that information and I neglected to pass it along.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PESTICIDES ACT, 1957

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 96, An Act to amend The Pesticides Act, 1957.

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

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this bill briefly. It appears to be relatively inconsequential, just dealing with some strengthening of the Act in terms of coping with termites, a problem that is of great magnitude in some parts of the Metropolitan area.

Section 2 is the one that I would like to address by remarks to at the moment. It is indicated that no member of the board, or officer of the board, is personally liable for anything done by him in good faith, purportedly done under the authority of this Act or its regulations.

Now, this raises the whole question as to exactly what this government is doing. I have raised in the last couple of weeks with the Minister, in questions before the orders of the day, what is happening to the government advisory committee on pesticides. In the Minister's reply it was quite clear that a number of people had resigned from the committee partly because of change of position, partly because of that euphemism "bad health" and partly—most important of all—because the chairman was in conflict with the department.

I think the public is entitled to know why. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it raises the whole purpose of this committee; what its public responsibilities are and to what extent it needs the protection of immunity in this way. I am not suggesting they should not be granted this immunity if there is any danger, but the Minister has not explained it.

I happened to have the privilege a week or two ago of attending a meeting of the conservation council of the province of Ontario, and I listened to Dr. D. A. Chant of the department of zoology at the University of Toronto make some rather scathing remarks with regard to the—I am going to use this term and indicate its source in a moment—the reckless irresponsibility of government in terms of authorizing the use of pesticides.

This would apply, in part, at the federal level where it comes under the food and drug division for authorization of the marketing of a new product, and in part at the provincial level in terms of the licensing of the use of these pesticides.

His contention as an expert in the field is that there is at best most cursory and fragmented kinds of research work done on the basis of which these rather fateful decisions are made. We really have no idea as to what the ultimate effect is going to be on plant life or animal life or, indeed, human life.

Today issue of the *Globe and Mail* carries in the last column of the letters to the editor, a letter from a gentleman in Lockeport, Nova Scotia, in vigorous protest at the distribution in Nova Scotia of a publication which emerges in the province of Ontario on vegetable production recommendations.

He lists two or three of the pesticides for which instructions as to their use are contained in this official publication of the province of Ontario. He points out, to my mind rather conclusively, that the conclusions reached are that it is rather dangerous for poultry or for animals and, therefore, he asks

a rather pertinent question: "Why is it being authorized for use on foods that are going to get into the supermarkets of the nation and be consumed by humans?"

He concludes:

I suggest to your readers that both the government and the chemical manufacturing industry have adopted an attitude of reckless irresponsibility in connection with the use of agricultural pesticides.

My question to the Minister in speaking to the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is what exactly are the responsibilities of this committee, that they require this degree of immunity set forth in section 2? What exactly is the jurisdiction within which this committee operates? How valid are the accusations or the comments of experts like Doctor Chant, this citizen of Lockeport, Nova Scotia, who is obviously somewhat familiar with pesticides? How valid are the contentions that governments, both provincial and federal, are acting with reckless irresponsibility?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to the bill before the hon. Minister replies?

The hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from York South has raised some very interesting points which, important though they are, I really do not believe belong within the principle of this bill. I think they are matters which are very worthy of further discussion and I sincerely hope and believe that there will be adequate opportunity to discuss them at length. However, the responsibility of the board, its main responsibility, as laid out in the Act, is to examine applicants for licences and recommend the issuance, the refusal or the revocation of those. I am sure my hon. friend would realize, sir, that there would be occasions when the board could be possibly in a difficult situation and might be subject to suit, justifiable or otherwise. It is really for this reason that it is believed, that they themselves believe, that they need protection, which I think is granted under many of the Acts of similar nature. This is really the reason for it. This is the main function as I answered the hon. member when he put the question a little while ago. Other things may be referred to them, but so far, we have not found it necessary to refer those things.

The staff of the department are well skilled in this field. There is no question in my mind that the opinions and experiences

of a man like Professor Chant cannot possibly be brushed lightly aside. He is a man of sound scientific background and high reputation in the scientific world. Whether we have had occasion to use the services of Professor Chant or not, I really could not tell the hon. member, but I would point out, sir, that I certainly hope there will be very adequate opportunity for us to discuss this at some length at another time.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 97, An Act respecting The Department of Health.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, this bill gives the Minister pretty wide powers insofar as direction of funds under clause 6 is concerned and I think my remarks, very briefly—watching the clock—are, in effect, that we have been aware across this province, across Canada in fact, of the growing lack of physical fitness of our people here. I think it would come under The Department of Health that we have a growing awareness of the need for moneys controlled by the Minister for a physical fitness programme for Ontario citizens insofar as the youth of our nation is concerned. We have been watching the performance of Canadians, Mr. Speaker, in the various olympias, olympics, the Pan-Am games, and more recently, we are ashamed of the performance of Canadian hockey teams in world hockey tournaments with the Russians. Almost any nation knocking us off at will. I think somewhere along the line there is a need for an awareness on the part of this government to launch a physical fitness programme which can be available under clause 6.

An hon. member: Adjourn the debate.

Mr. Peacock: Let them win another game.

Mr. Sargent: I do not want to adjourn. This is very important.

Mr. Speaker: I must point out to the hon. member that we have reached the hour for the private members' discussion.

Mr. Sargent moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 25, by Mr. Ferrier:

RESOLUTION: That this House strongly asserts that corporations exploiting mineral resources of this province should process them to the maximum degree possible in Ontario, and that particularly in the case of Texas Gulf Sulphur, smelting facilities should be established in the Porcupine community to provide the vital economic lift needed to compensate for the gradual phasing out of the gold mining industry.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 25, standing in my name. Mr. Speaker, the people of northern Ontario are becoming increasingly distressed and angered at the continuing exploitation of the north for the benefit of others.

For years we have watched the ore trains carrying away the ores and concentrates of the north to be processed in the south, in the United States or some other foreign country. Our sweat and labour have been used to provide jobs, wealth and a full range of municipal services for others while we struggle valiantly to keep from falling behind.

We resent bitterly, the fact that our part of the province has not kept pace with the expansion and growth of most of the other areas of the province. We believe that the time is long overdue for this Tory Ontario government to start to do something about development of the north for the benefit of northerners, rather than pay lip service to this concept, as is presently the case.

It is about time that this government ceased to be fully beholden to the mining corporations and began to think of the citizens of the north rather than the best way to protect maximum profit for the mining empires, most of which are American owned.

I contend that the decisions affecting any part of this province must be made by the elected representatives of the people and not in some board room in New York or some other part of the United States. If representative democracy is to have any content we must be *maîtres-chez-nous*. Because successive governments at Ottawa and here, at Queen's Park, have encouraged a "hands-off, come and do what you wish" attitude with American companies that operate in Canada and Ontario, it is no wonder that we no longer own or control large segments of our economy.

American policies largely control American

subsidiaries in their business and trade practices here, and we are becoming less and less *maîtres-chez-nous*. Decisions that have wide ranging implications for an entire region of the province have been made heretofore without much participation or opposition of the governments of the day. Just take a look at the second natural gas pipeline circumstance of two years ago and you will know what I mean.

At this moment, the entire future and development of northeastern Ontario hinges on the location of the smelter for Texas Gulf ores. I contend that this government, in their intensive negotiations with Texas Gulf Sulphur, must unequivocally, take the stand that one smelter, preferably the zinc smelter, must be built in the Porcupine. The government has a responsibility to, and for, the people and must say to this American company—whose stock value has more than tripled since the discovery of the Kidd Creek ore body northeast of Timmins—"The greatest profit for your American stockholders is not the overriding factor in the location of your smelter. You are mining ore that belongs to the people of Ontario and you are mining this ore in Ontario, in northeastern Ontario, and the needs of that section of the province, along with the needs of the people as a whole, dictate that you must build there."

So, the question of provincial autonomy, in the face of foreign-owned and operated corporations, is one of the issues that is at stake in the Texas Gulf smelter issue.

Last summer members of the Economic Council of Ontario toured the province. In due course they paid a visit to the Porcupine. What do you think they were shown? Of course, the Texas Gulf mine site and concentrator. From this they probably concluded that everything was going strong in our area. It is a strange thing, Mr. Speaker, that when outside dignitaries and officials tour an area, they are only shown the best things of that area, so that they may come to the erroneous conclusion that everything is rosy there.

This is the impression the government tried to foster in our tour of northwestern Ontario last fall in showing us the good parts but isolating us from the realities and problems that confront people and which the government has done little to remedy. For instance, one would have thought that we would have been shown at least one Indian reserve and had a chance to speak to the Indians to find out from them how they felt, what they wanted and what they thought we should do.

But, no, we did not have such a trip included in our itinerary.

So it was with the Economic Council of Ontario in their visit to our community. A few months before their visit, the Hollinger gold mine ceased operations, as well as the Preston East Dome. As an aside, I may say that at its peak the Hollinger had employed over 2,000 men, and latterly between 600 and 800 employees. The Preston East Dome employed about 130. Now, why was not the economic council taken to one of these mines or to one of the other four gold mines that have closed in the last four years, the Broulan Reef or the Delnite or Paymaster or Kenilworth mines? They would not see a booming economy or a particularly envious future from visits to these mines.

The closing of gold mines because of a depletion of ore or because the grade of the ore is so poor that it is uneconomical to mine it at the present fixed price of gold, has meant a great deal of uncertainty and anxiety for the residents of my riding. Many of our able-bodied men for the last few years have been forced to move away from the Porcupine, not because they wanted to leave our area—by choice they enjoy the north and the special opportunities of outdoor life it affords and the other amenities of northern life—but because they were forced to look elsewhere for gainful employment. This was why they had to move. Others hesitated, hoping for a smelter announcement. But because of the inordinate delay in its coming they have reluctantly moved away so we have lost many good citizens of our area.

Unemployment has remained high in our area because of a lack of job opportunities. The Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) bemoans the lack of skilled miners in the province but I can assure him through you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case in Timmins. Moreover, the number of people on welfare in our district is extremely high and is a subject of concern for community officials. In fact, the costs of welfare for the Cochrane district welfare board have risen to the point where they bear no relationship to the projection originally made by provincial representatives; so that the various municipalities are considering dissolving the welfare board on a district basis. The economy of no area is booming when it has high unemployment and a high incidence of welfare.

Because of the uncertainty that exists in the Porcupine, businessmen hesitate to make needed alterations or expansions to their businesses, as the risk is too great. While some businesses are doing well, a number of small

businesses have had to close, and others are just holding their own. People who own property or businesses are watching for the announcement of the smelter location with a good deal of concern because if the smelter is built in the Porcupine, the assessed value of their properties will remain constant or increase, whereas if the smelter is not built in the Porcupine, the assessment is bound to drop drastically.

Our community has not experienced a vast new building of homes in the suburbs as many of those in the south have. We do not have any high-rise or medium-rise apartment buildings in Timmins; we have mighty few new homes in comparison with others. In addition, local municipal councils which have been hamstrung for years because of very inadequate mining revenue payments, in lieu of direct taxation of mines, are faced with the demands for greater services, adequate paved streets, additional facilities and so on. Yet they are reluctant to commit themselves to any long-term high-price projects because, if the smelter is not located in the Porcupine, the assessment and population are both likely to dwindle and they do not want to be left with a very, very high debenture debt. So, because of the tax policy of this government, and the delay in the Texas Gulf smelter announcement, the councils are holding back in their long-term, but required projects.

There is another argument associated with the existing economic condition of our area that has a certain compulsion, I believe, on Texas Gulf to build at least one smelter in the Timmins area, and that is that Texas Gulf has been fortunate to find their ore body and develop their mining operations nearby an existing and developed community. If Texas Gulf has found this ore body out in the middle of nowhere and had started to develop it from scratch they would have had to spend a great deal of money to provide homes for their employees as well as to develop the required services, but they are spared these expenses.

So that it is clear to me that they have a moral obligation to the communities in which their employees live and work. It was the gold miners and those who serviced them who pioneered the Porcupine mining camp and who, over the years, sacrificed and struggled to provide good communities with the best services and facilities—educational, hospital and such—that they could afford, to meet their needs and those of their children. Surely their efforts must not go for naught. Surely Texas Gulf has an extra-special obligation to the communities of the Porcupine camp. This is another reason why Texas Gulf and this

government must give preference to our area as far as the smelter location is concerned.

By and large, northern Ontario is dependent on three basic industries for its livelihood and survival—mining, forestry and tourism. We realize that our future is tied to these industries, even though we hope to attract other secondary industries into our region. But even these, no doubt, will bear some relationship to one of the three basic industries. If we are to stabilize our economic base, and make it possible to attract secondary industry, we need in northeastern Ontario a processing plant such as a smelter and refinery for the Texas Gulf ore, and preferably a zinc smelter. This smelter not only will provide decent wage levels for a greater number of people during the construction stage, and when the smelter is in operation, but it will make it possible and sensible for secondary manufacturing to locate near our area, close to the supply of the finished raw material. This could lead to a huge industrial complex in the northeast, so that we can again experience, prosperity, expansion and growth in a fashion not yet envisaged.

Our present businesses engaged in services and such, will be strengthened and can go ahead with plans for expansion and diversification. There will be greater educational opportunity for our children and the medical services can be more widely developed. Our young people will not be so prone to move away and not return, as they now do, since there will be sufficient opportunities and challenges to keep them in the north. This will also mean that the badly needed leadership the north requires will be found in increasing numbers. Our unemployment problem will be greatly reduced as well as the number of welfare recipients.

This may sound like wishful thinking and dreaming, Mr. Speaker, but I submit this dream can become reality if Texas Gulf, on their own volition, or by government direction, build at least one of their smelters in the Porcupine area.

There cannot be much content to all this government's talk of regional development if, when presented with such a splendid opportunity to develop northeastern Ontario by means of a smelter in the Timmins area, this is not seized upon and put into concrete form. I therefore challenge this government to take whatever action is necessary, legislative or otherwise, to ensure that a least one smelter is built in our area.

Some people are somewhat critical of this position that I and a great many other mem-

bers of my riding, are taking. They say that you must not speak too strongly to Texas Gulf Sulphur because it might offend them and they might back off. My reply, Mr. Speaker, is that we shall never get anywhere by bowing and scraping. We must inform this and every other American firm that operates in this province that they do so on our terms and under our rules, and not with a free hand to do as they see fit. They have a responsibility to the province and the local areas and they must be prepared to accept it. We must remember that the ore body that Texas Gulf has is at least a \$2 billion ore body and the profits realizable through the mining and processing of this ore are enormous.

This company, with such wealth in their possession, can and should be directed by this government if they had sufficient backbone. The time has come for us to be *maitres chez nous* in this province. We must process as much of our minerals in this province and generate the wealth that can be ours rather than let it go to somebody else. We must stop the rape of the north because we are not enjoying the ordeal one bit.

In conclusion, I wish to review the government's handling of the issue as I see it. When the smelter issue began to come alive we were told that the government had appointed a Cabinet committee consisting, I believe, of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the then Ministers of Mines and Municipal Affairs.

In Timmins, it became obvious as time went on that this was another one of those committees that did nothing but was there for publicity purposes only. We were not told what stand the government was taking as to the location of the Texas Gulf smelters, whether they would take action to force it in the Porcupine area or not. It seems as though the government was dangling this carrot of a possible smelter before us, month after month.

Everyone expected that a couple of days before the election, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs would announce that a smelter was to be built. You can imagine the consternation, Mr. Speaker, when the *Saturday Globe and Mail*, prior to the election reported an aside of the Premier's in Kirkland Lake that it was quite possible the smelter would be built somewhere down there rather than in Timmins. It was a sight to behold as the former member for Cochrane South had to apologetically try to explain away the statements of the Premier which,

he claimed, were misunderstood. One wonders, with the Premier for a friend, if he needed any enemies.

Last July in his estimates, the Minister of Mines came out with the stand that the copper smelter should go to Timmins, while the zinc smelter could go anywhere in Ontario. This was a break-through at the time and we lauded it, but on further study it is seen that the amount of copper in the ore may not warrant a copper smelter and the necessity of the zinc smelter has become the main area of concern. Therefore, our battle is primarily for the zinc smelter now, although we shall rest content with one guaranteed smelter.

We were informed that Texas Gulf would make their feasibility studies available to the government in early January, 1969, and then they had to postpone it for a few months, a further delay to add insult to injury. We know that the zinc smelter feasibility study is completed and negotiations are going on as to its location. I therefore say to this government: Stop dangling the carrot before the people of my riding; give it to us, and tell Texas Gulf to build at least one smelter in the Porcupine and enact legislation if necessary to make them do so.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, in my mind, it is unfortunate that the NDP called this resolution for debate today, because the indications are pretty clear that the government, through the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), is in a rather delicate stage of negotiation right now with Texas Gulf Sulphur, in respect of its operations in the Timmins area in Ontario.

Perhaps some history is in order, Mr. Speaker. You will remember that in 1965 the Kidd Creek mine of Ecstall Mining Ltd., which is a subsidiary of Texas Gulf Sulphur, came into production and now produces zinc ore, copper ore, silver ores and lead ores. The copper and the silver are processed in Canada already.

The lead ore is an extremely complicated one and I am told, does not warrant, because of the metallurgy or because of the volume of ore, the building of a smelter. There is not enough lead ore produced elsewhere in Ontario to justify a lead smelter.

The announced policy of the government is to encourage processing in Canada. This has been repeated many times by the Minister of Mines and has been reiterated just lately in this House by both the hon. Treas-

urer (Mr. MacNaughton) and last week by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts).

Last year, the Minister of Mines outlined the very great pressures he had brought to bear on Texas Gulf to begin a smelter or even more than one. He stated, if my memory is correct, that the company had called for feasibility studies for both a zinc smelter and a copper smelter, and that these studies would be completed by January 1, 1969.

Then in November in the House, the hon. Minister indicated that both reports had been delayed, but said that he would be making important announcements before the House adjourned at the end of this session. Surely the Minister's word should be counted upon and accepted by this House without the need for a further debate such as this.

Then, just last week, the hon. Prime Minister indicated that the Minister of Mines was right in the middle of negotiations with the company, and the Minister himself stated that the company had received the feasibility study in regard to the zinc smelter.

Obviously the Minister's hard efforts and good work is not being assisted by the premature and ill-timed discussion today in this House. I can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of the Opposition would just have some patience, trust the new Minister who is aware of and working hard on the problems concerned, and not upset the applegart by any more inflamed or extreme statements.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear the views put forward by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson), but surely with the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) present, we will be treated to him speaking for himself before the hour is completed. It is a matter of great importance and this is at least the third time that it has been put before the House since the session began last November. I believe many of you may recall the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) in a fairly lengthy but, of course, interesting and well-thought out presentation—I believe it was 64 pages in length in his original script—putting before us all his views that Ontario requires a new national policy, or perhaps a provincial policy which will emphasize the use, the refinement, the development of our natural resources in a way that this government has not been able to provide in its 25 years, of responsibility in these matters.

The matter was raised again last week, when you, sir, in your wisdom, met privately

with the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier), in order to determine whether or not this matter was of significant importance and emergency to warrant the adjournment of our regular business for debate here. You took it upon yourself, sir, to announce your decision before the House. It was then challenged by the leader of the New Democratic Party. We voted with the government at that time and I feel that it is necessary to explain the position, since we certainly do not want, for a moment, for any person to put a political misrepresentation on this matter—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon:—since it is obvious from positions taken by myself, the member for Sudbury and others that we believe that the government has not been effective in giving leadership to those people who have had the capital and the initiative to develop these natural resources in the past.

To deal specifically with this question. Most of us received a communication from the mayor of Timmins, speaking for himself and his council. It was a communication backing up a very lengthy and well-worded telegram to the Premier (Mr. Robarts) on this very matter. If I might quote from the letter from the mayor:

It is our belief that natural resources in a province and in a country should not be exploited in such a way as to permanently deprive residents of the area, where they are located, the only foreseeable chance of its keeping parity with the rest of the province and the country. If it is right for government to make use of tax funds obtained from the people at large in order to help an underprivileged area, it is doubly right that we direct the resources that do exist in such an area will not leave it unless the rights of those very people who live and toil at the site of the resources are well looked after.

I believe that his worship has well expressed the view that is supported on this side of the House, and in opposition to the approach that is being taken by the government of the day. The member for Algoma has attempted to apologize for the inaction of the Minister of Mines and the Cabinet. The Minister of Mines has tried to reassure us on at least two previous occasions that he is prepared to exert his strong will and his office in order to require that this particular company, Texas Gulf Sulphur, will locate part of their facilities in Ontario, and hopefully in northern Ontario.

I agree with the mayor of Timmins and I agree with the member for Cochrane South, that at least a major part of these facilities should be established in the community of the Porcupine, where there is regional disparity as a result of the working out of the gold deposits. I recall on a trip to northern Ontario with the hon. members of the Legislature in 1962, being taken underground, I believe at the Delmite Mine, and meeting, on that occasion, I believe, with the mine management from the various companies active at that time. While they were particularly generous in giving us a good meal, and so on, the message that they were putting forward was that the gold mines would not continue long to support the community, and that this government had to make plans for assuming far more responsibility in this area than they had at that time. I recall meeting with the miners underground and they put a pitch to us that was even stronger than that. At that time—I believe it is still the case—many of them were not unionized; they were working at scales of pay which were unbelievably low, and the reason for this and the reason why they felt they had to accept it, at least on the short term, was that the economic prospects for the Porcupine were so poor, that they felt they had no alternative but to quit and move right out of the community, which many of them, particularly the older workers, were not prepared to do.

Well, now, something has come about that might very well save the situation. One of the largest and, potentially, most productive mineral finds of the last many years in northern Ontario has come about, and still they are afraid that the ore will be removed from the ground in that huge, open-pit structure, which I believe we flew over in one of the recent trips. We have not visited it since it came into operation. The vision of the Ontario Northland Railway, carrying great amounts of ore to another province, at least as one possibility—or even to the United States for refining—is a real nightmare as far as they are concerned. I trust the government is being much more active than appears on the surface. There is nothing to indicate to us, however, that the Minister is engaging in other than a display of histrionics when he gets red in the face and shakes his fist at us, and says he is doing everything that can humanly be done to insist that this development be located in the Porcupine.

I believe that legislation is possible; if not legislation, then a direction of funds by The Department of Trade and Development which would make it an economic requirement that

this development be located in northern Ontario, and specifically in the Porcupine and at Timmins. We have had an opportunity to examine the plight of many people of that area. When the mayor puts forward his views as he expresses them here, I think that this Legislature has the responsibility to respond. We did not have the opportunity to set aside the order of business last week, but we have an opportunity this afternoon to discuss these matters, and we would say we support wholeheartedly the resolution that has been put forward at this time, and that we are looking forward to hearing the Minister of Mines state his view in this important matter.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read a few excerpts from a speech given by the Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. MacNaughton) to the northeastern regional development council. And he starts out:

Development is a torrid topic in the north. We can hear the reverberations with increasing velocity and frequency at Queen's Park. They come in the form of questions like: "What are you doing for northern development? How do you plan to increase growth and activity in this important area in the province? How are you stimulating use of the north's resources?"

He goes on to say:

I do not want to launch into a long recital of the many programmes that the government is providing for progress in the north, but let me review some of the highlights that apply to both northeastern and northwestern Ontario.

The Department of Energy and Resources Management is financing a detailed survey. The Department of Lands and Forests is carrying on a planned inventory. The Ontario Water Resources Commission is carrying on an intensive examination. The Department of Municipal Affairs is continuing its studies of local government. The Department of Tourism and Information recently announced its intention to develop a master plan.

Now we are faced with a feasibility study. Mr. Speaker, that is all we have in the north. For so many years, in fact from time immemorial, I imagine, we have been getting studies, one after the other, with no action. We do a study, we do the study over again. We do research, we do the research over again. But when it comes to action, this government is sadly lacking.

The hon. Treasurer went on for some time

to put forward his programme of study, and I can tell hon. members the delegates to that meeting were as unhappy as I am with what he had to say. In fact, they not only told him what he could do with his speech but they told him in no uncertain terms; and at that time, in an offside remark, the Minister said he would not be back. If that is all he has to bring us, we hope he will not come back.

The Department of Mines, if I can just go on in this speech, has stated that we have passed the \$1 billion mark in our mining efforts and that we should draw a certain satisfaction from passing that \$1 billion mark.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we do, as northerners, draw a certain satisfaction from passing that \$1 billion mark, but we draw very little satisfaction when we look around us and see closed down mines; holes in the ground; waste land from tailings; and then we see the position we are left in after \$1 billion has gone out every year.

In Kirkland Lake we walk down the street and see nothing but mine shafts or mine head frames that are being torn down, whole buildings falling down, and know that over \$880 million came out of the hole in the ground in Kirkland Lake and the town is sitting on the border of financial ruin.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): All the money has gone to the States too.

Mr. Jackson: I can only say that at least \$40 million went to the Bahamas.

We do draw a certain amount of satisfaction from the development of the north, but I can tell you we draw very little satisfaction out of seeing what is happening right now.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle)—I imagine he was the Minister of Mines at the time—stated to the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers in Halifax last year:

While Canada's total land resources seem endless, her rate of urbanization is one of the highest in the world. Thus we have become a country of city dwellers creating the problems and crises involved in great clusters of humanity. In addition, many northern settlements, established on a single resource, have regressed to rural slums.

We have regressed to rural slums because we never got our fair share of the mining wealth that has left northern Ontario. The degeneration of our northern communities have come about because of the failing of this government to provide a reasonable return to the

communities that did the work, and to the people that by the sweat of their brow dug the gold out of the ground.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) mentioned that many of these miners are not unionized, and because they were not they were exploited for many years. When Kirkland Lake's gold mines closed down, literally hundreds of miners were left without pensions who were too old to go anywhere else; who were left trying to make a living in an area where there was no living to be made.

If the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) will speak to his colleague the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko), he will tell him that many of these miners are drawing welfare today because of the mining policy of this province for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a news letter that is put out by the Japanese-Canada Economic Council every month. Each one of these news letters is filled with what Japan is doing; how it is going ahead; how it is forging ahead in its industrial capacity. It is only able to do that by using the resources of countries like us. We give it to them so that they can produce industrial capacity, while we sit back and dig in the ground like a bunch of animals.

We do not want all of it. We do not want to hold back the industrial capacity of any nation. But at least we want our fair share, just a small share of it. When my colleague says that he will be satisfied with one smelter, I can assure members that the people of Timiskaming will not be satisfied with one smelter. We want both of them in Ontario.

This government has an obligation to the people of Ontario, to provide jobs for the people of Ontario, not for the people of Japan; not for the people of the United States; not for the people of Norway; but for the people of Ontario.

At this moment at a time of serious unemployment in northern Ontario, you have an obligation and a responsibility to supply jobs to those people and can do so, Mr. Speaker, not by a feasibility study; not by studying the land use; not by studying the water resources; but by telling Texas Gulf—and telling them in no uncertain terms—that they will smelt their ores in Ontario.

This government has no responsibility except to the people of Ontario. Their prime responsibility is to the people of Ontario.

We have a little clause in The Mining Act that says that ores will be smelted in Ontario, or in Canada, and yet this government writes

in loopholes—intentional loopholes—to exempt the largest part of the mining economy of Ontario from that clause. The first thing they should do is change it, take out the exemptions. Then sit down and talk to the companies that really have a reason not to smelt in Ontario, not because they have patented before 1917, but because they have a reason, a valid reason.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) in saying that this government has been remiss in their duty for 25 years. They have sat on the seat of their pants and on their hands. I can tell you that it is our opinion that most of the lead stayed with the Ontario government, it is not being smelted out of the country.

For once in your life, just for once in 25 years, show the people of Ontario that you really mean that you are going to do something for them. Do not give us another 25 pages of promises or studies. We do not need any more studies. We need a little action, and Mr. Speaker, the responsible Minister, the Minister of Mines, can give us that action if he has the intestinal fortitude to do it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River is the next speaker.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Have we run out of government speakers so soon?

Interjections by hon. members:

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I will yield, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Minister of Mines is stuck to the seat of his pants—to his seat anyway.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the Minister if he wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has the floor. He is the next speaker and a minute of his time has gone already.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, he can yield to the Minister if he wishes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has yielded to Texas Gulf.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution, I would draw the attention of the House to the speech mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, that of the member for Sudbury in this House last year in which he delivered a rather

weighty tome of 64 pages entitled "Northward lies the path of progress"—a new approach to the economic development of northern Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: And called for a study at the end.

Mr. Lewis: What was that about a tomb?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would just point out briefly, Mr. Speaker, in this speech of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), on page 13 he says:

I say to the Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he would make better use of his energies and be more loyal to his responsibilities if instead of these peregrinations to California he required Texas Gulf Sulphur to show cause why it should not for good economic reasons build its smelter at Timmins, telling them at the same time that it is a policy of his government in the interest of the people of Timmins, to maintain that town as a viable community.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this problem that we have contained in this resolution is only one small aspect of the neglect of this party, the Conservative Party, for the people of northern Ontario. This is only one small part of the lack of planning, the lack of co-ordination, of the Conservative government to the people of the north.

The hon. member for Sudbury points out very well in his speech, I think, the over 25 years of neglect of this Conservative Party towards northern development.

I would suggest that one of the first things, the prime requisite in any economic development, and the economic expansion of any company, is the transportation costs, a cost benefit analysis. This is one of the very real vital places that we in the north suffer, because we are at a very poor economic advantage in the cost of transportation, both of the supplies needed in the communities and for the shipping of the products out of the community.

I would just read to you a resolution of the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities in which they say that freight rate structures must be revised on all lines, and consideration given to lower rates being offered for finished products than that of shipping in the raw state.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it would seem eminently reasonable that The Department of Transport—which is now a very moribund department along with quite a few others over there—could become vitalized or revitalized with some kind of research projects being undertaken by that department.

I note in the estimates this year, of The Department of Transport, that there are no moneys given over to the research of transportation problems in the province of Ontario.

We in the north have been calling for such a research programme for many years so that we can prove to the government sitting opposite, and to the people of Ontario, that we are at a very severe economic disadvantage in the transportation problem.

I think it is eminently reasonable that goods processed in the north should be given some kind of transportation incentive so that these products might be processed much more than they are in the north. This is one of the first economic principles involved in the location of any kind of plan in northern Ontario, or anywhere in the country for that matter.

I would refer the members and you, Mr. Speaker, to a speech by the hon. Minister of The Department of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) in Halifax last fall. He was speaking to the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers on the problem of northern development. He goes on and points out very well—I was not aware that anyone on the other side was so well aware of the problems of the north—but in his speech he lays out certain problems that we face in the north. It is unfortunate that he is not able to impress upon his Cabinet colleagues just how important the north is to Ontario and to Canada, and the fact that some action must be taken.

We do not expect very much from the Minister of Mines. We realize that he is known in the north as the "Bay Street Miner" and he is more aware of the problems of underground sewers perhaps than underground mining. But the Minister of Lands and Forests indicates an awareness of these problems and I fail to understand why some action has not been taken. Now he says in his speech and I quote:

While Canada's total land resources seem endless, her rate of urbanization is one of the highest in the world. Thus we have become a country of city-dwellers creating the problems and crises involved in great clusters of humanity. In addition, many northern settlements established on a single resource have regressed to rural slums. Northern development and the resultant dispersal of our people is seen as one possible way to ease the pressures and strain of urbanization. It should also provide remedial action to the stagnating frontier settlements.

This is a statement of a Minister of this government and yet no action is taken in this vital area of the province of Ontario and of Canada.

The Minister goes on and points out that in the development of the north, northern Canada, the Yukon and Northwest Territories:

The main thrust of the economic development of these areas has been in the way of transportation.

He says:

You will notice that all items mentioned include some improvements in the means of transportation.

I would suggest that we not only need an increase in the means of transportation but some kind of subsidized transportation as an incentive to people like Texas Gulf and others to process their raw material in northern Ontario. The Minister goes on further to state:

We have to put behind us our unwarranted fear of co-ordinated planning and consider the long term interest of the people concerned and develop the north as a whole region.

This is certainly not a new concept. We in this party have advocated this over the years. The member for Sudbury has talked about this at great length. I have talked about it. Even some of the more enlightened people on the left have talked about it. Everybody seems to be in agreement—even the Minister of Lands and Forests and yet, nothing is done. It seems to be—

Mr. Singer: He only agrees when he speaks in Halifax.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Yes, I would think that certainly, if the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) was to add his voice to that of the Minister of Lands and Forests and the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) some co-ordinated plan and policy could be arrived at. It would seem, however, that the idea of natural resources and the concept of their development and utilization has not occurred to those people on the front benches.

Just to reiterate briefly, Mr. Speaker. One of our main problems in the north and one of the things that stand in the way of mines like Texas Gulf, and others, is the fact that the transportation costs in the north are excessive. Some of these rates are applied on the principle that they will be paid on the basis of what the traffic will bear. Because

we are at a disadvantage, we have to pay these high rates.

In some cases these transportation rates are pulled out of the air. I give you the case of the CNR's rate proposals for the mines of Steep Rock and Caland Ore, just outside Atikokan. The present structure of rates is not based on any academic or economic look at the figures involved or any rate that would be economic to the companies or that could be justified in any rational manner. Rather, it seems that these rates have been pulled out of the air and slapped down to the economic disadvantage of the mines involved. Perhaps, since, there has been some rational explanation given for these rates. I would reiterate—

Mr. Speaker: I would call to the hon. member's attention that he is now in someone else's time. Would he please draw his remarks to a conclusion.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would reiterate, in closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that one of the main things that is needed, and needed immediately, is a complete study of a complete co-ordination of policy in northern Ontario. To begin with, something that could start immediately is a complete study of the transportation rates and system in northern Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the most important thing about this debate is the utter contempt with which the government treats this important issue. Last week, when it was raised in this House, this government which has permitted itself to be conned into procrastination over the years, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) rose and said, "Now is not the time", and with that rare flash of anger that sometimes emerges from him he was indignant that the Opposition should insist that this issue be discussed at a time which he deemed not to be convenient. Today, when we put it on the order paper—when we were denied not because it was not an important issue, but because the archaic rules did not permit it—then what does the government do? They put up a backbencher, a lowly backbencher, who says, in effect, "Trust in God and Lawrence, and (presumably) your interests are going to be protected", and speaks for three or four minutes. The Minister sits through this whole debate, and they, once again, resort to this lame excuse that this is a private members' hour, and therefore presumably no government member can raise his voice from the

Treasury benches. I repeat, it is utter contempt for the whole issue which has been characteristic of this government's attitude towards this problem, and this is just a new manifestation of that characteristic contempt.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): That I deny.

Mr. MacDonald: That he denies! Well, we will just proceed to deal with some of the facts in relation to it, Mr. Speaker. The interesting question, Mr. Speaker, is: Is Texas Gulf directing this government or is this government going to direct Texas Gulf?

Mr. Lewis: We know the answer to that.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the issue. When we needed a Mines Minister to replace one in northern Ontario, the Prime Minister, in his wisdom, decided he would pick a man in Toronto, with his roots in Bay Street, so he is the voice of the north. Characteristically, on this issue, the Mines Minister is silent. So if he does not like it—and he normally is a fiercely independent fellow—if he does not like it when I ask the question, is Texas Gulf directing this government, or is this government directing Texas Gulf, it is a long time since he should have spoken, Texas Gulf are studying it as they see fit, and this government meanwhile is willing to procrastinate. Now—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Quite absurd!

Mr. MacDonald: Quite absurd? Well, the Minister's silence is quite absurd and no other absurdity can match it at this point, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say that the time for this government to act has come, and in terms of legislation. I want to deal in a moment with some of the rather waffling proposals we have had from the Liberal Party; but let us deal with the real problem at the moment, namely, the Tories. We need legislation, and Texas Gulf should be told that if it is going to exploit resources in Ontario then the legislation will dictate that they shall smelt those resources in northern Ontario, and if they are not willing to do it, let them get out, and let some company, some corporation develop these resources in the interest of the people of the province of Ontario and not the board members, wherever they sit, in New York or elsewhere.

It is interesting to recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the late 40s, we faced a comparable kind of situation in the forest industry. The Prime Minister of that day—not normally the most

flaming radical in the nation—finally could not take it any longer. Either through a bill or regulations—I have forgotten which—he fixed a limit for exports of unprocessed pulp within the province of Ontario. He gave the companies some six or seven years to phase down their exports to that limit of 150,000 cords a year, which is a relatively small amount and is chiefly gauged to meet the needs of marginal areas where there is no mill capacity. Now, a Tory government did that. One of the fascinating things about Tory governments is that the longer they go on, the more gutless they get; Tory governments 50 years ago would deal with the question of public ownership, for example, of power resources. Tory governments today will not touch it. Tory governments 20 years ago would deal with protecting our resources. Today Tory governments will not touch it—at least they have not touched it up until now.

On the question of the smelter, Mr. Speaker, I was interested in re-reading what the Minister had to say a year ago. His contention was that one of those smelters must be in northern Ontario and the second one must be at least in Ontario, the south or elsewhere.

I am sorry, I think I am misquoting him. He said one of them must be in Ontario, preferably the north. Then he raised this nice question that as Canadian—and we are first Ontarians—whether or not we should quibble over the proposition that some copper smelting is now taking place in Noranda. Presumably we get some benefits from it, it comes by the ONR, our railway.

But he finally concluded for reasons that mystify me now that the copper smelter should be in Timmins, and that the zinc smelter might be in the south. The Minister shakes his head. I just read his speech of a year ago, and I think I am accurately reporting it—the copper smelter should be in Timmins and the zinc might be somewhere else.

Mr. Singer: Maybe if the member misquoted him he could get him up on his feet.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I do not know. He shook his head, which presumably meant he thought I was misquoting. But it still did not get him up.

Mr. Speaker, all I know is that on the basis of some evidence that we got last December in a question put by the hon. member from the Porcupine area to the Minister of Mines, it was revealed that in the

loadings of ore coming out of the Kidd Creek mining area in the month of September, only 19 per cent was copper and 81 per cent was zinc. I suppose, to be perfectly fair, that may not be accurately representative of the whole ore body.

But assuming that it is somewhat accurate of the whole ore body, clearly the smelter that should be put in the Timmins area is the zinc smelter, not only because it is the major part of the ore body, but because you have got a copper smelter literally 100 or 150 miles away tied in with an Ontario railroad, Mr. Speaker.

If you have to make your choice, let us make it an all-Canadian choice, with the major smelter in the province of Ontario and the subsidiary smelting of copper, the lesser mineral in the picture, being done at Noranda. But at least have one in Timmins and let us have it by process of legislation at the present time.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to quit talking, to quit studying, to quit being conned by the Texas Gulf Sulphur and to act. To act in terms of passage of legislation which will make it very clear under what ground rules, under what guidelines this company can continue to operate in the province of Ontario.

Once they start to operate, if you think they are directing the government now, make no mistake about it, at that point the direction will be 100 per cent plus, because that is the way Inco and all of the big mining corporations have operated. They have directed the government, the government has not directed them.

Mr. Speaker, in 30 seconds, may I comment on the proposal that has come from the Liberal Party, to go back to that bankrupt presentation of the hon. member for Sudbury, after 64 pages the conclusion was that we should have more study before deciding where we are going?

I have often said that the Ontario provincial Liberals are more Tory than the Tories, and this is just another proof of it. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid), even today, after all the procrastination in studying and waste of time over here, concludes once again that we should have a study to know what we are going to do about it. Mr. Speaker, we have studied and studied and studied—

Mr. T. P. Reid: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I never said that at all.

Mr. MacDonald: The member's concluding remarks in *Hansard* will reveal that they asked for a study—

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South will please yield the floor to the member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that one of the rules of this House is that a member should not be misrepresented, and I dissociate myself with these remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: I reiterate—on my hearing of what the hon. member said—in his concluding remarks, he contended that one of the important factors in dealing with the resources was transportation costs, and he urged that we should have another study of those transportation costs in dealing with resources.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That was only one point in my whole comments.

Mr. MacDonald: Right! Well, we want a massive study from the hon. member for Rainy River.

The leader of the party, Mr. Speaker, said there should either be legislation—and I agree there should be legislation. Then he called for—and what exactly he meant I do not know—a direction of funds by the trade and development branch.

The proposition that this government should dip into the public treasury to give some money to Texas Gulf to do what they should do, is—well, if there is anything more preposterous than this government's lack of action, it is the proposal we have just had from the Liberal Party.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I adjourn the debate?

Mr. Speaker: Nothing is impossible so far as the House is concerned, in my view of matters. But I think it would be very unwise to proceed. I am quite prepared to do whatever the House wishes, but the private members' hour has expired. I would allow—if the hon. Minister wishes to get up on a point of order, or personal privilege, I think there would be no problem. Otherwise, I would think that as a member of the government benches, he is not entitled to—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say there has been no lack of concern on this side of the House. There has been no neglect, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this problem. There have been a great many man-hours and a lot of effort put in on it. May I assure you, sir,

and may I assure the House, that there will be ample opportunity to debate this matter further within a very short time.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out that the hon. Minister, although he did not phrase it, was rising on a point of order that the statements made there did not represent his actions or otherwise. It was a much better point of order than is often raised.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and in a similar vein, sir. I object to my privileges as a member in the House being usurped because the Minister deliberately contrived to move his estimates to the bottom of the list in order to avoid debating this subject. That is why we were forced to a resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The private members' hour is now completed.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go to some third readings. The Lieutenant-Governor will stand by for Royal assent, and then we will go on with estimates. May I say at this stage that in the order of estimates, we would like to introduce tomorrow the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services, and then followed by the winding up of the Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton) estimates,

Mines and Transport as we had originally planned.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What does the Minister mean by "introduce" the estimates of Social and Family Services? Does he mean just the lead-off speeches?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, I am sorry. I just want to point out that I had mentioned that following the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary we would then go to the Treasurer. Urgent business requires the Treasurer to be in attendance at certain meetings tomorrow, so we will go to the estimates of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) and we will see them through, and then go to the Treasurer.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A question there: does that mean that we are going to complete Social and Family Services before we go back to Treasury?

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is right!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We will not get back to Treasury for seven years.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

(Friday, March 21, 1969)

<i>Page</i>	<i>Column</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
2570	1	37	Change to read: operations of those units have been alerted to



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Credit counselling service, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Nixon	2905
Information on debtors, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon	2905
Douglas Point nuclear reactor, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Nixon	2906
Lake Erie shoreline, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. MacDonald	2906
Animals for research, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. MacDonald	2906
Typhoid in Ottawa area, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Ben	2908
Infants' dolls, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman	2908
Brockville psychiatric hospital, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mrs. M. Renwick	2908
Rent rebate payments, question to Mr. Yaremko, Mrs. M. Renwick	2909
Farm products marketing board, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Spence	2909
Waste acid, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Deans	2910
Yellow birch, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Jackson	2910
Lake Erie shoreline, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Deans	2910
Warrendale premises, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Brown	2911
GO-train fatality, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Innes	2912
Third readings	2912
Royal assent to certain bills, the honourable the Lieutenant-Governor	2913
Estimates, Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Yaremko	2913
Recess, 6 o'clock	2935

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the west gallery are students from Bridlewood Public School in Agincourt and from the Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology in Brampton.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

What responsibility does the department have for the credit counselling service of Toronto directed by George Penfold?

Does the Minister agree with Mr. Penfold that credit rating information, associated with the service, should be disclosed to private credit bureaus as reported in the *Toronto Telegram* of March 31, 1969?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my department has no responsibility for the operation of the credit counselling service of Metropolitan Toronto as such. We do, however, make a grant to that operation, along with the federal government.

The Metropolitan Toronto counselling service is a very responsible operation and it is against this background of trying to rehabilitate people with respect to their debt problems and the financial problems that some of them have found themselves in that this question, to which the hon. leader of the Opposition has referred, has arisen.

It is my understanding that no decision has been arrived at with respect to such a step, but in any event, the premise on which the proposition is advanced involves the consent of the debtor himself, that is the person or the citizen who is seeking advice from this organization.

The proposal is against the proposition that such revelation or disclosure of that informa-

tion, with the debtor's consent would be an assist to the debtor, with respect to his efforts to rehabilitate his financial circumstances, and be a deterrent against incurring further financial obligations which might not be absolutely necessary.

On that basis I would see no harm to the proposition that the debtor himself would give his written consent to the disclosure of the information. I understand no firm conclusion has been reached by that organization to take that step.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will permit a supplementary question, is he trying to tell me and the House that reduction in a person's credit rating could in fact be to his personal benefit if in fact he has not more or less the ability to control his actions in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is right.

Mr. Nixon: A similar question, really arising from the same circumstances, to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker.

Does the Attorney General agree that information on debtors should automatically be turned over to privately run credit bureaus from division courts, as will be the practice announced by division court referee David Scott on Saturday, March 29?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the question as notice just to check the facts of what transpired here. In the meantime, I would say that of course all the records of the division court are public. Anyone could get that information if he wanted to go in there and get it. But I would like to take the question as notice to give a full answer.

Mr. Nixon: I might ask the Attorney General, if he will permit, another question arising from the same source of information.

The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs said in the one case it would only be with the permission of the individual concerned, but in the other case it would be that the information would be turned over automatically. I would appreciate the

further information that the Attorney General has undertaken to get.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would like to point out as a basic answer that any citizen can go to the division court and look at the records and get the whole story with respect to everyone who is on record there in a case.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is not what the news story said.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I know what the news story said. The point is that the records of that court are public and if someone wanted to make a business of getting them he has a right to do so.

Mr. Sopha: It said the court was going to turn them over on its own motion. We do not want the Minister to be a fink.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

1. Is the Douglas Point nuclear reactor in full operation?

2. Have there been recent difficulties experienced with the fueling machines while attempting to refuel under load?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Douglas Point generating station is not operating due to difficulties which have been experienced with the fueling machines. Those difficulties did not arise while attempting to refuel under load. The necessary steps are being taken to effect repairs to the fueling machines as soon as possible.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary to that—I wonder if the Minister could tell the House how long the reactor has been out of commission and how long it is expected not to be working?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I do not have that information but I would suggest that if the hon. member would like it that I would arrange a meeting with some of the engineers at Hydro tomorrow and perhaps they could give him the answer much quicker than I could dealing with it before the House.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps that would be satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Would the hon. member like that?

Mr. Nixon: Yes I would, and I will get in touch with the Minister about it. The hon.

Minister is not prepared then to answer any supplementary question on this at this time?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests from yesterday.

Will the government be introducing legislation this year to resolve the confusion relating to deeds so as to assure public use of the beaches in the east Lake Erie shoreline?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for York South, the government does not plan to introduce legislation this year with reference to this subject matter.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask by way of a supplementary, does this mean that the government has foregone completely this avenue for solving this problem and is relying completely on the expropriation of certain properties to provide some public access to the beaches?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we have not completely abandoned the idea, but I would say that at the present time we are doing as you just mentioned—acquiring beach land to provide park land through the regular provincial park programme.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Minister in a position to indicate why one has to delay still another year in grappling with this admittedly complex problem, the complexity of which will not be reduced by procrastination?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the matter is still under study.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): That is consideration, not procrastination.

Mr. MacDonald: A difference of viewpoint. I have two questions of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. The first one is in three parts:

1. What figure does the government accept as accurately representative of animal needs—dogs and cats—for medical research?

2. How many animals were destroyed by the humane society during the last calendar year?

3. How many animals from municipal pounds were destroyed during the last calendar year?

Mr. Sopha: What is the member's policy on these matters? We have never heard.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the figures relating to the number of animals needed, were obtained from the deans of medicine and the directors of the research institutes and medical schools. How accurate they are we are not absolutely sure. I do not think any firm figures have been given, but we have been given to understand that between 5,000 to 7,000 dogs are needed for the medical schools and the teaching laboratories, and about 3,000 cats.

We were told by the various deans of the respective schools that because of the increased number of doctors in training in the next few years, that figure would likely escalate to about a maximum of 10,000 dogs and perhaps up to 5,000 cats.

The other figures that the hon. member has asked for, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid are not available because I know of no such figures that could be found for the last calendar year. The only figures we have to go on are ones supplied by the humane society themselves, and I understand that those figures were something like 50,000 dogs and 250,000 cats destroyed by the shelters operated by the humane society.

With regard to the municipal pounds, about all we have to go by is a brief that was submitted to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) by the Ontario Humane Society. They had requested a mail poll of the various municipal pounds indicating how many dogs and cats they had picked up and how many were destroyed. The total figures that were submitted to the Minister in that brief, from the 454 municipalities, indicated—if my memory serves me correctly—21,000 dogs and about 16,000 or 17,000 cats.

Mr. Speaker, we discussed these figures with the deans of medicine suggesting that this looked like quite a sizable source of animals that were being destroyed. They questioned the accuracy of these figures that had been submitted. Perhaps they were only estimates that had been mailed in to the humane society, rather than the accurate figures, because their experience had indicated that such numbers of animals just simply were not available in these municipal pounds. This is why they took some exception to the supposition that there appeared to be this availability of animals.

Mr. Sopha: Where does the NDP stand on these bills?

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. member for Sudbury had been around a bit more often he might know where we stand on many things.

Mr. Sopha: Is the member playing both sides of the street?

Mr. MacDonald: My second question of the Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Half of their friends are dogs and half are cats and they stand four square behind their friends.

Mr. Sopha: Playing both sides of the street as usual.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: That is what they always do.

Mr. MacDonald: I understand that a committee representative of the Ontario Humane Society and some of its affiliated societies has been set up to work out and present to the Minister proposals regarding Bill 73 which will make it more acceptable to the humane society. Is it the Minister's intention to consider any representations which this committee may make before proceeding with second reading of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we would welcome any representations that might be made by that group. We met with them and we had, I thought, a very excellent meeting. I think we appreciated the position that they were taking and I am sure they recognize the position that we were taking.

They asked if they could go back to their respective groups and discuss the matters that were of concern to both parties; they asked if they could make further representations and we quite agreed to do this. I am hopeful that we will hear from them in the near future.

Mr. MacDonald: By way of clarification, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister, when you say "that group", are you referring to a group that comprises both the affiliated organizations and the Ontario Humane Society?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. We met with them separately and it was the affiliated groups that asked if they could do this.

Mr. MacDonald: For whatever consolation it is to the Minister, I understand that there is now a joint group.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is what?

Mr. MacDonald: Now a joint group.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well that is fine.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber has a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Thank you, Mr. Speaker; to the Minister of Health:

How many employees in Ottawa restaurants, dairy bars, take-out counters and grocery stores have been given tests at the Ontario provincial laboratory at Bells Corners, in view of the fear of a typhoid epidemic in that part of the province?

How many typhoid cases have been identified at the laboratory?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, 192 persons have been tested. It is not known how many of them are employers or how many are employees. None of the tests have shown the presence of the typhoid organism.

Mr. Ben: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Are the tests still continuing, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe they are and will continue until all those who have been exposed or are likely to have been exposed have been tested.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has a question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Thank you, Mr. Speaker; a question for the Minister of Health:

Is the Minister aware that infants' dolls now being sold in Toronto stores, which carry the label, "This article has been made in compliance with the regulations under The Public Health Act of Ontario", are lethal weapons in that the heads slide off with very slight force to reveal a pointed steel spike which could penetrate a child's eye?

What immediate steps will the Minister take to prevent sale of these dolls?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, these regulations are now under The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, consumer protection division.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgency of this matter—that is, a child could very easily be seriously hurt by this type of thing—will the responsible Minister answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have heard of the matter. We will be glad to look at it.

I do know that questions of safety and obnoxious types of material—which would include the item the hon. member has referred to—are constantly before us. This would certainly fall into that category.

If the hon. member will send me the information about the manufacture and the source of the toy, we would be glad to look at it.

Mr. Shulman: Does the Minister think some immediate steps will be taken?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister would take this question as notice on transfer to him.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member for High Park forgot to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Health enquiring whether that label was used with his permission—with the department's permission.

Mr. Shulman: I thank the member for Humber.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a question of the Minister of Health and certain allied questions—or at least they appear to be allied—in connection with the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital.

It would seem to me that perhaps the hon. member might wish to place all these questions at this time of those Ministers who are present in this group, rather than when we come to the Minister in question. Perhaps you would address your question to the Minister of Health first.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): A question of the Minister of Health. Does the Minister agree with Dr. Miller, superintendent of the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital, that Dr. Mullner's work load was not an unfair one?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If I am to speak personally, Mr. Speaker, I would say, no, I do not agree with Dr. Miller's estimate—but then I might be a harder taskmaster than Dr. Miller. But I have every confidence in his ability to direct and organize his hospital, therefore I would bow to his judgment in this case.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

A question of the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. What complement of medical staff is on duty at the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. Monday to Friday, and also what complement for the 24-hour period of Saturday and Sunday?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, one physician on duty, nights and weekends; and consultants on call as required.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, with the whine in the speaking apparatus, I did not hear the first part of the Minister's answer. Could I ask if the Minister would repeat it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Speaker, one physician on duty, nights and weekends; consultants on call as required.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you. A question of the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Are all the medical posts at Brockville, except the three vacancies the Minister spoke of in answer to my question of March 26, filled with permanent staff or are some on a transfer temporarily?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, all posts are filled with permanent staff.

Mrs. M. Renwick: A question of the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. In the Minister's opinion, what would cause Dr. Mullner, at the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital, to have, in addition to his 144 hospital patients, 180 of the 310, or over half of the resident patients in his care, with four other doctors on staff, outside of the superintendent, to share in that resident patient load?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter again which I leave to the wisdom and judgment of the director of this hospital in whom I have complete confidence.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the Minister, of course, did not answer the question.

A question of the Minister of Health. Would the Minister tell the House the number of hospital patients, and the number of resident patients, assigned to each of the doctors and medical staff at the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this is a number that could not be given except as it obtained perhaps yesterday or today. First of all, I want to make eminently clear that there is no such thing as resident patients. These people are residents, and I think we went over this matter very, very thoroughly during meetings of the standing committee. Indeed, all of these questions were dealt with very extensively during that committee meeting.

I do not know how many patients are assigned to each physician. Again, I have to say, sir, that this is the responsibility and the duty of the director of the hospital, and I

have every confidence in his ability to look after it.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Does the Minister not recall that when I asked this same question of the committee, Dr. Miller said that the information was in his memos to which I do not have access now and to which the hon. Minister does?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I do not remember that but I still repeat that the number of patients under one doctor could change from day to day. The only answer I could give was the number that was under the care of a particular doctor yesterday or on some particular day.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services from the other day which she might place now.

Mrs. M. Renwick: A question of the Minister of Social and Family Services:

In view of Mr. Borczak's remarks, as reported in the *Toronto Daily Star*, March 29, that the "decision re rent rebates applies only to payments made in 1968", will the Minister assure the House, and Ontario welfare recipients, that any future rent rebate payments may also be kept by welfare recipients?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, government policy as to the future will be announced in the future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent has a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food comes in two parts:

Did the farm products marketing board order the flue-cured tobacco board to amend its regulations in order that the flue-cured tobacco acreage rights could be transferred from one area to another?

Is the Minister aware of the concern of the county of Elgin of farmers and the municipalities that this new policy may adversely affect the economy of that area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The answer to the first question, Mr. Speaker, is no, the farm products marketing board did not order the flue-cured tobacco growers marketing board to amend their regulations. And the answer to the second question is that we are aware

that the clerk of the township of Aldborough, I believe, in Elgin county, has written to the farm products marketing board expressing concern. His letter was acknowledged by the board. They expressed their appreciation for his concern and said they would discuss it further with the flue-cured board. This was a decision that was made by the flue-cured tobacco growers marketing board and I am sure the hon. member would not suggest that we should interfere with the decision of the producer board.

Mr. Spence: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The farm products marketing board approved of the action of the flue-cured board, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I assume they must have.

Mr. Spence: Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it possible, as I understand it, that the assessment will remain on the farm from which the flue-cured tobacco acreage rights are moved? Then will the farm that the acreage rights go to also be assessed for tobacco acreage?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I could not answer that question, Mr. Speaker; that is a matter for the local assessor. I have no idea what will happen.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): May I place my question of the hon. Prime Minister first?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will ask his question, please, of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and we will get the Prime Minister's question in due order.

Mr. Deans: To the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

What is the acceptable ratio between dilutant and pollutant permitted by the Ontario Water Resources Commission in the case of waste acid?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, there is no accepted ratio that can be broadly applied. Factors such as the strength and volume of the acid solutions being disposed of, the volume and buffering capacity of the dilution water, and the mixing time provided are always taken into account by the Ontario Water Resources Commission when assessing proposals for waste discharges.

Mr. Deans: May I enquire of the Minister, by way of a supplementary question, whether he might not consider neutralization as a better process than dilution, whether he would not consider neutralization of the acid would be a better way of dealing with it than diluting it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, again I think if the hon. member would like to speak to the engineer in charge of this particular department, I would be very pleased to arrange an appointment with him where he can ask questions and get responsible answers.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming has a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests?

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. It is in two parts:

1. Is it correct that The Department of Lands and Forests has been unable to achieve success in the successful regeneration of yellow birch?

2. What is the projected life expectancy of the lumber industry in Algonquin Park based on the present supply of yellow birch?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Timiskaming:

1. This information is not correct. The departmental staff have developed successful techniques for regeneration of yellow birch.

2. The lumber industry in Algonquin Park uses several species of hardwood, primarily maple. The present department management plans are for this industry to continue on a sustained yield basis.

Mr. Jackson: By way of a supplementary question, could the Minister tell us what percentage of yellow birch is used compared with hard maple?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will be pleased to have that information sent to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a question of the Prime Minister now?

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Prime Minister—I will leave the first sentence off because it does not apply; I discovered that in a question from our leader to one of the other Ministers—will the Prime Minister approach Dofasco and request that a major portion of the five miles of Lake

Erie shoreline, acquired under option by Dofasco for future expansion, be donated as a public beach?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the previous question has been asked, but this is a matter that comes under the aegis of the Minister of Lands and Forests. I would be happy to discuss it with him, I think the idea has some merit. On the other hand we would have to check into the matter, and I would be quite happy to discuss the proposal with the Minister whose responsibility it is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine has a series of questions. Perhaps he would start them with the one addressed to the Prime Minister?

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Prime Minister: Who acted on behalf of the St. Faith's Lodge Board in prior negotiations with The Departments of Health and Public Welfare for the government take-over of the Warrendale complex?

Is the Prime Minister aware that at the time the negotiations were under way this gentleman was not a *bona fide* member of the board?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will take the questions as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will place another of his questions? Would the hon. member continue placing these questions as long as he has Ministers in the House to direct them to?

Mr. Brown: I would be pleased to. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) is not present. To the Minister of Social and Family Services:

With whom did the Minister negotiate for the replacement of staff in the Warrendale complex in 1966?

Is the Minister aware that the individual involved was not a *bona fide* member of the board?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I am getting the information and will take the question as notice.

Mr. Brown: To the Minister of Justice and Attorney General:

1. Was the action of The Department of Health in occupying the Warrendale premises at Etobicoke legal at the time?

2. If not, what has been done by the Minister's department to rectify the situation?

3. If it was legal, why is the property still owned in the name of St. Faith's Lodge?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the action which was taken by The Department of Health for the welfare of these children was, in my opinion, legal. I am not familiar with the title aspects relative to the property and I will obtain these facts and advise the hon. member as to why the property is still held in the name of St. Faith's Lodge, if that is the case.

Mr. Brown: A second question to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General: Is the Minister aware that the Elizabeth F. Brown memorial camp occupied by The Department of Health was given to the board of St. Faith's Lodge one year prior on the agreed conditions that:

1. Its name would not be changed.
2. Its purpose would not be changed.
3. The high level of treatment would not be changed
4. It would not be turned over to anyone else.
5. If any of these conditions were breached, the property would revert to the original owners?

Would the Minister indicate on what legal grounds this property was occupied by The Department of Health?

Is the Minister aware that all the moneys spent in developing the camp were private funds and that government at no time contributed funds to the development programme or to the land or facilities?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the title aspects of this matter but I will get the necessary information and answer the hon. member as soon as possible.

Mr. Brown: To the Minister of Health:

1. On whose directions did The Department of Health direct the occupation of the Warrendale complex buildings in Etobicoke?
2. Who currently administers the programme there?
3. What are the costs for the repair and administration of the building?
4. Who bears these costs?
5. Why is the department using these facilities that are not owned or rented by the department?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: [Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: I have another question of the Minister of Health from the hon. member—No. 1073, in connection with the Elizabeth F. Brown memorial camp.

Mr. Brown: Oh yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the hon. Minister of Health: Has the Elizabeth F. Brown memorial camp been purchased by The Department of Health? If not, is the department paying for rental? Does the department have a contract for the use of the camp?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this question also as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Highways has an answer to a question.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question put to me by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes) on February 28 regarding a fatality in Scarborough involving a GO-Train, I said that Canadian National Railways officials promised a complete report and I would table it in the Legislature when it was received.

I am now informed that a public inquest is to be held in the matter. In the light of this information I just wanted the hon. member to be informed that it is now not possible for me to table a report prior to such an official enquiry. However, I did receive a communication from the railway on the matter, setting out the problem of trespassers on railway property and the means that the railway uses to combat it.

I shall now quote from a letter received from Mr. A. R. Williams, the Toronto area manager of the Canadian National Railways:

The question of trespassers, particularly children, is a matter of grave concern to the Canadian National Railways. Its employees, and particularly its investigation personnel, are continually on the lookout for trespassers so that they can be directed from the property before being hurt.

Where practical, CN maintains fences which it hopes will discourage children from venturing on to a right of way. More importantly, however, CN has for years maintained public education programmes aimed at bringing home to the public, and especially the school children, the dangers of playing near the railroad.

Last year our investigation people showed films and made safety presentations in Ontario to more than 187,000 persons, mostly young school children. Safety films were also shown over the educational television network and over private television stations.

CN has tried to reach parents through the medium of service clubs so that they, too, would be aware of the dangers, particularly where school-age and pre-school-age children are concerned.

Earlier this year CN added a new safety film, this one aimed at teenagers, to its Toronto library and hopes to make good use of it in the months to come, along with other films and presentations.

The nature of the railway property is such that it would probably be physically impossible to exclude trespassers everywhere, particularly trespassers as curious and ingenuous as young children.

CN believes, therefore, it is through the medium of educational programmes that it can most effectively reduce chances of an accident, such as that involving the GO-Train on February 24, occurring again.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just a small point on this first bill. It is indicated here that that bill is not reprinted. I have not checked in my book. Is there any requirement that it should be in its final form before we give it third reading?

Mr. Speaker: I am advised that the bill is not reprinted. It will be up in the morning. I am also advised that it has been the habit and custom here, unless there is some good reason for not doing so, that bills are, and have been, given third reading when they have been amended in committee and have not yet reached the House in their reprinted form. As far as I am personally concerned, it is whatever the House wishes with respect to this.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): There were certain amendments when the House in committee took place. There was no objection to those amendments being made at that time, as I recall.

The following bills were given third reading on motions:

Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill 89, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1968.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the borough of East York.

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the University of Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We will await the arrival of His Honour.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the Chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

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

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed several bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 23, An Act to amend The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act.

Bill 24, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Bill 64, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Bill 83, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill 89, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1968.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting the borough of East York.

Bill Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Welland.

Bill Pr33, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Bill Pr35, An Act respecting the University of Windsor.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Clerk of the House: The 29th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Chairman, one of the very happy events since the passage of the last estimates of the department was, of course, the return to his desk last spring of the affectionately esteemed Deputy Minister, Dr. Band. Upon his return, of course, he followed his usual practice of being at his desk almost continuously. It just so happens that on this day he is out of the city and I trust that he will be very pleasantly surprised to return to find the estimates of the department passed and the moneys made available for continued programmes.

I deem it appropriate at this time to make reference to the retirement this year of one of the leading figures in Canada and indeed in North America in the social services field, Professor Charles E. Hendry, director of the University of Toronto school of social work. He has made an outstanding contribution to the social services field in general and in particular here in Canada.

Professor Hendry came to the university in 1946 and became director in 1951. He has been a long-time member and now chairman of the executive committee of the Canadian Welfare Council and is a national officer of the Canadian Red Cross Society.

The development of research in the social services has been one of his major interests. He was instrumental in the founding of the Cassidy Memorial Research Fund and the development of the University of Toronto's new interdisciplinary centre for research in the social and health services. He was chairman last week of the roundtable on the social aspects of science policy. He has served this province and this government well, being on the Prime Minister's (Mr. Robarts) advisory committee on portable pensions, on the Minister's public welfare training committee as chairman, and serving at the Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart) request on the legal aid committee. He has maintained a constant interest in our programmes and has been generous with his own time as well as enabling members of his staff to be available for consultation.

An outstanding educator, a valued advisor to government, a leader, a personality at once warm, forceful and conciliatory, Dr. Hendry

is a distinguished Canadian to whom we pay tribute as he nears retirement, and I am delighted to record this in the records of this Legislature.

It is not my intent to discuss at any great length the progress and activities of all the programmes within the department, but I should like to touch on some of the highlights of development this past year. Of course, all details will be discussed in the committee as the various votes are made.

You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that I am requesting approval of estimates just under \$265 million, an increase from last year and an amount indicative of our intention to meet our commitments to the people.

As the members will recall, 1967 was the year of major and numerous changes in the legislation of the department. 1968 has been a year in which we have consolidated and undertaken the evaluation of these far-reaching changes.

One of the most significant developments within the department this past year is the formation of the research and planning branch which recruited the first members of staff in the latter part of 1968 and has been filling out its complement since that time.

When completed, all the social science disciplines will be represented; economists, psychologists, sociologists and social workers. The branch will therefore possess a research capability in all of these areas. Its main purpose will be to carry out continuing research and provide guidelines for future policy development. I look forward to an outstanding advisory function within the department.

Some of the activities of the branch might be mentioned: evaluation of both present and long-term needs of Ontario residents from the point of view of both economics and sociology; assessment of existing welfare programmes in the light of these findings; in-depth studies of individual programmes, and an inventory of welfare services to identify gaps and develop policy.

One of the earliest, already undertaken, is an analysis of statistics compiled from the various programme activities in the department. This information will be used to effectively indicate the need for administrative and programme changes and possible future research. I look forward to great things from this particular branch.

We are taking steps to initiate procedures to bring about benefits not only in the effectiveness of our internal operations, but also in relation to our work with private and

public agencies. I make mention of the fact that we have recently organized a systems and procedures branch to increase efficiency and reduce administrative expenditure. Already it has increased the efficiency of our filing systems. Of major interest to this branch will be a continuing assessment of the ways in which computer technology can be used to advantage.

In the near future our new programme analysis activity will have appointed a programme analysis co-ordinator to provide background for the defining of departmental objectives and the working out of short- and long-range plans to be co-ordinated with overall governmental activities.

In addition to our normal accounting procedures, we have established financial consulting services with the overall objective to maximize the effectiveness of our use of budgeted funds. It will also provide financial and business management consultation to subsidized agencies and institutions, both public and private, and an advisory service to the directors of the branches.

I touch upon the work of a small but important branch, the training and staff development branch. This achieves its objectives by increasing the competency of the staff to provide essential services of the department, by working with educational and training institutions in the province and by providing training programmes within the department. A variety of activities are carried on: a programme of bursaries; a programme of educational leave; a programme of staff development to make use of seminar courses and extension courses for staff members; and a wide-ranging series of courses within the department for the benefit of staff, including orientation of new members, in-service training, basic and advanced courses for field supervisors, a course for assistant supervisors in the family benefits branch, courses for municipal welfare administrators and for Indian band welfare administrators, and assistance to the in-service training programme of the child welfare branch. This branch is continuously devoted to upgrading the qualifications of our members.

I am going to take the opportunity some time of telling the story to the province of Ontario of our vocational rehabilitation services branch, a glorious story not yet known by the majority of our people. This branch continues to provide a comprehensive and high-quality rehabilitation programme for the disabled. The volume of services has increased right across the board. The number

of persons in training increased by 30 per cent. The total months of training have now reached 10,000 months and the number of persons over 1,000. The total case load receiving counselling and guidance is 6,600.

The programme of workshops subsidized is over 100, and this year operating grants were paid on behalf of 2,500 persons. I think were the citizens of this province to view, as I have, some of the agencies and the work that has been done, they would applaud and cheer.

As the members will recall, one area in which there has been recent legislative change is in the field of day nurseries. In August 1967 the legislation was amended to increase the provincial subsidy from 50 per cent to 80 per cent, and last April a new and generous needs test was provided with the object of assisting a greater number of low-income families. We are now in the position of noticing the impact that has been made on our programmes in this respect. An answer given by me a week or so ago in this House indicated that the number of nurseries receiving public funds increased from 45 in 1967 to 101 in 1968, more than doubling the number eligible for public subsidy. The number of preliminary applications for licensing has increased from 40 to 67, an increase of 60 per cent.

I think all members will be gratified that the legislation in which they played a role has been effective in terms of encouraging day nurseries and making these services available to low-income families. An examination, review and evaluation of all aspects of our day care programme continues, and we will watch with interest the studies and progress of others to ensure the growth and benefits of this programme.

I make mention of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that 1968 has also been a banner year for adoptions with more applications than ever before—in fact over 7,800 couples, an increase of 15 per cent. The total number of children who have found permanent security through adoption orders is 7,150, the first time the figure has exceeded 7,000, and now we reach for a new goal.

In family services, Mr. Chairman, the aim is to assist applicants and recipients of family benefits allowances to achieve more effective functioning, and where possible economic independence, and we now have a branch which is in its first full year of operation, participating in this work. A field staff of family counsellors is provided. The counsellors accept suitable referrals where speci-

alized services are required and assist persons and families in appropriate ways, and to utilize other services which are relevant to their needs. In addition, these counsellors are available to provide consultation to municipalities for the development of specialized services for the recipients of general welfare assistance.

In line with this programme, I touch upon the homemakers and nurses services, which also, of course, have been improved since August 1968 when the provincial subsidy was increased from 50 per cent to 80 per cent on services purchased from approved agencies. The introduction of a new and generous needs test has indicated new directions in this field.

An interesting development which we are encouraging is our teaching homemaker programme. It is a very simple programme, Mr. Chairman. The homemaker here goes to show a mother within one of our service programmes, by example and demonstration, how she can improve her basic housekeeping skills and develop the family well-being and sense of responsibility. The homemaker is employed by the municipality and works as a team member along with social workers, counsellors, field investigators, and other members of social service needs. She goes into the home to assess the family's needs, consults with other workers, and plans the best way to meet the needs of the family—such simple things, Mr. Chairman, as showing the member how to plan her housework, in what sequence, how to clean house, how to prepare nourishing meals, the laundry, do the mending, how to budget the family income, do the shopping and give the children the necessary personal care in accordance with their needs. These are very basic things, Mr. Chairman, but things that are essential to the well-being of all families, and in particular to these families that in some respects are at a disadvantage.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important aspects with which we are confronted at the present time, and one of which I have become increasingly aware since assuming this portfolio, is in reference to what I call the delivery of services.

We have, in relationship to the delivery of services—a matter which encompasses the whole range of administrative arrangement by which the social needs of our people can be most effectively met. And this problem is not one confined to this jurisdiction, it goes across many jurisdictions—indeed, all jurisdictions.

The history of the administration of social services is replete with the problems of gaps, overlapping, complexities. This happens at the national level, at our provincial level, at the municipal levels, between and amongst private agencies and between private and public agencies. Of course, history, and the fact that this problem is still present with us, indicates the complexity of the matter.

We have been improving our legislation in this field and using our own experience to develop new steps, but it is still a place where we seek solutions. The problem is still a baffling one, and I think that anyone that thinks there may be one single administrative device to solve this is really living in a world of illusion.

At this point I touch upon, appropriately, the developments that we have made in this direction. Most members are familiar with the concept and the work of the district welfare administration boards and the accompanying provisions with respect to county administration. We have been encouraging this these past few years, and we are gratified with the number that have come into being. We look to further steps in this direction, not only at the county and district welfare level.

Of course, we have here, in Metropolitan Toronto, the consolidation of welfare services, and as well the Ottawa-Carleton regional government. This was initiated whereby these broad programmes were assigned to the second tier. We are promoting this all along, based on our experience, in order that the benefits of the broad administrative units can be brought to bear.

The advantages cannot be questioned. The provision of skilled and specialized staff, better co-ordination with other services both within and outside the particular regional area. A general efficiency and economy of operation.

In this regard, of course, we continue to enlist the experience and assistance of the private individual and the private sector and the private agency, in order that all of the services may be effectively delivered.

My comments will remind the members of the report of the committee on local authority and allied personal services referred to in this Legislature, commonly known as the Seebohm report, the recent British study. We have been, since its release, studying the recommendations of the report and we will be giving particular attention to any of its findings which are relevant to our own needs and situation. Of course, from the policies which I have touched upon, it can be seen

that we had already been going in this direction of unified services.

I conclude these preliminary remarks, Mr. Chairman, by saying that it is an exciting time to be involved in the changes which are coming about. It seems clear to me now that the way in which our administrative services have developed provides us with a firm basis for our other programmes. We have gained useful experience and we are now on the threshold of advances which, I feel, will lead to the provision of more effective, more unified and more co-ordinated social services.

It is a real challenge to meet and satisfy the needs and wants of the some 400,000 citizens who turn to us and are in contact with us annually, and to whom we give service. I like to think we have had some measure of success, and I think the members of this House can use their own personal experience over the course of the year in relationship to the small number, perhaps, of that 400,000 with whom they may have had some direct contact.

Now, as we proceed to consider the estimates in detail, Mr. Chairman, I welcome on the part of members questions on the various items of expenditure, their comments, and above all, their suggestions.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to pay a few words of tribute to the Deputy Minister, Dr. Band, and his staff. I want to reassure them that we on this side think they are dedicated, hard-working and that they are rendering a true service to this province.

Mr. Chairman, when I realized that the unhappy task of criticizing the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) was once more upon me, I turned, Mr. Chairman, to that source of all our inspirations, the "Holy Bible", and I looked for parallels.

I thought what the Budget would be doing to the poor of Ontario, as of today, as the price increases caused by the machinery tax were gradually passed on in the form of inflationary increases in retail costs, and I found an appropriate text for the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) in Exodus 30, verse 15: "The rich shall not give more and the poor shall not give less."

Then I turned to the first book of Timothy, and it suddenly struck me that the Minister of Social and Family Services must clearly subscribe to the doctrine that the poor have brought nothing into this bailiwick and, by George, neither shall they carry anything

away. In all this, the poor sinned not, nor charged the Robarts government foolishly.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Social and Family Services has adopted the yearly stratagem of not tabling his report before his estimates. The comments he made with reference to the amount—\$265 million—that his department is going to be spending in the next year should indicate, Mr. Chairman, to any thinking person that in order for the Opposition to be able to know what is going on, we should have a copy of this report.

But in any event, Mr. Chairman, last year the Premier (Mr. Robarts) backed up this retrograde policy by suggesting that the estimates might be debated without benefit of a study of the annual report. He obviously hopes that by isolating the components of an operation, the full and disastrous social consequences of his administration will be obscured. However, Mr. Chairman, we know he is only playing a delaying game. In the end, everything will come out.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I formally introduced into the record of this Legislature, in a long and detailed speech, in the preparation of which I had the assistance of the distinguished American social scientist Mr. Robert Theobald, the concept of guaranteed annual income.

Last year's *Hansard* at page 3144 shows how the Minister of Social and Family Services rolled the phrase over on his tongue in mocking fashion. He said: "One must be very careful, in trying to give to the public at large, some sort of answer which is in the form of three neat words—a guaranteed annual income."

"Those are three nice words," he mocked. "Guaranteed," a lovely word. And not only guaranteed, but also on an annual basis. And "income—now that is a lovely word, income. Three nice words," he said Mr. Chairman.

Then, suddenly, all the world except for this Minister was acknowledging that Theobald had been right, and that more money was going into welfare administration than the recipients were actually getting in the end. And Mr. Stanfield undercut him, and he was left completely alone when the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White), as chairman of the select committee, came out with that report which advocated a negative income tax as the first step on the road to a guaranteed income. Now, Mr. Chairman, the final blow came when the Treasurer included positive reference to the concept in his Budget this year.

So, in the space of only 12 months, the rug has been pulled from beneath the Minister and he is the one who is now left to justify the enormous burden of administrative expense of his department which the timely adoption of a guaranteed income approach to welfare would have eliminated.

I want to read into the record at this time, the editorial from the *Financial Times of Canada*, of March 17 of this year, which says of the guaranteed income proposal:

To a diminishing number of persons this will seem like a horrifying proposal to reward idleness and "pay the bums for not working." The western world took most of the first half of the present century to digest fully the ideas that society must provide at least a basic living for the halt, the maimed, the blind, the widows and orphans, and even the able-bodied unemployed.

In the last 20 years this new social conscience has led to the proliferation of an enormous complex of government measures for redistributing incomes. Most of them have been based on the dominant, fashionable principle of universality. One Act after another has provided government payments to everyone who was blind, everyone under 16, everyone over 65, every farmer who was hauled out, everyone who could fit into the multitudinous categories prescribed by law.

This era, known to most of us as "the welfare state," has now led to two discoveries which are at the root of the current interest in guaranteed annual incomes.

One is that the principle of universality has become absurd. The taxable capacity of the productive spenders and savers is being exhausted to provide income supplements to whole classes of citizens who do not need them, while the prescribed classes too often exclude the persons in real need. The beneficent principle of income redistribution is fairness. Instead, it has become almost fortuitous.

The second discovery is that society's responsibility for the needy is no longer a matter of the moral conscience alone, but a demand of economic realism. As technology reduces the man-hours of labour required for a given amount of production, even the willingest worker may work shorter hours; the less skilled may find it difficult to work at all. Perhaps society can manage with fewer workers; what it cannot tolerate is fewer consumers. Some form of income maintenance is an economic necessity.

If the growing public debate about negative income tax and guaranteed incomes is to make any sense, it must be based on these two lessons of the welfare state. The basic principles must be to eliminate the inequities and sheer waste of the accumulated jumble of universal welfare programmes; to stop distributing pin money to prosperous families and \$80 pensions to millionaires; and to provide a minimum income to those in need without having to search the small print of a dozen predetermined categories.

To present the new concept as an addition to all the present programmes of income support would be a cruel deception and an economic absurdity. Their virtue is to suggest a line of approach which might combine financial feasibility with greater fairness. Understood in this way, the approach is promising. Its consummation in practical policies requires much fuller consideration.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we have heard things good and bad about the new U.S. administration of President Nixon, but one thing can be said about this new group in office, and that is that they have been willing to continue the more promising programmes of the Office of Economic Opportunity, even as we in Ontario have run away from innovation.

I have a late report from Trenton, New Jersey, where a practical scheme of negative income taxation is being tested for the first time in America. This pilot project involves some 80 low-income families, who are given weekly cheques, according to need, from "tax funds", to lift them to an adequate level.

Note that point, Mr. Chairman. The cheques are weekly disbursements, not accumulations at the end of a financial year. The people get the money as they have been used to getting it, on a weekly basis. They may spend the money as they wish, so long as they answer a questionnaire every three months.

The Trenton project, begun last year, is apparently working so satisfactorily that two new programmes have just been set in motion, one involving families at Passaic, New Jersey, and the other families at nearby Paterson. Both of these later projects are expanded, and involve several hundred families.

The "tax funds", in this instance, are funnelled through the federal Office of Economic Opportunity, but that is just for developmental purposes, since obviously the uni-

versal version would involve the tax system in general.

Now, these projects are being run by university organizations. One is Mathematica of Princeton, New Jersey, and the other is the Institute for Research of the University of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this government should certainly have its own research people down there, at the very least, to see what is going on. Have they taken any initiatives at all, I wonder?

Mr. Chairman, we in this party shall continue to press the concept of a guaranteed income, not only upon the Minister, but also upon our friends in Ottawa. We are convinced, as a caucus, of its applicability here. Our members of the select committee endorsed this proposal and when they reported back to us, we were certainly more than ever convinced of the validity of the idea.

What we could not buy was its being tied to a tax on food, as, of course, our representatives on that committee could not, and so we had a minority report on that. It struck me again this weekend, in pondering over my notes for this speech, that a government which would even entertain such a proposal as a tax on food and only finally reject it in Cabinet when the outcry became obvious, is certainly the kind of government which believes that if you are born poor, you should die poor.

Mr. Chairman, the welfare game is becoming a professional game which affords a nice living for anyone who could, in the past, achieve a social work degree. Now, you see, the professionals are closing their ranks. There are fewer jobs to be had. They can see the writing on the wall. Next, after the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has ironed out his present drafting difficulties we shall no doubt be having a new self-governing statute for the MSWs and the BSWs. Like the OSSTF, who managed to go all through their conference without once mentioning the kids, so it will be with the professional welfare establishment. They will be able to go through all the motions without once mentioning the poor.

The only way to break this vicious circle of an establishment with a vested interest in maintaining the *status quo* of poverty, is to throw the whole mechanism out the window and start again with the new principle of a guaranteed income that administers itself through the taxation system, and does away with those people who are not doing rehabilitation at all, but only administration.

I have no quarrel with the dedicated worker, the grass-roots toiler. All I am saying is there are too many who are in social work in name only, and whose entire time is devoted to maintaining the establishment and, of course, knocking the guaranteed income concept as part of that determined effort to keep things as they are.

Let me now turn to the situation facing the children's aid society, whose problems appear to centre on one thing: money; not simply a question of how much money is needed and provided to agencies, but also how, on what basis, and when, the money is given. Let me briefly review the pattern of what happens in this area.

The agency submits a request for funds to the province and to the municipality; if either government refuses to allocate the money requested, there is an attempt made to reach a compromise. Failing an agreement, the dispute is submitted, as it were, to arbitration.

Last year, in Ontario, all but four societies were in dispute with the government about the funds allocated to them; agreements were reached with all children's aid societies except the two in Toronto.

As a result, it was well into the fall before those societies got their moneys and this led to a trimming of service, particularly in two areas: first, the Metro CAS was unable to hire additional staff until well past the time when the pick of graduates had been snapped up for other social work positions. Second, the agency has had to refrain from expanding its preventive service—although these services of prevention are clearly laid out as a responsibility of the agency, according to the most recent Child Welfare Act.

To take the last point first, it is obvious that any curtailment of preventive service—which might rescue families in distress before the children need protection or custody—is the bookkeeping of the indifferent. The agency itself, not to say our mental hospitals, prisons, reform schools and other institutions are filled with children and adults, at least some of whom might not be there if they had been given help in time. It would be impossible to reckon the cost in human misery, let alone in the dollars so dear to the government's heart, that the lack of preventive service has caused and is causing. More than that, it is a cruel hoax to write an Act which reads like model legislation and then ensure that it is impossible of fulfilment.

The question of preventive service—or the

lack of same—brings us full circle back to the question of how money is allocated. Many of the wards of any children's aid society are disturbed—in a far larger proportion than is true of children in society generally. This is because children do not suffer the traumas that make them known to children's aid agencies without suffering some damage. The child whose parents are alcoholic, or who is beaten, or molested, or neglected, cannot come into the care of an agency a sunny, undamaged being.

Some of these children have suffered experiences which scar them deeply and make them unable to live in normal home settings, and many require institutional care. Under the present system, the government gives societies moneys which are simply to be turned over to institutions like Browndale, Boy's Village, and so on.

The CAS has no financial control over these institutions and has no say whatever in the setting of rates. If Browndale's directors were to decide tomorrow that the fees at Browndale were \$127.33 a day, the CAS could take it or leave it. Fortunately, they chose not to do so. The fees have remained the same for this year, at any rate.

However, the moneys which go to institutions are lumped, by the government, into the sum it gives agencies for their operation. First, this is an inefficient, not to say extravagant way, to handle the money; why should it go through the hands of the CAS instead of going directly to its intended recipient? This is a costly way of doing things.

More than that, it places the CAS in an invidious position: the government can claim that it has given the CAS as much money in one year—or even more money—than in previous years and yet leave the agency in a spot where it does not have one extra cent to spend and may, in fact, have less. For example, in 1967 the annual cost of care per child at Sacred Heart Village was \$8,760; in 1968 that figure was \$9,490 and in 1969, it will be \$12,282.25. Similarly, the Madame Vanier Institute in London had an annual fee of \$7,300 in 1967, \$10,585 in 1968. The cost this year will be \$11,888.05. Thus, if an institution raises its fees—by an amount that costs the society an extra 'x' dollars, the society must meet that bill—at whatever cost to other services. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the service to suffer first and most, will be prevention.

This is a nightmare in itself—but what happens when the institutions raise their rates and the government gives the CAS the same or less money than in the previous

years? It leaves the society in an intolerable squeeze over which it has no power.

There are several points to be made out of the above:

The societies must receive their moneys—even when there is a dispute—far enough in advance so that they can plan their operations realistically and intelligently.

Sums which are not meant for use or disbursement by the society and over which they have no control, must be paid directly to the institutions for which they are meant. The children's aid society, already overburdened, was designed as a service to needy families, and not as a handy adjunct to your friendly local bank.

The government cannot have it both ways: if it cannot provide the money for a given service, most particularly for preventive care, it must say so. This is just another example of the way in which the present administration sounds like heaven on paper and is hell in reality. The effect of this kind of sleazy dealing can only be to discourage the work of agency staff—from director to secretary—when they are given a job on the one hand and financially handcuffed on the other.

The government cannot cut down on its allocation to the CAS. It is quite evident that as Toronto and other cities grow, as they become more complex and as more is understood about family breakdown, the work of the CAS will, in the foreseeable future, continue to grow.

To use an old quote, John Dewey once said that, "What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must be what the community wants for all its children". The government's present behaviour certainly lives down to its usual standard.

Next, I want to turn to adoption, and the possibility of subsidizing parents who wish to adopt children on a permanent and legal basis, but who need some help to begin with. Not every child available for adoption is "Today's Child", by any means. But, regardless of the fact that not all children are equally photogenic, their chances of adoption should not be lessened.

"Today's Child" is only one avenue, and relatively, not a very good one since it discriminates on the basis of good looks. But every child, pretty or ugly, has a right to be loved, to be cared for, by parents in a home setting. It is a pity that most of the so-called unadoptables do not get the chance, and if we can help really genuine people to adopt children, not just act as foster-parents, then

we will have moved a long way towards making their lives worth living, and of reducing our unsatisfactory dependence on institutions.

For this reason, I was attracted by the favourable reports of the New York State Act of last year. Although this bill is not as wide as the one I would like to see enacted here, it is a beginning. Let me read into the record the report on the effects of this bill, as carried in the *Christian Science Monitor* of Thursday, March 20, 1969, under the byline of Miss Jo Ann Levine:

An expanding adoption market is stretching the old, inflexible restrictions on would-be adoptive parents. The parents have usually had to come from the middle or up-middle class. New York is the first city to open the way for lower-income families to adopt children. Its answer: provide these families with adoption subsidies of up to \$120 per month.

The programme of adoption subsidies here is based on a bill which was passed by the New York Legislature last year. It is the first bill of its kind. It is a cautious bill. It limits the programme to those foster parents who wish to adopt the children they have been caring for—children who also are legally available for adoption.

This programme will affect primarily older children, black and Puerto Rican children, and white children with physical or mental handicaps. Such children would have grown up in foster homes as public charges anyway and would be described in adoption "market" language as "not so appealing".

White children who are healthy are almost always placed when they are babies unless there are legal complications.

Miss Mae Neely, director of the division of adoptive services of the city's Bureau of Child Welfare, says of New York's new adoption-subsidy bill: "It is not perfect, but it is a beginning." Miss Neely would like to see the bill affect all prospective adoptive parents who make under \$11,000 a year—not just the foster parents.

But even of the 25,000 children in foster care as public charges, only 1,063 can be affected. These are the children legally free for adoption, the children who "could be adopted today" if there were homes for them.

For example, the New York City programme affects children like Jake, a four-year-old black boy whose four foster

brothers and sisters consider him a "real brother". Although his foster parents are considered to be "good financial managers" by the Bureau of Child Welfare, they do not have enough money to adopt Jake now, and they depend on the \$125 a month they receive as foster parents.

Jake's foster parents understand that even though they will receive a subsidy if they adopt him, it will not be as much as they receive as foster parents. Miscellaneous expenditures such as music lessons, camp expenses, and clothing are included in foster home care, but not under the adoption subsidy. Medical expenses are also allowed in special cases.

Mr. Chairman, the article goes on to describe some unusual children:

Jerry, a white child whose foster mother takes him to three different clinics for medical care is a special case. With a number of physical problems, Jerry is not considered by the Bureau of Child Welfare to be "good for adoption".

Jerry's foster parents, a minister and his wife, have cared for him since he was five months old. They were among the first foster families in the city to show an interest in adoption under the subsidy programme. Most experience so far with adoption subsidies has been in the form of paying for extra medical care.

Susan, a five-year-old Negro girl who has lived with her foster family since 1967, could be adopted now through the programme. Her foster family has one adopted child of its own and was waiting until it could afford to adopt Susan.

Now Susan's foster parents intend to apply for adoption and become her legal parents after the waiting period which in New York ranges from 6 to 18 months.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the article goes on to comment on the fact that such payments are not new.

For families like Susan's who will receive an adoption subsidy the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue has already ruled that the subsidy is not taxable "since it is provided from the general motives of philanthropy and charity".

An article on adoption subsidies in the February issue of *Child Welfare* magazine points out that "subsidies" in the form of tax credits, tax exemptions, or educational and research grants are nothing new in this nation. The article adds: "Children are our most precious resources."

Emanuel H. Fox, deputy director of the Bureau of Child Welfare in New York, notes a change in foster-care practices. He says: "Many years ago, there was some strong feeling that you had to be one or the other—foster parents or adoptive parents. Now, nationwide, particularly where many children are available, foster parents are encouraged to adopt."

Adds Miss Neely: "Our foster children have been adopted all along by foster parents. This has often been the non-white child's only salvation. A foster child always wants to belong. He wants to say, 'my family', but there is something that always comes between them."

Mr. Fox remarks that some people question the programme because they feel the "selfless love for a child" will be diminished by a subsidy. Mr. Fox does not think so.

Most of the disappearing "rules" surrounding adoption need no change in law—rules such as the old limits placed on the number of children a family can adopt, restrictions on the age of adopting parents, taboos against inter-racial adoptions, and adoption by single parents.

Adoption regulations are in a state of change, particularly in large cities which have a "surplus" of minority children whether they be blacks or Puerto Ricans in New York City, Mexicans in Los Angeles, or Indians in Phoenix.

But there is one professional opinion among adoption experts which has not changed. They still maintain that adoptions should take place through respected social agencies, that privately arranged adoptions are "risky".

Statistics show that "privately arranged" adoptions are remaining at a fixed level while the overall number of adoptions is going up. In 1967, agency adoptions accounted for 74 per cent of the 83,700 "nonrelative adoptions" in the United States.

Miss Neely notes another aspect of the adoption scene which has not changed: "We still look for people who love children, people who are mature, who have a good solid married life, who are responsible and stable, and who have the potential of developing into good parents." She emphasizes the word "potential".

Mr. Chairman, that is the end of that quote. My point is that if this is working so well in New York, why cannot we study this or at best import this idea into Ontario, and give

our children a real chance at family life? Perhaps this might be the solution to the problem of our unadoptables who are presently being exported, to no one's satisfaction.

Now I want to go back and quote from page 3138 of last year's *Hansard*, where I said:

We shall also want to know, in furtherance of Mrs. J. M. Barstow's inquiry at the Ontario Welfare Council of May 20, 1968, whether or not this government is prepared to subsidize family day-care programmes as well as day nurseries. Mrs. Barstow is chairman of the Toronto social planning council's day care committee, and she is apparently backed by expert opinion in her representations to the effect that agency-sponsored family day care is preferable to day nursery care.

Also, it is now said to be much more feasible, since the community colleges are offering courses in child care and homemaking. We would like to know, is an amendment to The Day Nurseries Act now seen to be imminent by the government, in view of these changed conditions? Perhaps the Minister would care to comment on this?

Now, Mr. Chairman, that was quoting from my lead-off speech of last year. Perhaps the Minister would like to comment on that this year, in view of the article that was in the *Telegram* yesterday. The *Telegram* is not necessarily a newspaper which is critical of the government, but in any event I trust the Minister has seen the article which is headed: "Toronto MPPs Ignore Day Care Agency". It is by Yvonne Crittenden, *Telegram* staff reporter, and I will just read a little bit of this, Mr. Chairman, because it points up what I have been saying:

The lack of day care for many children of working mothers is being ignored by Conservative MPPs, a Toronto family agency charges.

Protestant Children's Homes based its opinion on the reaction of Tory MPPs to letters from constituents urging the Ontario government to bring family day care under provincial legislation.

The article goes on to make other comments, Mr. Chairman. I will quote this part where it says:

"To date," says Mrs. Mary Turner, president of the Protestant Children's Homes, "the only success we have had is to discover how little our elected members know about day care."

Letters received back from NDP and Liberal MPPs were enthusiastic about family day care being brought under provincial legislation.

Tory MPPs however, almost to a man, replied with the sentiment expressed by Mr. Yaremko when he said: "The department considers it preferable that day care

of children apart from their parents should take place in a setting like a nursery where training staff provide a beneficial experience for them."

Now perhaps the Minister would like to comment on that later.

Our previous critic of this portfolio, Mr. Horace Racine, asked, two years ago—and I mention this, Mr. Chairman, just to point out what this party has been trying to do over the years, to repeat and repeat and to hope that some of our suggestions might sink in with this department:

Has the Minister thought of a programme similar to the one mentioned in the May 1967 issue of the *Christian Science Monitor* entitled "Success Insurance" which prods employers in the anti-poverty fight? I quote from that article:

"The Office of Economic Opportunity is more and more taking signals from the American business community. . . . Anti-poverty officials consider it good politics. . . . They also think of it as sound policy. Businessmen, after all, they say, have long experience in job training and development. . . . and it is job development which is central to the elimination of poverty, OEO officials maintain. . . ."

"The latest cue from the business community is a proposal to insure businessmen against the risks of taking poor people into training programmes. . . . OEO has agreed to try out a programme in a pilot project in four cities which will be announced later. . . . The OEO publicity people have given the new programme the title 'Success Insurance'. . . . The concept was advanced through the OEO Business Leadership Advisory Council which recently met in Washington to discuss the current direction of the poverty programme. . . ."

"The 'Success Insurance' plan was developed by Joseph H. Kanter, a Cincinnati banker and industrialist. 'Basically, the principle of this proposal,' he explained, 'is to motivate private industry to accomplish socially desirable objectives by insuring it against undue risk and loss.' He says the plan 'encourages and motivates the unemployed towards new achievements—and with dignity, since no hand-out, charity or giveaway is involved.' The programme insures the businessman who employs poor and under-skilled persons for both training costs and losses from low productivity during the learning period.

"This would come in Phase I of the programme designed to reach the hard-core unemployed. OEO will put up the funds for the insurance. Then, if an employee leaves during the training programme, the business would be reimbursed for the cost of the training. Thus the business will be protected. This protection is thought to give sufficient incentive to the businessman to willingly take on the training venture. If the trainee, however, finishes the programme and becomes a productive worker, without leaving the programme, then it would cost the Office of Economic Opportunity nothing."

And the article goes on giving a description of Phase 2 of the programme, which permits a worker who has received Phase 1 to pay for his own insurance, and to receive a loan from the business which trains him.

And the article ends thus: "Clearly, the interest which business is showing in the poverty programme is growing steadily."

And then Mr. Racine went on to ask this question of the Minister, two years ago:

Could not such a programme be implemented in our "Province of Opportunity"? Could not the Minister of Social and Family Services, with the Minister of Economics and Development, the Minister of Labour, and perhaps, the Minister of Education, get together to do something like this in the province? Immediate results may not be seen before a few years. But in 10 years we might have succeeded in making thousands of families in underdeveloped areas self-supporting and helping to develop our economy. Is this not one of the ways of eliminating poverty from our province?

Mr. Chairman, two years later I am asking the same question again, and this time I would like an answer, something Mr. Racine did not get.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a quick rundown of some of the other points I wish to make more fully as the various votes come up.

The Minister used to get over the long time lag in the statistics supplied in his annual report by publishing a monthly bulletin. This seems to have stopped. Why?

What happened to the much-vaunted welfare appeal board? Is it operating? Why do we hear so little about it? Is it that the Minister does not have enough people available to get the board going? We hear talk about involving the poor in programmes to do with the poor. Why then, is this not being done here? There are many capable people in receipt of welfare, and they know at first hand what the hang-ups are. So let us have them in positions where they can advance the schemes and methods of welfare in a meaningful manner.

Since last year, we have seen, on federal initiative, the establishment of two federal-provincial task forces. One will look into the implications of the costs of all social assistance programmes. The other will study the social alienation of welfare recipients and the integration of services to help combat that alienation. These task forces are not expected to report, however, before September next. But the dialogue must not die in the interim.

We have to be eternally vigilant, as Friday's *Hansard* shows (March 21, 1969). Here, and I quote, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) confirms the existence of a report setting out "the rate that will be paid by any department of government which subsidizes in full or in part the maintenance of patients in nursing homes". Any department. So that includes Social and Family Services. And here is the Minister of Health getting this secret report and refusing to table it in the House.

We are told by the Minister of Health that:

On the basis of an analysis of nursing home costs, it was ascertained that a rate of \$9.50 *per diem* was adequate to meet and curb expenditures and depreciation, and provide for an appropriate return on investment. In addition it took into account additional expenditures related to the increase in the minimum wage.

That is what the Minister of Health said. However, the report was not available to members of this Legislature—and just how long can this government continue to treat elected representatives of the people of Ontario in this fashion? This action is not so much an affront to this House, although it is that, but an insult to the people, the taxpayers, of Ontario as a whole. Since this report was not made available to the Legislature, no breakdown of costs was seen. Nor were they forthcoming when the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) pressed for them. "We simply state," said the Minister of Health with his usual degree of arrogance, "that \$9.50 *per diem* in our judgment is the rate that will be paid by any department of government". His words. Judge and jury. Take it or leave it. Gratuitously, he added: "We do not presume to dictate to the nursing home industry what they shall charge".

My point, Mr. Chairman, is this. Either the nursing home industry is making inordinate profits by charging more than \$9.50 a day, or the government is short-changing the operators by putting on this power-play, this squeeze-play in rates. It can only be one or the other, and, so far as the public is concerned, the situation either way is totally unsatisfactory.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to say that the shameful treatment of the Indians of Ontario by this government, which hides behind its unique interpretation of The BNA Act to duck its responsibilities in this regard, is becoming known far and wide.

Even the *Telegram* which, as I said, is usually quite friendly to this government, has just run a series of articles, and some of the things that I saw in these articles, Mr. Chairman, have left me really wondering. I did not know, and I am sure most of the people who read the *Telegram* had no idea of the facts, that an Indian has to ride in the rear coach of the ONR trains. If some of the things that were stated in that series of articles are true, then our northland, our Indian reserves are no better than some of the places found south of the border.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, we as a group cannot look in the mirror and say we have no faults. This government, Mr.

Chairman—if some of those things are true—has an awful lot that it could do.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, has the Minister of Social and Family Services ever considered taking the Cabinet, or asked the Prime Minister to take the Cabinet to visit some of these reserves? Has he actually ever considered meeting some of these Indians—and I do not only mean the band leaders, but I mean some of the new militants, some of the very ones you may be seeing right in front of Queen's Park here some day, who may be having a march of the poor. Let me warn this government, Mr. Chairman, that it is very possible that you will be having a Cabinet meeting right upstairs while they are downstairs, and I can see the Minister of Social and Family Services saying to the Prime Minister, "What do they want? What did we do wrong?"

For years, Mr. Chairman, my leader and many of the members from this party, and members from the New Democratic Party, have been trying to tell you to ask the Indians what they want, see what can be done to get them to help themselves, because if we do not, I am afraid there is going to be a bombshell of an explosion. I say this, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, because it is frightening when you see on television how the Rev. Abernathy had this march of the poor to Washington, and what some of the police tried to do to them there.

I wonder what is going to happen to the OPP, whether they are going to try and stop some of the Indians coming in, because it is going to happen. I am not just talking in fanciful terms.

The member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) mentioned what the police did when there was not even any cause for panic—no reason for trying to stop people from getting in here—when the humane society people came. I wonder what is going to happen if we do have Indians from all over Ontario come down to Queen's Park to protest their lot right here. If there is the slightest bit of violence, what is our OPP going to do then, what kind of orders are they going to get from the Cabinet? Mr. Chairman, the Indians of this province know that in every way, from OMSIP to community development, they are getting short-changed, and this Minister's department is no exception. To the Robarts government, Ontario's Indians are second-class citizens, period. Is that the way it must continue to be? I certainly hope not.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak as critic of the New Democratic Party for The Department of Social and Family Services, I have listed a series of questions for the Minister, questions which I expect to be answered during the estimates.

I would like to draw to the Minister's (Mr. Yaremko) attention that he is to be severely criticized if this is the last report that has been made from his department—"The 35th Annual Report 1965/66"—which leaves us with statistics three years and three months old. I would say, Mr. Chairman, if there is no more recent report, and none of our members have one, we are going to be here for a long time getting these facts and figures sorted out.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A number of months, I would think.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would advise the members where the report is—hearing an interjection just now—or the state it is in for our use.

An hon. member: When can we expect it?

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would make note that I believe this is the only department that is far behind in presenting its annual report to the members of the Legislature.

Question 1. What were the amounts requested by the Minister for his department in submitting his requirements to the Treasury Board?

Question 2. What cutbacks were made by the Minister on the amounts to meet the Treasury Board's decision?

Question 3. Would the Minister have expanded the services of his department if there were sufficient funds from the Treasury Board, and where would they have been expanded?

Question 4. What research, if any, has been done, or will be done, by the Minister's department to evaluate the successes and failures of the system now employed by his department in the various areas of alleviating social misery, social needs?

Question 5. What are the goals of the Minister's department? Where is the department going? What will the department have achieved at the end of spending nearly \$265 million, for which he is requesting approval during these estimates?

That concludes my questions, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of these estimates.

I would like to break my remarks today into three sections. First, I would like to

speaking about the people from whom the \$265 million approximately is taken. Second, I will speak for the people who are in receipt of the benefits of the \$265 million, under the Acts of The Department of Social and Family Services. And third, I would like to get to the heart and the mind of the members of the Cabinet who, in my view, have contrived a remarkable combination of neanderthal thinking with clever cunningness to give, and yet not give, Mr. Chairman, assistance under The General Welfare Assistance Act and The Family Benefits Act to persons in need in the province of Ontario.

This legislation is not worthy of some of the clever minds in the Cabinet of the province of Ontario. There is no point, Mr. Chairman, in having a legislative assembly where, if we come in here after hours, we find men very carefully dusting the fine scrolls on the wall, and upstairs we find the ladies very carefully dusting and washing the fine grille work on the railings, if we have the conditions that we have outside these doors.

There is no use, Mr. Chairman, in a government like this one, having the Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) entertaining symphony orchestra leader Mr. Ozawa and his parents on one night in this building, while in Metropolitan Toronto alone, 15,000 to 16,000 children of families in receipt of public welfare are being short changed in life, as children, and never really catching up in many instances. However, Mr. Chairman, it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister to not invite members of the Opposition in entertaining such an interesting family as the Ozawa family, but it is not, I say with respect, Mr. Chairman—because of the courtesy I have had extended to me in this Chamber—the prerogative of the government, the Cabinet or the Prime Minister, to disregard problems of the children and the unsheltered persons in the province of Ontario, except for these two dreadful Acts.

I refer, of course, to The General Welfare Assistance Act, and The Family Benefits Act. The Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, must take the responsibility for the unsheltered. They are the Prime Minister's people, Mr. Chairman, as much as the taxpayers, as much as the people with special income, special interests, or the people of the business and financial community. The responsibility has fallen upon this Prime Minister, or been sought by him, to lead the millions of people in the whole of Ontario to a full and productive life. The unsheltered in our province, Mr. Chairman, are in the direct

care of the Prime Minister, and that is a broad responsibility that rests on his shoulders.

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions that I would like to ask with respect of the Prime Minister. He may have the shoulders, Mr. Chairman, but does he have the will and the determination to overhaul this antiquated system that most of us are living under in this province, trying to assist persons in need? As an example, Mr. Chairman, in Metro Toronto there is something wrong with a society that cannot take 6,000 to 7,000 families into its mainstream of life when there are nearly two million persons here to do it. Something is wrong with the system, Mr. Chairman, and it is a challenge to the Prime Minister.

Ontario leads in so many facets; why not modernize its care for the unsheltered, so members like myself can be proud of the system? We are the province of abundance and members of the legislative assembly are always being told that we, in this province, lead in welfare assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I say why not? I am looking at a report of the Canadian committee of the International Council on Social Welfare for the 14th International Conference, May, 1968. On page 57, table 8 are the results of the United Fund Drive—numbers of affiliated agencies and population served by provinces in Canada in 1967. The source is the Canadian Welfare Council and the Canadian Community Funds and Council. Mr. Chairman, of the provinces listed, the province of Ontario in its United Fund drives alone, to say nothing of government funding, raised \$20 million plus in total receipts.

Other provinces, Mr. Chairman, drop away down below that. The nearest one is Quebec with \$12 million plus and then nearest to that is British Columbia with \$4 million plus. The others are \$1 and \$2 million; and there are three less than \$1 million. Why should Ontario not lead in this legislation?

As I said, Mr. Chairman, it is a challenge. But let us look where we are going in the province of Ontario in relationship to minority groups and especially to the unsheltered persons. I make those comments, with all due respect.

Lastly, I will speak on the things which might be changed in the Minister's department to bring it into focus as being a department which is knowledgeable about the reality of the conditions of the families for whom it is providing this service. There are a few facts of life which must be brought home to the Minister in this department, and

to members of Cabinet, before they can usefully spend \$265 million in this department and show some productive return for their efforts. They must make goals and set out to achieve them and must make research of what they have done and the effect it has had on the problem.

I turn now, Mr. Chairman, to section 1—the people from whom the \$265 million plus will be taken. There are many families in the province of Ontario who have contributed towards the budget that we are presently being asked to approve in these estimates for the department. Most of those families contributed the year before to last year's estimates of \$227 million and to the estimates before, Mr. Chairman, of millions of dollars. And in the interim periods they contributed to community chests, cancer campaigns, all the various drives of funds for social needs that we have had in our province over the years to assist government in its work of caring for persons in need.

Most of these individuals and families do not mind that they have been contributing to the alleviation of human suffering and need. These are not wealthy families, Mr. Chairman. Recent interim DBS statistics have shown that more than 50 per cent of the families in the province of Ontario earn less than \$7,000 a year. We heard in the Throne Speech debate from the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) that families of four who earn \$7,000 a year pay approximately \$1,287 annually in government taxation and premiums of one kind or another.

This leaves the family which earns \$7,000 with an income of liquid assets of \$5,713 from its \$7,000 income, or about \$15 a day. We heard in the same member's Throne Debate Speech that if the family income for four is \$5,000 a year, they pay \$862 exclusive of indirect taxes and motor vehicles taxes, in government taxation and premiums, leaving them \$4,138 income or \$11 a day. The cost of living for those families has risen in the last year 4.5 per cent on all items and 3.8 per cent on food alone.

I am impelled to point out, Mr. Chairman, that what the average family has left to live on is eaten up pretty well with the business of just living, paying for food, clothing and shelter and automobile, books, newspapers, smokes, incidental personal needs, and the money it has given to government is really the cream of its income, which if government were not taking any at all, it would in all likelihood accrue in a savings account for that rainy day when adversity might hit, for

the day in the family where one should fall ill or the day when drugs have to be purchased on a continuing basis or a catastrophe might strike, for the day when emotional instability might hit anyone in the family.

We are taking that money into government, Mr. Chairman—the \$1,287 in the case of the \$7,000-a-year family of four and the \$862.38 in the case of the \$5,000-a-year family of four. A lot of these people from whom we are taking this money are saying: "Why government at all? Maybe I would just as soon bank this money, take my chances with some other kind of system." And the government says: "Who will build your roads, build your schools, provide a network of communication?" And the reply will be: "Private enterprise, because they provide it anyway".

Perhaps they will provide it more expeditiously and more efficiently than it is provided under government because they are in the business of building roads and they are in the business of building schools and they are not, at the same time, caught up in the intricacies of government. And if they enquire they would learn that this year government is also asking for \$740 million in round figures in the estimates for education. And they will ask "Why do new schools have electronic clocks that cost some \$650, that are synchronized and electrically timed and we got through our schooling with a clock on the wall that cost probably closer to \$65?"

And because they see these visual things they will ask: "Why would plywood chairs with small nicks be scrapped in my child's school? Why were they not filled with plastic wood like I would have to do at home?"

In The Department of Highways, which is the second highest estimate we are looking at in this session—the \$483 million estimate they will say: "What are they doing all the time on Highway 401? Why has Highway 7 between Peterborough and Ottawa been under a constant state of resurfacing and repairing over the last 10 to 15 years?" And when they look at the \$397 million estimated for The Department of Health they will say: "You need all this money for health? Why did OMSIP premiums and my Ontario Hospital Services Commission premiums go up and why am I asked to pay them sometimes as far ahead as six months?"

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in these three departments and these three estimates—which are the only three departments with estimates in excess of The Department of Social and Family Services—at least the taxpayer sees some tangible evidence of what is being done.

He sees roads being built, signs going on them, schools coming into communities, probably children in them, community health services at school, hospitals being built.

He does not see anything for the \$264,700 that is being requested for The Department of Social and Family Services. Then, when these same families draw or need to draw on welfare assistance, I would like to give you half a dozen examples and a couple of actual statements of what happens to these families. These are all actual cases, Mr. Chairman.

Case A: The man in the family becomes ill. He had a small television repair business which now, because of his heart condition, he is unable to work at. The wife has worked for a public utility for 10 to 12 years and has built a small form of security with that company, earning approximately \$55 a week. After a month or two of illness, the family cannot meet their mortgage payments.

The money the wife earns is not enough to do the two things that are required to be done: one, meet the mortgage payments for shelter and, two, provide herself and her husband with food, incidentals, transportation, drugs. In the face of losing their home, the wife turns to The Department of Social and Family Services or The Department of Welfare for assistance.

She is told because she earns \$55 a week that the family does not qualify for assistance. She is told, however, that: "If you give up your job you will be entitled to shelter allowance, therefore your mortgage will be met—it is within the allowance made in provision under the Act and a sum will be paid monthly as well, to you and your husband, of \$80 to \$96 as persons of need."

But, Mr. Chairman, the family did not want to become totally dependent on government. The family simply wanted the mortgage payments met until the husband was able to earn for himself once more. The husband has provided the mortgage payments up until now; the wife's income does not allow for both care of her husband and herself and providing the payments.

It is not a very complex situation, Mr. Chairman. It is ludicrous that we have a government which will care for this family totally if the wife will choose not to work, but will not assist her in keeping herself in the work force.

Now I know, Mr. Chairman, that this is pretty dry stuff and it concerns only a few thousand people in the province, but it matters a great deal to the people who are trying to make it work.

I do not know where the press go when they go from the galleries up there, but I notice they are gone. There probably is not anything very exciting for them here because they have never really sat down and looked to find out what is exciting. The people do not know their rights and the press have an obligation, in my personal view, Mr. Chairman, to provide public information through the press as to how their government is working for them.

In case B, Mr. Chairman, a widow with small children is getting down to the last few thousand dollars of her insurance money—and, as I said before, Mr. Chairman, these are all actual cases. I would be glad to supply them to anyone who has an interest in their facts.

She applied for mother's allowance. Under the regulation for mother's allowance, she is allowed to keep savings of \$1,200 for herself, plus one dependent child, plus \$200 for each additional dependent child in the family.

The mother's allowance is going to take three months to process. That in itself, Mr. Chairman, is a farce. When a woman is widowed and is a clear-cut case for mother's allowance, there should be no reason why she should not come to this building, if to nowhere else, and declare herself, not go on the roll of the municipality left to provide 20 per cent of her care until such time as her case is dealt with by this government.

When she comes to this building, or to any other building, Mr. Chairman, and shows that she is a person in need, her allowance could begin immediately. It could be reclaimed if anything was done in error, as this system is in use today. She could do this, Mr. Chairman, before the money which the Act has made provision for her to keep is used up.

There are no great public notices telling widows of the province of Ontario to be sure to contact government three months ahead. The latest report I have back from a mother's allowance applicant is that the workers told her it would take six months to process the application. There is nothing to say: "It will take three months or six months to check you out and make certain that you are eligible for this allowance, so therefore please apply to us while you still have about \$5,000 of your husband's insurance money left."

In this particular case, the woman was advised to pay \$1,000 off her home—she had actually \$2,000 from her insurance money

on her husband's death—and when she got down to \$200 she was to go to welfare and they would expect her to live on the \$200 for one month. Then, after she had been on welfare and her mother's allowance was processed, she would be entitled to mother's allowance—when the nest egg of money specifically provided for in the Act that she would have been allowed to keep under the Act is used up.

In this particular case, the lady lived on welfare from April-May, 1968, until she called me in September, a full six and a half months later, to see why she could not get on mother's allowance. This system, Mr. Chairman, is defeating the whole purpose of having a Family Benefit Act. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the lady, once my action was exerted, was put on the allowance forthwith. That is another thing, Mr. Chairman, that is wrong with the system.

However, I was curious as to why this had taken so long, Mr. Chairman, so I wrote a letter. And before speaking of the letter, because it is addressed to Dr. James Band, I would like to say that I certainly join with the Minister in his affectionate remarks towards Dr. Band. Although I have not met Dr. Band personally and I will rectify it at some future date, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate from many reports I have had that the gentleman has done an excellent service to the province of Ontario and to this government.

But I wrote Dr. Band outlining how much the recipient appreciated receiving the mother's allowance and thanked all concerned. I quote now from that letter:

However, as a member of the legislative assembly, I am at the present time vitally concerned with the delay in processing applications for mother's allowance under The Family Benefits Act.

The delay, of course, can mean that the mother must use up the last thousand dollars before being eligible for general welfare assistance until the mother's allowance benefit is approved, where—

And then I outlined, Mr. Chairman, that she would have been allowed to retain some financial assets. In the last paragraph, I said:

I am now looking at several cases in my riding of Scarborough Centre where this has happened and respectfully request that you will please comment on the delay between the date of original application and the granting of an allowance in this specific case.

I think we have to know, Mr. Chairman, when there are delays like this why there are delays and why they cannot be handled more expediently.

By allowing this sort of "first welfare assistance and then mother's allowance" technique, this government is making a complete mockery of the rules and regulations of The Family Benefits Act, which distinctly call for an amount of money to be left with the family. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that emotionally and spiritually, by now, widowed and deserted and separated mothers in this position have not only suffered the loss of their husbands but they then have to suffer the indignities that go with public welfare. And there are indignities, Mr. Chairman, and I will deal with those later.

Case C: In this case the mother is an emphysema victim. The father earns \$85 to \$90 a week. The family is four children, ranging in age from five to mid-teens. The mother is anxious to stay well and alive and care for her children while she can, and to do this she requires somewhere between \$15 and \$35 a month for modern drugs for treatment of emphysema.

At the time I am speaking to you, Mr. Chairman, the family is in danger of losing their home because they cannot meet payments. They have until June to do so. They are in danger of the gas being cut off. And it is not that they cannot manage their income—they have a very strict budget which allows \$15 a week for food for the family of seven—but what they do need is to not have to put any of their housekeeping money on drugs. And if they do not offer, Mr. Chairman, through government, some form of partial assistance to this family, they have two alternatives.

One, the applicant says, has been carefully outlined by the Scarborough Department of Welfare: "Mrs. — if your husband leaves you we can supply you with everything." The husband has had a breakdown, on one occasion from the strain of stretching the dollars and the worry of the illness; watching the money grow smaller and smaller, depending on how many dollars of drugs are needed for that month, whether it is \$15 or whether it is \$35, because of the changing treatment, and he now is saying on occasion: "This is it. I am going, I am clearing out, you would be better off."

He had never been an irresponsible father, Mr. Chairman. His wife has testified to this. His wife has not lost hope, she is so anxious to do something for herself and for other

people in this position that she wants to do a television broadcast. She wants to talk publicly. She has asked me to use her name—I will call her Mrs. W. She wants to know what she could do to expose this unusual situation where a family needs such a small amount of assistance, and if they do not get it, might very well end up costing the government a great deal more.

There is something wrong with the system, Mr. Chairman, that cannot provide this lady with \$35 a month, or more, for drugs in the anticipation that the family will be kept from being totally dependent on government. If this lady is incapacitated any further before the children reach maturity, this government will have on its hands the cost of four children on children's aid, at as much per day as she is asking now per month, and the chances of that happening are very good.

The lady has been a TB patient. Her daughter is a TB patient, or has the same lung disease. The mother has had a legal abortion and hysterectomy because the doctors did not feel she was well enough or strong enough to bear one more child. In a few years if she can carry out her responsibility of raising her children it will have to be with the assistance of government.

Case D: Mr. Chairman, what happens in the case of an aged person whom no one in the family can support in the fashion that is needed once the aged parent becomes incapacitated?

I am looking at a case of a 65-year-old daughter who has supported her mother ever since her mother was 50 years old. Her mother at the present time is 91 years. For 40 years the government was spared having to support a lady who had never worked, whose daughter had the initiative to go to work and support the two of them, sometimes along with the help of her husband, so they were able to care for the mother in their home.

Now the 65-year-old daughter is widowed. She is suffering from angina herself. She cared for her mother right up until the day her mother had a stroke recently—about Christmas time, if I recall the case correctly—and financially the daughter had been able to care for the mother when there was no other case needed. The mother was a woman of sound mind and sound limb, but after the stroke she became a person who was able to wash and care for herself to a degree but was sometimes continent, sometimes incontinent; sometimes vague, sometimes unsure on her feet.

The 65-year-old daughter could not provide for the kind of care that the mother now needs. All her life the daughter has contributed to taxes, as have all these other people I have been speaking about, Mr. Chairman, and their husbands also. Then at some juncture of their lives they turn around to call upon the service themselves and find that there is nothing there. They find that they have been supporting something which is not real to them, something which is a paternalistic cash hand-out only if you are completely destitute in the area of public welfare, and only if you fall neatly into some form of categorical aid under The Family Benefits Act.

So after caring for a person who would otherwise have been dependent on government for 40 to 50 years, the daughter then finds herself now needing and begging government to take care of her 91-year-old mother. She had to declare to a hospital, Mr. Chairman, that she would not be home if they delivered the mother—because they threatened to deliver the 91-year-old home.

The private doctor was saying the patient needed convalescent care; the hospital doctor was saying the patient did not need convalescent care. The doctor was under pressure to clear the hospital bed—and we all know that story, Mr. Chairman, and we will discuss it under another department.

These people are shocked, they are absolutely shocked that they have been contributing for years to something which they cannot draw upon at the time they need it. It is usually the first time they have needed government in this type of assistance. In many cases it may be the last time.

Case E: This is a family with an emotionally disturbed child. The family have basically handled the child themselves, though the child is blind, possibly retarded, but definitely emotionally disturbed. The child is now eight, Mr. Chairman. In ten years the child is going to be an adult. What will she have learned by then and how far will her capacities have been tapped? Will they have been tapped to full strength?

The mother cannot keep on being a source of strength and source of supply to the child. Through The Department of Education the child is at present in a nursery school where the lady in charge of the school has worked with some deaf children, but other than this she has had no training whatsoever to work with emotionally disturbed children nor blind children. The child does not qualify for the blind school because of her emotional disturbance.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, the family who have been contributing now find that in their time of need there is nothing there. There is nothing in The Department of Social and Family Services for this family of need. And I would ask the Minister if he would support a day care programme in the areas where these cases come before us. Would he support a programme put in by the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis)—a day care programme in Scarborough, for instance—for emotionally disturbed children?

What seems to be the most dastardly flaw to me in many ways, because we tend to think of our civilization as being civilized now, is the plight of the unmarried mother who leaves the hospital with her infant and the infant is not allowed to be a recipient along with the mother, on mother's allowance, until the infant is three months old. So the two of them go on welfare. Mr. Chairman, this to me is deplorable.

This is government saying some mothers will give up their child, some of them will have a struggle and they will part with the child—and that is the likelihood in many instances—and the government really does not want the trouble of booking them on, booking them off, so we will just make a nice three-month cushion here. A shabby trick.

The other shabby side of the story, Mr. Chairman, is the plight of the pregnant girl whom the doctor provides with a chart requiring meat, vegetables, milk, and assistance is only provided under The Department of Welfare if the pregnant girl is not living at home, if under 21 years of age. If she is living at home, her parents are expected to provide for her. In a case I recently had the unhappy experience of sitting on one end of a telephone listening to exactly what happened in an instance such as this.

The father earned \$30 a week as a part-time worker in a shopping centre, cleaning it up. The mother had always managed to work and that was the combination that sustained the family—a family of courage, a family of religion, a family of close association with each other. They were so close that the mother's shock at the daughter's plight—aggravated by the fact that the partner of the pregnant girl found some delight in taunting the mother by telephone about the girl's condition—meant the mother was unable to work. She became severely depressed and took an overdose of pills. The daughter called an ambulance and got the mother to hospital. We believe at this date the mother has been saved.

But because the mother was so worried about what was going to happen to her 17-year-old daughter, with respect to food and care, she became absolutely useless to the daughter herself. And I am shocked and horrified to think that in this day and age we do not have a system in this province outside of private organizations and private religious groups, which have come to recognize that a lone pregnant girl—so often of the age of 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18—needs a secure warm, dry, healthy place to live and to be fed, providing she is being left by society to carry an unwanted pregnancy, because we have not any proper abortion laws in Canada or in Ontario.

We have not come very far from the days of *Oliver Twist* in many ways, Mr. Chairman, and there is very little point in our being proud of erecting a \$14 million pavilion at the Canadian National Exhibition when in fact we have these conditions, or in having "The Warble Fly Control Act" if we are missing the whole spectrum of care and accounting for unsheltered persons in between those two extremes.

I am not saying that we should not be building the \$14 million pavilion. I am simply saying that we have enough money, we have enough resources, we have enough brain power and we should have enough intelligence in the province of Ontario, to deal with the cases I have described in a healthy manner, in a manner of prevention, something which the whole Department of Social and Family Services is entirely without.

It is entirely without any programme of prevention, even though, as I pointed out during the last session, it takes huge amounts of money from the federal government, under the Canada Assistance Plan, an Act that carefully calls for prevention in the areas of social need, and an unlimited amount of assistance may be provided under the Act when necessary.

In answer to the provisions under the Canada Assistance Plan, in the province of Ontario, we get instead the devious cunning of the persons who devise these Acts, any amount of "special assistance" available, provided it is approved by the Deputy Minister. No one who goes in and out of the offices, or applies for these services, is ever told this.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the clause saying this "special assistance" of any kind may be granted, providing it is approved by the Deputy Minister, might just as well not be in the Act. It is simply window dressing.

And if, Mr. Chairman, the Minister can fault me and say, "Well, we do have this many cases of special assistance," I would say quite clearly that this is certainly not common knowledge of the average applicant for assistance in the province of Ontario in any of the welfare offices that I have spoken to in the last year.

It is the deviousness of this government that puts it there—the phrase "special assistance"—and then does not make it an actual avenue of expeditious service by not laying down the ground rules to municipalities, Mr. Chairman.

It is amazing, Mr. Chairman, what comes sometimes from the province of Alberta, besides, I believe, our own Prime Minister. But an act of prevention has come—

Mr. Lewis: That may account for it.

Mrs. M. Renwick: —has come from joining the Canada Assistance Plan. From the province of Alberta comes a prevention Act—and that province, for private United Fund drives, Mr. Chairman, was only able to raise almost \$3 million. We have raised almost seven times that much privately, and somehow, we are limping along behind another province. We are in the dark ages, Mr. Chairman, in that regard.

My last three cases are of the people who come to the door and knock and find there is nothing for them, sometimes are told so in sometimes polite terms, sometimes very impolite terms.

I would like to draw attention to the case of a lady discharged from hospital; a chronic care patient whose husband earns \$50 a week. The husband does the laundry for the lady; the lady is sometimes incontinent. The lady's spirit is such that she was determined to fight. The lady has, since I made these notes, Mr. Chairman, died.

The husband applied for assistance of someone to go into the home, or money to provide for someone to go into the home, even part of the day, to alleviate the long day of a chronic care patient. Once again, Mr. Chairman, if the husband had left his job completely all would have been cared for. The gentleman applied last July, the decision was made in November and the tragic end to that story was that in January, the lady died.

There is the case of a widow, struggling to meet rent increases—a case which I have brought into the House by name previously,

because of high increase of rent—supporting one son, 14 years of age. He was apparently a student who merited the \$30 board of education scholarship but, because he was 14 instead of 15, got \$20 from IODE instead. Her daughter went through the school on the same \$30 educational scholarship of this government and yet, somehow, we have not been able to tie in their need for housing with our anxiety to assist them in education.

People are concerned when they are in the next-to-poverty level, Mr. Chairman. I have a letter from a constituent in my riding which I will be glad to divulge to anybody who would like to see it, but because of the responsibility of it, I would have to make certain as to whom the letter was going. It was written in February of last year and I updated it partly through the year. It is a short letter, Mr. Chairman. It says:

Dear Mrs. Renwick:

I trust you will not find me too impertinent writing you but you are our member at Queen's Park.

Are you aware that there are employees in the Civil Service of Ontario—Department of Highways, to be exact—making less than \$4,500 a year? Could you raise two children and run a house on that? My husband is one of those underpaid workers. We would have more peace of mind if we were on welfare. The technical and drafting group has been negotiating for a raise since 1966, with no results.

Mr. Chairman, in there I have written "raise was given—\$150 a year, and they were asking for \$300 or more." To continue with the letter, Mr. Chairman:

Furthermore, is it fair that some departments in the civil service demand exams before a person can advance where others do not? I fully realize this is your initial term as a member of Parliament and do not actually know what you could do about it, but I thought you should be made aware of these conditions. I hope you will keep our name out of any discussions as I would not want to jeopardize my husband's job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is something rather pathetic about a letter like that. The government is on both ends of this letter.

If the family should disintegrate under the system and go on welfare, then they are having to take them on the other end. Why not look after their needs by providing a decent income to keep them from having to come to the government's door?

I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to a Toronto *Daily Star* editorial, September 21, 1968. It is entitled:

WELFARE SYSTEM PROMOTES LYING,
CHEATING

New York Civil Liberties Union: The union advocates the substitution of an income maintenance programme, which is unconditionally guaranteed as a matter of right, for the present welfare system.

We take this position because our examination of the present welfare system has led us to conclude that it contains severe and pervasive deprivation of civil liberties. The intrusion of privacy that is built into the present system, can best be illustrated by a description of the way in which the system actually operates in New York city.

The semi-monthly welfare cheque in New York city is based on pre-figured allowances in these categories. Food, personal care, clothing, school supplies, household supplies, utilities, and rent. The food allowances, for example, are based on the daily allowance, per person, of 15 cents for breakfast, 25 cents for lunch, 50 cents for dinner, or a total of 90 cents per person per day.

Now, I would like to stop there, for a second, Mr. Chairman, in that editorial, to say that I have been trying for some time to get the Minister to break down the pre-added budgets for me, to show me what portion of those budgets are for food, what portions are for clothing, what portions are for personal needs—and, in The Family Benefits Act, that would also take in utilities and cleaning supplies.

I tried this on a diplomatic basis, the first try. I wrote a note to the Minister either during the estimates, or sometime shortly after last year, and the Minister wrote back:

Margaret:

The regulations setting out the pre-added budgets were passed—FBA: April 1, 1967, GWA: July 1, 1967. The development of the amounts were an internal matter and form government policy based on the consideration of the factors involved.

(Signed)

Yaremko.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is too serious to say that. Sure it is an internal matter. This is the whole food supply of the family, plus their clothing, plus their personal needs; and we cannot determine how much the government

is allowing out of the public purse to these people for food.

Mr. Lewis: We will in this estimate!

Mrs. M. Renwick: The hon. member for Scarborough West says: "We will in this estimate". And this is what I say, Mr. Chairman. I demand that the Minister tell me in this estimate. I think it is shocking. I asked my secretary to check shortly after receiving this note and from her I have a memo, saying: "7, July 18, 1968. Mr. Groom, 2648. (1) How did they base pre-added budget? (2) Where and when was it updated? Answer: Treasury Board works on it—I presume that means Treasury, Mr. Chairman—economic council also works on it. Policy regulations, some allowances made. Updated April 1, 1967."

We talked today, Mr. Chairman, about the increase of cost of living for food alone in the last year.

Regulations, Cabinet and Executive Council. Mr. Groom unable to help. He suggested Minister, but he is away, so is Band. Executive Council, Mr. McIntyre 1944. I called Mr. McIntyre. On the basis of shared cost programmes with Ottawa not able to help. Miss Crittendon, 2388, Social and Family Services, Finance and Administration. Away ill, spoke to Mr. Nywening. Is taken by rent. And then the hopeful appendage. There is a research department in the planning stages for The Department of Social and Family Services."

Now, maybe, Mr. Chairman, for the first time I might have my finger on how this government arrives at about a-dollar-a-day-per-person for a family on general welfare assistance. I wonder if this is it; 90-cents-per-day-per-person. To continue with the editorial:

Equally destructing are the degrading values built into the personal care allowances. It is not only that the allowances are low, but that they so thoroughly degrade people who must live in such a web of regulations and standards. Welfare recipients are allowed a budget based on 12 bars of soap annually, 100 tissues—

Not 100 boxes, 100 tissues.

—one razor every four years, one comb every two years, one coat cleaning per year, and so on.

Mr. Lewis: You are not serious.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Scarborough West says, "You are

not serious." Now, I am speaking of the situation in New York which seems to have striking parallels with our own. We do not cheque semi monthly, Mr. Chairman, we cheque monthly, I believe. But I have heard reference as to the number of haircuts allowed, whether a man works or not, referring to our particular preadded budget, and I do hope the Minister will clarify that because of the cloud that is around them now. To continue with the editorial:

But in addition to such allowances, further distinctions are made. Ninety razor blades per year if a man is employed; 50 if unemployed. Twelve haircuts if employed, nine if unemployed. Two lipsticks per year if employed, one if unemployed. One haircut per year for females over 16, two for females between seven and 16. The level to which this specificity of the allowances descends includes the provision of 48 bobby pins per year, one sanitary belt every two years, 144 sanitary napkins per year. It is significant that no allowance whatever is provided for recreation of any kind, newspapers, books for children, or school field trips.

Conflict for the child on welfare is severe.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to stop at that one statement alone. If I do not say anything else today, the conflict that our services are making in the children of the province, alarms me. To continue with the editorial.

On the one hand the school teaches him to expand his reading, to use books and to increase his awareness through newspapers, and on the other hand the welfare system insists, these things are unimportant, and the expenditures for them constitute mismanagement of funds. The welfare system creates a culture in which few persons can avoid lying, in which manipulation is a virtue, nor are the effects of welfare limited to recipients. Indeed, the system can cause everyone connected with it to lie, and cheat or else abandon decency. Thus a young case-worker will falsify the case record rather than follow the direction of her supervisor that she personally inspect the worn out underwear of a man to verify his stated need of a special grant for new underwear.

Now the Minister will say: "Well, maybe we do not do that here." But I would like to draw attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the Minister in the last estimates expansively told me that welfare administrators

bent over backwards for recipients. I now know what he means by that. He means that where they may allow certain amounts for utilities, they allow the maximum amount, and where they may allow a certain amount for household cleaning supplies, in many cases they bend over and allow the full amount. It is a form of cheating too, one which I hope will continue until the Act is overhauled. To continue, Mr. Chairman:

The memories of social workers are crowded with such anecdotes. It is the welfare system itself which we believe leads to abuses and which needs to be changed if the abuses are to be eliminated.

Now for the first time, I believe in six years, there were six charges of fraud in Metro welfare cases. I have isolated only one of them, Mr. Chairman, because to do one is probably to do the other. It is a *Globe and Mail* clipping, April 1968. The title is "Ran Repair Business, Court Told. Man Faces Welfare Fraud Trial."

A 40-year-old father of five children operated a house repair business, while collecting \$1,166 in welfare payments in six months last year, a preliminary hearing in the magistrates court was told yesterday.

Then, Mr. Chairman, it mentions the name and address of the person which I can see no point in putting here, correct me, Mr. Chairman, if I am wrong. The gentleman was committed by Magistrate Addison for jury trial on a charge of defrauding the Metro welfare department of approximately \$1,400 last year. That is because his wife, when she reported separating from him in December, got some \$300. I believe that is the discrepancy in the figures, Mr. Chairman. To continue with the article:

The four others charged are to appear in court next month for their trial. Police hold a warrant for the arrest of a sixth person, a woman. The gentleman was paid \$131.90 by cheque from the welfare department twice a month for June and July, 1967, Douglas E. Richardson, Metro welfare district administrator, testified. He said that payments to—blank—continued in varying amounts for the next six months and welfare office forms indicated that—blank—did not declare any employment in that time. Blank—was paid \$1,166 by the welfare department from June 1 to November 16, the court was told. Three hundred and eleven dollars was paid by the department to—blank's—wife in December after she reported they had separated.

Alfred H testified he had paid a total of \$950 to the recipient, Mr. Chairman, in October, November, and early December, for demolition work to a house—and it gives the address—that was being renovated. The witness said that the gentleman had a truck with his name on it and supervised two other men on the job.

Mr. B told the hearing that he paid the gentleman a total of \$146 for repairs to houses from July to November last year. Mr. B, who operates an appliance store, said he buys houses, repairs them and sells them.

Mr.—blank—made repairs to a city-owned house in November and was paid \$49.50 by the city on December 4, a city property official told Magistrate Addison. A Metro treasury department official testified that \$209 was paid in December to the gentleman by Metro for repairs to houses.

So you might wonder what my point is, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with that so much in detail, but here it is: If you take all of the money that this family of seven—five children, two parents—received from welfare and all of the money they earned, in June they received two times \$131.90—\$263.80; in July two times \$131.90—\$263.80, a total of \$527.60; in August, \$182.40, in September \$182.40, in October \$182.40 and in November \$91.20, a total of \$1,166. If you add up what he received in the way of his maintenance work that he was carrying on, he received for the same seven-month period \$1,344. He ended up with \$403.70 per month, Mr. Chairman, or \$13.20 a day for a family of seven, less than \$2.25 a day for each of them. Now, if that does not prove conclusively, Mr. Chairman, that welfare is not enough and that we must somehow go into a guaranteed system, I do not know what does. When that family took their welfare allowances, and they took what the father earned with the truck, they still did not have any grand scale of living for a family of seven.

Regarding the welfare fraud cases, perhaps welfare fraud is a natural state of affairs when a father of five was paid only \$131.90 twice a month. This level of payment encourages fraud. Any social worker who does not understand the cause and effect in relationship between competitive affluence and hard core repetitive, unregenerate, even fraudulent poverty, has no business being in the profession.

We have heard, Mr. Chairman, the charges of the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk), of recipients being insulted, some be-

ing forced into being strikebreakers, whether welfare payments have been made in accordance with the provincial statutes is under question.

In the area of Scarborough—which I feel privileged to represent—children are given clothes. It is very fine for groups to do this, but what kind of society is this in Ontario where voluntary groups have to be formed because parents cannot afford clothes for their children? And this large area of activity by the private agencies in relationship to the government agency is an area that I asked—in my estimates of the last session—be gone into.

And I have no alternative, Mr. Chairman, but to repeat it, because it obviously fell either on deaf ears or on those who do not understand the crying need of an assessment between private agencies and the government agencies who are trying to assist people in need. If the question arises as to whether they are being given clothes, I have only this to refer to, from the *Toronto Daily Star*, January 11, 1969:

Scarborough group gives children clothes. Nearly 160 underprivileged Scarborough children have been provided with clothing since November from an emergency depot opened by home and school council women-volunteers in co-operation with the borough school board. It was set up after teachers, principals, attendance counsellors and public health nurses expressed concern about the number of people starting out for school in winter without adequate warm clothing or in badly worn garments.

Douglas Jenners, Scarborough board of education chief attendance counsellor, said yesterday, "So far we have been outfitting about 25 kids a week." Mrs. Donna Peachman, depot chairman and past president of the home and school council, said used clothing is collected and repaired by volunteers. "If a boy splits his trousers badly, and it is a week before next pay day, that can be pretty tragic for some parents," she said. "There is a definite need for this kind of service."

That brings me right back to the pre-added budget. How much of those budgets is the government saying, "We are giving you hoping you will have some left over from food to use for clothes?"

On page 3140 of *Hansard*, Tuesday, May 21, 1968, I called for a commission. I said:

It appears imperative to appoint a commission. The time has come when government's role and the private agencies' role have got to be assessed in rela-

tionship to each other and to the community they are serving; time to assess exactly what is happening in the field of private agencies.

Voluntary agencies need some government understanding of what is happening to draw comparison between what voluntary agencies can raise in their own communities for their own work—there is a large gap between that and what they want. They are cut down to what the agency even thinks it is wise to ask for.

The United Appeal takes it from there. They take it down to suit their ability, to fit into their economic forecast; and it is taken down again to what, in fact, the voluntary agency can actually receive, which is a very different figure from what it was originally. If the funds in various communities are unable to rise in proportion to increasing costs, they cannot afford to pay the salaries the government can pay. There is a steady drift of personnel from the private sectors to the government departments. Then comes the inexperienced staff, the untrained, lower quality, and this is sad, because the volunteer agencies were the pioneers of raising the standards of the staff of the service.

Rightist governments can deal this problem a severe blow while espousing the cause of individuals and individual efforts, not realizing what they are doing. Leftist governments give amounts to agencies and give them a job to do. Discussion must come from within the government with those outside the government to arrive at a sensible plan.

How does government see their role? Are they, in fact, providing their services, the volunteer agencies, in an efficient way? What assessment is going to be made of them? What is the criterion that brought about the dismay that the Big Brother movement was turned down by the department for the sum of \$30,000 when it is abundantly clear that they, in fact, provide an excellent counselling service, not only to the boys of their clients but to 75 per cent of the boys from one parent, mother oriented families. The counselling service has in fact extended effectively to the mothers of the boys in advising them of facilities available to them, through various social agencies to assist them in dealing with their problem, often before coming dependent on society.

The mothers, many of them, just did not know where to go or what was available to them in the way of social services. This is obviously an excellent agency which should be on a fee-for-service basis and its counselling continued, not cut back.

A commission should begin immediately to sort out where the categorical assistance of the federal Benefits Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act are in relationship to private agencies and where they are going, because the majority of volunteer agencies—due to the inability of volunteer fund raisers to provide sufficient moneys to meet increasing costs of operating—are today working with less staff than they did last year and last year they worked with less staff than they had the year before. The situation has continued for about five years and one is controlling the other.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we have private agencies as far back as 1967 collecting \$20 million in the province of Ontario, that this government owes them initiative to somehow assess the roles of the private agencies with the roles of the government

agencies because it does not look as though there is going to be any major overhaul of the social welfare system in the province of Ontario for some time to come. And my only hope is that an assessment will be made of how best to make the present system work.

I have an editorial, Mr. Chairman, it being two minutes of 6.00 o'clock, I think it could be read in that time. From the March 3, 1969, *Globe and Mail*:

FAULTY AS IT IS, WELFARE MUST GO ON

There is mounting evidence that our various welfare programmes, assistance plans, family allowances and equalization grants are, indeed, a patchwork. Not only are they inefficient and overlapping, but it has been shown conclusively that they are not eliminating the poverty cycle. The response in this realization has been a growing feeling that the most prudent approach would be to clear the battlefield and start all over again in the war of poverty.

The alternative that has been receiving the most attention has been some form of guaranteed annual income which might be implemented by means of a negative income tax. A family whose income falls below a certain level would receive a grant to bring it up to that level.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the next paragraph deals with the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White) and I would like to ask why it would not have been the Minister of Social and Family Services? To continue, Mr. Chairman:

Ontario Revenue Minister John White has joined those who want an investigation into the relative costs of what we call straight welfare programmes and guaranteed incomes.

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is something I would like to have heard from the Minister of Social and Family Services. Certainly not the next statement, to continue the editorial, which says:

He would also restrict spending of welfare programmes for the next two years until the comparison is in.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the hon. member could break her remarks at this point, it being time for recess.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT – DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 1, 1969

Estimates, Department of Social And Family Services, Mr. Yaremko, continued	2939
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	2969

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1969

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES (Continued)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When the House adjourned I was reading an editorial entitled, "Faulty As It Is, Welfare Must Go On." I had finished up to paragraph 4 where there was mounting evidence that we needed to take a look at the guaranteed annual income. Paragraph 4 referred to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. White), who had raised this question. To continue, Mr. Chairman:

Mr. White would do well to study the remarks of Dr. D. L. McQueen, the director of the Economic Council of Canada, made to a Glendon College seminar. He pointed out that the economic council's most recent report had been moderately successful in bringing home to Canadians the disgraceful fact that one of every five of us ekes out an existence in poverty, but the council has not been so effective in drawing attention to the failure of existing anti-poverty programmes based on our conventional wisdom. We all know, for instance, that Canada's poor are to be found in the Atlantic provinces and eastern Quebec, rural areas, and Indian and Eskimo communities. They are also to be found in families headed by widows or divorcees, and families where the man of the house is unemployed, and we have designed our welfare programme from this basis.

As Dr. McQueen puts it, it is all too easy to draw the conclusion that strong support of regional development in the eastern extremities of Canada, plus special measures for Indians and Eskimos and Metis, plus more day-care centres for small children, plus categorical welfare assistance for those too old or otherwise unable to work, would just about add up to an adequate anti-poverty programme

for Canada. But our figures indicate that while all of the measures mentioned are highly desirable, a programme limited to them alone would leave untouched a very large part of the low-income population.

Mr. Chairman, to pause there, I would like to draw to your attention, that is where I began my text today, with that section of the economy, for which I am beginning to have exactly the same concern as the people who fall in the levels below low-income population. To continue:

The economic council, which sets the poverty level at \$1,800 a year for a single person and \$4,800 for a family of five, found when it began to count heads that most of the poor live in cities rather than in rural areas and more than half of them live west of the Ottawa River. Most poor families are headed by men under 65. Furthermore, most of those below the poverty line could be described as "working poor"—not the unemployed but at least part-time members of the labour force.

Dr. McQueen's economists have been studying guaranteed income and negative income tax and they conclude that such a scheme would not be the panacea. Manpower programmes, individual improvement programmes and community improvement programmes would still be needed. They agree with Revenue Minister White, however, that more research is needed into the cost of welfare programmes as well as research into the root cause of the poverty.

Dr. McQueen has suggested that more use might be made of the Canada Assistance Plan, which at present covers only the aged. The council, with the help of the Vanier Institute of the Family, is exploring pre-school education as a means of giving the poor a running, instead of a limping, start into the formal educational system.

But the council never suggests, as Mr. White does, restriction of spending while new programmes are under investigation. It may seem, said Dr. McQueen, "that our main proposals for early action mostly involve the patching, co-ordination and extension of existing programmes." When,

you may ask, are we going to get out and do something for human beings? In answer to this question we should bear in mind that there are already people out there doing something—welfare workers and others who have dedicated their lives to dealing with poverty and its consequences. To leave them standing still while the research went on would be unthinkable.

Mr. Chairman, the next section of my text, if you recall, is to deal with the people who are at present living on the benefits of the almost \$265 million budget we are being asked to approve. I would like to draw your attention to about a dozen cases—baker's dozen maybe, Mr. Chairman, I believe there are 13—and these cases are taken from an NDP service centre in the east end of Metropolitan Toronto, the riding of Beaches-Woodbine. I think, Mr. Chairman, that they involve pretty concisely, exactly the sort of problems that the recipients are running into under The General Welfare Assistance Act and under The Family Benefits Act.

Case 1, Mr. A, receiving \$25 a week unemployment, no other income, not covered by Ontario Hospital coverage, is crippled and refused family benefits assistance.

Case 2, Mrs. B, separated—the date is on this one, Mr. Chairman, May 1968—separated from husband, has dependant daughter, has to board her daughter with married daughter. Mrs. B boards with a brother and is waiting for a reply on the list from Mrs. Meredith at OHC. Since that was May 1968, Mr. Chairman, that case may have been dealt with. I will check that out and see.

Case 3, Mr. and Mrs. B, February to November 1968, they were getting \$127 a month on family benefits assistance and the rent was \$110 a month—sorry, Mr. Chairman, they collected from roomers \$110 a month, which paid their rent. Their allowances were reduced \$37 for overpayment, \$30 a month left to feed the three people. This, Mr. Chairman, was rectified after letters from the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown), but I do not like the fact that these cases are rectified if pressure is put on by any person, either in the Legislature or out in the public service field.

Case 4, Mrs. F, December 1967, refused assistance under The Family Benefits Act, immigrant; because sponsor is in position to provide financial aid.

Case 5, Mrs. F, July 1968, separated, one girl, three years; one baby, one week; on welfare, applied for Ontario Housing Corporation last August, rent \$170 a month. Was

sharing accommodation with other girl who has left. August 26, a letter from the Ontario Housing Corporation saying they are sending a worker. The lady in this case is on welfare “pending”, Mr. Chairman, mother's allowance.

On calculation under The Family Benefits Act, after paying the rent, this lady would have about \$49 a month left for herself and her baby of one week and her three-year-old child. If she is, Mr. Chairman, on general welfare assistance, which she is on unless she has been switched over by now, she really only has an assurance of \$32 a month to live on. The additional \$17 for utilities and household allowances are at the discretion of the welfare administrator.

Case 6, Mr. F, December 1968, medical shows partially employable, six months tried to get job. Refused welfare. Miss Wilson said single men should get work. They called and then said they would help for a week or so.

Mr. Chairman, this sort of substitute type of welfare is not discussed anywhere under The General Welfare Assistance Act, and I think administrators take it into their own hands that if they can somehow put their finger in the dike, perhaps some of these cases will go away.

Case 7, Mr. and Mrs. H, April 1, 1968. Husband on compensation plus help from welfare. Rent is \$120, welfare pays \$85, has two boys, one getting married. Is getting behind in the rent. I told her when she gets notice to vacate to take it to the Ontario Housing Corporation and then let us know. Also told her to phone Mrs. Meredith and explain situation and it might help.

Case 8, Mr. and Mrs. G, December 1968; young couple, one child 22 months, new child expected any time. Husband out of work for last two weeks, have gotten behind in rent. Families split rent, \$60 each, with couple upstairs. They are out of work, too, and have not paid their rent. They went to the welfare last week and Mrs. Chong came today to visit them but offered no help. Told him to go and get information where he worked before, but this is a long way and they have no carfare and she offered none. Has not received welfare before, talked with Mrs. Chong. If he takes letters to welfare tomorrow they could give him a cheque then.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in The General Welfare Assistance Act saying to go back to your previous employer or bring up letters.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The hon. member's time is up.

Mrs. M. Renwick: To the member for Grey-Bruce, Mr. Chairman, who is calling "time"—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He always speaks very highly of you.

Mrs. M. Renwick: —I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago I listened many times to his plugs on the radio station in Owen Sound, trying to get some action for the people in Owen Sound with industry, and I am going to try to get some action for people under The General Welfare Assistance Act. And that is going back a long time, it is going back 20 years.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): He should be on old-age pension by now.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Case 9, Mr. and Mrs. L., January 1969, rent is to go from \$125 to \$135, so he reported this to the field worker. He was getting \$184 a month. They reviewed his file. They now say it is to be decreased to \$176, including \$29 fuel allowance to be cut off March 1, because his son and grandson pay \$15 weekly board. The rent is \$135, so this leaves him with a balance of \$12 after fuel. This case, Mr. Chairman, was reviewed, and he was given \$188. That is what I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, that sort of discrepancy.

Case 10, Mr. N., March 1968, was told by a welfare case worker to go around to all the places he applied for jobs. He applied mainly to gas stations, transport companies. If he does not go he will be cut off welfare. Has one child and a wife, had to quit work and is taking pills for nerves. Had hepatitis before Christmas and could not get unemployment insurance.

Case 11, Mrs. O., February 1969. Received cheque for \$56 February 1. Thought it was for two weeks, but since she lives with stepfather it was for the month. She is pregnant. Her husband lives in the United States, and she has an appointment to get a visa February 27. It will cost \$28.45. She has no money. Can her welfare cheque be dated to February 26 so that she can get her visa on February 27, and be off welfare? Mrs. Wilson says no, she must borrow it or explain to visa people.

Well, granted, Mr. Chairman, the Act does not allow for any changes such as this, but in an Act where so much is left to discretion on the part of the welfare administrator, I would have thought it would be easy to date a cheque on February 26, when February only had two more days, in order

to get a lady off welfare, get a visa and go to the United States to join her husband.

Case 12, Mr. and Mrs. M. C., May 1968. \$75 take-home pay, three children. Because of crowded conditions—three children in one room aged six, four, and three—husband elsewhere, sometimes in car. Applied four years ago to Metro Housing, applied one and a half years ago to Ontario Housing Corporation, two and a half years ago offered Moss Park, but did not want to live in either Moss Park or Regent Park, anywhere else. Letters sent June 7 and 10, accepted occupancy for August 1.

Case 13, Mr. and Mrs. M. Landlord, Mr. M., has tenant, woman with child at school. Applied to Manpower for retraining, also to welfare. Got \$69 first week from Manpower so could not get welfare this week. Had to wait a week. Pays rent \$16 a week. Out of \$69, paid landlady \$20, loaned \$10, food \$18, carfare, and so on, and now owes more rent. Welfare claims she should have paid rent with that.

The baker's dozen was a little large, Mr. Chairman, there are three more cases from this particular centre.

Case 14, Mr. and Mrs. R. Mrs. R. worked part of last year, is on family benefit—this is February, 1969—and now has an overpayment of \$661 and is only to get \$109 starting next month. Husband has heart condition, she is diabetic, has two mortgage payments and taxes monthly which come to \$102. Can the deductions be spread over a longer period pending? She is giving up going to try to get a job and that, Mr. Chairman, is another subject altogether. We defeat these people.

Case 15, Mrs. V. Has job, part time—128 hours every four weeks; getting \$1.25 an hour, or \$33 a week, or \$176 a month, plus \$65 a month from boarders. Her T-4 slip for 1967 shows \$1,489.45. Cut off mothers' allowance because they say she is employed full time, more than 20 hours a month; now owes them—mothers' allowance, family benefits people, I presume, Mr. Chairman—\$199.95. This was reduced on petition to \$107. Is painfully honest about wanting to pay but just not able.

Case 16, Mrs. S. Had heart attack in 1961; owns a home, rents it to her daughter for \$100 a month; pays \$108 a month rent herself; desperate. Went to welfare, offered her \$5 a month for medicine. April 9, June 26, got \$97 from Metro after letters from John Brown, MPP.

That is one area, Mr. Chairman. From a report which I believe the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) will discuss at some length, I hope, I would like to give a synopsis of a Peterborough "poverty study", with special reference to those 19 of the 50 families on different types of public assistance, types unspecified. This was a study by, I believe, two undergraduate students of Trent University.

Mobility: There is a tendency for welfare families to be among the most mobile. The effect that this has on children is instability, insecurity and poor achievement at school, therefore reinforcing the poverty cycle.

Housing: Crowding, increasing family strain.

Costs for housing: Five welfare families with four children each; four of those five spend more than 48 per cent of income on rent and utilities. Obviously reduces money for other things.

Income: Income of some of the employed householders not much greater than those on welfare; shows need for a guaranteed income to bring up the level of employed who are still poor, or a more realistic minimum wage law.

These families on welfare seem to be in the most dire situations, representing a total of 119 individuals. Nineteen of these families have less than \$40 spending money per individual per month. That is pretty low income, Mr. Chairman.

Dental and medical costs: If on welfare, these are often high bills. This is because the welfare will pay. There were five cases of dental costs of about \$100 each and they were all on welfare. This indicates that non-welfare poor are forced to neglect their health since they cannot afford to pay the bills.

This little fight on the dental aspect, Mr. Chairman, I think is going on right now in East York, where Reeve Davidson is insisting that the poor people are being done out of the dental services that welfare people are able to enjoy.

I would like to go now, Mr. Chairman, to the area of Kingston to show that this is a problem that is not simply relevant to Scarborough; it is not simply relevant to Toronto. We have facts now from Peterborough, we are going to get some from Kingston, and we will get some from the Windsor area. We have not yet reached northern Ontario.

This is a paper done by a student—a law student at Queen's University who did a paper quite recently, in the last couple of

weeks, I believe, on "Human Rights". The introduction states, Mr. Chairman:

This paper is not concerned with Ontario welfare projects in general, but a more particular programme entitled "General Assistance," which forms part of a more extensive scheme under The General Welfare Assistance Act. The reasons for choosing this particular welfare scheme were certain inherent conflicts and paradoxes that do not necessarily characterize other programmes. The general assistance programme was set up by provincial legislation and is a statement of the provincial government objects and goals. But at the same time the programme is partially financed and almost totally administered by municipal governments.

If I may say, Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a considerable flaw in the whole programme. To continue the paper:

The aims and objectives of the two levels of government do not always coincide and this is reflected in the administration of the Act. The Act defines assistance as a legal right and extensively sets out the criteria to determine eligibility and amount of assistance. Municipal welfare administrators do not necessarily apply these criteria, and at this moment there is little that can be done by the recipient to enforce his right.

That particular view can be discussed under the fact that if the recipient has a case that may come before the board of revenue he can discuss a decision. But he has very little to enforce his right. The paper says:

There are limitations to the paper. One, it is concerned with legalistic methods of bringing about reforms and not broader political programmes, although the two are closely related, as evidenced in the United States. Two, it is basically not concerned with the myriad of detailed reforms needed within the Act or proposing sweeping reforms to bring about greater social justice. The paper assumes that the present legislation will continue to operate basically as is now, and it will be its problems that recipients will face from day to day. Three, the paper has not considered the special priorities that must be reviewed when acting for a welfare client—this would be a paper in itself.

I would like to go to page three, Mr. Chairman, "Improvement Through Legalization":

What are the alternatives? The problem is deeply rooted in our cultural and economic values. Essentially, what must be

done is to legalize welfare administration and to end its insulation from legal consideration. Because of this insulation, welfare administrators are permitted broad areas of discretion in which they make law, by administrative interpretations or *ad hoc* policies that may not be in accord with the original purposes of the Legislature. If welfare assistance is to be regarded as a legal right, it must be enforceable in a legal style, and the administration of welfare must be made subject to those standards and procedures that safeguard other areas of government regulation and dispensation. In other words, elements of objectivity, consistency, rationality and accountability must be introduced. In order to do this, welfare legislation and administration must provide the following (there are six points):

1. Legislation must define welfare assistance as a legal right available upon qualification.

2. The statutes, regulations and rules by which administrators are to act, should furnish clearly and concisely criteria by which eligibility and assistance can be determined, so as to produce uniform decision-making. A legal right is useless if its substance is not defined.

3. The regulations and rules should be published and an effort should be made to make their substance known to welfare recipients and the public in general. A legal right is non-existent if one is not aware of it.

4. The basis of all decisions should be explained. A legal right cannot be protected if decisions affecting it cannot be challenged, because one does not know the basis of those decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot get the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) to explain to me, as a member of the Ontario Legislature, how they have made up their pre-added budgets and how can we ever hope that they will come to the point where they feel that the municipalities should be delivering welfare on a fair and just basis, as the Act is devised, instead of their own discretion. Point five:

5. There would be some known form of review or appeal from decisions made by administrators. A legal right is ineffective without some accessible procedure to ensure the proper use of discretion and accountability for decisions made.

6. At all times, the welfare recipient should have a right to representation especially before a review board. This is

essential for those who cannot effectively speak for themselves.

The above not only ensures that the welfare recipients' substantial rights are protected but it also introduces qualitative changes as to style. Fundamentally, the law has a way of doing things. It involves doing things with reference to formal standards of justice, with fixed and attributable responsibility and with rational justification for decisions. These stylistic characteristics are the antithesis of tyranny, arbitrary discretion and official caprice.

If it is true that the poorest spend much of their lives being subjected to forces that act tyrannically, arbitrarily and irrationally, the introduction of some element of regularity, responsibility and rationality is a positive boon to prize as such, whatever its value. If the ultimate services delivered to the poor through the intervention of legal processes is only modestly enhanced, they nevertheless are delivered in somewhat more decent fashion and that is a value not to be minimized.

On page 16, Mr. Chairman, we skip over to the recipients' rights and the administrations of general assistance.

At the beginning of this paper, six criteria were listed as being essential for any system of welfare administration if the recipients' substantive rights are to be protected. This portion of the paper will analyze The General Welfare Assistance Act in the light of these criteria.

A. Welfare as a right. There is little doubt that the Act establishes welfare assistance as a legal right available upon the recipient's qualifications. However, the attitude of the general public remains just the opposite. Welfare assistance is still viewed as largess or some form of charitable gratuity.

And I pause there, Mr. Chairman, to say that if you do not believe it, I heard on my left when I mentioned a welfare benefit had been cut, "Good". To continue:

The community's general commitment to social welfare affects the content and administration of welfare programmes. If the environment is hostile, officials will gradually retreat from the original goals of the programme to more modest goals. A minimal commitment means a minimal commitment of public funds. A major cause of the harshness and restrictiveness of welfare programme is a deeply felt need to

save moneys. In our research, the above relation was quite evident.

The Family Benefits Act is entirely financed and administered by the provincial government. Mr. D, who is the local regional supervisor and responsible for local administration, spoke of assistance in terms of rights and entitlements. His policy was to determine eligibility and amount of assistance strictly according to the Act. He has the reputation of dealing with the recipients in a fair and polite manner. According to him, a major factor in his possessing this attitude was his access to virtually unlimited funds and the lack of pressure upon him to cut corners.

An excellent example of the opposite end of the administrative spectrum is Mrs. B, the local municipal welfare administrator. She agreed that assistance is a legal right under the Act. At the same time she also asserted that the city was very generous and that the recipients were fortunate to receive so much without being asked for anything in return.

Mrs. B, to say the least, is a controversial figure among welfare recipients. During the course of our interview she was accused of being unfair, unsympathetic, giving favouritism to those who informed on others, "like a stone wall to talk to", and "snotty". In response to the question, "Do you think the city welfare office is generally fair and sympathetic?" one recipient gave Mrs. B as the sole reason for his negative response. A number of recipients interviewed related instances of Mrs. B. shouting at them and continually accusing them of misbehaviour, sometimes relating back to the beginning of the recipient's trouble. Others told us of extended diatribes overheard while waiting in the welfare office reception area.

We suggest that much of this harsh treatment is related to the office's inadequate financial allowance. There is without doubt pressure from the council to minimize expenditure, and Mrs. B told us of a constant stream of complaints from irate taxpayers. It is Mrs. B's duty to work out an annual budget, and expenditures during the year must be kept within this budget. The unenviable position of Mrs. B results in a harsh and summary attitude towards applicants and also a definite deviation from the goal set out in the Act. This will be more fully documented later in this paper.

The case of Mr. T is an example of how preoccupation with limited finances leads to a rigid and harsh policy. Mr. T, along with six others, was refused welfare in April 1968. At that time the city had adopted the policy that anyone who was fired or quit his job was refused assistance unless the social services committee decided that the employer was unfair in releasing the applicant. Supposedly such release or quitting was evidence that the applicant was unwilling to accept employment for which he was capable. At that time, the applicant would have been eligible for welfare assistance in at least the cities of Cornwall, Belleville and Ottawa.

The social services committee chairman stated that it was not easy to get on welfare and that the committee was attempting to keep the average person aware that he must retain his job. According to him, the policy of the committee was to take a more severe stand towards those who live off welfare. He went on to relate that the city's welfare budget had been reduced by \$40,000 and this forced the committee to get tougher. According to him, getting tougher meant showing people it is not a matter of walking into city hall and walking out with a cheque. The above expressed attitudes are hardly consistent with the right concept of welfare assistance.

In fact, the reason for denial was not the recipient's unwillingness to work, but rather the limited budgetary requirements of the municipality. In other words, the recipients were forced to sacrifice their rights under the Act because the municipality failed to fulfil its responsibilities under the same legislation. In effect, the poor were forced to subsidize the rich.

Mr. Chairman, where the attitude crept into the municipality that it was going to be made tougher to keep people from living off welfare, I think a programme of education has to be done by the department here at Queen's Park. But there is nothing being done to get families off welfare, there is simply a system of an allotment of money each month. Outside of the three Manpower men on George Street, whom I have referred to earlier this year, and their three assistants, for help in getting jobs in the community, there is no real programme, Mr. Chairman, of analyzing a family as to what its talents are, what its capabilities are, and of taking that family and in a period of maybe 18 months having them rehabilitated.

The attitudes of the recipients themselves are instrumental in determining whether or not assistance will be treated as a right. Out of 15 interviews, 14 recipients said they considered assistance to be a legal right, but only three stated that a lawyer might be able to aid them in enforcing this right. Out of these 14, only two had the idea that a legal right should be enforceable by the courts, but these same people felt a lawyer's services were not feasible. One stated that the expense was prohibitive, the other said he would resort to a lawyer only if he were really desperate.

Mr. Chairman, this paper explains why a lawyer is not the person to resort to, because a lawyer does not understand these Acts any better than the recipients do.

The other recipients interviewed described their right in one of the following manners:

1. Because he was incapable of working and had no money, he had a right to welfare.

2. "The government cannot force me to take care of my children. However, if I do not do so, they would become wards of the state, therefore I am entitled to welfare assistance to provide for my children."

3. "Welfare is paid through taxes to which I have personally contributed or to which my family have contributed."

4. "I am entitled to it because I use it for the proper purposes—that is the purpose for which it was meant."

5. "I suppose it is a legal right because the kids should not starve."

The above expressions are more in keeping with the notion of moral right than legal right—that is, largess rather than right. This type of conception of their position is hardly surprising when one realizes their complete ignorance of the contents of the Act. Only one recipient expressed a vague knowledge of the Act's provisions and then it only extended to the idea that somehow the amount of assistance was pre-arranged.

A note at the end, Mr. Chairman, said:

This recipient will be enrolling in the university in the coming fall semester to study welfare administration.

The remainder of those interviewed had only the limited knowledge gained through dealings with the welfare office. They had a rough idea of what was required before they could be put on the "pokey" and also that their cheque was to be spent on food,

rent, etc., as directed by the welfare official. From past experience or sheer desperation, they might realize that they were being shortchanged, but one referred to the Act and based his claim upon provisions. Not one recipient envisaged himself as a right-bearing citizen claiming benefits he is entitled to by law.

The result of this failure by recipients to realize their rights under the law and the improper attitude of the public and the welfare administrators as to the state of the law in this area, in effect negates the intention of the Legislature. The intended legal right becomes reduced to an outmoded concept of social charity.

Mr. Chairman, this is what is happening at many municipal levels. I have learned this through being a member in this legislative assembly for the past year and a half.

B. Defining the rights. The Act defines the criteria for qualification, and the recipient for entitlement to a degree that should ensure that the intention of the Act is substantially carried out. The administration of general welfare assistance should be characterized by uniform decisions consistent in the Act. Unfortunately, in our research, we have found that the record is at best erratic.

Case 1, Mr. S. Home was destroyed by fire in a township outside the city, and had to move in with friends in the city. He applied for welfare at the city office and was denied. At this time Mr. S. was petitioning for divorce and had custody of his children. He was told that he would not be granted welfare unless he gave his children to his wife who was a known prostitute. The children's aid society indicated that they would be recommending that he should have custody of the children after the divorce. Giving the children to his wife at this time might have severely prejudiced his chances of securing final custody. A week later, Mr. S. became a *cause célèbre* for other reasons. The city found him an apartment and granted him general assistance.

Case 2, Mr. and Mrs. F., and their two children. Had been on welfare for three months. Mr. F. found employment for one week, and the welfare benefits stopped for that week. On the Monday of the following week they applied to welfare again and were refused. The explanation was that they should have saved their money. They were told not to come back for two

weeks. The manner in which they had disposed of their money should not have been a factor in determining eligibility.

Further, it would have been unreasonable to expect them to have any money on Monday, let alone for the next two weeks. He had made \$73, and \$40.50 was spent on rent, \$20 on clothes for the children and linen, and the husband spent the remaining portion, \$12.50 on self-entertainment. The family was extremely short of supplies. The fact that there was only one blanket between the four members of the family was characteristic of their situation.

Much of the fault for this shortage was due to the manner and amount of the previous welfare payments. They were entitled to \$28.50 a week for food and clothing, and were only getting \$24 in the form of one food voucher. This meant that they had to buy the food in one entire purchase, and they had no cash on hand for clothes or purchase of food like milk that should not be purchased on a weekly basis.

The laundry had to be washed by hand and dried in their small, two-room apartment. Their rights were explained to them by a third party and they were told to go back to the welfare office with a copy of the Act, and explain to the administrator that they knew what their rights were, and that they insisted on being granted their entitlement. They were not only given the full pre-added budget allowance of \$28.60, divided up into separate vouchers for food and clothing, but also the \$7 maximum monthly allowance for household supplies, which is seldom paid.

Case 3, Mrs. W. Had been on welfare for 15 years. Her 19-year-old son had moved in with her after losing his job in Toronto. He acquired a job in Kingston and at the time asked the welfare office for assistance until he received his first pay cheque. Assistance was granted to him on the understanding that he was to bring his pay cheque into the welfare office where the amount owing would be deducted. He did not report.

When Mrs. W. left the hospital she was told she would not receive any assistance, and that she could rely on her son to maintain her. Her son had moved out while she was in hospital and Mrs. W. was left without funds.

There is no obligation on children to provide for their parents. The welfare office might have the right to insist that if the son was living with his mother he must contribute towards the rent, or pay his mother for board. They would then be able to reduce the rent payments to Mrs. W., or apply a reasonable charge for lodging as income.

Instead of doing this, they attempted to force Mrs. W.'s son to pay off his debt by denying Mrs. W. A third party was asked to speak to the welfare officer for Mrs. W. and the assistance was supposedly reinstated at the full rate. Without investigating to see whether her son had moved out, the welfare officer assumed he had not and decided not to include the portion for rent in the cheque that was given the next day. In the circumstances he had no authority to do this. Mrs. W.'s landlady was asked to phone the welfare office to confirm that her son had moved, and the matter was finally settled.

Case 4, Mr. F. Twenty years old and single, applied for welfare and was told that welfare was no longer given to single people.

I am very sorry that the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) is not here. I believe he had quite a confrontation with the Minister during the estimates last year. I think he would be quite interested in these remarks.

Mr. Singer: He was here earlier; he left with the member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick).

Mrs. M. Renwick: Continuing to quote:

After enquiries were made he was told that his case would be reconsidered if he applied for a Canada Manpower upgrading course. Unless one assumes that single young men are only unemployed because they are unwilling to undertake employment, the administration's policy to discourage young single people from applying for welfare by denial of assistance is not authorized under the Act.

Mr. Sargent: Take it as read.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would draw to the attention of yourself and the members of the House, that I am only dealing with one part of one Act—the general assistance of The General Welfare Assistance Act—and the ramifications of it are unending. I have made it as concise as I feel it should be, when presented to those persons in the assembly who are interested in the problem.

Case 5, Mr. H. He was laid off his job because of alcoholism and overstaffing. He enrolled as an outpatient at the alcoholic centre of the Ontario Hospital. He was not able to find employment and applied for welfare assistance. He was refused on the basis that his employer was willing to re-employ him. His employer denied that he told this to the welfare office. Mr. H., acting on this information, re-applied and was denied again on the same basis.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out here that this—the divine right to rule that exists in municipal welfare—was quite shocking to me. I would not have known about it except for the last year's endeavours in this assembly.

His employer was asked to phone the administration and state the real reason for laying him off. Once this was done he was declared to be eligible. The administration's previous decision was based merely on the suspicion that he quit because of his drinking problem, and that employment was available if he chose to work since he had been on welfare before the administration was aware of his drinking problem. Their purpose in denying him was probably coercion to work.

The only authority under the Act for their decision would be that inability to work because of alcoholism is evidence of unwillingness to undertake employment. This is inconsistent with the medical view of the problem. Further, it is inconsistent with present practice, since many families are on welfare because the head of the family is an alcoholic and unable to work. But there is a policy set by the social services committee to deny welfare to those who are single and unable to work because of alcoholism.

Case 6, Mr. I. He was 19 years old, unemployed, living with his sister and brother-in-law. He applied for welfare and received \$8 for food per week. His sister said they could not afford to keep him if he was not able to pay for his room. The city refused to give him any assistance although he was entitled to a maximum of \$43 per month for shelter. The reason given was that his sister was a prostitute and he should not be living with her. They offered to grant him the extra \$2.80 for food he was entitled to, but no more unless he moved out.

An unauthorized denial of assistance was used to force a recipient to do what the welfare administrator thought best. The benefit was used as a reward for appropriate behaviour.

An hon. member: Do you know the municipality?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Kingston. Mr. Chairman, for any members who have joined us since we began an hour ago, these cases are cases prepared by a law student at Queen's University in Kingston and the cases are from that area.

Case 7. Mr. X lived in a rural area, and after being unemployed for six weeks during which he received no unemployment insurance or other income or saving, he applied for welfare at his municipality's office. He was denied on the basis that he must be lying about having no source of income since no family could live without money for six weeks.

Mr. Chairman, I will stop right there. If you live in a rural area and you manage to have stocked up some of the vegetables and so on from the rural areas, it is quite possible to continue for some time.

After subsequent efforts were made, the administrator was convinced that he had no income, but he was denied again, the reason this time was that she had not received her monthly allocation of funds and had no money to give out. Mr. X told his story to the local regional supervisor who directed that the municipality pay out the assistance. It was done. The only plausible reason for the administrator's behaviour is that a penny denied is a penny saved. There is no provision in the Act that could possibly be used to justify her action.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in social and family services, Mr. Nywening took a case for me as recently as Friday, a case in Stouffville, rural route 3. The administrator in Stouffville had been giving a deserted woman with four children \$30 weekly allowance. She was now behind two months in her rent and two months in her fuel. She had to lie to the fuel man who came to the door when he asked had any money been sent in to the company. She said yes, in order to get fuel. This welfare administrator in the local municipal area had been visiting her once a week and leaving her \$30 to live on, his own interpretation of The Welfare Assistance Act.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that from The Department of Social and Family Services a telephone call went out on this particular case over the weekend to make certain this lady was in no hardship, now until Monday.

What I am trying to say is that we cannot have this kind of concern once the case

hits Queen's Park. This is wrong. We have legislated Acts which are laws. They must be carried out in the municipality as laws and as a right to the individuals concerned.

To continue with the paper, Mr. Chairman:

These are not the only examples of mal-administration we have come across, but our research was not extensive enough to enable us to estimate the extent of mal-administration of the Act. But it does exist. A partial cause is the absence of the four other preconditions necessary to safeguard the rights of welfare recipients. The preconditions are interdependent and inter-related. The absence of one or more undermines the effectiveness of the other.

Mr. Chairman, I pause to go back—because the Minister is listening intently, I believe—to say that in the Stouffville case, why the welfare administrator acted as he did, is that the lady comes from Scarborough. It was a trial of her marriage relationship to go to a house of their own. They could only afford one in the country.

The marriage relationship has broken down and she wants to come back to Scarborough. She is filing an application with the Ontario Housing Corporation, but you and I know, and certainly the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), who was here earlier knows, filing an application with the Ontario Housing Corporation does not mean that Mrs. S. will be able to move from Stouffville into the municipality of Scarborough. The responsibility squarely rested in my view—and correct me if I am wrong in any way—with the municipality who dealt with her as far back as two to three weeks ago.

The awareness of rights. To the typical recipient, the welfare office is a place you go if you are in desperate need. One recipient did not know of the existence of welfare assistance before she applied. Those who have had contact with welfare recipients before application—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think the member is making a good speech, but she is trying to break the record held by the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) for the longest speech. This is bad manners to have us sit here all this time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: There should be an understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there is a time limit on speeches. Let us get together and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Well, they should not speak this long. It is not good manners.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not know why the House should, every now and then, be treated by the hon. member to both ignorant and impudent terms in interrupting a serious presentation.

Mr. Chairman: Speaking to the point of order—

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder Lowry described that as a leader without a party over there.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Speaking to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I can only say that there was at one time an arrangement whereby the lead-off speakers would devote 20 minutes to the lead-off speech in connection with the estimates, and we would go into the estimates.

Perhaps this is what the hon. member had in mind. However, that arrangement, to my recollection, has gone by long since. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): It was a piece of diversion anyway.

Mr. Singer: Read page 1774.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you. I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the assembly and yourself, Mr. Chairman, that in that 20 minutes' gentlemen's agreement, in which as a lady member of this gentlemen's club I participated, my lead-off in last year's estimates was 20 minutes to the clock and the Liberal critic for the same department spoke longer. This does not bother me. I feel that if people have something to say here it is important that it is said.

I will take only one moment because it is not worth a great deal more. But might I suggest to you as Chairman that perhaps my

remarks, since the hon. member for Grey-Bruce was one-time mayor of Owen Sound—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is out of order. The hon. member is out of order. She will please proceed with her speech.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I will proceed, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He was the mayor. He never even got them a drink.

Mr. MacDonald: Give them some cases from Owen Sound.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yes I will. Owen Sound next trip.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mrs. M. Renwick: To continue with the paper, Mr. Chairman:

Those who have contact with welfare recipients before application might be aware that you must be sick, unemployed, or have lost your husband before assistance will be given. Women who have been separated or divorced are usually directed to welfare services by the children's aid society, or welfare officials attending family courts.

Generally they are not aware that loss of family head entitles them to assistance. Nor are recipients generally aware that they may receive welfare assistance while they are drawing unemployment insurance. In terms of what services the welfare offices give, and who is eligible, most recipients have only the vague notion that this is a place to turn to for help when you are in desperate circumstances.

Recipients know practically nothing about income and budgetary requirements, calculations which determine the amount of their assistance. Most know that the family allowance was not to be considered in determining the amount of assistance. This does not mean that they were aware of the income budgetary requirement method of calculating assistance, but only that a welfare official could not say that, "We will give you \$250 per month, but since you are receiving \$30 family allowance, we will only grant you \$220."

They were not aware that donations for religious or charitable organizations are not to be used for income calculations. It is not uncommon for a recipient's assistance to be reduced by the amount of money received from a charitable organization in the previous month or week. Nor are they

aware that the Act provides that they are entitled to different amounts for rent, food, etc. based on criteria set out in the Act.

They accept the assistance given as being what they are entitled to receive. They have no criteria in mind to test whether the assistance given is the proper amount. It might be disputed if they feel they could not possibly live on the amount granted.

Usually the assistance is broken down in that they are told that they are supposed to spend so much on rent, food and clothing.

Now, the basis of this calculation is not explained. Not one recipient answered positively to the following questions:

(1) Did the officer make any attempt to explain the Act in general and your rights under it?

(2) Do you know how this amount of assistance was calculated?

(2b) Was it explained to you?

Many of these people had disputed these amounts or had asked for explanations or changes in assistance given. The usual explanation was that this is all you are entitled to receive, and the welfare office's fund does not permit greater assistance.

There was no evidence of a welfare officer explaining what the recipient's general position was under the Act, and how the assistance was calculated.

Mrs. S, who was well educated, knew that somehow the assistance was calculated on a pre-arranged basis, but after several enquiries she was not given a straight answer as to who was responsible for setting the amount, or what were the specifically scheduled amounts for the different circumstances. She, like most recipients, expressed great surprise when the Act was explained to her.

In the local provincial and municipal welfare office there were no brochures, pamphlets, etc. on display. We have not come across any government efforts to explain welfare services to the public in general or the recipients.

An even more hidden area of rules and regulations is that which is properly or improperly based on policy set by local administration or the government itself. There is no source for obtaining such policy directives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pause and ask the Minister a question which I hope he will answer during his estimates.

I found in policies in the east-end welfare office, at Coxwell and Queen, a form obliging the applicant to sign that anyone may enter the home on behalf of the department. I believe it said at reasonable hours. Now, there is no sign of that form in the Act, Mr. Chairman, and I would like the Minister to clarify with me if these local forms are permitted at the decision of the municipality?

Secondly, when I followed one particularly tragic case we discussed previously in the House—an inquest case of infant death—from the day the infant went on welfare until the five months later when she died, I followed her to the department of municipal government that allots a burial amount.

I said at the time, Mr. Chairman, a similar comment, that I do not personally hang up much on high-costing burials, but in this case what bothered me was that the Act specifically required an allowance, I believe up to \$125 or \$150. The gentleman at the burial office said to me: “Oh, we are just going by the \$100 allotment that we always had, you know, when we had the old Act, when we had the old welfare”.

I think those discrepancies are very important, Mr. Chairman. Are we allowing the interpretation to vary that much at the municipal level?

To continue, there is no one source for obtaining such policy directives. Consequently it is practically impossible to determine whether a given administrator is carrying out the policy as established by the government.

To continue with the paper:

This is especially important for special assistance and supplementary aid, because the entire programme is permissive and left to the discretion of local authorities. The only way this data could effectively be collected is by detailed analysis of the minutes of the social services committee meetings since the passing of the new Act.

Under section 4 of The General Welfare Assistance Act, the director of general welfare assistance is given the power to supervise the administration of the Act and regulation, and to advise municipal and regional welfare administrators as to the manner in which their duties under the Act are to be performed.

During the course of an interview, the Deputy Minister of The Department of Social and Family Services was asked to explain the precise nature of the directives issued to municipal welfare administrators. He replied that the supervision

exercised by the director under section 4 in general consists of explaining to the local administrators how the Act and regulations operate.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot explain to administrators. We must instruct that the Act is carried out in the strict interpretation of the Act. The Minister of Social and Family Services had a very unhappy experience in another department of his, in the children's aid in Guelph, in the foster-children of the Timbrell family, where the administrator interpreted the Act. The administrators are left in this position, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that the instructions should be very clear. Not guidelines, but actual instructions. To continue:

We are not able to determine how extensive these explanations are, or precisely the influence which they carry, nor is it known if an administrative handbook is available from which the departmental attitude towards the Act could be ascertained. Given the tenor of the above reply, one would suspect that such directives are of a most informal nature and that nothing akin to a handbook in fact exists.

So I would ask, Mr. Chairman, is there a handbook from The Department of Social and Family Services to the welfare administrators to make certain that they interpret the Act as it was passed by the members of the assembly? To continue:

If an interested party wishes to become familiar with the process of welfare administration beyond the rather rudimentary outline contained in the Act and regulations, he would have an arduous task before him. Of course, such knowledge is crucial to the establishment of any effective regular appeal procedure.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say that before the board of review is working this action will have to be taken by the department, the handbook.

It is possible that the regular provincial audit of local welfare administration may act as a check. Apart from certain difficulties inherent in the audit procedure itself, there are other reasons to doubt its true efficacy.

The local regional officer informed us of the dismay of the provincial auditing officers in discovering that certain local rural municipalities had not been providing general assistance to the extent specified in the pre-added budget, much less making provision for shelter costs, utilities,

household supplies. The regional supervisor felt that nothing could effectively be done, and there is no evidence that any such attempt was made.

The policy of the provincial government seems to be to leave the municipalities alone, except for the few individual cases specifically brought to their attention.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services and it is a question involving municipal welfare. With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's classic remark is, "That is a municipal responsibility," or "It is up to the municipality."

I want to make it quite clear what I am saying here tonight. I have had a year of dealing with these cases, and I cannot talk now for only 20 minutes on them, even if that had been the rule. I would have found it very difficult to adhere to it. The problems are so flagrant that the Minister must act.

Our research definitely indicates that few recipients are aware of who is responsible for deciding what assistance is to be granted. This fact, in combination with their suppliant attitude and vague conception of their right, precludes any control over the process by the recipient. One such recipient stated that there simply is no time to think at a moment like this, referring to the application process.

Mr. Chairman, that is understandable enough.

She went on to say there was no reason to disbelieve them and she accepted what she was told. Others continually indicated that their dependent relationship prevented them from being assertive.

With their lack of knowledge, they are too unsure of themselves to argue and insist on anything with welfare officials. If welfare recipients are to be able effectively to insist upon their rights, they must know the exact nature of those rights. They cannot question an administrator or an administrative decision if they have no established criteria upon which to judge.

Given the lack of such criteria, the administrator is free to make as arbitrary a decision as he wishes. The protection of the welfare recipient's interests and right is dependent on the local administration, and the government's dedication and determination to administer the Act in accordance with the Act and regulations.

D. Explanation of decision: The basis of all decisions should be explained to the recipient, be they negative or positive. For the most part, this would only involve a

summary of the relevant provisions of the Act. As indicated in part C, this is not done.

Other decisions may be based on local policy and not the Act. For example, the welfare administrator may demand that the recipient surrender his automobile licence plates to the office during the time in which he is on welfare. This is not done in all cases and it should be clearly explained to the recipient what the general policy is and why he is being asked to surrender his plates. Certain regulations within the Act involve a degree of discretion. The policy behind each decision should be explained.

Some possible examples are as follows:

1. Why, in practice, is nothing usually given the recipient for household supplies?

2. Why was \$15 granted for fuel when the actual monthly expense was \$25?

3. Why is a weekly pre-added budget of \$36 granted in the form of a \$34 food budget, leaving a remainder of only \$2 for clothes and personal requirements?

4. Why is it necessary to report three days every week to the welfare office in order to indicate that the applicant is making reasonable efforts to insure employment. Is such a requirement necessary in the circumstances to show he is willing to work?

I was looking at an old welfare Act today—I believe it was 1965—and there was a requirement there where welfare recipients were required to report three times a week to the social service centre, to the unemployment centre, and we do not now have such a requirement.

What evidence we have compiled indicates that such decisions are usually presented in a form of a fiat, with little or no explanation. Seldom is reference made to the relevant legislative provisions, and the individual's queries are consistently discouraged. In order to alleviate this situation, we suggest that a statutory duty should be imposed on welfare administrators requiring them to give full explanation of all decisions concerning the recipient or applicant.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Minister that if I were in his particular position, at this point I would insist that it be done. You have the member for Brantford bringing shocking reports of welfare administration, the report from Peterborough of disparities, now one from Kingston. I would say that the

time to overhaul the municipalities in their administration of welfare is now.

This would assure that all recipients would possess at least a minimum knowledge of their status under the Act, and also make an effective appeal procedure feasible. Without knowing the basis of the decision it is impossible for the recipient to decide whether the administrator's decision is in keeping with the purposes of the Act, or whether the discretion exercised is within the ascertainable limits laid out in the Act.

E. Appeal Procedures: Reference was made above to three official appeal procedures available to the welfare recipient and their serious shortcomings. There are also a number of unofficial methods that have in the past been used. Several women recipients have disputed decisions by taking their children to the welfare office and refusing to move until the decision was reversed. By office closing time, the officials were usually amenable to change. Others have taken their problems to the press in the form of news stories or letters to the editor.

And, Mr. Chairman, I assure you that I had a Kingston case where the lady asked for a stove. Mrs. S. was told "go out and buy a hot-plate", so the lady, the recipient, took her welfare cheque and went out to a secondhand store and bought a secondhand stove, then went back to the welfare office and asked for a food voucher.

Mrs. B. refused to give her a food voucher, so the lady went home and called her and said: "You give me a food voucher by five o'clock or I will send my five children over to your house in a taxicab." The welfare voucher was received by the lady.

This lady is anxious to tell you these things because she is going to be married this year. She will not be on welfare assistance any more. Her husband will be in the faculty at Queen's and these people feel there is a story to be told.

All recipients interviewed were asked to whom they would appeal if they were dissatisfied with the decision made by a welfare officer. Several alternatives were suggested if the recipient was unable to give an answer.

Their responses were as follows: Five said they would appeal either to their alderman or mayor. Of the five, only one had ever expressed dissatisfaction with the decision, and none had ever actually appealed to the mayor or an alderman. Two

recipients felt they were not in a position to appeal because of their dependent relationship.

Mr. Chairman, this is where I think the onus is on the Minister to remove these people from such a dependent relationship, it is not a healthy situation.

They believe that such a complaint would single them out and do more harm than good in the long run. One recipient replied that she would seek help from an alternative source such as the children's aid society. Four of them thought an appeal to the mayor or an alderman was totally useless, since the problem would only be passed back to the administrator without any directive. Two of these had personal experiences with it.

None believed that any success would be achieved by asking the welfare administrator to reconsider his decision. None of the recipients thought that the regional provincial office could help them. Only one recipient had attempted this and was unsuccessful.

Finally, one recipient suggested that the community information services might help. She was the only person interviewed who had had previous contact with this service.

As far as most welfare recipients are concerned, an administrator's decision is final and there is little that can be done to alter it. This assessment of the situation is, in our opinion, quite realistic. What is needed is an appeal procedure that is both regular and effective.

And, of course, on February 1, Mr. Chairman, the regulations to the appeal board were published in the monthly *Gazette* and we will discuss the appeal board at another time during the estimates.

In 1968, legislation was passed to establish a board of review for decisions made under The Family Benefits Act, and general assistance provisions of The General Welfare Assistance Act. As of this date, the board has not been appointed.

This work, this paper, was done by the student prior to February 1, or if it was not, he certainly learned that the regulations had been published February 1 after he had written it.

The size of the board and the extent to which its hearings will be centralized depends on the number of appeals. This can only be decided in the light of experience.

It is impossible to say in advance whether the procedure of the board will be similar to the labour relations board or to any other existing tribunal. Generally, the board will be fulfilling a judicial function in that it will apply legislative rules to findings of fact. The standards of procedure of a judicial tribunal would, therefore, seem appropriate.

On the other hand, formality and delay will have to be kept to a minimum if the best interests of those being served are to be safeguarded. Since this board has not yet been established, it is not known how it will act.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fair enough statement to say right here that this board in all likelihood would never have been established, if it was not a requirement to comply with in order to receive moneys from the federal government's Canada Assistance Act.

In our opinion there are four conditions necessary to make the board truly effective:

(1) A board and procedure should be set up in such a way that appeals and decisions can be made within a minimum of three days, at least in those cases involving complete denial of benefits. Such circumstances are usually, in fact, emergencies, and consequently the time element must be paramount.

(2) Definite efforts must be made by the government to ensure the recipients and applicants are aware of the board and its function. Its efforts should include the usual forms of advertising, plus the statutory duty imposed on welfare officials to inform the applicant of his right to appeal the decision. This would be in conjunction with the approved statutory duty to inform the applicant or recipient of the basis for the decision.

Mr. Chairman, we all saw in the province of Ontario what the government did and was able to do when it wanted to advertise publicly the medical insurance plan. We found the large, conspicuous blue and white folder in every possible conceivable public place—banks, restaurants, you name it; I believe even chain stores. I think the writer of this paper has done the government a service to point out many of the things that need to be done. To continue:

(3) The appeal procedure should be as simple and as practical as practically possible.

You are not dealing with sophisticated people in many of these cases.

If the board is centralized in Toronto, and/or a few other major centres, argument, information, etc., should be allowed in written affidavit. Personal appearances would not be feasible in most cases because of the extensive ignorance about welfare legislation, not only on the part of the recipient, but also of lawyers and of the public in general. The board should play an educative role by giving written judgment.

(4) The review board will only be effective in protecting the rights of the recipients if it is in fact consistently utilized. Voluntary organizations who come in contact with recipients will have to make an effort to inform themselves and recipients of the latter's rights in order to aid them in making appeals.

F. Representation. A welfare recipient should have a right to representation not only before a review board but at any stage in the proceedings of his application. This should be based on the general principle that everyone should have the right to competent representation before an official process whenever he feels he is incapable of speaking for himself.

There is no reason why such a right should interfere with the welfare official's job, or why he should treat such a suggestion as a claim of incompetency. It would only lend dignity to the entire process and help ensure that the Act is administered judicially and impartially. Welfare is of the utmost importance to recipients and denial often means destitution. In such a crucial manner it is only elementary that the recipient be allowed a knowledgeable spokesman, nor should such a right be based on the money value of the matter in question. Spokesmen need not be lawyers; anyone with a reasonable working knowledge of the Act and the administration process would suffice.

Apart from appeals to the review board, it is not envisioned that lawyers will play a significant role as spokesmen. Our research has shown that present welfare recipients do not, and will not, turn to lawyers for aid in these matters. Welfare recipients are hardly in the position to meet the cost of such representation. However, legal aid should be made available, at least for appeal to the review board.

Another drawback at present is the fact that few, if any, lawyers have a working

knowledge of the welfare process. Given the present circumstances, if welfare recipients are to realize their full rights, positive educational measures will have to be taken. They will have to be approached and informed of such rights, and persuaded to assert and insist on such rights. They must be convinced that under the legislative intention their dependent relationship in no way prejudices such demands. The people who will be assigned to fulfil this positive function would also be those best qualified to act as spokesmen. Legal aid, and the traditional role of the lawyer are not structured in a way that permits the profession to fulfil such a positive role. This is not to say that appeals or any other representations are not to be made using what is traditionally called the legal approach. Concepts of fairness inherent in this approach are essential to protection of recipients' rights under the Act.

Conclusion. In making the above recommendations, we are not so naive as to assume that the basic evil faced by the poverty-stricken is the denial of their legal rights, and that once they understand their rights and are helped to gain them, justice will be done. But the securing of welfare recipient rights is a part of the fight for a more equitable distribution of society's resources, and should be seen in two different perspectives:

1. Legal. People who can qualify under The General Welfare Assistance Act are granted certain legal rights by our duly-elected representatives. All obstacles to enjoin such rights should be removed. A legal type of assistance can play a significant role in securing the proper administration of general assistance.

2. Political. Ultimately the power to create legal relationships is a form of political power. Official behaviour is a part of the law-making process. If the welfare recipient is able to effectively challenge and criticize official behaviour, he is, in effect, enfranchised and representative in the decision-making process. This involvement in the processes that shape the services so fundamental to the poor is the first step towards full citizenship. Welfare problems are one of the numerous problems that form a web of despair around which the poor may develop a sense of community that can develop into organization to increase their social and political power.

Mr. Chairman, in Kingston there is a community information centre that was started in

January, 1968, by a small group of people and students under the sponsorship of the local organization of Kingston NDP. The community information service is a volunteer staff centre which offers information on dealing with a variety of problems—housing, welfare rights, garnishees, agencies. We try to refer you to an agency or person that can help or we will do it ourselves if we can find no one, or we will fight for you if your rights are being ignored.

The service is open from five to nine, five days a week, staffed by regular shifts of volunteers; a telephone answering service is used to ensure a 24-hour availability. Some people come into the office, but in many cases the volunteers go to people's homes after talking to them on the phone.

One outstanding characteristic of this organization is its action orientation. It has a strong link with ATAK—Association for Tenants' Action, Kingston—a militant organization whose president, Joan Newman, is a community information fund, and a recently-elected alderman. Their general stance is one demanding rights, not asking for favours. For tax return benefits for financial supporters they are considering severing official links with the NDP while keeping a live contact.

A regular newsletter is sent to all people on their files to inform them of recent developments concerning their rights. Cost and office needs: expenses are approximately \$80 a month, \$40 for rent, \$20 for telephone answering service, \$20 for phone, etc. Most of this is raised by donations from Queen's professors, a drawback—

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member speaking to the estimates at the present time? It does not sound to me as if this has anything to do with the estimates.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I can complete it shortly. I am going to ask the Minister if he would consider making this type of office, at this low cost, available to the general public as a right from government and not leave it up to local citizens to form. I will make it brief. A drawback here is the amount of time spent to raise it. Government, of course, could finance it. It is a wealth of source material. You see, Mr. Chairman, for the people in need in the areas—be it a city or be it a town—where do they go to get a source of material that is kept on hand for them to see? This source includes income tax guides, Canada Assistance and Canada Pension Plan handbooks and many statutes on

human rights, labour, workmen's compensation, minimum wage, legal aid and The Police Act.

In Sweden, the people are provided with a handbook which they can read. It is not a lot of gobbledygook like the Canada Pension Plan handbook put out about three or four years ago. It is a book saying what their entitlement is under government Acts. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the people of the province of Ontario in need—granted they are a minority and for that reason are being ignored in many areas of government operation, in my view—simply must have at least access to know what their human rights are in these days of people spending time on making certain that we have a society that has good civil rights and good human rights.

I would like to tell the Minister formally, Mr. Chairman, he thought last year that the two pre-added budgets were identical and I say that they are not identical. The pre-added budget under family benefits allowance includes the maximum allowances for utilities or household needs that are provided under The General Welfare Assistance Act. The total maximum is \$17. The general welfare assistance people get their utilities and their household cleaning supplies at the discretion of the welfare administrator of the municipality. I ask that under the Canada Assistance Plan, which is a plan to help all persons equally, we do not have two different Acts for persons in "need" in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is taking the time of the House—and a long time—and it is no pleasure to stand here and go on for ages unless you feel there is a cause. I feel there is a cause in this particular instance.

I would like to draw to your attention that the constituents are concerned with this problem. It is not just a law student who made a paper that I think is absolutely magnificent. Next to the Seebom Report, that the Minister thankfully is dealing with, I have not seen anything presented from a private source to compare. I left out the diatribe on the deviousness of the Acts because I used examples which show that deviousness. I could keep the House for three-quarters of an hour just listening to the inconsistency of that Act and its paradoxes.

Mr. Chairman, it is the Minister of Social and Family Services who should be saying this to his Cabinet, not me. I would like to read a letter from a constituent of mine. The letter dated October 1968 from a constituent who got into an automobile accident. Now, Mr. Chairman, that can happen to any of us.

I was talking about the poor people before and I suppose I was making some members impatient and uncomfortable. They do not see the poor. They come down here on the expressways. They do not live with them but they have to take the responsibility of looking after them, Mr. Chairman, and that is one endeavour I intend to make from this side of the House.

The letter, I will spare you, Mr. Chairman, and also the details of the accident but I will start with the classic statement—well there is one detail I will not spare you, Mr. Chairman. I would like you to know that the settlement of the accident was in close proximity, and that the gentleman who wrote this letter might never have been in need of assistance from this government, if the settlement has been made. I will read that paragraph:

In the meantime I have a lot of expense because of the accident. I have not received one cent in compensation. In November last year, we had a three-day trial and the jury awarded me \$25,000 for my injuries because my lawyer was able to prove to the jury that my injuries were of a permanent nature. In the meantime my lawyer had asked for only \$13,000 and, after consulting with me, he told the judge that he would be willing to settle for that amount.

The lawyer for the insurance company refused to settle and appealed the decision. The appeal has not yet been heard.

So, to put it bluntly, I have money problems. I applied at the Scarborough municipal office for welfare. They sent a Mr. R. Langford to my house to interview me and he took all the particulars and later phoned me and told me that I was not eligible for any assistance.

You have had enough experience with these people to know that they never tell you anything that you can actually use as fact. For instance, he told me that he did not know how much a family of three is eligible for. However, I knew at the moment I could not expect any help from him, but if I go to the hospital for the operation, then everything will change and they will not be able to refuse me some assistance.

As near as I could figure out his line of reasoning, Mr. Langford had established my income in this fashion: unemployment insurance of \$36 per week, \$156 per month; payment of \$20 per week from my son for room and board; \$52 they consider as income. I could keep \$52 of the \$86, putting \$34 into the income column. My wife

had a part-time job as a maid in the local motel. Many weeks she has very little or no work in the winter, but since she made \$700 last year he feels she should be considered as earning \$16 a week, regardless of how much she makes, \$69 a month, total \$259 per month.

His budget for my needs as follows: payment of interest on mortgage and taxes on dwelling (actual figures) \$54; heat, hot water, gas—equal billing \$17; food—indefinite amount evidently according to whether they feel we should eat 20 or 25 days in the month, certainly not enough for 30 or 31 days—he said it should be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$100; incidental expenses for three people—I have a daughter still going to high school—\$9, total \$186.

I knew that the amount I could expect on welfare would be somewhere around \$200, and at this time my income was more than that. However, if I am cut off from unemployment insurance because I am not able to work because of the operation and things get so slow at the motel so that my wife does not work at all for the whole winter—this has happened before—and if there is not enough to eat in the house and my son moves out—and I would not blame him—then I will have to ask for welfare again.

If they again refuse to give me some assistance I will then have to ask for your help. I do not know what you could do to help me but I assume that they are not quite so arrogant if there is a third party with a little prestige in the community taking an interest in the case.

I have never met a more sadistic or loud-mouthed group of individuals than they have in the welfare office. One would think that someone was asking for some of their money when, in fact, especially in my case, all I am asking is a small portion of the tens of thousands I have paid into the common pool through my working life.

It seems to me to be absolutely ridiculous that not a single person in the whole of Canada knows what they are eligible for in total assistance, if you do have to exist on welfare. I thought it rather peculiar that Mr. Langford would lie to the extent that he said that he did not know how much a family of three would get as a food allowance. Evidently they give you any amount they feel like, as long as it does not exceed an amount set by some level of government.

If this is the case, and they do practise discrimination, then it is high time that the figures were made public. It is little enough as it is, and if their twisted little minds feel they are justified in deliberately starving people, then they should be made to untwist their so-called minds.

By the way, I would appreciate it if you could obtain a copy of the Act pertaining to welfare payments and send it to me. I think that it is just about time that the poor in Canada started organizing for their economic rights.

Unfortunately, some of the poor are even among the fully employed. This is because the government is the tool of big business and refuses to pass an adequate minimum wage Act. Because the poor belong to more than one strata of the population I think the problem could only be solved by an organization that would operate as a committee of the poor.

The aim of this organization would be its own liquidation by abolishing poverty. Boy, would I ever love to have a part to play in an organization of this sort. The opportunity does not exist today but it might tomorrow.

Yours truly,

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is just in case anybody thinks they are fooling the general public. That gentleman never did need welfare assistance. The claim was met and he did not, at any time, have to come back to the government as a person in need, and I presume he is contributing this year, Mr. Chairman, to the amounts of money that we are being asked to approve.

Now, I would like to put on record a case from Windsor, Ontario, Mr. Chairman, to show that this is a serious problem that this is not isolated in any particular area. This is a welfare recipient in Essex who presented on request a résumé of what had happened to her in applying for welfare assistance in the area. She was asked to make this résumé by the Family Service Bureau who were counselling her. When I first heard of the family, Mr. Chairman, there was a letter written because the family had a sit-in at the welfare office, and I would like to quote from January 27, 1969, the *Windsor Star*:

**SIT-IN AT WELFARE OFFICE KEEPS
FAMILY IN HOME**

A sit-in by an Essex welfare mother and her family at the Essex County Social and

Family Services Department started and ended this morning—

It is surprising, Mr. Chairman, how quickly you can get some things done:

—started and ended this morning when the department came through with enough money to prevent their eviction.

Mrs. Darlene Bednarick, her two children, Tracy, 4, and Duane, 5, and her parents Mr. and Mrs. Fred Ouellette also of Essex, sat in the office at the county building on Sandwich Street for about half an hour.

After another three-quarter-hour discussion with Murray Smith, county administrator of social services, they went away with an \$80 cheque for mortgage payments on their home at 162 Iler Street, and \$11.36 for drugs they needed in the past few months.

Both youngsters have been ill. Tracy and her mother have heart conditions and require drugs which until now have not been paid by the department.

Mr. Smith said Mrs. Bednarick paid the bills herself out of her welfare payments, then sent the bills to the department. He said it is not mandatory for the department to pay for drugs. The family home is an unfinished prefab. The ceilings and floors have not been finished; to save on heat they have been confining their activities, including sleeping, to the living room and the kitchen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a case of a deserted woman, the mother of two children, and her father became concerned. I shall not read the full letter; I shall read the pertinent parts to the problem of social and family services administration at the municipal level.

As you can see by this newspaper clipping, we have had problems. The social and family services of Essex county, with Murray Smith as administrator, is a one-man administration and answers to no one.

This is the father's letter, Mr. Chairman.

For three months my daughter received \$138 per month from them for herself and two children. For some unknown reason \$16 was deducted from the December cheques.

After our daughter questioned their office on this, Smith's secretary stated that she herself took it upon herself to cut the budget as she felt her heating bill was estimated too high. Murray Smith had come out himself and assessed her expenses and

he handled her case himself right from the start.

Metro field worker, Jerry Billings, saw our daughter in a local store buying some hockey equipment for her five-year-old son and he went back and reported it to Mr. Smith, who came to her home the next day and questioned her about how much hockey equipment she bought and where the money came from. We had given her the money.

This deserting husband worked under Murray Smith's nose for four months in Windsor driving a city bus, and no attention was paid to him and he did not contribute a cent.

Although he left September 3, there was one delay after another until the trial came through on November 5, whereupon he was charged with desertion. He was to pay the \$80 mortgage payment and \$10 a week. Still he did not pay and on December 3, 1968 our doctor was instructed by Smith's office to lay a "show cause" charge. That day they gave her a paper saying the trial would come off December 31. On December 30, my daughter called Smith's office stating her plight to him. Her mother was sick in bed with the flu; her five-year-old son had the chicken pox and she did not have the \$3 bus fare to get into court and back.

Smith told her if she failed to come to court the next day that they would drop the charges and throw it out of court and cut off her welfare. By the way, one of their social workers, Mr. Billings, lives two streets over from my daughter and goes back and forth to the court and county and social offices every day.

Well, at 11.15 p.m. the said social worker called our home and told us the trial was off as the summons had been misplaced and not delivered after laying there for three weeks. All this time, of course, the husband is still not paying and under their nose in every other hotel in Windsor.

We proceeded at this point to call in Eugene Whalen and Don Paterson, and at this action the summons was soon delivered. During this interval the husband skipped town but our daughter still had to go back to court two more times. This is making her amount of court trips seven or eight times and yet she is supposed to be the victim, not the accused.

Smith related to our daughter how angry he was for our contacting two MPP's over it, who in turn contacted Deputy Minister

James Band about the case. Smith said we should be minding our own business; he was tired of getting rubbish from Ottawa about it and he then proceeded to turn the case over to Billings.

On December 31, Billings came down asking her to sign countless forms, one of which was a paper stating she would get a receipt for any dollars she spent out of her \$122 welfare cheque—by the way her home is 26 feet by 42 feet.

She promptly told him to go to hell and refused to have anything more to do with the matter. Even though the children were healthy and clean, and herself the same and the house clean, and the household bills paid up, she was promised by Billings that they were sending Deputy Minister Band a bad report.

Before and after the husband's disappearance, Mr. Smith had promised to make the mortgage payments if the husband failed to. He told our daughter this and her lawyer, Barry Ruben. She had asked both Smith and Billings on numerous occasions about the house payments and they assured both she and her lawyer that they were taking care of it.

Then on January 25 she received a letter from her mortgage company stating two months were in arrears and unless paid promptly legal action was being taken. When her lawyer, and two MPP's, and even the Deputy Minister could not get Smith's one-man organization to answer, or to come across with anything more than excuses and lies, we took matters into our own hands.

Thank God for the freedom and power of the press. They were more than willing to co-operate; they knew they had a good story. Smith had no choice but to hear us out and believe me we certainly gave him a mouthful. We also caught him in one lie after another.

Two days after the newspaper article, our daughter received \$11 from Smith's office. I call it payola. She was contacted by a local radio station and a statement of some portion of the letter she sent to James Band was broadcast several times.

Both this radio station and the Windsor *Star* want to be kept posted on this case. They were only sorry they could not print and say all there is in this case and tell the people how it really is.

So, Mr. Chairman, it certainly is a happy ending for Minister Mr. "Happy-Up", (Mr. Yaremko), in the case of the tax rebate going

back to the welfare recipient. Something bothers me in that whole thing and that is all I am going to say about it, because I am delighted with the results—and I cancelled a good part of my leadoff I might say.

But I would like to say that Mr. Anderson, the Metro administrator, was reported in the past as having said that the people have not protested. So what do they want the people to do, Mr. Chairman? You see, I do not think families should be driven to having to protest as this family did.

I would like to read, Mr. Chairman, an editorial from the Windsor *Star* about that same time, about the end of January or early February:

HIDING HUSBANDS

Hiding husbands are one of the most serious welfare problems in Ontario. Men desert their wives and families and vanish. Court orders are made directing the husbands to pay so much per week or month to help support the family.

Often the payments are made for a couple of months and then they end. When the courts start looking for the errant husband, he is away and gone. No one knows where he is and he makes sure that no possible contact can be made.

If he is found, the husband can be jailed for failure to keep up the support payments. Technically, he is not jailed for debt, but for contempt of court in that he has refused to pay the sums that the court has ordered. It amounts to the same in the end.

But most of the husbands just bury themselves in the crowd of some distant community. They are not recognized, and they make sure that no word gets back to the home town.

Some better means of checking on this procedure should be worked out. It would be difficult, but the husband should not be allowed to get away with it.

Now, that is exactly what happened to the husband of Mrs. Bednarick and then a quite serious matter came up. I will take a section of the letter only, Mr. Chairman:

As stated in our previous letter, the local welfare officer, Mr. Billings, has had our son-in-law's social security number for nearly three weeks, along with a couple of addresses. Also, Deputy Minister James Band has this information, as has this area's local representative, Mr. R. Jones, along with a photograph.

Last night, our daughter received a summons to court for a debt from Avco Finance for nearly \$1,900. They said her husband will be served, too, if they can find him. But in the meantime, she is handy to serve judgment against, and this could result in an execution being put against her home.

The local welfare office knows about this, and why in God's name, with the information they have at hand, and also James Band's office and representative, are they not at least making an effort to find this man? If the summons is served to him, at least there is a chance that the court may garnishee his wages, which would most certainly be better than having this young family out on the street eventually.

This way, even if the house has to be sold, the Avco Finance would come in for their full amount from our daughter's share of the home and the husband's would not be touched if the summons has not been served to him.

Our daughter's Windsor lawyer, Barry Ruben, who also happens to be Avco Finance's lawyer, told her three weeks ago that this finance company located her husband in Winnipeg and even though she passed the information on to the proper sources there, have no results, other than her becoming more involved in the summons and more court proceedings for her.

Then the father has listed Barry M. Bednarick's social security number as 418 141 412. He should be driving a city bus or some kind of transport bus, and may even have a new union number and could possibly be staying with Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Fraser, 3491 Portage Avenue, Suite 16, Winnipeg 22, Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when the daughter supplied the appropriate people with the information that the finance company had managed to dig up, one certainly would have thought that somehow some action could have been taken out in Winnipeg to try to locate this particular husband. I would like to put the case on this record, Mr. Chairman, it is on the record of the Family Services Bureau and this is the case.

Received first cheque from welfare on September 13, 1968. Within two weeks of the above date, I was advised against coming to Family Service Bureau by G. Billings, the social worker from welfare who was not even handling my case.

He stated, "You only get confused running to organizations like those". However,

before he said that, his first question to me was where I was getting the money to go.

Sometime in October I was in a Canadian Tire Store buying my five-year-old son about \$10 worth of hockey equipment whereupon I spotted Billings and he spoke to me and asked me if my husband had been back to the home.

Two weeks later, Murray Smith, who learned of the case from the *Star*, came to my home and asked where I got the money to buy my son new hockey equipment. The following month my cheque was cut down \$16.

After three phone calls to Smith's office by myself I was informed that my heating bill estimates were too high. This being the reason for the deduction. This left me with a monthly welfare cheque of \$122. With this I am supposed to buy groceries for myself and my two children, utilities and heat my home which is 42 x 26 without garage, buy clothing, dry cleaning, haircuts, any dental work. Welfare only pays for extractions.

I also had to go to court at the Essex county court house seven times up to the present writing, five times was for the court appearance and two times being to lay a charge. Welfare allowed no extra money for this and each trip cost me around \$3, since I have to come in from out of town.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Minister that surely in a case like this, if the husband does in fact contribute to the family, and is saving money for the welfare department, then surely a simple cost like \$3 bus fare seven or eight times is something that could have come under special assistance.

With regard to Mrs. Bednarick's comments about welfare doing only extractions, I would ask the Minister that he explain that to me during the estimates. Apparently this is a municipal decision because we have had, quite recently I believe, dental service in the Metro area which includes dental care as well as extractions for welfare recipients.

Page two, to continue:

Murray Smith was approached by my lawyer, Al Gatti—

(because of the conflict of interest, I would presume the lady changed her lawyer as the lawyer was handling the finance company's and her work:

—Al Gatti, just before my husband's desertion trial of November 5. My husband wanted to sign his half of our home over

to me in return for being left off the hook for desertion. Mr. Gatti pleaded with Mr. Smith—

Mr. Chairman, I pause to state, that Mr. Smith is the welfare administrator:

—for ten minutes on the telephone to accept this, explaining the legal ways to get him charged with desertion, etc., a few days later.

However, Smith's answer was, "No, we cannot accept this offer. We have to take him to court now and just get some kind of a token payment from him".

Up to this time, welfare had not made one house payment. This was done and he was ordered to pay the \$80 house payment every month, plus \$10 a week for the three of us. My husband failed to comply with the court order, although he did make a couple of house payments.

I was advised by welfare to lay a show cause charge against him. I did this on December 3, the trial being set for December 31.

During the month of December, I found out November's mortgage cheque had been returned to my husband for non-sufficient funds, and he was supposed to present Smith with a receipt every month so he would know that the house payments had been made. He did not do this, so Mr. Smith never knew if the house payments were being made or were not being made.

Mr. Chairman, I can only ask the Minister, is it because Mr. Smith did not care? To continue:

Only after two weeks of telephoning his office did I find out if they (welfare) would pay the house payments if necessary, which they said they would. And only then did he call the mortgage officer at Canada Permanent, who had been after me for two weeks to talk to Smith about arrangements for the house.

Mr. Chairman, we saw the hon. Treasurer objecting to any sort of harassment against a lady with children in this type of disaster. I really question that this lady was left to deal with the Canada Permanent with an Act that actually outlines the shelter allowance. To continue:

During December Gene Whelan, MP, and Don Paterson, MPP, were informed of the whole situation and they proceeded to investigate. I called Mr. Smith's office on Monday, December 30, 1968, to explain my difficult circumstances which were that

I had no money to get into court, and my five-year-old son was sick with chicken pox.

Murray Smith proceeded to light into me about the rubbish on his desk from Ottawa. He also stated that my parents, who contacted the MP, should mind their own business and had no right to do this.

I replied to him that as taxpayers they had every right to contact their member of Parliament if they felt it necessary and, furthermore, if he were running his organization all right he should not mind someone from the government asking a few questions.

He also told me if I did not get into court the next day they would drop the charges against my husband and then they would cut me off welfare and that, furthermore, they did not have to pay my house payments if my husband failed to do so. If the mortgage company foreclosed, they were not responsible, even though they would have to find me another place to live and undoubtedly pay much more than the \$80 a month. He ended the conversation warning me to find a way into court the next day. By the way, G. Billings, their social worker, lives two streets over from us.

The same night, December 30, at 11:30 Billings called my parents' home telling them there would be no court order for me next day as the summons for my husband had been lying around the court for the whole month of December. He told them he did not have my phone number. I had left it with the welfare office on half-a-dozen occasions and had also told them it is unlisted. The next day, Tuesday, December 31, the government official was at my home to investigate as he had to send in a report to the Deputy Minister, James Band, who was contacted by Jean Whalen. His parting words were, "Murray Smith is making a lot of unnecessary garbage and complicating matters for everyone." He is for mother's allowance—

I presume she is referring to the man from Dr. Band's department, Mr. Chairman:

—and informed me that his office and Smith do not see eye to eye on anything. The same day, December 31, Billings from welfare came down with a lot of forms to fill out and wanted me to sign a few, just as I had at the beginning after my husband left. He said Smith would not handle my case any more and had handed it over to him. He then proceeded to ask me to sign

a form stating I would keep a receipt for every dollar I spent out of my \$122 monthly welfare cheque. I asked him if he were kidding me and he said no.

So I simply told him to go to hell and to tell Murray Smith the same thing and that under no circumstances would I sign such a stupid thing and that if they wanted to cut me off welfare they would just have to do it. I also questioned Billings on medicine and he informed me that they would pay for any prescription if the receipts were provided. He knew I had no previous knowledge of this, even though I had personally asked Murray Smith before and even his secretary.

I also questioned him about my house taxes, as they were supposed to be making some payment towards 1968 but which they did not and now it is 1969 and they have not made any payment towards them either. During this time, Jean Whalen and Don Paterson were keeping in touch with the whole situation and were also questioning Murray Smith. Billings told me that these MP's were not going to do me any good and they would not break the rule and do a favour for one person and not for everybody. Also that I might not even get on to mother's allowance since I had no divorce and that they did not have to make my house payments.

Mr. Chairman, I pause once again, to say that that sort of statement is not consistent with the Act. To continue:

And that he had other cases where things were going just like this and I was just out of luck. Also that they had to send a report into the Deputy Minister, James Band, about me, and that it would not be at all favourable.

Two weeks ago Billings came to my house to pick up \$13.26 that I had in receipts which I had spent for drugs. He told me that since only one of them was for the current month Smith most likely would not give me the money for the other one. This past week, on January 22, 1969, Billings came back to my home and informed me I would only get \$3.15 back on the money I spent on drugs and that they close out their books at the end of every month so he could not bother with the other one and I was just out that money. This was Murray Smith's decision, who has the final and only say with welfare money.

I also questioned him about my house taxes and he said they would see to it and that furthermore maybe I should be paying something towards my taxes every

month out of my monthly \$122. My taxes are around \$250.

I presume, Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Bednarick means per annum.

He also could not say when I would get back the \$3.15 I spent for drugs, only that it might be on February's cheque. This is the whole situation up to today, January 23, 1969.

On Tuesday, December 31, 1968, Jean Whalen contacted my parents by phone to inform them they had found him and to quote a few words: "Your case was very badly handled and without a doubt you were misused. This county welfare is away under par and behind the times and that Murray Smith is a very bigoted person." He, along with Don Paterson, said that they have people after them every week to try to get some place for them on welfare but this case was just about the worst so far that they had encountered.

There was a note attached to this, Mr. Chairman, saying:

Dear Mrs. Renwick:

I believe I have forgotten to mention the fact that on January 14th, when my husband failed to show up on a show cause charge, Judge J. McMahon issued a warrant for his arrest. This was to be taken care of by my lawyer at that time, Barry Ruben, Ouilette Avenue, Windsor.

Yours truly,

Darlene Bednarick

It had to be done, Mr. Chairman. You can see what I have tried to do is to show that welfare cases from the Kingston area to the Windsor area are being mishandled, to say nothing of east end Toronto, to say nothing of other areas of the province, such as the member for Brantford raised.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted beyond imagination that the Minister referred to the Seebohm report. While I spent a great deal of time bringing out parts of this report, there are two things, and only two, that I believe should be recorded at this hour. I feel it has caught the interest and the imagination of members on the other side of the House and that was what I set out to do.

In chapter 15, under research:

The case for research, 455: We have made it clear in several chapters how much importance we attach to research. The personal social services are large-scale experiments in ways of helping those in need. It

is both wasteful and irresponsible to set experiments in motion and omit to record and analyze what happened. It makes no sense in terms of administrative efficiency and, however little intended, it indicates a careless attitude towards human welfare.

In 473, the conclusion of their research, chapter 15:

Number 473, we cannot emphasize too strongly the part which research must play in the creation and maintenance of an effective family service. Social planning is an illusion without adequate facts and the adequacy of services mere speculation without evaluations; nor is it sufficient for research to be done spasmodically however good it be. It must be a continuing process accepted as a familiar and permanent feature of any department or agency concerned with social provision.

In the area of prevention, Mr. Chairman, one comment in the conclusion of prevention, chapter 14, number 454:

Although we often do not know how to prevent social distress or where our efforts can best be concentrated, it is, we believe, right to strive towards prevention. We are convinced that the more integrated service we suggest, together with an increase in resources, will give an opportunity to think and plan and to undertake work other than that caused by family and individuals in the late and final stages of dependence, disintegration and despair.

Only when the imperative demands made upon the casualties are diminished can prevention become possible. But the number of casualties can only be reduced by preventive action. It is crucial therefore, that this vicious cycle is broken by a forceful and widespread commitment to prevention. We do not pretend to know exactly the form this will take—in no field is systematic research more needed. Meanwhile, we must act on the best available information and regard what is done as an experiment in the broadest sense from which to learn.

Mr. Chairman, in a private conversation recently with the member for Carleton East (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), I raised the fact that in trying to write this one Sunday afternoon, my blood began to boil and I could not write any more. I had to put it on tape. He said, "I think we all agree about the problem but we do not know what to do about it." I can only hope that there are enough people interested, Mr. Chairman, on the other side of the House to take a look at prevention and research.

The report of the committee on local authority and allied personal services which the Minister refers to, and rightly so, is the Seebohm report. It was chaired by Frederick Seebohm, and attempted to point out that all persons in need, under several departments of government or certainly most of them, should be under one department. I will not take a great deal of time, Mr. Chairman, to point out that there are two or three important reasons why this government should consider doing exactly that.

Persons in need fall under The Department of Health where they have learned about prevention. Persons in need fall under The Department of Child Welfare where they have learned about prevention. Under the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman), there are children in need who should not be isolated from services of any category as to whether they are children who are juvenile delinquents in need, or whether they are children in need.

In the December 1968 *Journal of the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies*, I quote from page two, at the bottom:

In the year 1967, some 49 children representing 23 families required foster boarding care at the cost of approximately \$29,000 because their parents were unable to provide them with a roof over their heads. Of these 49, some 29 are still in our care, as of this moment, with very little hope in the foreseeable future of being reunited with mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters. This is a tragic situation which is going worse, not better and not only throughout the city of Hamilton and the county of Wentworth, but the country as a whole.

That is a perfect example, Mr. Chairman, of the need of the Minister of Social and Family Services to have some access to the housing supply in the province, or some recommendation or some continuity of relationship to the persons in need in his department.

In ATAK, the housing organization which I referred to earlier, in Kingston, one case, Mr. Chairman, is Mrs. M, a separated lady drawing \$182 family benefits and \$20 family allowance. She has four children, two boys and two girls. Until the end of May she lived in a three bedroom row house, renting at \$85 a month unheated, but was forced to move when it was expropriated by the federal government to build a parking lot.

The only other accommodation she could find was a small third floor apartment with three bedrooms renting for \$110 heated. She was forced to move again in July because the

landlord objected to the number of children she had and she moved to the only suitable accommodation she could find, an unheated house in the village.

The rent was \$110. She was given notice to vacate in September and could find nothing. She lived for two months in a windowless basement of a student co-operative before she found housing.

Now there, Mr. Chairman, is a perfect example of the federal government coming in, expropriating a person who is falling back in need on this government under housing, and also a person who falls under this Minister's department under family benefits.

The third incident, from *CW6*, magazine of Canadian Welfare Council, November-December 1968:

HOUSING COSTS FOR PEOPLE ON WELFARE

First findings of the completed survey of housing conditions of public assistance recipients, see *CW5*, September-October, indicate an impossibly high proportion of meagre incomes being spent on accommodations. The housing is much below the average enjoyed by other groups in the population but the welfare recipients had to pay 47 per cent of their incomes for it.

The average income for a family of four was \$210 a month which is below the decent living standard level of \$240 a month set by the social standing council of Metropolitan Toronto.

Almost one-third, 30.2 per cent, thought that their life had been adversely affected by housing conditions and more than one in ten of those living apart from their spouses believe that the housing had been a significant factor in the breakdown of their marriage.

When the marriage is broken down, Mr. Chairman, then the family becomes the responsibility of The Department of Social and Family Services who might not have got this family, if they had got some housing.

The total sample consisted of 433 individual recipients and 1,749 families living in two provinces, six municipalities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, someone on the government side of the House is going to have to take the bold step of saying, 'We have to do something. We have to act and we have to move.'

You see there is a reluctance on government to participate even in the private endeavours of the private agencies, and I will show you a classic example, Mr. Chairman.

Back in October, 1967, people were concerned. Two agencies united, North York and Weston family service. The two non-sectarian family service agencies of Metropolitan Toronto amalgamated to form one Metro-wide service, the largest of its kind in Canada. The former North York office, Family Service Centre's main office in Willowdale, became one of the district offices, with sub-offices in Weston and Lawrence Heights. Fifteen people were chosen from each board to form the board of the new agency.

And all this was not done without some concern, too, because so often on a merger like this—it may be a smaller agency with a larger agency—they have come to the conclusion and they said:

Not only will joining forces simplify administration and help us to give more effective service to the community, but it indicates a new level of maturity, and will lead to a joining of forces of more and more family service agencies, and family and child services as they look for ways to get on with the job as quickly and effectively as possible.

In short, I believe this merger is the beginning of a closer co-ordination of services among many public and private agencies who share the same goal.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is from a publication called *On Record*, the annual report of 1967.

Now let us see what has happened from 1967 to 1969. In 1967, *On Record*, dated October 1967, wrote about Lawrence Heights:

Such an attitude of responsibility is Lawrence Heights, a large OHC project in North York. The municipality pays for a recreation director, a community service centre, and a day-care centre operated by the public welfare department.

The North York and Weston family service centre has had an active programme for several years, including a clothing depot, and about 60 voluntary friendly visitors.

Recently, the Children's Aid and Family Services Association has begun a co-ordinated programme. The National Council of Jewish Women, in co-operation with the local school, has been active in a head start type of programme involving the whole family.

The crux of the problem, is, of course, finances, the question of who can and who should provide social service.

You see, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's department has provided a day-care system, but now who provides the social service and recreational facilities in housing projects? It is so complex it defies a simple answer. Ontario Housing Corporation has felt, up until now at least, that it is in the business of providing housing, shelter and nothing more. Yet, OHC provides the building for the nursery school at Warden Woods, and has recently furnished a lounge on the ground floor of the high rise. It is also conferring with public and private welfare agencies about the provision of services in forthcoming housing projects. The municipalities vary in their participation but each is already carrying a heavy load in municipal services and higher taxes. It would seem evident that all forms of government must be involved.

Mr. Chairman, government should not have to be told that it should become involved, when there are at least six or eight private agencies already trying to help the people in Lawrence Heights. And you see exactly the same thing in Warden Woods. I will not take the time of the House, but it certainly lists everything but The Department of Social and Family Services, because in Warden Woods there is nothing from the department.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, there is a dogged member there.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, somebody has to take the initiative. Mr. Chairman, perhaps out of 117 members there will be somebody who will say, "Let us do something about this system, because this system is not working for the people."

Mr. Chairman, the government got very concerned the other day when it had 40 delegates on the front doorstep from a particular department. I would say that if they do not get concerned with these problems they are going to have many, many more groups of people that are in need on this front doorstep, if not in these galleries or right in their offices. Mr. Chairman, I am not doing this exercise for the good of my health, I am doing it because it has to be done.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister looks terrified already.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it has to be told as it is, as the young people say these days—tell it as it is. And this is the way it is.

Mr. Sopha: I thought he looked traumatized.

Mrs. M. Renwick: You see, Mr. Chairman, two years later I pick up an *On Record*, February 1, 1969. Now, mind you, the government gave me hope in the tax rebate. When the tax rebate recall arose in the Minister's department, Mr. Chairman, I gave up on this government, I had not given up until then and I have not given up now. I think the thing is that they are living in a world that is completely devoid of reality and whoever is informing the Cabinet Ministers, and the Prime Minister, indeed, cannot be informing them correctly, Mr. Chairman. Certainly not, as I see it, in at least half of Metropolitan Toronto as an example.

I pick up an *On Record* dated February 1, 1969, and what have they chosen for a subject? They have chosen another one of these developments, one that I listed, Lawrence Heights. Then I say to myself two years later, Mr. Chairman, have they got a social and family services representative in Lawrence Heights? No. What did *On Record* February 1, have to say? You would not believe it, Mr. Chairman, unless you were working with it every day as I am in my riding, and as critical as I am of this department. But, particularly, Mr. Chairman, from my riding and from neighbouring ridings in Metropolitan Toronto.

Lawrence Heights, geographically isolated from its middle class neighbours and vital services by chain link fences and circling expressways. This alienated and neglected community of 5,200 people.

Mr. Singer: The expressway is a long way away from Lawrence Heights.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I did not write this, I say to the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I do not care if you wrote it or not, if you are going to say it, say it correctly.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Well now, really, reading from an official document.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: If you are going to put an expressway near Lawrence Heights put it in the right place. I am sorry to be so technical.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A little sensitive?

Mr. Singer: No, no, I am not sorry to be so technical.

Mr. Lewis: You lost every poll there last time.

Mr. Singer: All right, I can tell you polls and polls and—

Mr. Lewis: And there are more than 15 votes in Lawrence Heights.

Mr. Singer: Yes, there are.

Mrs. M. Renwick: To have the record straight, Mr. Chairman, *On Record* says, "encircling expressways."

This alienated and neglected community of 5,200 people including 3,000 school-age children desperately require more than professional caseworkers.

Mr. Pilkey: What riding is that in?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Since the fall of 1967, the family service association and the Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto, are two agencies which have worked closely together in the area and have combined their efforts to provide prompt services with the common aim of preventing family crisis and breakdowns.

These are private agencies at work to save this government from handling the cases, Mr. Chairman. The project owes much to the vision and perseverance of Miss Gwen Oliver, director of programme development of family services of FSA. As executive director of the former North York and Weston family service centre, Miss Oliver played a large part with leaders and with the CAS in originating the idea and in launching the experiment. This is a worthwhile experiment, Mr. Chairman, have no doubt about it. Meanwhile, the flexibility and the enthusiasm of the staff, the volunteers in the unit, their willingness to become involved in the community itself have generated exciting results. The staff works hand in glove with the community school, and the community centre located in the project, and whenever possible has fitted into the existing structure to provide a broad range of services. An extensive volunteer programme includes nutrition classes, home-making courses, friendly visiting, sewing groups, all helping people to become a more vital part of the community. After school, girls' groups have helped youngsters discover new talents, acquire poise and learn household skills. The staff recognize the great need here for programmes planned specifically for boys, because of the high proportion of fatherless homes. At present, two college students are successfully working with boys and teenagers, co-operating with a social

worker and assisting in the teenager drop-in centre.

Under the aegis of the community school, the units' male staff is handling three groups of boys, aged 9 to 13, to help them modify behaviour problems. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Correctional Services should be glad that the private agencies are doing this sort of thing and the Minister of Social and Family Services should also be equally appreciative. The staff provides leadership for a family life education programme for parents—

Mr. Singer: Why should the Minister for Correctional Services be glad? They are not criminals in there, they are nice people.

Mrs. M. Renwick: If the member for Downsview would take some concern about—

Mr. Singer: They are nice people.

Mrs. M. Renwick: —about the Minister—

Mr. Singer: They are nice people. The Minister of Correctional Services does not need to interfere in this, they are not criminals.

Mrs. M. Renwick: If the member for Downsview would take some interest in the National Health and Welfare's proposal to this government, that they would indeed supply 50 per cent of the funds of all detention homes providing they fall under the Minister of Social and Family Services, he would see that the Minister of Correctional Services—

Mr. Singer: But how do you relate correctional services to Lawrence Heights? I would like to know why the NDP does that.

Mr. Lewis: On the basis of the member who represents them.

Mr. Singer: Well that is fine. I am glad to hear the NDP relate correctional services to Lawrence Heights and I hope the record shows that. They are all criminals according to the NDP in Lawrence Heights, and I hope the record shows that.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect—

Mr. Lewis: Have you got all that from the member for Downsview? You realize he is doing that for a true political advantage? You want to get it all in. He is desperately salvaging votes in Lawrence Heights, so make sure you get every word of what the man said.

Mr. Singer: *Hansard* will show it and people will know it. I will make sure they know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: No. *Hansard* will have it and my voters will know it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: What else is new?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not really know what the member for Downsview is so apoplectic about, Mr. Chairman, but he can indeed yell a great deal louder than I can.

Mr. Singer: I just do not like you running down my people. They are nice people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I could hear the member for Downsview ask the Minister of Social and Family Services for a social and family service representative in Lawrence Heights I would be delighted.

Mr. MacDonald: He is not interested.

Mr. Singer: No. I would rather refer them to the Minister of Correctional Services.

Mr. Chairman: Surely the hon. member for Scarborough Centre realizes that the interjections are out of order. She may continue.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just thought everyone was being so patient with this year's work of mine. The members have been patient, Mr. Chairman, I thought they would enjoy a laugh in between.

Mr. Sopha: Patience is our most towering quality.

Mrs. M. Renwick: In fact, Mr. Chairman, the member from Timmins drew attention to the fact that there were very few press members in the gallery, and I had thought on one occasion of talking to Clerk Lewis and asking him about the rules on dress. I was thinking perhaps if I gave this diatribe in some unusual dress I might have attracted some press recognition.

Mr. Lewis: I thought you wanted me to do up my tie.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps we can get back to the estimates.

Mrs. M. Renwick: We are, Mr. Chairman, and we are coming now on the home stretch.

It is not often that I would like to attribute remarks to John Munro, but we might as well all get with this movement that is necessary both in Canada and the province of Ontario at this time in a common war on poverty. So from *Council Comment* dated January, 1969, in an item called "Focus" hon. John Munro on new trends in social work:

Instead of seeking to help those trapped in poverty to adjust to their poverty, we must help them by providing direction and motivation to break the chains of their disadvantage.

This opinion was expressed by John Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare, when he spoke at the opening of the McMaster School of Social Work on December 4. He was commenting on an important trend which has become apparent in social work—the shift from a case-work approach to a group or community development approach. The difference between the two approaches has been described as the difference between helping man to adapt to his situation—as in case-work—and helping to adapt the situation to man for community development.

The Minister commented on the view of the social worker as a "social animator," which has been praised by the Economic Council of Canada's Report on Poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to define to you what a social animator is. I think they are people who when they see a person in need give him a fish, then they are doing what we are doing now; if they teach him to fish, that is a different proposition which has been praised by the Economic Council of Canada's Report on Poverty. He felt that the new development of schools of social work at the undergraduate level would encourage the trend by making it possible in a four-year course to interrelate the course with other behavioural sciences.

In the old two-year programme, which followed the completion of a liberal arts education, it was necessary to devote much of the time available to training. Training, Mr. Chairman, we will deal with later in the estimates.

Mr. Munro noted that in 1966-67 almost \$800 million was spent on research in Canada and that less than 1 per cent of this was in research on the social sciences.

Clearly, he said, we must devote far more of our resources to finding answers to questions as to why, for all our welfare expenditures, we have failed to break the debilitating cycle of physical and emotional poverty for one Canadian in five. Why the growth of urbanization and industrialization has been matched by the growth of an alienation which threatens to rob man of his essential humanity. Why the gap between the generation born after World War II and that which preceded it now reached such proportions that many of our young people have become convinced that our society can only be saved by destroying all of its institutions. The needed research, he felt, would have to be done by co-ordination and integration of the efforts of the various branches of the social and behavioural sciences.

We must lure the psychologist out of his laboratory and the social worker out of his client-by-client orientation to join with the sociologists, the social anthropologist, and others, to seek answers collectively.

Now in the *Globe and Mail*, January 18, 1969, on the meeting of the Social and Family Services Ministers of the provinces—sorry, two committees—the Ministers agreed on immediate establishment of two of the three committees proposed by Mr. Munro to seek ways to improve welfare services. Of the two committees which would go to work immediately, one would study the means of keeping closer control of social assistance costs; the committee will look at better ways to keep track of welfare costs, and the factors which cause them to rise.

I would appreciate, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister, during the estimates, would inform me of any progress that has taken place to this date in those two committees.

I believe from this department there emanated at one time words in reference to the community colleges having two-year courses for social service assistance. I would draw to the Minister's attention, Mr. Chairman, March 21, 1969, in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* an article entitled "Job Vacuum for Social Service Aides".

Mr. Chairman, the Minister even has trained social aides coming along that he might put on rehabilitative, preventative research work.

The first casualties of the community colleges could well be students trained as social service assistants. More than half the community colleges have two-year courses for social service assistants, para-professionals who assist the social workers

in field work and administration or similar training programmes.

Despite this, no social agency in the province has established a job classification for the social service assistant, according to Dr. Wilson Head, of Toronto Social Planning Council. This spring, 200 to 300 of these new para-professionals will be looking for jobs in social agencies. They are not ready for that. Even the directors of the social service courses are concerned.

Robin Duff, course director at Humber College says only one of his 31 graduating students has a job lined up.

Allan Cutcher, director of Seneca College, believes most of his students will get jobs, but may have to go into rural areas that cannot attract professional social workers. Mr. Cutcher expects the crunch to come in the spring of 1970 when all the social service courses will be graduating full classes. The solution is to phase out the social service courses somehow. But the problem is finding someone who is brave enough to try.

I pause, Mr. Chairman, because I was not sure if I heard an interjection from the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) saying "No one is interested," or "No one is listening." Did you hear an interjection of that kind?

Mr. Chairman: I heard no interjections directed to the hon. member. The hon. member has the floor. Interjections are out of order.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would draw to the attention, with all due respect to the Prime Minister, that my last line in quotations is: "But the problem is finding someone who is brave enough to try."

That is exactly what I asked earlier, Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister, with all due respect, would have the will and the determination to overhaul this complicated kind of programme? I ask that with due respect, Mr. Chairman, because of the reception I have received from the hon. members from the other side of the House—

Mr. Lewis: There was some agitated *sotto voce*.

Mrs. M. Renwick: To continue, Mr. Chairman, with the problem of finding someone responsible for the problem in the first place.

In 1966-67, the emerging community colleges looked at their precursor, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, and saw a small

successful programme turning out special service assistants. In a competitive scramble to get off the ground, all three colleges in Metro adopted the Ryerson curriculum.

After cursory surveys of job opportunities, Dr. Head said there was little or no consultation with social agencies expected to employ the course's graduates. The council of regents responsible for curriculum approval essentially had to rely on the colleges' assurances that they had done their homework, but a responsible and careful look at Ryerson's course would have revealed how difficult it would be to duplicate its success. The average age of Ryerson's students in the course is 35. Many are housewives and businessmen.

Surely it meant businesswomen. Maybe businessmen looking for a more exciting occupation.

According to course director Russell Jolliffe, others are already employed in social agencies and are being sent back to school so that they can take far more responsible jobs.

"The students in the Ryerson course are a different breed to the students coming out of the community college courses," Dr. Head said. "I do not think that 18- or 19-year-old kids can give adequate marriage counselling, for instance, to a 45-year-old couple. Maturity is needed for something like that."

I know that this has taken a lot of time, but I am at the end. The thing is that when we live on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, and ask for a preventive programme, or ask for an expansion of service or an understanding of the needs, we are told so constantly that these people are not available, we are short of doctors, we are short of all the trained people. Now, at least, we can present to the Minister that there are some people available, one of whom in a class of 31 has a job.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, obviously a guaranteed income is the solution to a great part of this morass—I would hate to call it a "can of worms", but I will not go into the guaranteed annual income because it will be dealt with by the New Democratic Party at a more appropriate time.

But I would like to read two paragraphs, one from James Cutt, York University, "The Guaranteed Income for Canadians".

The likelihood of significant reforms of welfare policy has been increased in the sixties in both Canada and the United States by the happy coincidence of will and means

of both a new concern over poverty and a comparative affluence to make possible steps towards its alleviation if not elimination.

Strategy is being directed both to build-up the earning capacity of low-income groups, and to assuring every family an adequate standard of living regardless of its earning capacity.

On the question of income maintenance, concern is now focused not only on income interruption, but on the whole issue of the income inadequacy or deficiency, and a variety of devices has been suggested to provide a minimum income slot, either for a particular group or on an universal basis.

And that, of course, Mr. Chairman, is not the same language the Minister for Revenue is using when he talks about guaranteed income. We may as well be talking two different languages, Mr. Chairman.

From the *Financial Post*, March 15, 1969, entitled "What Guaranteed Income Really 'Is'", one or two paragraphs written by James Cutt, quoting the Economic Council of Canada, which recently brought together some startling evidence of poverty in Canada, particularly among certain groups and in certain regions:

One increasingly popular approach to this problem of poverty is the provision of a guaranteed minimum annual income—which would be fine. A minimum socially acceptable income level for individuals and families, and then ensure that incomes were not permitted to fall below those specific levels.

The Canadian Welfare Council suggested in January of this year that the reform of welfare policy in Canada be built around the principle of a guaranteed minimum income, and the latest Ontario Budget stresses that the apparatus of the provincial income tax would provide the framework from which a guaranteed minimum income might be established. There are two basic approaches to the provision of a universal guaranteed income, the negative income tax and the universal demogrant.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take out of context, two lines from a remarkable American, George Wall, the 62-year-old Harvard University biologist who won the Nobel Prize for medicine in 1967 and who recently made an impassioned speech in Boston appraising our tragic times and the future of today's young people.

It was a speech that is shaking the United States, one man's dissenting views on American war policy. Now this is one of the best efforts of communication for the masses that I have had the privilege of reading. Mr. Wall states in two lines a very important fact of government.

If you recall, Mr. Chairman, I began by looking at the people from whom we take taxes and what we give them—what happens when they need us “in need”. There is no imagination and assistance is based on a paternalistic handout; but with imagination, this can be rectified. I realize, Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way since the days of Mr. David Croll and the House of Providence.

We are in different times now, we can do more, and Mr. Wall has said that “the only point of government is to safeguard and foster life”. Mr. Chairman, government is not business, government is people.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we shall continue with the estimates of the same department.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:00 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Tabling report, Ontario Fire Marshal, Mr. Wishart	2973
Toronto stock exchange, bill respecting, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	2973
Mining Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	2973
Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	2973
Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Brown, first reading	2974
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brown, first reading	2974
Provincial Courts Act, 1968, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading	2974
Tabling DHO capital construction programme book, Mr. Gomme	2975
Alex G. Brown memorial clinic, statement by Mr. Grossman	2976
Douglas Point nuclear reactor, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Nixon	2977
Dofasco, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Nixon	2978
Security deposits held by OHC, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. MacDonald	2979
Westinghouse company, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. MacDonald	2979
Grace graduate nurses, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald	2979
Ontario regional development council, question to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. MacDonald	2980
Westinghouse company, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Pilkey	2980
University scholarship funds, question to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Breithaupt	2980
Compensation for crime victims, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Davison	2981
Film censorship, questions to Mr. Auld, Mr. Davison	2981
Sale of OHC homes to tenants, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. B. Newman	2981
CMHC loans, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Peacock	2982
Zinc smelter, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Jackson	2983
Town of Ajax, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. R. S. Smith	2983
Infants' dolls, questions to Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman	2984
Transfer of prisoner, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman	2985
Information on debtors, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon	2986
Estimates, Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Yaremko, continued	2988
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	3010

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: In the galleries today we have as guests: in the east gallery students from Durham College in Oshawa and the W. A. Porter Collegiate Institute in Scarborough; and in the west gallery from Sacred Heart Separate School in Toronto and Streetsville Secondary School, Streetsville.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Ontario Fire Marshal for the year 1968.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TORONTO STOCK EXCHANGE

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Toronto Stock Exchange.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, this new Act will replace the original Toronto Stock Exchange Act, which was passed in 1878. The purpose in the new Act is to clear up anachronisms in the existing legislation and to ensure the exchange's position as one which provides service for, and in the interests of, the investing public. The two main provisions, to which I might make reference, have to do with the election of two public directors, and also to clarify, define and strengthen the position of the president of the exchange.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder on a point of clarification if the Minister could advise whether the members of the Legislature will have any ability to express an opinion in the selection of these two public directors.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No. Their nomination will come in the normal process and be con-

firmed by the Executive Council of the government.

Mr. Singer: The Minister means the answer is no.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I have two bills that are rather complementary in nature. I wonder if I could introduce them one at a time and then make the explanation.

THE MINING TAX ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MINING ACT

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, these two bills are being introduced together because they are complementary, one to the other, and because they represent a very immense change in the policies of this government in respect of its mineral resources policy.

The Mining Tax Act changes, in the main, were already outlined by the hon. Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) in this House in his Budget address, but I do want to emphasize to the House, that the government does not look upon its mining tax provisions and increases as solely a revenue-producing matter, but rather as a vehicle for implementing public policy and the emphasis in our taxing statutes from now on, sir, will be to encourage and provide incentives for the development of our mineral resources, and for the processing and treatment in Canada of the ores mined in Ontario.

We believe that the changes incorporated in the mining tax bill will do some of these things, and it is my hope that as a result of certain studies which will take place over the

next year, that further incentives and further encouragements can be built into our mining tax system and its procedures.

But the major change in government policy, Mr. Speaker, has to do with The Mining Act itself, which is being amended by changing section 106 so that all Ontario ores, regardless of when the mining claim was patented or the lease given, will have to be processed and treated in Canada, subject to certain exceptions.

Hon. members will already know, Mr. Speaker, that the present section 106 of The Mining Act requires all ores or minerals removed from any lands disposed of by the Crown since April 12, 1917, to be refined in Canada. In our view, this has been a rather ineffective requirement, Mr. Speaker, because by far the largest number of Ontario's producing mines are on mining claims that were patented prior to that 1917 date.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, we are now removing that 1917 date from the Act.

Henceforth the government will require, subject to certain exceptions, all ores and all minerals mined in Ontario to be treated and processed in Canada, and in this way we want to ensure the development of our north, and to guarantee that Ontario's mineral resources will mainly benefit the citizens of Canada. We are trying to ensure that our northern resources will be utilized and provide employment and security for Canadians first, rather than for the benefit of others.

I should point out that obviously these changes cannot be imposed by us overnight, and some of our resources, even in the foreseeable future, will have to be exported in the form of concentrates, rather than metal, so there is provision in the amendment for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to grant exemptions to the over-all policy of requiring the processing to be done in Canada.

These exemptions will be granted only after consideration has been given to the following:

1. Whether there are facilities in Canada already for refining in Canada, and if not, why not.
2. Whether the ore can be economically treated to the metal stage in Canada, and
3. Whether there is a market in Canada for the product.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out, it has been the policy of this government, and to be fair, sir, its predecessors, to encourage processing in Canada.

We are now changing that policy to the

extent that before ores can be processed outside Canada specific authority must be obtained from the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

I want no one in the mining industry to be fooled by our attitude and our intention. We mean business. Ontario's natural resources belong to the people of this country as a whole. We mean to preserve them for future generations of Canadians, or preferably, and in the emphatic alternative, to utilize them first and foremost for the benefit of Canadians.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman, on point of clarification in relation to this statute, which is a reflection of his party's policy for a good many years, what part of the bill is directed specifically at the decision made, or to be made, by Texas Gulf Sulphur?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: This will affect, as I have indicated, sir, all ores and minerals mined in Ontario.

THE GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-1962

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Brown: The intention of this Act is to prohibit the use of dogs in the taking of game and in fishing.

THE PLANNING ACT

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

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Brown: This amendment ensures that home care can be provided for children with social need.

THE PROVINCIAL COURTS ACT, 1968

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Provincial Courts Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to raise the upper age limit of persons who are to be dealt with as juvenile

delinquents by the provincial courts from 16 years of age to 18 years of age.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Highways has a statement.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table The Department of Highways capital construction programme book for the 1969-70 fiscal year. This is a departure from arrangements that have been followed in past years when the book was introduced with the estimates of the department. The book was then made available to members a few days in advance so that they would have an opportunity to study it.

The reason for this new procedure is to assist municipalities to organize their works programmes so that there will not be any loss of good construction weather. I am sure the hon. members will agree on the desirability of releasing this information as early as possible.

A copy of the programme book has been sent to each member in the usual way, and when my department's estimates are being presented they will be able to deal with its contents.

For the benefit of hon. members I will briefly outline the programme highlights:

First let me say that despite the financial restrictions imposed on the department, we plan to carry out a volume of work equal to last year's programme.

In order to do this, we carried out a searching examination of operations which has led to the adoption of new standards and procedures in road construction and maintenance. As time does not permit me to do it now, I shall deal with these changes in detail in the course of presenting the estimates.

The total value of capital project work outlined in the highway construction programme is estimated at \$289.1 million, of which about \$164.1 million will be the expenditure in the current fiscal year.

Work is proposed on a total of 878 miles. The bulk of the programme is on two-lane highways and includes the grading of 138 miles, grading and paving of 247 miles and paving of 436 miles.

The proposed work on multi-lane divided highways will include six miles of paving, 20 miles of grading and paving and 11 miles of grading. Twenty miles of grading and paving are proposed for multi-lane undivided highways.

Work is proceeding on the widening of Highway 401 to 12 lanes in the Toronto area. Proposed for award is an additional 1.5 miles, including complete reconstruction of the Kennedy Road interchange. Also slated for award this year are two contracts for a major interchange at Highway 401 and Highway 27.

Six-laning of the Queen Elizabeth Way between Toronto and Hamilton continues, with the proposed award of a contract of 3.4 miles easterly from Bronte Road interchange. Work is progressing well on the control of access programme between Hamilton and St. Catharines, with two more contracts scheduled for service roads at Jordan Station interchange and Vineland.

Proposed for award this year on Highway 406 is an additional six miles of grading and paving to extend it south from St. Catharines to Highway 58. The awarding of a contract for the construction of the East Main Street tunnel at Welland is scheduled under a cost-sharing agreement with the seaway authority. Cost of the four-lane tunnel, including approaches, is estimated at \$5.7 million and will be shared equally by the seaway authority and The Department of Highways.

In the Ottawa area work continues on Highway 416 between Highway 401 and the capital city. Work is under way on the Spencerville Diversion and it is proposed to carry out clearing and grading between this section and Highway 401. Proposed also is additional work north of Spencerville.

Ottawa's 65-mile freeway link with the Quebec border—Highway 417—will proceed, with the award of contracts for the first major grading project on 9.5 miles between Baseline Road and Vars Side Road.

On the west side of Ottawa, Highway 417 will link the Queensway with Highway 17 west of Ottawa. Work continues on grading between Highway 15 and County Road 9, and follow-up paving contracts on this section are proposed for award this year. Grading of a section from County Road 9 easterly is also scheduled for this year.

With the award of a contract for the 2.4 miles from Bridgeport Road to King Street North—Highway 85—the major portion of the Kitchener-Waterloo Expressway will be under construction or contract.

Also proposed in this year's construction programme is a start on grading and drainage of the E. C. Row Expressway in Windsor.

On the Lakehead Expressway, the first expressway in northern Ontario, a contract

for paving the section from Broadway Avenue to Neebing Avenue, and paving of the 9.4 miles between Tertiary Road 800 and Highway 17 are scheduled for award this year.

With a view to having the Sudbury-Timmins highway open by the fall of 1970, contracts on the final 18 miles are proposed for award this year, as is the first paving contract on 33 miles from Highway 101 southerly.

On Highway 631, a grading contract is scheduled for award this year from Highway 17 northerly for 12.5 miles, and clearing of an additional 12.5 miles is also proposed.

On Highway 71, between Kenora and Fort Frances, contracts are scheduled for the reconstruction of 17 miles from Nester Falls northerly and asphalt surfacing is proposed over a 25-mile section.

New contracts are proposed on a total of 271.9 miles of Trans-Canada Highway. Most of this total will involve the repaving of 191.6 miles, an additional work will include the grading of 5.1 miles, grading and paving of 70 miles and the construction of 5.2 miles of truck climbing lanes in northern Ontario. Included in the Trans-Canada Highway work is the proposed new 3.7 miles bypass at Sault Ste. Marie.

The Department of Highways is also responsible for design and supervision of construction of a number of miles of resources roads. Under this year's programme we propose to award contracts for 35.4 miles of resources road work in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, this is just a brief summary of the programme's highlights to indicate to the hon. members the extent of the construction programme that the department has been able to schedule with the funds that have been allocated to it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Correctional Services has a statement.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 18, during the debate on the estimates of my department, the hon. member for High Park made a statement that some inmates selected for the treatment programme for drug addiction at the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic were, and I quote him, "sent there and took marijuana and no other drugs".

To support this statement, the hon. member sent across the floor of the House, the name of one inmate alleged to be in this category. The hon. member then stated, and I quote again:

I can well understand that errors can

occur and I ask the Minister that he take steps in future to make certain that boys, and this is a very serious problem, who are just smoking marijuana are not sent there.

Mr. Speaker, the contention of the hon. member was that we took a young lad whose sole experience with drugs was using marijuana and placed him among those who were addicted to the more dangerous drugs. As I promised at that time, I have looked into this case and am advised that the facts are as follows:

1. The young lad referred to is nearly 22 years of age.

2. This man was convicted of trafficking in narcotics.

3. On his own admission, this convicted drug trafficker had been using methydrone, LSD, and marijuana for a number of years.

Let me emphasize that this is the same man to whom the hon. member referred as a young lad "just smoking marijuana". Therefore, sir, in accordance with the policy and practice in my department, this man was quite properly assessed for treatment at the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic.

Mr. Shulman: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? For clarification, Mr. Minister, would you inform me if the narcotic, for which he was convicted of trafficking, was not, in fact, marijuana?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member asking me about the offence for which he was convicted?

Mr. Shulman: The Minister said the man was convicted for trafficking in narcotics and was the narcotic not, in fact, marijuana?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is beside the point, Mr. Speaker. Whenever we get someone into our system, whether they are convicted for narcotics trafficking or for any other purpose, and we find out that they should be at the clinic for treatment of an addiction, that is where they go—regardless of what he was convicted for.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may not convert this into a debate. He has been answered and I think he should yield the floor now—

Mr. Shulman: Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is reminded that this is not a period of debate. He has a privilege, according to the customs of the

House, of asking questions for clarification. He has asked one and has been answered by the Minister as the Minister wished to answer. I will be pleased to hear the member's other question and if it is a proper one, the Minister may accept it or not as he wishes.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the question which I wish to ask for clarification—the lad referred to, the 21-year-old lad, was he, in the opinion of the Minister, addicted to any narcotic drugs?

Hon. Mr. Crossman: The answer, sir, is yes.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a question of clarification. That is a question of the Minister's opinion. It is not proper and it is out of order, as is the answer.

The hon. member for Algoma has been catching the Speaker's eye.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I would like to sweeten up the operation here—

An hon. member: The hon. member should have done that last night.

Mr. Gilbertson: —the page boys are now going to distribute some maple sugar on every member's desk. It is compliments of the Algoma maple syrup producers.

I would also like to announce, Mr. Speaker, that we had our festival last week and we had Miss Dominion of Canada on St. Joseph's Island—

Mr. Speaker: Before we get into the question period, I would like to ask the co-operation of the members of the Opposition parties today and tomorrow with respect to the question period. After the leader of the Opposition and the member for York South have asked their questions as is our custom—and which custom I think we should preserve—I would like to ask the hon. members both today and tomorrow to catch Mr. Speaker's eye as they can and we shall proceed in that manner and see if there is any improvement in the manner of handling questions.

I may advise the House that a meeting is being scheduled for immediately after Easter, between the party leaders, to start the review of what should be done with respect to procedures. The question period is one, I know, that will be considered. So perhaps the hon. members will now take it upon themselves, after the two leaders have asked their questions, to catch the Speaker's eye if the Minister to whom the question is directed, is in

the House. If they neglect to do so, I shall not, as in the past, remind them and call it to their attention.

The hon. leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, further to my questions of yesterday.

For how long has the Douglas Point nuclear reactor been out of operation?

Was there any escape of radioactive materials from the reactor?

Has the reactor been refueled under power since it was commissioned?

When is it expected that it will be back in operation?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the Douglas Point nuclear reactor has been shut down since March 6.

The reactor has continued in a safe state throughout the entire period since shutdown and no significant release of radioactivity to occupied areas of the station or the surrounding environment has occurred.

The reactor has not been refueled under full power since it was commissioned.

The annual planned shutdown for routine maintenance and overhaul, originally scheduled to start in mid-April, has been advanced so as to be concurrent with the unplanned shutdown caused by the fueling machine failure.

It is expected that the annual shutdown will require from six to eight weeks at which time the reactor will again be placed in operation.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

I did not hear the Minister too clearly but am I to understand that there was an escape of some radioactive material?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, since this particular plant was designed to be refueled under power and a similar design is the basis for the much larger Pickering plant, what assurance can he give us that actually the design is in fact workable, since we are so heavily committed to it in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should read a statement from the Atomic

Energy of Canada Limited and it might explain some of the problems.

A mechanical failure in one of the two fueling machines at the Douglas Point station has caused the plant to be shut down. Fueling of the station is carried out by two remotely operated machines which work as a pair, one at each end of the reactor. The machines lock on to the ends of a fuel channel and one machine pushes fresh fuel into the channel while the machine at the opposite end receives spent fuel. The system is designed to refuel the reactor while it is at full power.

During the commissioning of the refueling system, however, this work is being carried out with the reactor shut down. Defective fuel bundles had been discovered in the reactor channels and the fueling machines were removing this fuel when the mechanical failure occurred in the west fueling machine. This failure rendered the west fueling machine inoperable while locked on to a reactor channel.

Procedures for removing the fueling machine from the reactor channel are now being prepared. The annual shutdown of the station for routine maintenance and overhaul, which was scheduled to start in mid-April and last for several weeks, has been brought forward.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, I understood the Minister to say in his first answer that no significant radioactive material was lost. Then he emphasized that there was some loss of material. I do not want to be misled in this but can the Minister assure me that there was no loss of radioactive material?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there is no problem there. But again, Mr. Speaker, and I told the hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday, I think he has got some questions there that might better be answered by the nuclear engineers in Hydro, where they could give him the answer that he is seeking on the floor of the House.

Mr. Nixon: I would just say, Mr. Speaker, in response to the Minister's comment, that it is not my intention to get into needless technical questions. But I made the point that the principle of the Douglas Point reactor is being repeated on a much larger scale in Pickering. Surely this is a matter of policy, not just a matter of technology, and we are concerned about it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of policy. We are talking about

a mechanical failure which can happen in anything, not only in—

Mr. Nixon: The Minister has not had that thing working yet.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: —not only in nuclear reactors but it can happen in anything. It will be ready. I cannot see where any government policy is connected with that.

Mr. Nixon: The important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that this particular plant was announced in 1961. Now in 1969 it has still not worked to specifications.

An hon. member: Is this a debate?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader will continue with his questions.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That was a red face—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, the Minister always does that to me.

Were any of the regional development facilities consulted by Dofasco before the company reached the decision to option 5,000 acres at Port Burwell for a new major steel complex?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Treasurer might indicate to the House, what the function of his regional development councils would be if they were not to play some part in assisting these major industries to locate in a part of the province where it would be an advantage to the whole province and perhaps fit into an overall plan of the province. There has been some considerable—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader has placed his question now. He need not comment on it. The Treasurer is available either to answer or not the supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think an appropriate time to debate that matter is when the estimates of The Department of Treasury, regional development branch, are under consideration in committee.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions of the Minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt the hon. member for a minute? I have a question of

the Minister of Trade and Development from the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: I spoke about that earlier.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me. The hon. member for York South; I am sorry.

Mr. MacDonald: My first question is, in view of the case cited by Action Line, Toronto *Telegram*, March 28, would the Minister indicate for how long tenants' security deposits are held by the Ontario Housing Corporation?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the security deposit required by Ontario Housing Corporation is a nominal \$25. These funds are held in trust by OHC during the period of tenancy. They are refunded in full at the termination of the tenancy provided that there are no repairs required which are the tenant's responsibility and that the rental account shows no arrears.

As the hon. member realizes, the interest on such a modest deposit is not much more than \$1 a year. The corporation, therefore, uses the interest to assist tenant groups and tenant recreational and social activities. For example, \$300 was recently made available to the Neighbourhood Youth Corps in South Regent Park and regular annual grants are made to groups like the Lawrence Heights recreational committee and the Scarlettwood-Westmount Youth Club.

Mr. MacDonald: By way of a supplementary question, in view of the fact that the tenant mentioned in this instance had been there for 13 years, so that the \$13 interest is a 50 per cent increase in the security deposit. Does OHC pocket all of the interest?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I just said OHC does not pocket any interest. They use it for the tenants' benefit.

Mr. MacDonald: On another occasion we will pursue it, Mr. Speaker.

To the same Minister, in view of the fact that Westinghouse is closing down its Etobicoke plant, with consequent loss and hardship to the employees in the community, will the Minister explain how an application by Westinghouse for a forgiveness loan to open a new plant at Orangeville can be entertained?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, there is no loan approved yet for the Westinghouse Company at Orangeville. I might say that consideration is always given with reference

to what would happen when a plant moves. I might say I spoke to the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) about three weeks ago about the same plant, and also to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

I pointed out that this was a chain reaction on the part of Westinghouse; they were moving some of their production out of Brantford to Orangeville and out of Hamilton to Brantford, and that in the shuffle there would be \$7 million of export products going out of the Brantford plant back to Westinghouse in the United States.

Since that time, of course, the matter of the Etobicoke plant has been brought up, and I might say that we had the UEW group in yesterday and they met with the Prime Minister and myself. We are looking at the situation and I have asked my people to see what effect these moves would have on the Etobicoke plant. But what they make in Etobicoke has nothing to do with these three other plants; there is no chain reaction there I can assure you.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Minister not agree that what in effect is happening is that the public purse is subsidizing the transfer of a plant from one community to another community?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not in this case. The plant in Etobicoke is obsolete and was being closed out anyway, so the Orangeville plant has nothing to do with what is happening in Etobicoke. If the member wants to tie them all together so he can make an argument out of it, I suggest that if we are going to employ more people in Brampton than Orangeville, we have to weigh the circumstances—how many jobs you lose in one area and how many jobs you create in the other. In this case, I do not think that Etobicoke has anything to do with what we are doing in these other three locations.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will get back to that one when the rules of the House permit a fuller exploration.

To the Minister of Health. Can the Minister advise the House whether the Ontario College of Nurses, having been apprised of the Minister's view regarding their rules with respect to nurse registration examinations as they apply to Grace graduate nurses, have indicated to him that the rules will be changed so that the Grace graduate nurses may write their examination under conditions similar to those spelled out in sections 8 and 9 of the regulations under The Nursing Act?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, they have not so advised me yet, but they have given me to understand that they intend to review the situation in the light of actual experience of examinations to see if the present system is good and worthy of being carried on. They have undertaken to review the decision and to recommend whether or not added courses should be taken or more opportunity given to re-write examinations. This, I am sure, will take place at the next meeting of council towards the end of this month.

Mr. MacDonald: A question to the Provincial Treasurer. Has the Provincial Treasurer received representations from the Ontario Regional Development Council and member regional development councils with regard to their work? Will the Minister make the council brief available to the Legislature? And if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I met with representatives of the Ontario Regional Development Council and member councils to discuss their future role in provincial planning and development. We met yesterday afternoon.

Both the government and the council are reviewing the nature and extent of the contribution these dedicated bodies can make to Ontario's economic progress as a complement to the valuable assistance they are providing in the preparation of regional development programmes.

The submission made by the Ontario Regional Development Council is directed specifically to the Prime Minister, the hon. Mr. McKeough and myself, and its contents suggest that they did not wish the material to be made public.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): A question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When the town of Orangeville sells to Westinghouse for \$90,000 land which the municipality purchased for \$200,000, is this subsidization of new industry permitted under the law or departmental regulations?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this matter was just recently brought to my attention. At this point, I am not in a position to agree or dispute the figures. We wrote to the municipal clerk on March 20 asking for the facts. We have not heard back from him but when

we have, I will be glad to discuss it with the member.

Mr. Pilkey: A supplementary question. My second part of the question is—regardless of the amounts of money, I am talking about the law and the departmental regulations. Would you care to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The law is very explicit.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs:

What guarantees are there to protect the public investing in university scholarship funds? If there are no guarantees, would the Minister recommend a system of protecting the public, similar to the depositors' insurance legislation?

An hon. member: Good question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Minister of Commercial and Financial Affairs ready to answer?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am sorry—

Mr. Speaker: A question has been placed by the member for Kitchener, on behalf of the member for Parkdale—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes—

Mr. Speaker: —in connection with university scholarships.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Excuse me, I was directing my attention to a matter which was just delivered to me.

Now, with respect to this question of university scholarship funds, amendments to The Securities Act 1966, which took effect on September 1 last year, brought scholarship plans or trusts within the jurisdiction of the Act by a change in the definition of security.

The result is that those selling such plans are obliged to meet the licensing requirements of the Ontario Securities Commission; those being asked to buy are, through a prospectus, given adequate information on which to base their decision. This information discloses that the net funds accruing to depositors are placed with institutions which are already insured under existing deposit insurance legislation.

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Trade and Development, Mr. Speaker.

1. How many invitations have been sent out for the Provincial Conference on Women to be held at the Royal York on April 16, 1969?

2. How are the names chosen?

3. To what extent is the conference being subsidized by the department?

4. Why are there no opportunities for Opposition members to speak or participate on the panel?

5. What is the function of the women's advisory committee?

6. Who are the members of this committee and what are their qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and get that information for the hon. member.

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

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): A question to the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General.

Since The Law Enforcement Compensation Act 1968 does not apply to persons assisting police without having been requested by the police to do so, and is totally inadequate in its application to situations in which private citizens may find themselves from time to time, is the Minister now prepared to introduce legislation which would provide compensation for victims of crime?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misinformed as to the content of the Act. The question reads that the Act does not apply to persons assisting police without having been requested. Section 3 of the Act refers to any person being injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person occurring in or resulting directly from assisting a police officer in arresting any person or in preserving the peace. I would just point out that there is no need of a request to assist.

Clearing that point, I would continue to say that any person assisting a police officer in arresting a person or preserving the peace is included as one who is entitled to compensation under the present Act.

As to the last part of the question, which really calls for a statement of government policy, I think I am prepared to say this—the matter of further extension of this compensation is under consideration and legislation is in the course of drafting. The matter

of government policy as to how far that will go has not yet been determined.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a further question.

Mr. Davison: A question to the Minister of Tourism and Information.

Do films purchased by public or private bodies which are made available for public showing, whether for profit or free of charge, have to be approved by the director of the theatre branch? If so, was the film "Revolution Underway" screened and approved by the department?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the film to which the hon. member refers was a 16 mm film. I can simply say that the board makes a charge for reviewing films. There are many films of an industrial, educational, travel or various nature, on 16 mm, which are not submitted to the board, nor are they required to be, because they are not proposed to be shown for profit. As far as the film "Revolution Underway" is concerned, I am informed that it has not been submitted to the department.

Mr. Davison: A supplementary question; this was a film shown by the Police Department of Toronto, and it was not submitted to your department?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Attorney General. In view of the increasing responsibilities of justices of the peace as a result of proposed and past legislation, would the Attorney General advise as follows: What criteria has his department established in evaluating the qualifications of persons appointed to such office? Is there any programme of continuing training and education afforded to justices of the peace, and what type of examination or review as to competency is conducted by the department?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and give an answer very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Has the Minister arrived at a decision as to the sale of homes

to the tenants in Bridgeview and other subdivisions in the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, we are satisfied now that the pilot project in Guelph has worked out to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned. We are submitting to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation approval on all other projects of a similar nature in many areas of Ontario. I might add that this totals about 6,000 units, of which we believe 3,500 to 4,000 can be sold on this basis. We hope to approach it on a concerted basis where everybody is in agreement. We will not be doing it on an *ad hoc* basis the way we did in Guelph. So I would assume that shortly we will hear from Central Mortgage and Housing that the proposal has been accepted, and we will start to work with these other areas to give them the same opportunity as at Guelph.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. Has the Minister approached Central Mortgage and Housing concerning the Windsor situation specifically or not?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It would be included with the rest of the submissions. Every project outside of Guelph is now included in this submission of 3,500 or so.

Mr. B. Newman: Could the Minister be a little more explicit and possibly give a date as to when occupants of these homes in the city of Windsor could expect to purchase them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No I cannot at the moment. I think we shall have to wait and see if the general proposal submitted to Central Mortgage and Housing is accepted. Then I think we can notify people. We can estimate the value of their homes, what repairs are required, and make a contract or arrangement such as we did in Guelph.

Mr. B. Newman: If I may ask the Minister another question, Mr. Speaker. Back on February 4 I asked the Minister this same question and I got the same answer. I hope in a month from today I do not get the same answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order! If the hon. member wishes to ask a supplementary question he may do so, but he did not do that. He made a statement.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Perhaps I could clarify that, Mr. Speaker. We did do some preliminary investigation and estimating, as I have suggested to you, and Windsor was one of

the areas where we did some preliminary investigating on the value of the homes, which helped us put our report together for this major report we have submitted to Ottawa now.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister if he is aware that the homes keep deteriorating as a result of no action?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has had a great deal of leeway with supplementary questions and I think that he has asked sufficient. The hon. member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Trade and Development.

Following the meeting of the Prime Minister with the federal Minister of Transport last week, was the Ontario Housing Corporation instructed to withdraw loan applications covering a portion of the 3,000 units then awaiting CMHC approval?

If the answer is yes, what is the number and location of the units covered by the withdrawn applications?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The answer to the first question, Mr. Speaker, is that we were not asked to withdraw any submissions. To my knowledge, only one has come back, and that was due to a slight change which our people are working on and it will be resubmitted. But the applications we have in there will remain there until they make a decision on them.

Mr. Peacock: May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister, Mr. Speaker? Was it proposed to the Minister, or to the Prime Minister, by the federal Minister of Transport that a portion of the units awaiting loan approval be replaced by the rent subsidy programme proposed by the federal Minister of Transport?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not quite follow that. There were no proposals made to change the programme that we have at the present time and, as I said earlier, we have no intention of withdrawing any projects we have up there. We are awaiting decision from Ottawa as to what they are going to do with them. We have no projects approved in Metro Toronto, I might say, right now. I would hope before too long that some of these projects will come forward, but there are no changes contemplated at the present time that I know of.

Mr. Peacock: My question is, was it proposed by the federal Minister of Transport that the rent subsidy programme replace some of the units for which the Minister has loan applications in CMHC's hands?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If I understand, I think you are referring to the apartments that are vacant now in some of the buildings. That is a rent supplement, like the former rent certificate scheme. No, it was not discussed to my knowledge. We wrote, as I said earlier, on February 18, asking if Ottawa would be interested in sharing a rent subsidy on that rent certificate scheme. So far we have not received any reply from them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to place a question from the member for Cochrane South to the Minister of Mines. It is in five parts.

Have meetings been held between the government and Texas Gulf concerning the location of the zinc smelter?

What is the date of the most recent meeting?

Who attended the meetings?

Where were the meetings held?

What is the date of the next meeting to discuss the location of the zinc smelter?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, in answer to these five questions. Number one, have meetings been held? Obviously they have. As I have indicated in the House on a number of occasions, within seven days of assuming the office of the Minister of Mines I had them in and we were holding a meeting.

What is the date of the most recent meeting? The most recent meeting was held a week ago Monday, that is Monday March 24.

Who attended the meetings? On that particular meeting, sir, Mr. Earl Huntington, of New York the assistant secretary of Texas Gulf, Mr. R. D. Dick Mollison, the vice-president of the metals division of Texas Gulf who is also the executive vice-president of Ecstall Mining Limited, in Toronto, Mr. Stephen Gilmore, the traffic manager of Texas Gulf from Houston, Texas, Mr. Devon Smith, the manager of the public relations for Texas Gulf, Toronto, Mr. Gordon McKee, junior, of New York City, the treasurer of Texas Gulf, Dr. James R. West, the manager of research for Texas Gulf of the city

of New York, Mr. J. W. Hall junior, the manager of the sulphur and metal sales division of Texas Gulf of New York city, Mr. Brady Lee, the mines assessor of The Department of Mines and of the city of Toronto, Mr. Donald P. Douglas, the deputy Minister of The Department of Mines and of the city of Toronto, and Mr. Alan F. Lawrence, QC, MPP, the Minister of Mines and of the city of Toronto.

Where were the meetings held? This particular meeting was held in the office of the Minister of Mines, Room 1302, Whitney Block, Parliament Buildings, Queen's Park, Toronto 2.

What is the date of the next meeting to discuss the location of the zinc smelter? In the same place, on Tuesday next, April 8, 1969.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Why did you not invite the hon. member for Cochrane South?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Because I do not think the member for Cochrane South would add one single little bit to the discussion.

Mr. Jackson: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Does the Minister support the resolution that was introduced in this House on Monday?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is not a supplementary question.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It would be nice to have a majority of Canadians in those meetings, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question left over from yesterday to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister received a request from the town of Ajax for a meeting to discuss the new town budget? And, secondly, why is there such a marked difference between the residential commercial assessment under the previous assessment procedures, and those used by The Department of Municipal Affairs assessors in that community?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's first question is yes, I received such a letter today. The answer to the second question is that I do not know, we will look into it. Of course, there is an error in the second part of the question. The assessment has been carried on both previously and as of today by the

assessors for the county of Ontario and not by the assessors of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. R. S. Smith: As a supplementary, is the Minister going to meet with these people as requested?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The door is always open.

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

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

What formal meetings and/or exchange of correspondence took place between the Minister and representatives of the Ontario Medical Association between November, 1968 and April, 1969 regarding the increase in the OMA fee schedule?

Secondly, if there has been correspondence, would the Minister table it in the House?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that this question be held over as I expect to make a statement on this matter tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister is taking it as notice then?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if it is considered that the question is incorporated in the statement, may a supplementary be asked at that time?

Mr. Speaker: The question of supplementary or clarification will be considered at the appropriate time.

The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs:

What action has the Minister taken to remove from the market the dangerous dolls which were shown to him yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, this has to do with a question directed originally to the Minister of Health and of which I took notice and undertook to look into the circumstances.

I instructed my department to ascertain the facts of the matter and the situation is this—that while the label on the doll was as described by the hon. member for High Park, it was also identified as having been manufactured in Japan.

The article in question was, in fact, im-

ported approximately three years ago and was presumed to have been sold out.

This type of doll, together with another doll which contained metal pinned eyes, were discussed with the importers some two and a half years ago by officials of the stuffed articles section.

At that time, arrangements were made with the manufacturer, through the importer, to discontinue production of dolls of this type for the Canadian market.

With respect to the doll which was produced yesterday in the House by the hon. member for High Park, it was sold at a Becker's milk store and the Becker's people have assured my department that they will at once recall and destroy any of these dolls which still might be in stock, and that undertaking was given to us yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in the form of a supplementary, and I hope you will allow this—it is not quite a supplementary—in today's press, the manufacturer of these dolls was quoted as saying there are far more dangerous metal toys on the market which can shred a child to pieces. Will the Minister look into this matter and see that such toys are also removed from the market?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have not seen the article. I shall read the article and decide then.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. What action is the Minister taking to prevent the sale of dangerous toys bearing labels indicating that they have the approval of his department?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs has answered this question. The label on the article only has reference to the material used in stuffing the animals, and is in keeping with The Public Health Act. It has nothing to do with any other part of the toy at all. We have no authority at the present time to deal with these matters.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question? Would the Minister agree that these labels are highly misleading to the public and might lead the public to believe that the Minister of Health, in his usual way, was looking after their health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the industry knows full well what the labels mean and I think the public knows very well that it has to do with the material. Indeed, I believe, if I recall the wording of the label,

that it has definite reference to the stuffing or the packing used in stuffing the article, or toy, or whatever it may be.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, sir, the Minister is incorrect. Perhaps the Minister sitting beside him would pass the toy so he could read the label and look into the matter.

I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Is an inquest to be held into the death of Mr. William Smith of Oakville, whose car collided last week with a tanker on the Queen Elizabeth Way?

And will the Minister direct the coroner's office to hold an inquest without delay, as had been requested in an editorial in the *Oakville Journal-Record* of yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am getting the facts of this matter. Until I have the facts, I do not propose to give any answer on the question.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister taking the question as notice?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will be glad to give an answer as soon as I have the facts. My action will possibly answer the member when I get the facts.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Minister is different from the member for High Park, he gets the facts first.

Mr. Shulman: I might also say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is on his feet for the purpose of asking questions, and not for making statements. Now, if he has a point of order that he wishes to state, or personal privilege, that is in order. Otherwise he asks questions, he does not state something.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, or point of personal privilege, you may think it best applies, I would hope the member who made the interjection—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not stating a point of order, he is hoping the Speaker would do something. Now, if he has a point of order, he will state it.

Mr. Shulman: The point of order is, sir, that the member for Sarnia never gets the facts.

I have a question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, if he has a point of order, will state it. He has not yet

made it clear, and his remarks so far are out of order. Now, if he wishes to state a point of order, I will be glad to consider it; if he wishes to go on with the other questions he has, he has the floor.

Mr. Shulman: I have made my comment, sir. I will put my question now to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not to engage in a discussion with the Speaker about the Speaker's rulings or about matters of the House. The hon. member, at this time, has the floor for the purpose of asking questions, not for having the last word when any matter is being discussed. If the hon. member wishes to continue with his questions, he certainly is entitled to do so.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Correctional Services and I am always glad to give you the last word, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is persisting in showing disrespect, not to the Speaker personally, but to the Chair, and I would hope that he would ask his questions without the personal references which he always seems, at this time, at least, to be inserting in his remarks. Perhaps he would carry on with his question.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Correctional Services: Why was Stephen F., who was transferred from Burwash to Sudbury jail to face charges laid as a result of complaints within Burwash and found not guilty, then transferred to Millbrook?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am first of all grateful that the hon. member has changed his question so that the inmate's name does not appear publicly on the record, which is the way I received the question.

I can only tell him, because he had used the inmate's name in the question as I have it, the only information which I can give him now, is that the inmate was transferred to Millbrook for reasons of security. I am satisfied, having gone into the matter, that those reasons were very good and sufficient.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question? Was the inmate transferred directly from Sudbury jail to Millbrook, or was he returned to Burwash and then something happened in Burwash which caused the transfer to Millbrook?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course I am not in a position at this moment to answer that question. I do not have all of the details before me. Besides, I really do not think it is of any consequence. The fact is that if, in my view, I think that he is properly in Millbrook, I have given the correct answer—and I am satisfied that the proper action was taken no matter from where he was transferred.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister inform me of the facts?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have already done so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister answer my question either now or at some later time?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister states that he has already done so.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): A question of the Attorney General: How many children are there at the present time in juvenile detention homes and how many in each age group?

How many juvenile detention homes are there in Ontario, and where are they?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this question was asked today, first of the Minister of Correctional Services, and then transferred to me a moment before I came in the House, so that I am sure the hon. member will realize that it takes a little time to get actual figures. I shall take it as notice and provide an answer as soon as possible.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister should have those figures at his fingertips.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question by the hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday, I believe, question 1060, and I answered it partly at the time.

The question was: "Does the Minister agree that information on debtors should automatically be turned over to privately run credit bureaus from division court as will be the practice announced by division court referee, David Scott, on Saturday, March 29".

Now I have not got before me the words I used yesterday in partially answering the question but I did, I think, point out that any court of record information, is public information, which a member of the public may obtain.

I did promise to expand upon that answer and I should like to say this now, Mr.

Speaker: I am not in agreement that information secured by the division court referee should be turned over to the credit bureaus, and the referee has been so advised of my view.

I would like to go further and state this, that all references of persons from division courts in the county of York to the judge in chambers are first processed through the division court referee's office. Such persons usually wish to secure relief from garnishees and wage assignments which were entered into prior to March 29, 1968, and they require or seek appointments for consolidation orders. These are processed through an official known as a referee in the county of York.

The referee makes a complete investigation and, where possible, the point at issue is cleared between the debtor and the creditor. In other words, if an arrangement can be arrived at as to the settlement of the debt, or an arrangement for payment made, that is quite often achieved. If this is not possible on the basis of the information he has obtained, he recommends to the judge in chambers that an order be made, and he supports his recommendation with the proper documentation.

On the basis of this, the judge in chambers makes the order or not, or varies the recommendation as he sees fit. In 1968, approximately 4,200 orders were made and I do not feel that such a volume could be processed by the county court bench without this assistance from the referee's office, a very valuable office in advising the court; arranging appointments; bringing the parties together; sometimes achieving settlement or arrangement for payment.

During his discussion with the debtor on which to base his recommendation to the judge, the referee secures a list of the creditors of the debtor and this is the information referred to in the newspaper article on which the hon. leader of the Opposition based his question.

Mr. Scott's remark was based on the fact that if such information were available to the Toronto Credit Bureau, it would reduce calls to his office, and would possibly reduce the issuing of further credit to such debtors until the debtor's credit rating improved.

I would like to interject that one can understand that the credit bureaus keep calling for the status of debtors, the number of judgments, executions against them, Mr. Scott felt that if the information were known it

would reduce the work in his office and perhaps be of some assistance.

This may, or may not, be right, but we do not approve of him giving out information on the basis he suggested. I have advised him that such information is not to be turned over to the bureaus. The date mentioned for the giving of information to commence was April 1, and no such information has been divulged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say further in discussing this—so that the members may be fully informed—I think an organization such as the Debtors' Counseling Service, which is supported by government funds and which does a great deal of good work in assisting debtors—

Mr. Nixon: Is that the one receiving grants from the department?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, that is right. It receives a grant from one of the government departments. I think they are to be commended for the work they are doing because they are assisting the debtor. I think information might very well be given to them that is not in question here—in the question asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

In the case of the credit bureau which is pursuing the debtor, I do not think we should be in the position of placing information at the disposal of such an organization by such an arrangement as Mr. Scott suggests. So, as I say, we have told him that is not to be done. But he felt there was some virtue, perhaps, in lessening the number of applications which would be made to the court and assisting the work. He does a very large volume of work as I have indicated—4,200 orders made last year.

In any event, I do not think it is right that though the information is public, an official of the court should be turning it over to a credit bureau which is engaged in pursuing the debtor. I think while it is not asked, and is not in question, that perhaps assisting a debt-counselling service might be a very proper use of such information.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General will permit a supplementary question.

As I recall, in the answer given by the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs yesterday he disagreed with the Attorney General to some extent in that he felt this information might be to the long-range advantage of the debtor if it were turned over to the credit bureau. I would ask the Attorney General if he can assure me on his policy and the policy of the Minister of Financial

and Commercial Affairs, is it the same now that it has been examined?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not listen to my colleague, apparently being engaged in something else yesterday. I was here when the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs spoke, but I have had no occasion to discuss the matter with him.

I do not believe we disagree. I have indicated, I think, in the remarks I made a moment ago that there perhaps could be some benefit to that debtor because if the information were known, even to a credit bureau, it might look at his situation and say there is no point in us pursuing him; there are such garnishees, such orders, against him now, such obligations which he has assumed, that nothing more can be done at this time. In that case he might be subject to less harassment than he otherwise would be. So I think perhaps one could very well say that there might be some benefit to the debtor in many cases. But I do not think it is proper that a referee, who is an official of the court—the division court—should, as a matter of course, take information off the files of the court and give it to an organization which is engaged in collecting debts.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am out of order; if I may say so. It seemed that the hon. Attorney General's reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition was more in the way of a statement. If I might ask a question in terms of clarification?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that it is a matter which would develop into a debate because I am sure the leader of the Opposition would then want to place a question of clarification.

May I suggest that the hon. member for Lakeshore and the Attorney General, who has indicated that he is quite available to discuss it, might get together on it. If they cannot, then a question tomorrow would serve the purpose.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wonder if I might make a procedural inquiry of you? As you are aware, sir, I have lodged with you today a question to the hon. the Prime Minister involving the Law Enforcement Compensation Act—the Dr. Lindzon affair—and a proposed bill that I had before this House on December 4, 1968.

I consider this a matter of extreme urgency, and although the Attorney General has partially answered the question in a reply to

the question from the hon. member for Hamilton Centre, I am wondering if it would be possible for your office to direct that question to the hon. Attorney General so that I might have a reply tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: The question was directed to the hon. Prime Minister for a purpose I presume, and if he feels that the purpose would be better served by redirection to the Attorney General I certainly would have no objection and we would do that. But I am rather averse to redirecting questions when the Ministers concerned are not in the House.

The Prime Minister is not here and presumably there is an answer from his office for this question, because had he been here I am sure it would have been asked and answered. Therefore, I think perhaps that what the hon. member might let me do is communicate with the Prime Minister's office and let him know the urgency which the hon. member feels, and see if we can have it arranged to be on tomorrow.

Mr. Bullbrook: I would appreciate that very much, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 23rd order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES (Continued)

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Chairman, the only remarks I have to make at this time, following the remarks that were made yesterday, is to say to all members of the House that I want to assure them that I am just as anxious as each and every one of them that the reports of the department be made available at the earliest opportunity. We will set it as a goal for this coming year to ensure that all reports are in the hands of the members of the Legislature prior to the discussion of the estimates.

I am very proud of the facts and figures which those reports will disclose, and I am very anxious that they be made public at the earliest opportunity.

On vote 2001:

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us, first of all, on what date last year's report was issued, and also what has become of the

monthly summaries he used to send out which more or less keep the public up to date on what is going on in his department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That matter is being gone into and we are going to reinstate them. The last report—the 1967 report—is in the hands of the printer. The 1968 report, I think, is now being finalized. The monthly reports will be forthcoming in the future.

Mr. Braithwaite: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us, are these reports being handled by his research people or the computer people?

I recall yesterday when he made his opening remarks, he did remark on the fact that he had quite capable staff now and that he was going into, I believe it was automation of the facts and figures. I am just wondering if he could tell us who prepares this report, and what is the reason for the fact that we have not had it for two years?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Which report, the annual report?

Mr. Braithwaite: The annual report.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It has just been a delay in bringing it out. May I point out that all of the people involved in the department are involved in this preparation. I assume they have been too busy doing things to be talking about them but that is something I am going to assure the House about. We will make sure that all the facts and figures are available on a continuous basis and as early as possible.

Mr. Braithwaite: When would that be, in the fullness of time, or can you give us a date?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well I expect to have the 1967, 1968 and 1969 reports in the hands of the members before the next estimates are up.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, surely the Minister can give us a better explanation than that. Why have we gone three years without a report of what the department has accomplished? Even the statutory provisions would indicate that we would be entitled to that in this Legislature. It is just not enough to say that his department did not get around to it. He did not get around to it. Surely, there is some further explanation. Are you trying to put too much into the report? Have you statistical range that simply cannot be accomplished by the staff that is presently employed? It

seems incredible that you have gone three years without reporting to the Legislature, other than through your own person in answering the questions. Is there no further explanation other than your department did not get around to it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have made an explanation as to the fact that they are now in the process of going through the mill and rather than look at the past, I am making the statement that the reports will be in the hands of the members, in what I would assume will be the acceptable period, which is, in advance of next year's estimates.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well that could be any time between now and next February, is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The other reports will be distributed as soon as they are printed, the 1967 as soon as it comes from the printer and the 1968 as soon as it is printed but I am giving the further assurance that we shall attempt to also have the 1969 report in the hands of the members before the next estimates.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well that is not going to help much this year—

An hon. member: No help at all this year.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the hon. Minister recalls the discussions we had last year, during which he chided this side of the House for talking about figures and attempted to make us quite uncomfortable about it. I am wondering, in view of what he has just had to say, whether he cares to perhaps admit that he had us at a disadvantage or perhaps to admit that he might be sorry for some of the discomfort he caused us. Nobody understood the facts that the hon. Minister brought before the House, Mr. Chairman, so it was not at all fair.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not recall chiding the members for not having the figures. I do not recall—

Mr. Braithwaite: Oh yes, we discussed millions of dollars and you made quite a thing of it, as if we were not supposed to discuss figures. At the same time you were holding the figures away from us. I do not think that is fair at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2001?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I do not know to whom one

appeals for a ruling, but why should the members of this House be asked to vote any moneys for this department at all, with absolutely no information on its undertakings for more than two years? How can members responsibly be expected to conduct themselves when there is not a single basis on which to review this department?

There is not another department in the government that has the effrontery to come to this House, without any reports or material whatsoever dating back now some three years and three months. Only this Minister and only this department have any idea of what is being undertaken. We are being asked to vote this kind of money without having anything on which to base it, without any of the historical material over the last two or three years to appropriately evaluate how he is spending the money and you are now asking for these estimates. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is in your prerogative, sir, or in the prerogative of the Provincial Treasurer as the House leader or indeed, as a matter of essential self-respect, on the part of the Minister, that these estimates be stood down until we have some basis on which to work.

You cannot expect us to engage in travesty. We are not fulfilling our roles as legislators if you ask us to vote, *carte blanche*, sums of several hundred million dollars without any material at all. That is just absurd Mr. Chairman. There is not another Minister in the Cabinet who would ask it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but support the statement that has just been made. Really, the comments made by the previous members who have spoken on this are completely valid and the Treasurer must surely be sympathetic with the problem that faces us on this side.

We are accustomed to a number of departments bringing forward their reports for the past year—the immediate previous year—perhaps a few weeks later than is convenient for us on this side, and that we are sometimes asked to consider the financial estimates for the coming year without having the immediate report. But for two years in succession, it really is incredible that you would be asking us to even discuss your next year's estimates. Is there no alternative to this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if I might, the 1967 report is tabled. It is available where the reports are.

An hon. member: Where?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was tabled last year. It was tabled here in the House.

Mr. Lewis: Where is the report?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the printed report; I am talking about the tabled report.

Mr. Lewis: The only report that is available to members of this House is December 31, 1965, for most of its information. You are three years and three months behind the times.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am suggesting that you perhaps might assign those researchers that I made available to you as Provincial Secretary, to go and look at the reports that have been tabled.

Mr. Lewis: Well what are you saying then? The—

Mr. Nixon: Use some of the money that we vote you to print it up so we can get the information.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister must have it in front of him. Surely one of your aides can produce the report about which you speak. Show it to the members of the House. Have you any material for us, more recent even than December 31, 1966?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The reports have been filed as required by the statutes; they have been tabled in the Legislature. They have not been printed but I am suggesting that I have explained them to you.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): They have not been printed.

Mr. Braithwaite: What date are we talking about?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am talking about the 1967 report.

Mr. Lewis: Which covers 1966.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: 1966 to 1967.

Mr. Lewis: It covers 1966. Your statistical data in this one which covers 1965-1966, brings us up to December 31, 1965. Your report for 1966-1967, if in fact it is tabled, would bring us up to date to December 31, 1966. So let us concede, that somewhere there is such a document which was not given to the members of this Legislature.

Where is 1967? Where is 1968? At the very best, we are two years and three months out of date, and there is just no legitimacy for members of this House to vote the estimates now on the basis of no prior information at all over that period of time.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to move a motion reducing this Minister's salary to \$1?

Mr. Chairman: Well, if the hon. members would give the Chairman an opportunity to speak. There has been much said by many of the hon. members; questions directed to the Chairman to which the hon. Minister has replied. As far as the Chairman is concerned, we are gathered here to discuss in committee the estimates of this particular department. Now, if for any reason any members wish to dispute or amend these estimates, they may do so by motion. So that if the hon. member for Etobicoke wants to introduce a motion to that effect, I believe it would be acceptable and in order.

Mr. Braithwaite: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the light of the comments made by my colleague, I move that the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services not be presented to the committee of supply until the annual report covering the years 1966, 1967 and 1968 are presented to the members of this House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, my understanding is that my salary is statutory.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister was not listening, we are not discussing salary.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister is not listening. That is one of the mistakes of this House, but it does not affect the motion.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Do you want the Minister to go on welfare?

Mr. Braithwaite: If necessary the hon. member for Parkdale will second the motion.

Mr. Chairman: No seconder is necessary in committee.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if the motion is on the floor, I want to put to you, sir, and I want to put to the Minister, because I do not think there is a point. I am sorry, have you not put the motion?

Mr. Chairman: No, I have not dealt with the motion at all. I was simply going to say

that in my remarks to the committee I suggested that the motion would be acceptable to reduce the estimates. I believe that is what I had said. This motion, however, does not do that, and I am not at all certain that the motion is in order.

The motion is, and I am not putting it to the committee at this time, I am simply repeating it for the information of the committee:

I therefore move that the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services not be presented to the committee of supply until the annual reports covering the years 1966, 1967 and 1968 be presented to the members of this House.

Now, I am not at all certain that the motion is acceptable or in order.

An hon. member: What is wrong with it?

Mr. Chairman: I know of no precedent for accepting such a motion.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, Mr. Chairman, in that event, I move that the committee rise and report progress—no progress.

Mr. Nixon: Take your pick, we are going to vote on it.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman is fully aware of this. Some vote will be coming up.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why that motion is not in order.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the hon. member that I did not say it was not in order. I said I am not at all certain that it is in order. It may or may not be.

Mr. Lewis: If you say it is in order, we will go along with it.

Mr. Chairman: This would have the effect of delaying the entire deliberations of this committee's estimates.

Mr. Pitman: That is the point.

Mr. Chairman: And then we have another motion to the effect that the committee rise and report.

Mr. Nixon: Only if you will not accept the first motion.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the House would, I am sure, grant you recess for a moment or two to consult and to come to a conclusion on this.

Mr. Chairman: I have heard nothing from any member of the committee to the effect they do not believe the motion to be in order.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, Mr. Chairman, surely a motion is in order.

Mr. Chairman: You misunderstood. I said I have not heard anything from any member of this committee to the effect that they do not think the motion is in order. Therefore, I must accept the motion as being in order.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Etobicoke has moved that the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services be not presented to the committee of supply until the annual reports covering the years 1966, 1967 and 1968 be presented to the members of this House. Those in favour of the motion—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. members would not want to deprive those people who are waiting for these funds.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! When the motion was first placed before the committee, there was an opportunity to speak to it. I have now called for a vote.

Those in favour of the motion, will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members.

The member for Etobicoke has moved that the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services be not presented to the committee of supply until the annual reports covering the years 1966, 1967 and 1968 be presented to the members of this House.

Those in favour of the motion will please rise.

Those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 40, the "nays", 54.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

We will proceed with vote 2001. The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the House is now placed in a very difficult position in terms of analyzing the expenditures of this department. I will assume that the main office expenditures, the titles remain roughly what they were. And frankly, Mr. Chairman, if these estimates have to take a month as a

result of this lack of information, then that is what they are going to take; because we are going to get every single figure from the Minister, one by one, if he is not prepared to table his report.

Now, could he tell us the refunds of ordinary expenditure from the government of Canada as applied to the main office in the following categories: salaries, travelling, administration, bursaries and tuition, for the last year for which he has them available?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, those figures are given in the public accounts that were tabled. They may not be broken down in detail as the hon. member referred to them, but they are shown in the public accounts. For example, you will find the actual expenditure for 1967-68 shown there.

Mr. Lewis: What percentage of the estimate which you have in front of you, in vote 2001, will be recoverable from the government of Canada for each vote?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member repeat the question so that I might find specifically what he was referring to?

Mr. Lewis: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what moneys will be recoverable from the government of Canada and in what amounts for the main office expenditure?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In the departmental administration programme there will be a reimbursement of \$1,085,000, in round figures.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, under The Canada Assistance Act, the board of review is now required by the legislation. What money will be received for that board of review?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: 50 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: Has the Minister an amount?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: 50 per cent of whatever we spend.

Mr. Lewis: 50 per cent of the \$146,000, is that what you are saying?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If we spend \$146,000.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Trotter: I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, while we are on the question of the board of review. Could the Minister tell us why, for the year ending March 31, 1968, we voted \$60,000 for the board of review and did not spend anything on it? According to the public accounts, nothing was spent on it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The board was not operative.

Mr. Trotter: What year did it actually start to operate?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is now in operation.

Mr. Trotter: It is now in operation—when did it actually start? We have been voting money for it going back about two and a half years and always this money is unexpended. I know it helps the Treasurer to show that they balanced the Budget, or come closer to balancing the Budget when you vote funds you do not spend, but I would like to know why the department has been so long in implementing the board of review. As I understand it, it just recently started. I am not too sure of that. When did it start and why is it that it has been so long in getting under way?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The board of review was appointed in January of this year and is now in the process of being organized and will go into operation. Actually, the set-up of the board of review—the framework—is unique in Canada. We want to make sure it operates in the finest way possible.

Mr. Trotter: Come now, we were voting funds at least two years ago for this board of review. I do not think it has actually met, has it? How many meetings have they had? Who is on the board? Can you tell us something about it? Let us get going. Who, what and why?

Mr. Lewis: If you had a report, all this would be saved.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The three persons appointed are Miss Robena Morris, vice-chairman, with Mr. Frank Drea and Mr. Earl Armstrong as members. They have met as a board and will now be going into action to have hearings.

Mr. Trotter: All right. When did they meet? You are talking about February, 1969; I go back in the public accounts and I see this board of review mentioned about two years ago, something like that. I want to know why it has not been operating. I come back to a question that you are evading. When did it first meet and how many meetings has it had?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They were appointed this year and they met in March of this year.

Mr. Trotter: How many meetings?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One meeting, I believe.

Mr. Lewis: They must be exhausted.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to continue in the same vein as the member for Parkdale. The Minister has had a great deal of correspondence with the United Workers Unemployed organization of the city of Peterborough and they have been requesting a board of review monthly, I think, since well into last spring. Each time it was said that the board of review appointment was almost imminent. I still do not understand from what the Minister has said why it has taken so long to get this board of review under way. As well as that, I would like to follow-up from what the member for Parkdale has said—what did the board do in its first meeting? Secondly, who decides when there will be a board of review? On what basis is it going to be decided? Does anyone who requests a board of review get one, no matter what the dispute is in regard to welfare payments and so on?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the procedures have been set up both in the statutes and in the relevant regulations which have been passed. Those have been worked out.

Mr. Pitman: There is a good deal of leeway in those regulations.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The board is going into operation now. With reference to Peterborough, they are meeting in Peterborough, I believe, next week. They will be dealing with all of the cases which have accumulated.

Mr. Pitman: Over the last year and a half?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They will be travelling to Peterborough to give a hearing to those cases.

Mr. Braithwaite: Could the Minister tell the House what the ultimate size of this board is going to be?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The statutory figure is nine, I am sorry, ten; nine, plus the chairman.

Mr. Braithwaite: Could the Minister state the salaries of the chairman and the two existing members?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: For the chairman, we budgeted \$15,000 a year; and the three members, \$30,000 a year so far.

Mr. Trotter: The three members—that is \$10,000 each, is it?

Mr. Braithwaite: Is that \$10,000 each?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the amount that is in the estimates.

Mr. Trotter: You only have three; how could that be? Are you going to appoint more?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have the flexibility of possible appointments?

Mr. Trotter: What is the policy then? What do you intend to do?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have tried to explain the policy before, Mr. Chairman. We are pioneering in this field, we have—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: What are you intending to do? That is all I am asking. Are you going to appoint five or six for \$30,000 as voted; are you going to get each of them for \$10,000, or are there going to be six members getting \$5,000 each? This is all I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have said we have budgeted for a chairman at \$15,000 and three members at \$10,000 each.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could follow on now. Last year, when we were discussing the bill that set up this board of review, all the members of the Opposition drew quite closely to the attention of the Minister the fact that it would be a proper thing to have somebody as a representative of the poor, if not one perhaps more than one, on this board of review.

I understand that in the city of Toronto, we have the social planning council, I believe it is, a representative of the poor. I know our good friend at Ottawa, the Minister of Health and Welfare, Mr. Munro, has taken steps in that regard. Would this Minister care to tell this House if he is going to look forward to, and if he is going to accept graciously, some of the suggestions that we have given him in that regard?

I understand that he should have no difficulty at all in getting some representatives of the poor to be on this board of review. I am sure that he would have no difficulty if he wanted to.

At that time last year, he said that his party was here to govern and we were not. But I still feel that times have changed. Perhaps the Minister would be good enough

now to tell us whether some of this booty—this \$10,000 a year—is going to be given to a deserving and capable person, who is perhaps on relief. It does not really matter who it is as long as it is somebody who is poor.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this matter was discussed at the time of the passing of the legislation.

We are looking to a board which will be representative of the people of the province of Ontario and who will be capable of discharging the duties that have been assigned to them. The appointments will be made on that basis—capability and discharging of duties.

Mr. Braithwaite: There are a couple of names that the party to the left of us could suggest. Would the Minister be good enough to put one of these people on the board as our nominee?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I will accept a submission of names from anybody, but I will assume the ultimate responsibility of making the choice.

Mr. Braithwaite: But will you seriously consider them? That is what I want to know.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will seriously consider everything.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, what was the criteria that led the Minister to make the appointments, to make the recommendations that led to the present appointments? What were the considerations that were taken into account, and how many names were considered?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would say about ten names. I had during the course of the period, about ten names before me. Miss Morris, I assume, is known to a great many people, and particularly those from Metropolitan Toronto. She has great experience in the social service field. She was formerly welfare commissioner for the city of Toronto and, of course, has other experience besides that in the social service field.

Mr. Frank Drea is the director of the feature "Action Line" in the *Telegram* of Toronto, a man who deals with complaints in many fields, from many citizens across the province of Ontario. He was the first Canadian winner of the Heywood Broun Award presented by the American Newspaper Guild for his 1961 series of the exploitation of immigrant construction workers. He came to the

fore, I might say, because of that series of articles.

Mr. Armstrong is a Gloucester township dairy farmer with wide municipal experience. He has served as township reeve since 1951, and has served as warden of the county of Carleton on three occasions. He has also served as chairman of the county welfare board.

Mr. J. Renwick: Have any of those three people been recipients of the benefits of the government department of which you are the head?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would not think so.

Mr. J. Renwick: In other words, you are having people who are reviewing decisions of your department who have at no time run up against your department, or any of the municipal administrations departments. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They have had knowledge within the field.

Mr. Lewis: At which end?

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, Mr. Chairman, with reference to Miss Morris, was she dismissed or did she quit whatever job she had; I believe she was with the department or with the Minister of municipal welfare was she not? What I would like to know, Mr. Minister, is, was she dismissed or did she quit?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: She retired, I think, with grace and honour.

Mr. Braithwaite: Was there any break in the time from her retirement to the time she was appointed to the board?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: She was acting director of the general welfare assistance within the department.

Mr. Braithwaite: Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the very point I am making. There is a very good possibility that the chairman of this review board could be sitting reviewing cases upon which she, or somebody under her jurisdiction and control, might have ruled. This could be very bad.

I wonder if the Minister could comment on that. If there was no break, there is a very good possibility that somebody at some time was denied welfare or ruled against in some way.

They will be appealing. And we will have someone sitting as the chairman of the very committee that is supposed to be hearing the

appeal. How can the hearing be objective if sitting on the board is a person who directly or indirectly might have had something to do with the very decision that is being appealed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not think that there is a likely possibility of that occurrence. I for one have full faith in all three members, that they will arrive at a conclusion which will be the proper and just one under the circumstances.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is not the point I am making, Mr. Chairman. Justice must appear to be done as well as be done. This is what I am wondering about.

How is the person who has come to this appeal board to feel if he looks up and sees somebody with whom he might have had contact at the time he was denied welfare of some sort? I have confidence in the lady too. It is not that. It is the principle.

Mr. Chairman: You want to say something along the same line?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The three pre-eminent of this review board are all honourable people. They are all people of great honour, and one would not suggest otherwise.

Let us leave them for a moment, and have the Minister discuss with the House his rationale for excluding from the board those who have, at some point in time, been a recipient within his welfare apparatus. What is the rationale now, many months after the Act has been passed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have not excluded anybody. I have decided, in the discharge of my responsibility, to make the appointments, and these are the three that have been made.

Mr. Lewis: Do I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister will be appointing, imminently, a representative of other than the chosen, someone from the uprooted and disinherited, someone who has, perhaps, had some small experience with the social welfare apparatus of this state? Is the Minister about to make such an appointment to the review board?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: At the present time, I am not considering any further appointments. I may say, Mr. Chairman, I have not looked into the private lives of these three individuals. Whether, in the course of their careers, they have come into contact with that sphere

is something I do not know and would not enquire.

Mr. Lewis: I will ask Mr. Drea, if the Minister would like. I know him and he could ask the other two. It hardly satisfies the point, does it? I would like to pursue it for a moment, Mr. Chairman.

The member for Scarborough Centre in this House last night, read a list of violations of the civil liberties of people receiving money from his department which was absolutely scandalous. I do not think this House has been treated to such a recitation in a very long time. It is entirely possible the member for Brantford, in the very near future, will be setting out to this House a parallel situation which makes one's hair stand on end.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that in this province, the recipients under The Family Benefits Act, and under general welfare assistance, have had their rights abused and violated systematically for as long as any of us can remember, there is no appreciable difference in the introduction of The Family Benefits Act or in the assumption of authority on the part of this loquacious Minister.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely unthinkable that one sets up a board of review through which hands pass people who are thoroughly intimidated by the actions of local or regional welfare administrators, and who put their economic lives in the hands of the board of review people, without any comprehension or with only marginal comprehension on the part of the people on the board of review, of what it is like to be on the receiving end. I am not interested in that paternalistic "gobbledygook" which invests those board members with some form of clairvoyance to understand how it feels to be a welfare recipient, or someone on a dependent father's allowance, or a mother's allowance, or a blind person's allowance, or a disabled person's allowance.

What arrogance is there in the department that it cannot see fit to move into even the marginal mainstream of present social welfare thinking, and allow to sit on the board, people who have been recipients of their programmes, people who are now recipients of their programmes, or, at least, have a real working knowledge of it from a different perspective?

Does not the Minister realize that that is the way one invests these programmes with some social integrity? You do not always run these programmes, Mr. Chairman, with a sense of olympian rightness so that only those

of the administrative establishments have the right forever to rule on the lives of the recipients.

Mr. MacDonald: Like Santa Claus.

Mr. Lewis: Forever, forever. Or that, at a moment of great beholdenness—of great charity and magnanimity—the Minister says to the House, “It makes me feel like Santa Claus,” when he can reverse a policy decision so corrupt that it casts an aspersion over his entire department and its function.

Now the thing is, Mr. Chairman, that this board of review is not a legitimate creation until the Minister appoints people who are in the recipient category. It can never be a legitimate creation. However hard Robena Morris and Frank Drea and the third appointee apply themselves, with all the feeling, compassion and sensitivity they can muster, it will never be legitimate until you have allowed to cross the moat into the promised land of your department, some people who have received your endowment.

Worse still, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the revelations about the administration of this department that emerged last night, one would say that not only should there be a recipient on the board of review, but that the board of review should have a majority of social assistance recipients or beneficiaries on it, in order to begin to comprehend the nature of the requirements and to treat them with some feeling.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, what it takes to move this Minister into the 20th century. His department is always behind private agencies and semi-private agencies in the area of social service—always.

Even the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto, a very industrious and relatively enlightened agency, has seen fit to allow on its governing body a member who comes from that stratum of society which we look upon with disfavour in this House through the eyes of the Minister's department, or we would not have the category of poor in this province that we now have.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that it cannot be allowed to rest without the strongest possible protestations being made from this side, and notice being served on the Minister that he is allowing his programme to be further corrupted by his unwillingness to move on this very simple, direct, and explicit matter. Put some beneficiaries on that board of review, and instil a little participatory democracy into your department, in-

stead of forever running it like some autocratic state.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, the matters I intend to bring up right now concern the administration of welfare in the province of Ontario, and they were touched on earlier last night, and in the discussion of the review board.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us: Does anybody appearing before the review board as an appellant have the right to have a friend or counsel with them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I have here on my desk a part of the *Ontario Gazette*, dated February 1, 1969. I have a part of the very regulations the Minister spoke of. I see nothing there that specifically says that this will be so.

Now I know, and, as I say, we all have some doubts as to whether the Minister knows what it is like to have to appear before one of these autocratic boards. It is my feeling, Mr. Chairman, that such a provision should specifically be set out in the regulations that an applicant would be allowed to have someone with him.

Now when this was discussed last year when the bill was going through, several members on this side brought up the point that even if a person had to go to legal aid to get a lawyer, they should be allowed to have legal counsel so that when they appear before this board, they could be certain of having a fair hearing. Before I go on to the other questions, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to answer that if he would.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My understanding is that in the course of the hearing the board may permit agents to act for, and/or advise, either the director or the applicant.

Mr. Braithwaite: What section would that be, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the comment to regulation 15, subsections 6, 7 and 8, and 15(a) 5, and 6.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well that is not the interpretation I make of it, and that is the very point I am making, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister would give this House a commitment that the regulations will be revised so that they specifically set out that this is

possible—because I do not read that in the regulations before me.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the appellants will be given the offer of an opportunity to be represented by whomsoever they wish—an agent, counsel—to come to assist them in the deliberations. That will be the case and I can assure this House that if that is not done so, the regulations will be clearly stated to be such.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, just a moment. I sat here last night and listened to the hon. member for Scarborough Centre relate many cases that had to do with the regulations. I would have done the same thing in my opening speech. There are many cases where we have regulations that are being bent, twisted and ignored by officials in the Minister's department. Why should we wait until it happens?

I am asking the Minister right now, why does he not just change the regulation and make it specific? I have the regulation right here and it does not read that way to me—although I am supposed to be trained in the law.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I give the hon. member the assurance that this will be the case, that every applicant will be given the opportunity to be represented by an agent, or whoever the appellant wishes to bring along.

I may say that the board is going to have to determine the rules of the game as they go along. They have been set up as an appeal board; they are to give the appellant the fullest opportunity. My understanding is that the board, right from the very beginning, will even give those people an opportunity to appear, even though it might clearly appear on the statutes that they are not entitled to a hearing, in order to make sure that everybody does get an opportunity to have his say. The board would rule in that respect.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, the McRuer report, as I understand it, specifically sets out that it should be made clear in regulations. Why is the Minister whiffing and waffling? Why does he not just do it?

If he has no other reply to that, I want to go on, Mr. Chairman, to make the point that when it comes to welfare and this sort of thing, many complaints—I am sure the Minister can bear me out on this—come from people who will phone in a complaint and want to remain anonymous.

The point that I want to make is that if a person on welfare, or a person who was refused welfare, and could have an argument, or in some way become unfriendly with his neighbour. That neighbour could set out to get him and inform on him. No matter how incorrect the information given to the department might be, there is no way, from my review of these regulations, that the person appealing the ruling of that department would know what he is faced with.

Could the Minister tell me whereabouts in the regulations does it state that the appellant shall be able to see the case that he is faced with—the complaint, or the decision the board has come to and on which the original refusal has been made?

This, I think, is quite important because there is no sense in a person going to appeal if he cannot have a counsel with him, and if he cannot know what he is faced with so that he may say, "It is wrong", or if he is not given an opportunity to explain the circumstances.

Could the Minister tell me where, in the regulations, does it say that a person who is making the appeal shall have an opportunity to see the file, to see what it is he is charged with?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is not going to be charged with anything, Mr. Chairman. He is going to have the right to have the decision reviewed, the decision which will have been made by the official and on which the appeal is taken under regulation 15(a) (5):

The director or his representative shall be given an opportunity at the hearing to give reasons for the decision, order or directive being reviewed.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is not the way I read it. As I understand it—and perhaps the Minister could correct me—the time at which a decision is arrived at is when reasons will be given. I am wondering about the time before the case is heard. I want to know if the Minister can assure me that the person who is before this board will have an opportunity to know why he has been refused whatever it is he is asking for.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the whole purpose of the review.

Mr. Braithwaite: Where does it say that in the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have given the directive in my—

Mr. Braithwaite: That is not the way I interpret it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I assume that section will cover the point. If it does not and it turns out there is not, then the regulations will be amended. I may say, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I may say that these regulations have been passed by this department on its own, of course, in anticipation of the time when the Attorney General will bring in the necessary legislation and regulations which will govern appeals such as this—generally across the board—administrative appeals. We are pioneering in this. I look forward to the board of review being very flexible and giving the utmost opportunity and fairness to the appellant to state his case. After all, that is the purpose of establishing the appeal board.

Mr. Braithwaite: That is the point I am making. It is not a question of the appellant stating his case—it is a question of the appellant knowing why he was refused so he can state a case in answer to the refusal. You cannot prepare for something about which you know nothing. It seems a shame—we have regulations and the Minister gives us his interpretation of them. Why does the Minister not make the regulations specific? Then we will not have to worry about trial cases which will be used to determine what the board is going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister—where are these regulations available? Are they going to be available in the various welfare offices, for anybody who wants to have a look at them? Where will they be available?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They will be made available in all the necessary offices, they will be distributed. Presently, they are in the *Gazette*. Of course, that is not satisfactory for the general public at large but we will produce publications which will set these things out.

Mr. Braithwaite: When is this going to be, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will proceed with them forthwith.

Mr. Braithwaite: Forthwith. "Forthwith" could be anytime—you mean three years like the reports? But in any event—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We are starting hearings next week.

Mr. Braithwaite:—when are they going to know? Mr. Chairman, just one last point before some other member gets an opportunity to ask some questions on this.

I wonder why the application forms are not available in the various offices except, as I understand it, from the provincial director's office? I may be wrong—perhaps the Minister can correct me on this—does the Minister's office want to know about all these applications? Is this why he is having the applications available only in provincial director's office?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I fail to get the member's point.

Mr. Braithwaite: Why are applications not available in any welfare office or anywhere else, even in the post offices around the province, so that anybody can go and get one of these things and then can sit down with whom ever he might want to help him before the application is made? As I understand it, the provincial director's office is the only place you can get one of these application forms for the review board. As I say, I could be wrong and I am asking the Minister to clarify this.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know just where these applications are available, but they will be available in other than those offices that the hon. member has referred to.

Mr. Trotter: Do you not know where?

Mr. Braithwaite: You have your staff here; I will wait if you would like to ask. I would like to find out where they are available.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, really the procedures are going to be as simplified as possible.

Mr. Braithwaite: When?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All that a person will have to do, in effect, is to write to the chairman—

Mr. J. Renwick: How will he know enough to write?

Mr. Braithwaite: How will he know what to do?

Mr. J. Renwick: In each case are you advising them that a person has a right to appeal the decision to the review board? Is there some form or slip of paper or letter which accompanies the decision of your department, or of the municipalities throughout the province of Ontario, which will

advise the person that, in the event he disagrees with the decision which has been made, he has a right to appeal to the review board? Is that being done?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have not got those forms in process at the present time, but I assume that people will become aware of the—

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, people will not become aware. I want to know whether or not this department will communicate with every single person on receipt of benefits under any of the Acts which you are administering, and whether the municipalities throughout the province of Ontario will advise every recipient under the Acts which they are administering that if they have any reason to be concerned about or disagree with the allowances or the determination which has been made they will have a right to process this matter through the review board; and in a properly set-out pamphlet indicate to them what steps they are to take and how they are to do it and when they can expect a hearing to take place? Is that going to be done? Or are you barricading?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I am not barricading. This is a matter which I will take under consideration during the development of the appeal board procedures.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just let me finish this point. A year ago the member for Scarborough Centre introduced a question of a recipient, or recipients, being the members of the review board; also raised during that debate was this question, and the answer that was given then was identical with the answer now. In other words, not one single solitary moment's thought or consideration has been given to what we all discussed on the second reading of the bill to set up this board of review. When is the discussion going to take place? Has the department discussed it? Has any decision been made about the procedures in that kind of essential ingredient? Has any discussion taken place in the Minister's department about it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That particular matter and all aspects of this have been discussed in the period of the past year. I used the term that we will be pioneering in this field. I am using the word. If the hon. members have comparable cases where other jurisdictions have set up the kind of board of review that we have, I should be very pleased to receive from them such information.

Mr. J. Renwick: We are not interested in other jurisdictions; we are in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Other jurisdictions had better family benefits Acts before you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is the member's interpretation; that is not my interpretation of it. We are pioneering in this field—

Mr. Singer: They have to have a review board to take advantage of federal legislation.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As we go through the year, we will find out what the necessities are and we will develop our programme to meet the exigencies of the matter.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister answer two final questions? Did he have any part personally in the preparation of these regulations?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In the general discussions which invariably take place in the course of development of regulations of this kind.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am asking a specific question. The Minister can either say "yes" or "no". I am not asking for "if" or "could have been", yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The regulations are passed upon my recommendation.

Mr. Braithwaite: Yes, but that does not say the Minister had any hand in the preparation. I want to know if he knows what is in them. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman; I would like an answer.

Mr. Trotter: He does not, obviously.

Mr. Lewis: Do not be embarrassed to admit it; it is evident.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know what is in them.

Mr. Braithwaite: All right now, if that is so, then why does the Minister have to say that, "My understanding is that this is going to apply, and it is my understanding that that is going to apply"? Why does he not make it specific and set out these things? Mr. McRuer went to all the trouble to prepare his recommendations and the Minister, as I understood it, when we discussed the bill that set this board up, said he was going to follow this, etc. In all the questions we raised, he said, "Wait until the regulations come out".

Well, they are out. And we have nothing specified in them, Mr. Chairman. I only ask the Minister, why does he not take the regulations back and amend them so that no matter what happens, he will not have to come up here next year, and we will not have

to go through all this again and have him say, "We are pioneering"?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the regulations have been passed in order to carry out McRuer's suggestions. I have McRuer's recommendations, the Act and the regulations as they have been carried out. That was the whole intent of the exercise and, Mr. Chairman, though I do not know whether there will be any pleasing the members opposite. They will discharge their duties as I am discharging mine.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister this: Would he confess that the only reason he is setting this board up, is that he is really not intending to do anything? He really is just setting it up so he can get some money from Ottawa? Is this the reason for it, because otherwise we should have more specific answers? I cannot understand why anybody, with all the help he has—look at the help back there—why cannot we come up with regulations; how can he come before the House with estimates of \$255 million and not have any figures for three years? Well, I will not go into that. All I want to know is, does the Minister really and truly mean this board to operate as a viable body?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: Does he mean for the board to operate with some sort of knowledge of how it feels to be the recipient of welfare? Or does he really just want something that he can say, legally and technically, "We have a board and we will take the money from Ottawa and that is it"? From year to year there is not going to be a thing done. This is the suspicion we have over here.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask four or five questions in regard to this board of review. At the present time, have there been any applications from people who have been refused welfare, who want to be heard by the board of review?

Mr. Pitman: Is the member kidding?

Mr. Trotter: And can the Minister give us an idea how many?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are, I believe, seven, all pending, in Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Oh, come now.

Mr. Trotter: If there are only seven appeals just in Peterborough, and nothing from any other part of Ontario, it is almost in-

comprehensible to my mind. But how does an individual know that they have a right of appeal?

Mr. Brown: It is a secret, even the Minister does not know.

Mr. Trotter: If I had been refused welfare, how would I know that there is a board of review? What is the procedure?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, how does a citizen know a great many things? He makes inquiries.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, that is just an indication—and it is a pity, because I heartily agree with the principle behind a board of review, not just to get money out of the federal government—because if I understand this right, Mr. Chairman, you must have a board of review in order to get the benefit of The Canada Assistance Act—am I right, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We entered into an agreement.

Mr. Trotter: The federal government had better start to ride herd on some of these so-called pioneers who are dragging their feet. To my mind, the Minister is a cowboy riding a hobbyhorse in the wilderness, he is no pioneer.

I would like to know if—and I am just assuming—you are going to be inundated with appeals—

Mr. Singer: If the word gets out.

Mr. Trotter: I know cases myself, and probably every member here knows of cases that want to be appealed. I am just assuming that you are going to be inundated and I would like to know how the three people you have already appointed on the board are possibly going to hear the appeals.

Mr. Singer: Very simple, they never meet.

Mr. Trotter: So I would ask this of the Minister. Assuming that you will be inundated with appeals, and I am telling you that it is a very safe assumption, has the Minister any plans to expand the board in the immediate future from three to 10 members, and if so, is there any schedule or any routine set up for the members of the board to meet? Is there any schedule? Any plans?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we have provision for 10, nine members and a

chairman, and we do not know what next month will be. The member says we will be inundated—

Mr. Trotter: You will be inundated.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If we had proceeded to appoint 10 members and then I had been asked the question, "How many appeals are there?"—and I had said seven or eight, the hon. members opposite would have had a legitimate excuse for berating me for making an appointment of 10 to handle so few appeals. The provision is there in the statute and the regulations, and, as the need arises, the appointments will be made.

Mr. Trotter: All right. Are the members going to be paid a salary or on a *per diem* basis?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: *Per diem*.

Mr. Trotter: *Per diem*. All right, suppose you did appoint them and they did not meet. Suppose you had no cases; it would not cost you anything, but at least they are ready, and you are ready, and I do not think this Minister ever will be, because I do not think he cares: I do not think he is interested.

It really is a disgrace, and I think it is an indication of the political leadership that this department gets from this Minister and from his predecessor. The only thing that has carried this department—and I think it is one of the most vital departments in the province of Ontario—over the years is that there have been dedicated civil servants.

But the responsibility of policy does not lie with civil servants; it lies with the Minister and the politicians, and the Minister is not giving policy of any kind. He is just drifting. This is a complete indication, and to tell me it is in the regulation is just stupid. I am just appalled at the conduct of the Minister at this point, and it is typical, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, of the history of the political leadership of this department. It is Tory government at its worst.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I think we have discovered one of the most appalling facts possible in discovering that there have been only seven or eight appeals from all the welfare recipients right across this entire province. Now, if the Minister really believes that this is because all the welfare recipients are happy and content, or if he feels that he has

satisfied them all, then he is living in a dream world.

Obviously, the only reason that this appeal board has been appointed is because of the day-to-day, week-to-week, and month-to-month prodding that went on in the city of Peterborough. That is the only place with a single appeal, and why is that? Not because of any effort on the part of the Minister to give justice to the people who are receiving aid from this department, but because of a man like Ray Peters, who organized the United Workers and Unemployed Organization, and who has month by month been writing this department asking for a board of review.

Indeed, does the Minister realize that his office was picketed in Lindsay by the outraged citizens in that area? For heaven's sake, one wonders just how incredible a Minister we have here when he admits to the House that, in the whole province of Ontario, he has managed to keep the whole welfare programme so secretive, and made the appeal procedure so unknown, that no one is making any kind of an appeal, months after legislation has been placed forward. Well, perhaps I can give him some other information, too.

The Minister gave the impression that these forms were available in various offices. They are not available in various offices. I had a very pleasant chat with the Deputy Minister and the only place that you can get an application for a board of review is by writing to the Minister's department. It is the only way. There are no applications; they are not sent out in bunches; they are not sent out to the welfare offices, and there may be a very good rationale for that. But, the point is, after the letter comes asking for the application, is a decision made in that office as to whether there is going to be given a board of review or is it automatic? That is the first thing I want to know.

The second thing I want to know is, when the application is sent out, is it made perfectly clear to the recipient of that application that he will be able to have counsel, or his friend, or anybody else he wants to take with him to that board of review? If those two things are not being done then this is a facade. We are not really getting at the problem at all. Very luckily the people in the Peterborough area will be represented by this dedicated man who is not getting \$10,000 a year, Mr. Chairman; he is getting nothing, he works many hours a day for those people who are receiving welfare in the area of Peterborough. They will be represented, but I fear for those

people in the other parts of Ontario where there does not happen to be an organization like this.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, listening to this debate, I am just flabbergasted. I just do not understand how this situation could come about in this province. I can recall this Minister, when he occupied a different portfolio, the portfolio of the Provincial Secretary, telling us in the House—and being an honourable man, we believed him—that he was concerned about people. He used to boast about how many languages he had used to interpret those pamphlets about Canadian citizenship and how they were being distributed, and so on. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that that same kind of intelligence would have been brought with him to this portfolio. What do we hear? We know that we have to have, by reason of the federal legislation, a review board, but with great reluctance, with foot-dragging slowness, positively with almost complete abhorrence, we ignore estimates that have been in the estimate books for over two years. We really have not had an operative review until you were being pressured by somebody over in the city of Peterborough.

You have a moral and a legal obligation and because of the basis on which you accept several hundred million and cannot give us the figure, my guess is that at least \$200 million, and probably more, collected by the government of Canada to use in this programme to set up a review board, has not been used to do this at all. You have named a couple of people who have met once, who have no schedule of meetings, who operate by secret regulations, and worse than that, there are interpretations of the regulations which apparently, only you have. There is no distribution of this information. If each regulation has to have an individual interpretation why do you not take them before the cabinet and have new regulations passed in accordance with your interpretations.

Surely if you read McClure you must understand that for justice to be done, these procedures must be known to the people who can use them. You have kept them a secret. You have been pulling the wool over the eyes of the federal government and over the eyes of the people of Ontario, and unless it is absolute negligence, you are subject to a worse charge. You have been doing it in order that the people who are affected cannot use these procedures.

Now, is the Minister stupid, or is he negligent, or is he deliberately denying to those people who are entitled by reason of the federal legislation, a right of appeal? A right of appeal that no one hears of, because there are no regulations published, there are interpretations which nobody knows of and there are no forms available. The Minister knows as well as I that many of the people with whom his department deals, cannot speak or read English properly, so there is no basis for arranging for the purveying of any information if any was available, into other languages than English. How can the Minister bring these estimates before the House and tell us no more than he has this afternoon? Really, Mr. Chairman, it is a disgrace.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us if there is any provision made whatsoever for new citizens of this country who may have difficulty with the English language? Is there any provision in the way of pamphlets for them to know that such a procedure as a review board is available to them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Those pamphlets have not been available. I can assure the hon. members of this House that there will be pamphlets and information—

Mr. Singer: When?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —produced by this department, that will, I am afraid, lead the hon. member for York South to use the term that they have been produced for aggrandizement. I tell him now that that will not be the purpose. The purpose of the publications—

Mr. MacDonald: You either do too much or nothing at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The purpose of the publications will be to make known to all of the people, both the taxpayers and as the hon. member for Scarborough Centre made reference—to the recipients, all aspects of all of the programmes administered by this department. And I say to the hon. member for Peterborough, who asked me two questions, that the answers to those questions are to be in the affirmative. The procedure in my mind will be as simple as possible. If a person writes a letter, a letter which is received, which indicates that—

Mr. Trotter: Where does he write?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko:—however it comes into our possession—

Mr. Trotter: How?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: By whatever means they write, if it comes into our possession, it will be handled as an initial step in the appeal and in order that the procedures be regularized, the application will go out so that the board will have before it some sort of a simplified résumé. The document which we have prepared, which is in the regulations, is in the very simplest of forms.

Mr. Trotter: To whom do we address the letter, Santa Claus? Where do you address the letter? You say, "these letters that come into our possession." We do not know where to address them to right now.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: To the chairman. I assure you that if there is a letter that comes into my possession or into the possession of any member they will be treated as an appeal and directed towards the chairman.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, is it some transcendental happening? I mean, how do these things occur? How are you going to facilitate it? What, in this House at this time, is the Minister's resistance to the proposition that every single recipient under The Family Benefits Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act should be given a separate form, perhaps in a separate colour, which indicates the availability of the review board procedure. What is his resistance to that proposition?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have no resistance to it, I just have not seen the need of it yet.

Mr. Lewis: You have not seen the need of it yet, after eight appeals? You have \$108 million in federal money coming in for income maintenance in 1969 and 1970. The federal government in this instance, with unusual perception, knowing the department with which they were dealing, requested that there be some kind of a review board apparatus set up to safeguard their investment of \$108 million, an investment which is supplemented in almost equal sum by the Minister's own department—\$215 million on income maintenance—and the Minister is saying, and expects to be believed, in this Legislature that an expenditure of \$215 million on income maintenance would return only seven complaints in the entire province?

Mr. Pitman: All in Peterborough.

Mr. Lewis: What kind of travesty are you putting on this House? We had, Mr. Chairman, made light, occasionally, in that engaging way that members of a club have, about the Minister's predecessor. Compared to the Minister, the Minister's predecessor's knowledge of his department was encyclopaedic.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that one cannot allow in this kind of department, this continual abuse of the recipients, because then the department is not a department of Social and Family Benefits at all. It is a department, as the Minister has been kind enough to indicate to us with his coming, for the self-aggrandizement of the visage of the Minister of Social and Family Services.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to it because I think it is a simple proposition and I think we can achieve this perhaps, if nothing else. Is the Minister prepared to undertake to the House now, that he will inform hereafter every recipient, by way of a special notice, that they are entitled to a board of review, and indicate how they then apply to that board if they are dissatisfied with some aspect of the allowance? Can that be undertaken by the Minister, or is that too much to ask at this point in his estimates, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The undertaking that I give, Mr. Chairman, is that the legislation as passed by this Legislature will be carried out. The appeal board has been set up to serve a purpose. The undertaking that I give is that the appeal board will serve that purpose, period.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, we are just strangling on words. Now, it is just not so difficult. Let us place it again because I do not think that the request that is being made is unworthy. You have x number of recipients under The Family Benefits Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act, and you have a board of review purportedly to correct the abuses under those Acts, should they occur. Will the Minister guarantee to the House, not with some sophistry about the legislation, but in simple plain English, that the recipients will be informed of the board of review in a formal way as a matter of course, including the direction for the appeal to be routed? Can the Minister answer that, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have given my answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lewis: I do not appreciate the answer. Then we shall take the answer as you have given it. It just seems to me that it is kind of silly to prolong things this way but I will ask the Minister for an interpretation of his answer. What does he mean by, "as the legislation provides"? The legislation, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, provides for a board of review. There are regulations which are set down which require ministerial interpretation, unlike any other regulation in any other Act of any other department where they are quite explicit and open.

What does the Minister mean when he says the board of review procedure will be given under the legislation? Specifically how?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just that every applicant for assistance who is refused should be given the opportunity of having his case reviewed, period. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Lewis: Well, will he be told that in some precise way? Are you giving him some indication of that right, and how are you doing it? Can you answer that?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is a lawyer; he must be familiar with the standard form of assessment notice as approved by his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Every time anyone gets a real estate assessment—it relates to property—there has to be, and the department insists upon it, on that notice, the provision for appeal within so many days, in such and such a way, and the person who gets the assessment notice is told how it is done. Now why cannot you do that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That sounds very reasonable.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, whenever a new programme is introduced, in most cases, large government advertisements often appear in newspapers. I, quite frankly, disagree in most cases with the advertisements because I think it is a waste of public money, but here is a case where I do not ask that you have large advertisements in newspapers, but I do ask that you use some form, such as the member for Scarborough West has suggested, or the member for Downsview has suggested. We have discussed also the use of pamphlets which could be printed very inexpensively and distributed naturally only to those who have applied for welfare, or are receiving welfare.

In other words you do not need the mass media to advertise the board of review. Can

the Minister give us any indication of what type of programme he has planned for the future in letting the people who will use the facilities of this board know that such facilities are available? Are any pamphlets drafted that could be circulated? Or these throwaways that they have, have they been drafted in order to be circulated among these people who have applied for welfare? Have you got anything in this line?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are some pamphlets being printed that have been set up but I do not know whether they contained paragraphs to that effect or not—I am not aware of it. All I can say is that the proposals which have been made in this House will be taken into consideration in order to make the appeal boards work, but for the hon. member to try to pin me down to a specific of the kind that he has—I want this board to be as flexible as possible so that it will carry out the job that is being sought.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York South was trying to get the floor.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister was replying to the point I had raised, Mr. Chairman. Your board is so flexible, Mr. Chairman, that only 30 per cent of its appointees are presently appointed; it has no regular meetings; it hears none of the applicants or recipients; and it has no prospect of any future employment at all—that is how flexible it is. It is so flexible that it does not exist.

Mr. Trotter: Like nailing jelly to the wall.

Mr. Lewis: Now what kind of rigidity is a member of the Opposition accused of when he asks a Minister to publicize to applicants for, or recipients of, a programme of their rights? What kind of rigidity is that?

When legal aid was introduced, the Attorney General made certain things known to those who had to apply—not sufficient to appease all of us in the Opposition but certainly a gesture of intent far exceeding that which the Minister had undertaken when OMSIP was brought in. There was an enormous advertising campaign to indicate to people that to which they were entitled and what might be available to them.

When the Provincial Secretary had his estimates up before the House a few days ago he indicated by way of pamphlet, the numbers of facts and arguments that were available to all those new citizens of this

country who might require certain lucidation on certain matters. What inflexibility is there on the part of the Opposition that can be imputed by asking a Minister to inform the applicants or recipients of a programme what they are entitled to by right?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): How does that affect the possibility of a review board?

Mr. Lewis: And does it affect the possibility of the review board, precisely? Something very strange is happening, Mr. Chairman. Whether the Minister feels that just because it is being put to him by the Opposition he cannot concede an inch—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Minister—

Mr. Lewis: If the Minister does not feel that, then the Minister is deliberately intent on scuttling his programme because that is what he is doing to it. It is absolutely unheard of, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is intent on reducing the review board to obscurity just so that it can cash in on a few dollars from the federal government—more than a few dollars.

It is determined to perpetuate the discrimination against recipients or applicants in the social welfare field, visited upon them by innumerable welfare administrators across this province.

That is an intolerable proposition and if the Minister wants to understand why we, in the Opposition, do not regard his department as credible, why we in the Opposition feel that he fights a war on the recipient rather than a war on poverty, then let it be demonstrated by the attitudes which are amply shown, in one instance after another, whether it is the rebate on the basic shelter exemption, or whether it is on the review board. There is a consistency in this department's approach which is as punitive as one can possibly contemplate for this kind of undertaking.

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

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Minister does not seem to realize that at this point, his credibility is sub-zero—on the basis of his record, Mr. Chairman, I invite the colleague of the Minister who objects to reflect on that record.

Two years ago, in the spring of 1967, we seriously debated the appropriation of \$60,000 to appoint a review board. Nothing happened for the whole year. One year later, in

the spring of 1968, we seriously debated the expenditure of \$60,000 for the review board and the Minister got around to appoint it in the tenth month of that year.

He now tells us he has got three of the nine members appointed; that they have had one meeting; and that the only place for which any applications have been considered are from the city of Peterborough. Now can anybody, including the Minister of Mines who is normally rather bright, say that the Minister's credibility at this stage is anything other than sub-zero?

The Minister of Social and Family Services gets up and says to us, "I am going to implement the Act that is passed." Mr. Chairman, for two years he has been sitting on the Act and doing nothing about its implementation. It took him 20 months with two authorizations of appropriations, before he moved. Why should we, for one moment, believe this Minister is going to proceed now?

Furthermore, and I sit down with this point, if the Minister were really serious, if he were not trying to perpetrate a fraud on the poor victims who are in receipt of allowances, as well as on the general public, he would willingly say, "Sure, it took us all this time to get the board set up because we wanted it to be the finest board and we did not want to make any mistakes, and we were pioneering"—you know all of the excuses he has trotted out. At least, belated but at this point, he would be willing to have notices go to every one of the recipients saying, "finally we have got the board set up and your rights are established and we remind you of your rights."

But no, the Minister sits in his seat. He will not give us any guarantee. He says he is just going to implement the Act. But the record shows that he has not fulfilled the Act. That is why I say his credibility is sub-zero and nobody can deny it because the record speaks for itself.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, one small point, because I think it puts it fairly neatly. Whenever there is an indication of entitlement that goes out to someone under The Family Benefits Act, or when there is a change, there is a little form—this one—that goes with the letter. The form is headed as follows: Notification of Changes in Income, Assets or Budgetary Requirements; this is in 10-point bold type. Beneath, it says as follows:

Since allowances are computed on the basis of income, assets and budgetary requirements, it is necessary for you to advise

the family benefits branch or your regional administrator or your field worker if there is any change in your circumstances, such as address, number of dependents, budgetary requirements, income and assets.

Mr. Chairman, why is it not possible to reproduce, for the purposes of indicating the right to review, precisely the same kind of form to go to every applicant and every recipient who falls under The Family Benefits Act or The General Welfare Assistance Act? Why is it not possible for the Minister this afternoon in this House to give us that guarantee in the simple way which his department has already adopted in other areas so that people who receive it, will know that the board of review exists? And that the board of review can be given something to do? If the Minister is not prepared to accept this, then who can do other than to suspect his motives? What has the Minister to say?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I keep repeating, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Downsview has his suggestion, you have your suggestion. Those letters go out to people who are in receipt of allowances. Anybody who is in receipt of an allowance is very seldom likely to be the appellant.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The basic problem will be to let those who have felt that they have suffered by some refusal or suspension of that, to know where they appeal.

Mr. Lewis: The basic problem, if you will forgive me, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister just does not know what is going on in his own department at all.

An hon. member: Plain, simple ignorance.

Mr. Lewis: It is enough of a disadvantage to put the Opposition in, in that we do not have annual reports; we do not even have an annual Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that the bulk of the appeals will come from those who feel that the allowance which has been stipulated, discriminates against them in one or another area; that the pre-added budget—about which I hope we will get details but about which the Minister has never said anything—has somehow not fulfilled the requirements of the Act or has been computed on a discriminatory basis.

That is where the appeal procedure will be used, not simply for applicants who have been

turned down but for the vast number of people, all of whom were listed in the House last night, who are in receipt of an allowance and whose allowance is in some way inadequate. Surely, in his many years of experience in his department, even in the whisperings of the halls as he travels to his office, somebody has pointed out to him that this is the area of greatest social grievance under The Family Benefits Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act. That is precisely why this kind of notification will make a world of difference to people. Why impugn the integrity of those whom you have appointed to the review board, which is what you are doing? You are saying, 'I cannot allow the recipients to know of any injustice and to give them the review procedure because when they get to the review board, Messrs. Morris, Drea and Company are so conspiratorial, so sinister that they will not grant them the review or they will not re-appraise their allowance or they will not alter the benefit'.

If you have any faith in the integrity of your review board, then give them something to do. If you want to give them something to do, then indicate to the recipients that to which they are entitled. It is just an embarrassment of this department to go around the merry-go-round endlessly in this fashion, Mr. Chairman, when it is such a simple proposition. I cannot help but feel that the Minister is resisting because the department has contrived the board of review for income-receiving purposes only, and it has no intention of employing its usefulness whatsoever and that, in this department, is a crime.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Does the Minister wish to answer? Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will not answer we will continue with this barrage, I suspect, until 6 o'clock because what is the Minister up to? What is he afraid of? What is he afraid of in sending out, as the member for Scarborough West suggests, simply a statement telling recipients what their rights are under the legislation which exists? Is he afraid—and I wonder if this is really the point—is he afraid that the horrible mess, which the member for Scarborough Centre described last night, is really just one small part of a horror which exists within that Minister's department? Is he afraid to lift the whole lid so the province will become aware of the inadequacies of the legislation in this province? Is that what he is afraid of? If so, let us state it. Let us get it out in the open.

In one small community, seemingly, the only community where this review board came to be known—immediately you had indication of need. It is to be suspected that it exists right across the province. Now, for heaven's sake, surely it is justice to inform the people the rights they have under this legislation? There is no justice whatsoever in giving an appeal board and then letting it quietly lie dormant. That is not justice at all.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Tory philosophy.

Mr. Pitman: No justice at all. I appeal to the Minister—for heaven's sake, one small indication by the Minister that he is ready to send out, not an expensive pamphlet with his picture on it—we do not expect that—just simply a statement, a small slip of paper along with the indication of what the level of assistance is.

The Minister says it is those that are being cut off. Who are affected? It is not those that are being cut off. There are very few in this province who are cut off from welfare. The main problem is that they just cannot live on what the Minister is giving them according to the budget which was set up by his regulations. I think that the Minister is going to learn a great deal from those who come before his appeal board.

He could learn a great deal more but he will not listen to the members on this side of the House. His appeal board is certainly going to have to listen to those people who come before them and it is going to be a pretty grim story that he is going to hear. I suggest that he put this legislation through. He is getting the money from the federal department as expected and he has a responsibility under that legislation to make this appeal board effective. Let us get on with it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: I wished to point out before the hon. member for Peterborough spoke that there is one thing I cannot grasp. Perhaps I am obtuse—but in reply to the question of the hon. member for Scarborough West, you said this. You said that if you notify recipients then you are going to affect the flexibility of the review board. I cannot grasp that at all. This is the inference I glean from what you said. That is what you said.

I must say this to you, we have many appeal procedures that the public are aware

about. Do you think that the court of appeal of this province is restricted? Is it inflexible because the public know that they have that avenue of approach? Explain to me then, as well as to your colleagues in this House, what you meant by that because this is what I understood. You thought you were adversely affecting the flexibility of your review board by notifying recipients. That is what I understand.

Mr. Lewis: How many people—this figure surely must be available—are presently in receipt of allowances under family benefits and general welfare assistance? A rough figure. How many thousands of people in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: 58,000—

Mr. Lewis: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: 58,000 under family benefits—

Mr. Lewis: 58,000 under family benefits? And how many under general welfare?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Approximately 50,000.

Mr. Lewis: Approximately 50,000. So we have roughly 108,000 recipients right across the province of Ontario, of whom eight have a legitimate grievance, according to your figures. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, we set out a review board for The Department of Health to review the cases in the Ontario Hospital system which, if memory serves me, was only dealing with 20,000 people. There were several hundred who lined up to the review board. Here, out of 108,000, we are talking about seven or eight cases.

It is an entirely fraudulent apparatus; it does not make any sense at all. I do not see why one should vote money for the review board—\$15,000 for a chairman and \$30,000 for three members when the Minister has no intention whatsoever of making the recipients aware of that to which they are entitled. Why are you asking us for \$45,000 for seven cases? Can you justify it? \$8,000 a case.

Why do you not give the money to the seven people in Peterborough? You will have them all; they will pay more in taxes in 10 years than you will ever achieve by your review board. I do not know what is being pulled off before the House, but it just does not make sense. There is not another department of government with any review procedure that operates as fraudulently as the Minister has put to the House today.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! If the hon. member for Scarborough West wants to ask his question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the last speaker a question first; is he objecting to a review board?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, let the member for Eglinton attend to his board of appropriations and I will attend to the board of review.

Mr. Reilly: Is that his answer?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, we have sat in this House for one hour and 45 minutes now on the question of review boards and we debated it for two hours last year. We have had it in the estimates for two years, and the board came through the House by way of Act. If you are asking this party their feelings about a board of review—

Mr. Reilly: I am asking you because you have been speaking against it—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Oshawa had the floor.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order or personal privilege to defend what little virtue I have left—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That should not take long.

Mr. Lewis:—having been smitten so low by those devastating remarks by the member for Eglinton—I always resist the proposition of a review board which is corrupted and perverted and distorted out of all substance by this government and its Minister. That is no board of review at all. And if it can be replaced by a reasonable board of review which appropriately attends to the recipients of these benefits, then we will be very pleased to support it. But this kind of review board, which is a fraudulent creation, cannot possibly be perpetrated any further in this House, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Get on your white charger!

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, surely with the human beings handling The

Family Benefits Act, and with all of those imperfections, there were more than seven people who were wronged as my colleagues have pointed out.

Mr. Pitman: Only in one area.

Mr. Pilkey: And surely a review board is really designed to be a guardian of democracy; it is an element by which we find redress for the wronged and the inequities that are visited upon people in this bureaucracy that we participate in.

Surely, in the case of a review board, set up to render objective judgment on the basis of these wrongs that are perpetrated on these people provided with family benefits, it is not a question of flexibility. My colleague talks about scuttling the programme. I submit to you, Mr. Minister, that you have not got the programme off the ground.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no programme to scuttle at this point.

Mr. Pilkey: And this is the tragic problem. It seems to be a callous way that your department has instituted upon you, sir, to set up a review board by which people have a course of redress from those laws. Surely you can stand up in this Legislature and make a statement that this review board is going to be a practical, tangible vehicle for people to find a measure of justice? This does not seem to be a great request by the members that have made such an eloquent plea to you. But it seems to me that every time you make an answer to the questions that they pose, you take them away out in Lake Ontario somewhere and prefer to drop them there. There is really no answer—

Mr. Singer: And hold them under?

Mr. Pilkey: And hold them under is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not carry the analogy too far, we are bogged down enough.

Mr. Pilkey: And it seems to me, sir, that you could give an answer that this public review board could be a real instrument in your department to solve those inequities and give redress to those wronged. I think this is the answer that the members on this side of the House are looking for. For the last two hours I have been in the House, you, sir, have not given a real answer to that question yet. I think, before we conclude on the question of the review board, you, sir, ought to give this side of the House a proper answer to that question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I say to the hon. member for Oshawa that the words he has used are really my words. That is what I have been trying to convey to those sitting on your right for the same period of time. That is exactly the approach I am giving to this; I assume it is the approach that every hon. member that voted for this legislation wants me to do and that is exactly my intent and purpose.

Mr. MacDonald: You have had the intent for 24 months.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Read the words of the hon. member for Oshawa. He has stated the intended purpose of this appeal board—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: Let us assume for a moment that your intentions are good. Let us just assume that for a moment. How are you going to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: Let us just assume for a moment, I said, that your intentions are good. How can we be guaranteed that you are going to carry out the intent? I think what the members want you to say, sir, is that we are going to notify the recipients under The Family Benefits Act that they have a right to redress of their wrongs through this review board, and that you are going to give these people prior notice and public notice of their rights under this review board. This you have not said yet.

Mr. Braithwaite: He has not said anything.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, every time a decision is made by this department in respect to a case, I believe a communication goes out to that person. Is that correct? So that the communication goes out in the case of an award or a change of status, I believe that is correct. Then what is wrong, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, with that letter having an added paragraph which simply says that there is available an appeal to the review board, and the appeal is to be made to such and such a person, at such and such a time, or within such and such a time?

Now, I, for the life of me, cannot understand, why it is not possible for that added paragraph to go on that letter. Or else, if you do not like that, have a small form such

as has already been read by the member for Scarborough West, a form which sets out this matter in detail and which can be clipped to that letter, so that when the recipient gets the communication and he is not satisfied with it, he knows that he has a certain length of time to appeal to a certain place, under certain circumstances to be heard. It is a simple thing. I cannot understand why the Minister cannot give the House an assurance that this can be done.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. J. L. Brown (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, there are times when the Minister of a department should provide leadership to the senior civil service and to the entire department, and there certainly come times when the senior civil servants should give leadership and aid to the Minister. The fact is, as we watch this debate this afternoon, that we find both parties are failing to do that with one another around this simple issue of making information available to applicants and recipients, regarding their rights under the Act.

We then have to question why are both sides in this particular issue unable to act, and I think the answer is quite simple. It is a traditional problem with the Tory party in Ontario that when it comes to service to people, it is deathly afraid of taking any act that will indicate the degree of amount of abuse or lack of service.

Any structure that gets set up which will make it possible for people to determine and discover the degree to which people suffer is boycotted and blocked by the Tories. The one single thing that would come out of this procedure, suggested by the hon. member for Scarborough West, would be that the department would know how many recipients and how many applicants are dissatisfied with the department's service.

Now, what is so dangerous about that if your intentions are good as far as people are concerned? The only danger comes if you want to pretend to the public, and to the government, and to the Legislature that you are providing an adequate service when you are not providing an adequate service; that you are providing service that meets the satisfaction of the law, when you are not providing that service.

I say to you, that is the issue this afternoon, and any Act that would correct this situation, as you have outlined it for your department, would result in my being very

pleased to retract that statement. But as long as both the senior civil servants and the Minister are adamant that they are not going to notify applicants and recipients of their rights under the law, then I say to you that it is because they want to cover up the incidence of malpractice, incompetent practice, lack of service, and abuse of people in need in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and begs for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, we shall continue with these estimates tomorrow.

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

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1969



CONTENTS

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	3013
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, withdrawn	3021
Marketing of fresh water fish, bill to regulate, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	3022
Fish Inspection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	3022
City of the Lakehead, bill to incorporate, Mr. McKeough, first reading	3022
Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading	3023
Municipal financing, statement by Mr. McKeough	3023
Law Enforcement Compensation Act, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Bullbrook	3026
Lake Erie beach properties, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Gisborn	3026
Steel complex in northwestern Ontario, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Stokes	3027
Westinghouse of Canada, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon	3027
County school boards, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Good, Mr. Pitman	3027
Transfer review board, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Nixon	3029
Police Act, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman	3029
Transfer of inmate, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman	3030
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lawlor	3031
"Representative" on Anguilla, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Lawlor	3031
Summer courses for Indian education, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	3031
Metro teachers serving on boards of education, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	3032
Teachers' superannuation commission, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman	3032
Essex county canners, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Ruston	3032
Liquor permits, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Deans	3032
Lake Erie commercial fishermen, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Spence	3033
Junior kindergartens, question to Mr. Davis, Mrs. M. Renwick	3033
Women principals, questions to Mr. Davis, Mrs. M. Renwick	3033
Ore discoveries, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier	3033
Texas Gulf smelter, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Ferrier	3034
Estimates, Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Yaremko, continued	3036
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	3050

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1969

The House met at 2.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that commencing on Tuesday, April 15, this House will sit at 2 p.m., Monday to Thursday inclusive, each week until further order.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in this connection I might say too that it will be the intention to have night sessions on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday when we come back from this brief recess. We will leave Wednesday evenings clear until further notice.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, while we are dealing with the future business of the House, is the Prime Minister in a position to indicate what the succession of estimates are beyond Mines which I—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I believe this list has been given to the House—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We were going to follow Social and Family Services with Mines, and following that, Transport—

Mr. MacDonald: What of Treasury?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, we have got to finish Treasury, which is under way. This is a rough list—Labour, Highways, Energy, Health and the Attorney General. According to the exigencies of the situation, we may have to shuffle these around, but roughly that will be the order and we will give you due and ample notice if there are any changes.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act

to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister going to give them their money?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to The Medical Services Insurance Act, effective April 1, 1969, changes the rate of payment for physicians' services from 90 per cent of the 1967 Ontario Medical Association schedule of fees, to 90 per cent of the schedule of fees introduced by the Ontario Medical Association on April 1, 1969.

You will recall, sir, that the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) asked a question yesterday concerning this relative to the meetings I had had with the Ontario Medical Association and on correspondence exchanged between us. I met with them on March 24, 1969, and on January 29, 1969, at which meetings this matter was discussed.

The department carries out on an on-going basis a very careful review of medical care costs associated with OMSIP, particularly because the 1967 schedule increased costs by about 15 per cent. The present schedule will increase costs by approximately ten per cent. This review includes the impact on the public of any lowering of payments by OMSIP as related to the new schedule.

It may be well to emphasize here that a very detailed study of all health care costs has just been launched and in this OMSIP costs constitute a growing factor. While I again must express my concern and that of the government on the escalation of health care costs, we have decided that it is in the public interest to accept the new schedule and this amendment provides the legislative authority for this action.

We shall, of course, have to review our premium structure as related to these increased costs, since it is our belief that the income must bear a real relationship to expenditure.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): I think that is the most shocking statement ever made in the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Minister by way of clarification if a review of the costs will include a review of the government's decision with regard to Medicare?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, as I intimated in this House a few days ago, this matter is very actively under review at the present time.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification, if I may, I would ask the Minister whether or not he in any way endeavoured to roll back the doctors' fees charged in this province? Did he endeavour to do that or did he just sit meekly by and accept what they had to say to him? It is the most shocking statement that has ever been made in this House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose the hon. member will believe anything I say anyway—

Mr. J. Renwick: I agree, I agree 100 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —but yes, I did endeavour in every way possible.

Mr. MacDonald: Some people violate the guidelines with impunity.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber has the floor.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, may I ask the hon. Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Humber has the floor, I would ask that he be given a hearing.

Mr. Ben: May I ask the hon. Minister is there anything in this proposed bill which would relieve those people whose fees are subsidized in whole or in part of the onerous burden of this ten per cent, which is now in fact over ten per cent, so that they would not be deprived of medical services because of their inability to raise that ten per cent?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is really a matter of clarification, but this is not touched in the amendment to the bill.

Mr. Ben: Why not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification on a question asked the hon. Minister.

Is it the intention—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I think this clarification has gone far enough.

Mr. Speaker: We will hear what the hon. member for High Park has to ask and if it is a matter of clarification I think he is entitled to ask it. If it is merely a comment he is not.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. Is it the intention that the increased fee shall be paid when the bill has received its third reading or will it go into effect as of the time the OMA announce their increase which was April 1?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that that question was not a proper question for clarification, but a question for discussion when the bill is debated.

An hon. member: Well, Mr. Speaker, we want to know.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question or a point of clarification.

I am not sure whether this is directed to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, or to you, sir. But have not the rights of the House been entirely violated by the Minister because of his assurance on the last occasion when this bill was debated, that no further increase in the OMA fee schedule would be accepted without legislative approval? I want to know how the Minister unilaterally accepts an increase from the Ontario Medical Association without ever bringing it before this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is not accepting it. That is the purpose of the bill. As I said in reply to a question put by the hon. member, I believe, we cannot change the amount paid in claims until we have amended the legislation and that is the purpose of this amendment today.

Mr. Lewis: On a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not entitled to ask a supplementary question.

Order. The hon. members will realize that the Speaker has endeavoured to allow questions of clarification which really are not allowable by the rules in order that reasonable understanding of the meaning of bills being introduced can be given to the House. But it cannot degenerate into a debate or we

lose the whole purpose of the opening part of the business of this House. Therefore, some of the questions which were asked today, I thought, and I still think, were exceedingly in point and matters of clarification and were so answered. Others were matters which went to the principle of the bill and should be debated on second reading in my opinion, rather than on first reading. I do not see how a supplementary question can enter into the picture when it is a matter of clarification.

If it is a point of order then it is not a supplementary question as to the point of order. It is either the same point of order which is being spoken to or a new point of order. So I would ask the hon. member for Scarborough West, to clarify what he is trying to put before the House.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I asked my original question. I was not sure whether to direct it to you or to the Minister by way of clarification.

Yesterday I asked a question of the Minister on precisely this subject. He asked that it be taken as notice to be incorporated in his statement today. I am not satisfied that the question was appropriately incorporated in his statement today and I would therefore like to either put the question or to ask a supplementary which will elucidate it. I think it is a fair request.

Mr. Speaker: I think if that is the basis upon which the hon. member has placed it, when we come to the question period, he having given notice and his question having been filed yesterday, I would certainly allow him to ask the question, but not at this juncture.

Mr. Lewis: Is it not more appropriate to do it now?

Mr. Speaker: It may be more appropriate but it certainly is not in accordance with the rules which we try, until they are changed, to observe in the House. So if the hon. member will accept that ruling, I will give him the opportunity later this afternoon to place his question again.

Mr. Lewis: I can wait for the number of minutes that are involved.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the question which I had asked for purpose of clarification is merely to find the effective date of the bill. Surely, that is a reasonable question for clarification.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, in my statement I stated the date was April 1, 1969. I stated that when I read the statement—

Mr. Lewis: Then the Minister has capitulated and we are faced with a *fait accompli*.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), the adjournment of the House on the definite manner of urgent public importance, namely, the unilateral capitulation of the government to the dictates of the OMA concerning changes in the schedule of fees for professional medical services.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has placed in the hands of Mr. Speaker a motion for the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. This matter, of course, in accordance with the rules of the House should have been brought to Mr. Speaker's attention at an earlier date. In view of the situation which arose some time ago when I stated that should one of these cases arise again and come into my office in accordance with the rules, I would most certainly allow the motion to be made from the floor of the House, and then the matter could be dealt with, I would therefore read the motion.

I would therefore rule that it is not in accordance with the rules and that therefore the Speaker's ruling is that it cannot be debated. On that basis any questioning of it would not be of the motion, because undoubtedly the motion is well put, had it been earlier submitted, but it would be on the matter of the Speaker's ruling in accordance with the rules of this House.

The motion by the member for York South, seconded by the member for Riverdale, is that the member for York South moves the adjournment of the House to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the unilateral capitulation of the government to the dictates of the OMA with schedule of fees for professional services. I do, and have stated that I would, rule that this motion is not in order in accordance with our present rules and therefore cannot be voted on or debated.

Mr. Speaker's ruling is open to debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on two grounds I will have to challenge your ruling: (a) once again, the archaic rules of the House; and (b) I submit to you that the rules of the House are frustrating in another way. This is literally the first occasion that we had

an opportunity to move such a motion because the bill has just been brought into the House. We are about to adjourn for some two weeks. This is a matter of urgent importance to many, many thousands of people across this province. The fact that the amending bill was brought in on the eve of a recess is in itself a matter that merits debate in this House because the government's capitulation was withheld until this eleventh hour as we are about to recess.

Mr. Speaker: I would like, if I may, if the hon. leader of the Opposition would allow me to correct a comment that I made. It was not open to debate, but it is open to comment by the mover of the motion in answer to Mr. Speaker's ruling. I certainly would allow the hon. leader of the Opposition for his party to express his views on this matter, although it is strictly not in order. But all I am calling to the attention of the House is that I am not making any ruling as to the urgency or the public importance of the motion, merely that the motion does not follow the rules of the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we must join in the challenge to your ruling. We feel on this side that the statements by the Minister have been inadequate in this regard. We recall very definitely putting forward a suggestion that seemed to have a good acceptance on both sides that matters of this type should be referred to the standing committee on health so that the doctors could bring forward their reasons for raising their fees for service. They have done this unilaterally. I am not satisfied to any degree that the Minister has had meaningful consultation with them and he is not prepared to tell us the means whereby he has attempted to roll back this increase.

I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that the rules are archaic and it is unfortunate that you have to apply them in this particular way. The only way we can express our disagreement with the rules is to join in the challenge.

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow any further debate. The rules of the House do not allow a debate on Mr. Speaker's ruling. I have allowed the mover of the motion to comment further on it and I have also allowed the leader of the Opposition, because I felt it would be well for the views of that party. If anyone from the government party would wish to speak for that party before I put the motion, I would be glad to hear him, even though that also is out of order. Otherwise—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would appreciate your giving the reason for the ruling again, if you would.

Mr. Speaker: My reason for the ruling is that the rules of the House require that such a motion be submitted to Mr. Speaker and—

Mr. MacDonald: How could it?

Mr. Speaker: I am not discussing whether it could or not, I am merely pointing out that the rules of the House so provide and if there is one thing that Mr. Speaker must do, it is to endeavour not only to deal with the rules properly but to try and deal with them in the context of the House and that is why I have allowed a certain amount of debate.

I personally understand the situation—I am sure we all do—in which the third party find themselves in making that motion, because they are quite right that they, of course, did not know what was going to happen. But nevertheless, until our rules are changed, that is what the rules say and therefore I feel I am duty bound to follow the rules. Therefore I have ruled, and I confirm that ruling, that the motion is out of order and cannot be put. It may not make any sense from the hon. members' viewpoint, but nevertheless, there it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: It is ludicrous.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, perhaps, although my point of order is not a valid one, I would like to draw it to your attention, sir. The hon. Treasurer last year assured this House that no bills would be made retroactive unless out of extreme urgency. Surely the raise in the doctors' fees is not a matter of extreme urgency. This bill should go into effect at the time it has passed this House.

Mr. Speaker: The member is now debating the bill again as he endeavoured to do earlier, and I would rule that his comments are out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I draw to your attention, sir, that as far as I can see, this bill has been introduced into the House in violation of the rules. There was no notice of 48 hours given.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There was no objection to the bill when I stood up to bring it in—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —and therefore I would expect the objection to be raised at that time.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you, sir, cannot allow deviousness on the part of this Minister in addition to the destructiveness of the unanimous—

Mr. J. Renwick: On a point of order, this is the cheapest trick that has ever been played by that Minister.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member will please, please obey some of the rules of the House. One of his party was on the floor on a point of order, and he unceremoniously interrupted him and took over the floor. The hon. member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: I do not call that interruption unceremonious, Mr. Speaker. I accede to it. But not only should this Minister resign, Mr. Speaker, because of his performance this afternoon—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The hon. member is rising on a point of order. Now a point of order is not whether the Minister should resign or not.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that there is some small evidence that unanimous consent is lacking for first reading of this bill without notice having been given.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, if I may speak to it, in order for a bill to be brought in without notice, you, sir, must request unanimous consent from the House. This was not done, and we, certainly, will not consent to it.

An hon. member: Withdraw the bill.

Mr. Ben: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Riverdale accused the Minister and said that this was the lowest, cheapest trick. Now, with them pulling so many cheap tricks, on what authority does he say this is the cheapest?

Mr. Speaker: It is easily seen that all of the members are going to need a good rest when the House adjourns this afternoon.

Mr. J. Renwick: We shall get him to withdraw this bill if we have to sit through the whole of this session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, of course, is going to have to take some other means to

have withdrawal of the bill because the bill has been introduced; the bill has been given first reading. There was no voice raised in opposition.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, are you going to allow the rules of this House, archaic as they are, to be distorted by a Minister of this government? You cannot allow that. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is your obligation to make certain that this—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I have pointed out to the hon. member and to all hon. members that the bill was introduced by the hon. Minister, and perhaps to the Speaker. It was given the usual motion; the motion was passed without dissent; the first reading has taken place. Now, in order to correct that situation, if it needs correction, some other action than just—what shall I say—saying unfortunate things about the Minister, other proceedings will have to be taken. I would be glad if the hon. leader of the Opposition, of the third party, or his deputy who have been speaking to the point, would wish to consult with the clerk and see what action is open to them. It is certainly not open to Mr. Speaker to do anything about it. But, if there is some action that can be taken, I would be most pleased to revert to this particular order of business, or such order of business as the House wishes to have it dealt with.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order that has been raised with regard to the lack of notice. I believe, sir, it is your responsibility under advice from the clerk, not to accept bills of this nature unless there is unanimous consent. When we are in a position to bring forward motions and certain bills, we are always carefully advised and abide by those rulings, and certainly on several occasions it is true the government has attempted to introduce certain legislation and we on this side have brought to Mr. Speaker's attention that proper notice has not been given and you have asked for unanimous consent. I believe, sir, that the prime responsibility as the presiding officer is with yourself, not to wait for objections from other sides. On the other hand, the way the circumstances have developed on this occasion, the bill has apparently been introduced and you have, sir, a challenge to your ruling which is presently before you. I would suggest that one way that one of these things can be settled is to proceed with that challenge.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion that it is not our obligation to approach the Clerk and find out how we can get respect for the rules of this House. It is your responsibility as the presiding officer to take corrective action if a bill has been introduced illegally and it is drawn to your attention. You cannot as you did ten minutes ago insist on the observance of the rules of the House and now tolerate their breach.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I recall that we had a precedent not so long ago where one member of the House introduced a bill which was given first reading and which was out of order. I would suggest to you, sir, that this bill is equally out of order and it should be treated in exactly the same way and should not be proceeded with.

Mr. MacDonald: The government should withdraw.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order—

Mr. Speaker: If the member for Riverdale will please observe some of the niceties of the Chamber by allowing other members the floor, particularly in his own party. The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Niceties are not always necessary. Mr. Speaker, if I may draw your attention to the same point of order. This bill was obviously introduced illegally. There was a breakage of the rules at that time and I suggest that we cannot condone that and therefore this should be reverted back to its previous state and taken again. You cannot break the rules and then say, just because it happened, we are going to allow it. The rules were broken when the bill was permitted to be introduced and, without asking if there was unanimous consent—and as this happened, we must now revert back to the position prior to introduction of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Order, Mr. Speaker.

In the first place, I think perhaps we should deal with the motion on the business that is before the House which is really a challenge to your ruling on a motion made by the hon. member for Riverdale.

Now, as I go back in my memory over the events in this House and the fact that the procedures at one stage of the game were that no notice was ever given of any—I sit quietly and I listen to you argue your point of order so you might sit quietly and listen

to me put my point. It is only in very recent years that the government has followed the formality of putting notice of intention to introduce bills on the order paper. For many, many years in this House it was not a practice that was followed. I am quite sure there are many, many bills that have been introduced in this House, if we were to check the records in the last sessions and probably in this session.

Mr. MacDonald: Very interesting, but very irrelevant!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have no objection whatever, if this is going to be a large matter of consequence, that this bill be withdrawn from first reading here and reintroduced; it could not matter less as far as the government is concerned. The intent of the bill is there; the bill will be introduced, and it will be debated in due course.

I have no intention of calling second reading of it this afternoon; therefore it could not be dealt with in any event until this adjournment is over. It is a very simple bill. The intent is there; we will put notice on the order paper; I will give you notice right now that the bill will be introduced on Tuesday, April 14.

Mr. Lewis: There will be enough of a storm over the recess that you will be sorry.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, sir, if this relieves any embarrassment in which members may find themselves, the government is quite prepared—I do not know—

Mr. J. Renwick: We are not embarrassed.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I suppose by unanimous consent we can withdraw this bill from first reading and I would be quite happy to give that consent, but I give notice now that the bill will be reintroduced on April 14.

Mr. Lewis: It will not be; they will retreat over the recess.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Between now and then the members will have their 48 hours notice.

Mr. MacDonald: We are not coming back till April 15.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Was it the 14th or the 15th? Anyway, on the Tuesday.

Mr. Lewis: We will be here on the 14th.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will be here too, but in any event the bill will be introduced for first reading and I presume that we can put a notice on the order paper. I do not know

what the virtue of the technicality is, but nonetheless—

Mr. MacDonald: Sometimes technicalities have no virtue.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us really examine the situation. When we put notice to introduce a bill on the order paper, we do not say what the bill is; you would not have had any more information if there had been a notice on the order paper that this bill was to be introduced.

Mr. J. Renwick: We might just have caught on.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: How would you know what was to be in the bill unless the Minister showed it to you?

Mr. MacDonald: So what? The rules demand it should be there.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will go along with the rule, Mr. Speaker, I will go along with the rule that 48 hours notice is required. I do not think it really means anything in the merits of the situation, but that is the rule. And if that is the rule we are going to follow, why we will follow it. But in the meantime may I suggest, sir, that we deal with the challenge to your ruling and in regard to that, perhaps I should speak on behalf of the government.

This rule is referred to as being archaic. I do not think it is the least bit archaic that there should be notice given of the intent to introduce a motion which suspends all the business of this House to debate a matter that may be introduced by any private member. We must have some orderly method of conducting the business of the House and that is why, sir, the rules say that notice must be given so that we have some notice as to what is going to be done.

Now I am going to support your ruling, sir, and I am not really going to offer a change in that rule which would permit every day of the week, every sitting day of the week, for somebody on that side of the House to introduce a motion and thereby frustrate the business of this House, which must be ordered by the government.

The business of the House is ordered by the government and we must maintain our right and our position to do so and that is what the rules assure us. I support your ruling, sir, and we will support your ruling and we believe it is a good ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale was first on his feet.

Mr. J. Renwick: My comment will be very brief and it will be on the first part of the Prime Minister's reference to the orders of this House.

We have been sitting here with bated breath since February 25 for the Minister of Health to introduce an Act to amend The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967; an Act to provide for ambulance services; an Act respecting facilities for children suffering from—

Mr. Speaker: What is the hon. member's point of order?

Mr. J. Renwick: My point of order is very simple. Since February 25 there have been three bills of urgent importance we have been waiting for that this Minister has been sitting on. And on this last day of this session, he purports to violate the rules by bringing in this bill, and the Prime Minister can speak—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has no point of order and he is out of order. The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of being out of order—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order. He is not here at this point to castigate the Minister. If he is on his feet it should be for a point of order, and the point of order has to do with something in connection with procedures of this House, and the procedures of this House that he has been pointing out have been properly observed apparently, because notice had been given. Certainly it would be up to the Minister giving notice to choose the time that the bill should be introduced, and therefore, as I say, the hon. member has no point of order. He is merely pointing out that the Minister was following the rules in one case and is not in another, according to the hon. member.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have not been as clear as I should have been on the occasion of this particular event.

I was speaking about the point which the Prime Minister raised a few minutes ago that, for some reason or other because of the past history of this House, the government did not give notice of intention to introduce bills. He is suggesting on this occasion that they can surreptitiously slip a bill into this House and get away with it on the basis of some kind of past history. Now I am simply saying that—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. J. Renwick: If I am out of order, then the Prime Minister was out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I must say that the hon. member's interpretation of what was said by the Prime Minister is not that of Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say this. I take strong exception to the latter part of the Prime Minister's remarks dealing with a motion to adjourn the House to debate a matter of public urgency. The way the rules are now, and are now being interpreted—not the way they were 10 years ago—makes it impossible for any member who wants to make such a motion to set out the reasons for that motion being made.

It is apparent from the Prime Minister's remarks that that is the way he wants it to continue and if that is in fact so, sir, the whole procedure is ludicrous.

We have had many issues in this session which illustrate the inadequacy of the rules under which we operate, and it seems to me, sir, that every day that we go on longer, and every day that the government takes advantage of these technical procedures in the rules, we are being set back that much further in our effort to pursue our democratic right to discuss matters which we have a right to discuss.

I would just say as a postscript, sir, that every day the Prime Minister further delays convening a satisfactory committee to bring in up-to-date rules, every day he denies democracy to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park was on his feet a moment ago. Does he still wish to speak?

Mr. Shulman: No, sir.

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

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, in response to the Prime Minister, I think to use his phrase "the virtue of the technicality" in this case of having the Prime Minister withdraw the bill until notice is given, is that a sufficient public furor will arise over the recess so that the Prime Minister will think twice about reintroducing it on the 15th—that is the virtue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, of course, was out of order. Does the hon. member for Humber have any point of order to raise?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order not with reference to your ruling but the subject matter of the introduction of the bill.

Perhaps it may have slipped the memory of this House, but exactly the same issue arose last session when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) introduced his bill resulting from the Budget.

At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, if your memory recalls, I refused to give consent to a bill being introduced without the consent being asked for. At that time—for the benefit of the members who were not here—what had occurred was exactly what has occurred here. The Minister got up and asked for leave to introduce the bill. The bill was handed to you by the page. Subsequently you read it out and asked that there be first reading of the bill and it was passed on to the Clerk.

At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, it was your ruling that any person objecting to the introduction of a bill without proper notice had to interject his objections during that interval while the bill was being passed from you to the Clerk at the table.

Now it was argued at that time, Mr. Speaker, that it was rather onerous to put that burden on the members, because, first of all, they did not know that a bill was being introduced. Second, they had to grab the binders which contain the orders of the day, and glance to see if there was a bill with that caption listed there as notice having been served. At any rate, you made your ruling.

In accordance with that ruling I guess you can only do the same thing again, Mr. Speaker, but the point is this. It gave rise to quite a discourse—a gentle discourse, I will grant—between Mr. Speaker and myself; nothing but soft words were spoken.

So, I would have thought that the hon. members of the front row over there, the government benches, would have tried to avoid such a hassle in the future. I would have thought they would have recognized the situation and not have embarrassed your person.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here we are not so much debating or going to vote on your ruling, but frankly what we are voting on is: shall the person of the Speaker continue to be insulted by the government members?

Mr. Speaker: Well, the first matter before the House, of course, is the matter of Mr. Speaker's ruling. The second matter before the House is the matter of the bill, which has been given first reading, and which, I believe, by unanimous consent, will be withdrawn.

The motion by the member for York South with respect to the adjournment of the House for debate of an urgent public matter was ruled by myself as out of order, because it was not in accordance with the rules of this House as we presently have them. It is now for me to put Mr. Speaker's ruling to the House.

On appeal, Mr. Speaker's ruling was sustained on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Ben
Apps	Braithwaite
Auld	Breithaupt
Bales	Brown
Belanger	Bukator
Boyer	Bullbrook
Brunelle	Burr
Carruthers	Deacon
Carton	Deans
Connell	De Monte
Davis	Edighoffer
Demers	Farquhar
Downer	Ferrier
Dunlop	Gaunt
Dymond	Gisborn
Evans	Good
Gilbertson	Haggerty
Comme	Innes
Grossman	Knight
Guindon	Lawlor
Hamilton	Lewis
Haskett	MacDonald
Henderson	MacKenzie
Hodgson	Makarchuk
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Newman
Hodgson	(Windsor-Walkerville)
(York North)	Nixon
Johnston	Paterson
(St. Catharines)	Peacock
Johnston	Pitman
(Carleton)	Renwick
Kennedy	(Riverdale)
Lawrence	Renwick (Mrs.)
(Carleton East)	(Scarborough Centre)
Lawrence	Ruston
St. George)	Shulman
MacNaughton	Singer
Meen	Spence
Morningstar	Trotter
McKeough	Worton
McNeil	Young-38.

AYES

Newman
(Ontario South)
Potter
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Snow
Stewart
Villeneuve
Welch
White
Whitney
Winkler
Wishart
Yaremko-54.

NAYS

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 56, the "nays" 38.

Mr. Speaker: I declare Mr. Speaker's ruling upheld.

I would also now, direct the Clerk, with the unanimous consent of the House, that the bill in question, introduced this afternoon to amend The Ontario Hospital Services Act, be withdrawn. I would also at this time draw to the attention of the members that, since we are endeavouring to do something about the rules—and I would advise the House that the party leaders are making the weekly return from recess—I shall now, on the introduction of bills, allow no points of clarification; and no questions are provided for by the rules.

I shall also scrutinize very carefully any questions of clarification which may be raised from the floor with respect to Ministers' statements, because they also, by rules and practice, are very carefully scrutinized. I have endeavoured to give the Opposition side of the House every opportunity to obtain the information, and desire that they should have it.

But as it has become a matter of debate now, which is neither dignified nor in the best interests of the House nor the people of Ontario, I therefore give notice to the House that that is the manner in which I will deal with these matters when they come before the House at a later date.

I am sure I will have the support of the members who today have indicated that they

do wish the rules of the House to be observed as far as possible.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Now that The Medical Services Insurance Act has been withdrawn, I have a recollection in my mind that once a bill has been introduced and withdrawn that it cannot be re-introduced in the same session. Am I correct?

Mr. Speaker: I would be most pleased to take that matter into consideration in due course. If that is the case then the necessary action will undoubtedly be taken. I may say one other thing: I am asking the law clerks of the Crown, who are responsible for the preparation of bills for introduction that hereafter they will attach to each bill, as it reaches Mr. Speaker, a note indicating when notice has been given, so that neither Mr. Speaker nor the House will be put in the invidious position in which we all found ourselves this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I would like to make it very clear that when I said that we would consent to withdrawal of the bill, which had been duly accepted by this House, of course, I made it very clear at the time that the bill would be re-introduced on April 15, and I made no—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am making this point very clear that a proviso to my agreement that the bill be withdrawn was that it would be re-introduced on April 15—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and I made the two statements at the same time standing on my two feet in my place. I think it must be accepted because that was the condition of the withdrawal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that what the Prime Minister says is quite correct and I also believe that it should be the rule or the precedent, which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Downsview, that there should undoubtedly be ways and means by which this sovereign assembly can deal with it. The matter certainly should not cause any member of the House—whether the government side or the Opposition side—any difficulty over the Easter recess, and should not spoil the rest we have all earned.

Introduction of bills:

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a bill, notice of which has been given—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would wait a moment until I ascertain if there are any more government bills.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MARKETING OF FRESH WATER FISH

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act to regulate the marketing of fresh water fish.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the marketing of fresh water fish in a designated part of Ontario, and the participation of the fishermen in the designated part in a fish marketing plan being established under federal legislation controlling fish marketing in the prairie provinces, the Territories and a designated part of Ontario.

FISH INSPECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fish Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the appointment and duties of inspectors under the Act.

CITY OF THE LAKEHEAD

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the City of the Lakehead.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, in presenting The Act respecting the city of the Lakehead for the first reading, may I make a few observations arising mainly out of the deliberations of the inter-municipal committee whose consensus helped to resolve a number of points at issue during the preparatory stage of the legislation. These had to do particularly with questions related to the basis of representation and organization for the new city and the consequences of the amalgamation of the portions of the municipalities of Neebing and Shuniah, which are included in the new city, and the residual portions which continue as the townships of Neebing and Shuniah.

While the mayor and aldermen will be elected by general vote, the aldermanic candidates will qualify as residents in the four respective wards into which the new city will be divided.

The first council will hold office for a three-year term, putting it on the same cycle for elections as the board of education.

In keeping with the government's policy to have municipal councils assume greater responsibility for all municipal services, certain boards and commissions would be dissolved. The members of the Hydro-Electric Commission of the Lakehead will be an appointed body for the first time. It was the unanimous view of the inter-municipal committee that there should not be a board of control.

The decision to set the date of June 23 for the election of the first council, originally proposed for September, arises out of the expressed need for adequate time to draft bylaws for implementation in January, and to prepare for the necessary changes in the administrative structure and the city-wide provision of municipal services at the beginning of the year.

Should there be some question as to the name of the new city, an opportunity to make a final choice from several names can be given at the time of the election of the first council.

Considerable attention has been devoted to whatever financial adjustments should be made in the interests of the residents of Neebing and Shuniah who will become part of the new city, and those who will remain in the two townships. Provision will be made for a phasing-in of tax increases in the Neebing and McIntyre wards of the new city, and graduated payments over a five-year period will be made by the new city to the corporation of the municipality of Neebing.

In order that this House may have the benefit of any further reactions from the Lakehead community prior to second reading and committee of the whole, it is my intention to meet with the municipal councils, boards and commissions on April 17, 1969.

THE GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-1962

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: This amendment has been introduced at the request of the Ontario

Trappers Association. At the present time, there is no season on racoon and they are being slaughtered so rapidly throughout the province that the trappers association is fearful that the whole racoon fur industry will be destroyed.

This amendment sets up a reasonable reason for the trapping or shooting of racoon and in addition, protects the farmers of southern Ontario by exempting all of southern Ontario south of Highway No. 7.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has a statement.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, today I am addressing a letter to the heads of all municipal councils in the province, and I thought it would be wise if the contents of that letter were put on the records of the House as well, because I know members will be interested.

TO THE HEADS OF ALL THE COUNCILS:

All borrowers of long-term money, as I am sure you are aware, are experiencing, today, unprecedented difficulties in their attempts to borrow funds to finance the cost of their capital works.

I am told that long-term money has never, during this century, been as scarce, nor as expensive, as it is today. For instance, a prime Ontario municipal credit will pay, at the present time, at least 8.5 per cent for long-term money—such a credit would have paid 7.9 per cent a year ago, 6.40 per cent two years ago and 5.60 per cent five years ago—this represents an increase of 52 per cent in the cost of long-term money within the period of the last five years.

Fortunately, the province, in keeping with the government's policy to grant first priority to the needs of education, established three years ago the Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation to purchase debentures issued by the municipalities and the separate school boards to finance the cost of public and separate elementary schools and secondary schools. This corporation purchased debentures in the amount of \$121 million in the calendar year 1966, \$172 million in 1967 and \$198 million in 1968.

The corporation has provided the local authorities, during the last three years, with slightly more than half of their total long-term money requirements. The money that was loaned to the local authorities by this corporation, during these three years, was loaned at interest rates that were approximately one per cent below the rates that a prime Ontario municipal credit would have to pay in the public money market—the availability of this money at lower rates of interest has resulted in a total reduction in the interest expenses of Ontario's school boards of some \$40 million.

In order to outline the government's financial policy with regard to these matters, as they relate to Ontario and its municipalities and school boards, may I make reference to a few excerpts from the Budget statement of the hon. Charles MacNaughton:

With regard to the government's expenditure programme he stated: ". . . Our policy has been one

of severe and deliberate restraint, aimed at cutting back the growth in expenditures in line with anticipated revenue growth."

With regard to the problems of the public finance system in Ontario which, of course, includes the municipalities, the Treasurer stated: "The first and foremost stage in a programme of fiscal reform must be the containment of expenditures. The only way to arrest growing tax burdens and to relieve the pressure on the province's tax system and debt-raising capacity is to arrest the growth in total public spending." And, again, the Treasurer stated: "Our decision to stay out of the public capital market in 1969-1970 is based on two considerations. The first is the need to avoid inflationary demands on the capital markets. The second and most important consideration, however, is that borrowing is not an effective substitute for the steps we must take to strengthen our fundamental fiscal position."

And finally, in direct reference to the local authorities, as I am sure you are aware, Mr. MacNaughton stated: "I would strongly urge our municipal partners to follow our example in the exercise of voluntary restraint in spending programmes, particularly in the field of education. To the extent that this does not happen, the Ontario government may be obliged to consider the introduction of machinery such as a budget review board to ensure that the taxpayer is not overly burdened and to guarantee that any further financial aid from the province to the municipalities finds its way into the hands of the taxpayer."

I am confident, and the government is confident, we will secure the co-operation of the locally-elected officials in its programme to restrict the level of all expenditures of the province and of its municipalities and school boards.

Because of a growing population, a demand for new and additional services and the increasing standard of these services, the municipalities, but particularly the school boards, have increased, greatly, their capital expenditures in recent years. For instance, the total amount of the debentures issued by the municipalities, for purposes other than schools, in 1956 was \$112 million—the amount increased to \$159 million in 1960 and to \$176 million in 1965 while the amount fell to \$172 million in 1968. On the other hand, the amount of the debentures issued by the municipalities and separate school boards for school board purposes in 1956 was \$53 million, the amount increased in 1960 to \$79 million, in 1965 to \$83 million and in 1968 it reached an amount of \$198 million.

As a matter of fact, the capital expenditures of Ontario school boards have reached such a level that the \$175 million that was allocated to the Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation for the province's fiscal year ended March 31, 1969, was not sufficient to purchase all of the debentures that were presented to the corporation for purchase. As of March 14, 1969, the corporation was holding for purchase, debentures in an amount of \$35 million for which funds had not been appropriated by the government to the corporation for the fiscal year. Because of the capital moneys available to Ontario, at that time, the government was not prepared to appropriate additional funds to the corporation.

As I am sure the members are aware, the Treasurer's Budget has allocated to the corporation, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970, an amount of \$175 million. Discussions are presently being held between officers of the Ontario Education Capital

Aid Corporation and The Department of Education to devise methods that will ensure that the funds allocated by the province to the corporation, for the current fiscal year, are made available to the school boards on the basis of their cash requirements.

Insofar as the municipalities are concerned, with the exception of one relatively small federal and three relatively small provincial programmes, they are required to rely entirely on the public money market to secure their long-term money requirements.

The municipalities are experiencing historic difficulties in the public money market. The essential characteristics of these difficulties are as follows:

(a) Money has never been as expensive in this century.

(b) Our cities are being required to pay approximately 8.75 per cent for 1- to 20-year money, while our towns and villages are being required to pay approximately 9 per cent for 1- to 20-year money.

(c) Many municipal treasurers, rather than face the difficulties of the market and borrow at these rates, are relying, temporarily, on the banking system at an interest rate from 7.5 to 7.75 per cent.

(d) Some of the more fortunate municipalities are sufficiently large to place issues in the United States dollar market—unfortunately, the hedge that has historically existed with regard to United States dollar borrowings, namely, a spread between the price of money in the United States and Canada, has almost disappeared.

(e) Debentures with a maturity from one to five years can usually be placed in the banking system; debentures with maturities from six to 20 years have been sold in Ontario in very small amounts in recent months.

(f) Historically, municipal long-term financing has been accomplished by the issuance of an installment debenture—by the use of the installment debenture municipalities have been able to raise, by way of taxation each year, an amount of money equal to the principal amount of the loan and the interest that is due on the loan within each year.

(g) A hiatus has developed! On the one hand, it is, essentially, not possible to sell installment debentures with terms in excess of five to ten years. While, on the other hand, because of the relationships between term of the debenture and rates of taxation it is not possible for most municipalities to issue installment debentures with terms as short as five to ten years and, finally:

(h) The spread between the cost of money to Ontario and to its municipalities has widened, sharply, in recent months.

As the Minister responsible for the province's municipalities, I write to you to suggest that you discuss this letter with the members of your council and, in particular, I request that you discuss the following specific recommendations with them.

(a) I would recommend to your council that it give very serious consideration to deferring, for the present, the construction on any new project that is to be financed from the proceeds of a debenture issue, unless the construction of the project, in the council's opinion, is essential.

(b) I have reviewed these money market problems with the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board and the chairman has informed me that, effective immediately, the board will require, as a condition of the approval of a capital expenditure, other than an expenditure for school board purposes,

that the debentures to be issued to finance the cost of a capital project be sold, or other financial arrangements, satisfactory to the board, be completed, before the board's final approval to proceed with the construction of a project is given.

(c) With regard to debentures to be issued to finance the cost of school board projects, The Department of Education is in the process of developing a policy with regard to the approval of projects that is related to the annual appropriations made by the government to the Ontario Education Capital Aid Corporation. As I indicated earlier, the appropriation to the corporation, for the current fiscal year, is \$175 million.

(d) With regard to projects that have received the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board under section 64 of the board's Act, arrangements to borrow money by the issue and sale of debentures to finance the cost of such projects should be completed, and the debentures sold, before the municipality lets a contract for the construction of such projects. This procedure will ensure that the council is aware of the cost of the money to be borrowed and that the money can actually be obtained at a price and under conditions that are acceptable to the council.

(e) The council should give consideration to financing the cost of capital projects, and certainly the cost of non-essential capital projects, by the prior accumulation of reserve funds. One of the principles in municipal finance that underlie the establishment and the use of a reserve fund is that the construction of a project be delayed until the funds to meet the cost of the project have been accumulated. The funds may be accumulated by the council by the annual appropriation of funds in the municipality's current estimates. These annual appropriations, with interest, accumulate each year until a sufficient sum of money is available to pay for the entire cost of the project. This method of financing does not restrict the municipality's credit and, because of the interest earned yearly on the money accumulated, the method reduces the net cost of the project to the ratepayers.

(f) To eliminate the necessity of borrowing money at today's historically high interest rates, the council might give consideration to the provision in the current estimates of a "capital levy". A "capital levy" is a sum of money that is provided in the current estimates of a municipality to meet the cost of a portion, or all, of a capital work. Obviously, the money raised in this manner need not be borrowed. Many of Ontario's municipalities have used this vehicle to control the level of their debenture debt and to reduce the cost of interest.

(g) Because of the demands on the money markets, municipalities will be under pressure to examine the feasibility of financing the cost of a capital project within shorter terms—for instance, a 10-year term rather than a 15- or 20-year term. Such a step will reduce the cost of money to the municipality and will, certainly, facilitate the sale of the municipality's debentures in today's markets. However, to the extent that the term of a debenture is shortened, the annual provision in the municipality's estimates for the repayment of principal and interest on the debentures is increased and the mill rate is increased. This device may be used to good effect in today's money market. However, the device must be used with caution.

The government has examined into the suggestion that legislation be enacted to authorize all of the municipalities, or certain of the municipalities, to

sell debentures in foreign currencies other than United States dollars or sterling. It is the government's opinion that, at the present time, it would be undesirable and not in the interests of Ontario's municipalities to accept this suggestion.

Before I conclude these remarks I wish to inform you about the immediate plans of the government with regard to the very difficult problems being experienced by the municipalities in the sale of their debentures.

The Treasurer and I have requested our advisors to examine, carefully, the changing nature of the market for fixed obligation securities in Canada and, particularly, the municipal debenture, and to prepare recommendations that will attempt to ensure that the municipalities' essential long-term money requirements are available when needed.

This examination will include, among other matters, the availability of authorizing the municipalities to issue and to sell several additional types of debentures including installment debentures that are selected by lot, subject to prior purchase and installment debentures that are payable within a period that is shorter than the authorized period during which the cost of the project must be raised by way of taxation, subject to the amount that is not raised by taxation, being refunded within the authorized period.

The examination will include, also, recommendations with regard to the desirability and the feasibility of establishing effective procedures that will permit the government to exercise an element of co-ordination over the long-term money requirements of the province, its municipalities and its school boards.

The province, in 1968, undertook two major measures to assist the municipalities financially, namely, the introduction of the residential property tax reduction programme and the transfer to the province of all of the costs for the administration of justice. These changes transferred approximately \$150 million from the tax base of the municipalities to the tax base of the province.

As Mr. MacNaughton indicated in his Budget statement, these changes do not constitute an adequate long-run solution. The government's major local government finance reform objective is to increase the province's financial support for the local governments in order to reduce the burden of the financing which falls upon the slow-growing and the oppressive property tax.

In the meantime, it will be necessary for Ontario municipalities to cope with this current money market problem. I am sure that the elected municipal officials and their advisors, will cope with this problem, as they have coped in the past with so many other problems.

The municipal officials are assured of my full cooperation with regard to the problem.

With kindest regards,

Yours very truly,

(signed)

W. DARCY McKEOUGH,

Minister.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, could the Speaker tell us please, was that a ministerial statement, or was that the Minister's budget speech?

Mr. Speaker: I think the Speaker announced that the Minister of Municipal Affairs had a statement and obviously that is what it was.

I wonder if the leader of the Opposition would allow the Prime Minister to give some answers to some questions which he has, before the leader's questions? One of them has not been asked—from the hon. member for Sarnia—and the other one was from the hon. member for Hamilton East. I wonder if the hon. member for Sarnia would place his question?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having regard for the latest incident involving The Law Enforcement Compensation Act, 1967, would the Prime Minister consider immediate amendment to such legislation as contemplated in a bill proposed by me, on Wednesday, December 4, 1968, and ruled out of order, so that situations such as Botrie and Dr. Lindzon could be compensable?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I simply say that The Law Enforcement Compensation Act is presently under review.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member for Hamilton East would place his question now.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question of the Prime Minister. In view of the need to preserve Lake Erie beaches for public use, will the Prime Minister request the Steel Company of Canada to purchase and donate for public use, Lake Erie beach lines equal to the amount now taken for industrial use?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, this is the second question of this type I have had in the last few days. I discussed this with the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), in relation to the Steel Company of Canada and Dominion Foundry and Steel, and the land that they own on Lake Erie. When one examines these properties one finds that there is really no beach there that could be classed as suitable for bathing. The shore line is very rocky and it is considered to be unacceptable from the point of view of bathing.

We considered buying some land in 1963, in the area where Stelco is, with a view to establishing a park there, and abandoned the idea because it simply is not suitable. The shore line is very rocky and very steep. But just five miles further along the beach is a provincial park where we have acquired

property and where there are proper beach facilities.

The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked about the property acquired by Dofasco and my research indicates that the shore line there is too low to be used for bathing. There are 60 to 75 foot eroding clay cliffs right behind it, and it just simply does not lend itself to this.

The beach is very, very narrow and, apparently, when the water is rough there is no beach at all. The water comes right up to the foot of the cliffs.

However, the government recently acquired some 8,000 feet of beach property just east of the Dofasco property which we will be turning into a bathing beach for the public. This will become a future provincial park, so I think that is the answer to the question. If the land were suitable, we would be quite happy to look at it—but it is not.

Perhaps I could deal with some of these other questions here, sir. The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson) asked me about a nucleus of key men who would be hired from outside the area to work on the Ontario Hydro Lower Notch project at Cobalt. I indicated that I would look into this matter and I can now offer some further information.

The hon. member asked that I issue instructions to prevent the importation of 23 workers from Quebec to work on the project and he also asked that instructions be issued that all workers other than key workers be hired locally, so long as local workers are available.

Well, the instructions Ontario Hydro gave to its contractors on this project were that priority of hiring be given to the local Canada Manpower office insofar as practicable and insofar as qualified workmen are available from that source. These instructions are presently being followed and I do not see any reason why they should be interfered with.

My investigation indicates that, at the time the question was asked, only 12 of the 113 men working on the project were from Quebec; only eight came from areas of Ontario not immediately adjacent to the Lower Notch project and, in addition, there were only eight local men listed at the local Canada Manpower office available for work, several of whom were unacceptable to the contractor.

No large numbers of workers from Quebec were brought in to work on the project, so

I think the matter is presently quite satisfactory.

The member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) asked me concerning a study on—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister would note that the member for Thunder Bay is not in his seat. If the leader of his party would wish the answer given—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, he can read it in *Hansard*. I may not be present when he is here, and it might be weeks before we got together.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sure he would prefer that it be put on the record now.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The member asked about the study of the feasibility of a steel complex for processing and manufacturing steel in northwestern Ontario. In answer to this, we are doing a great many studies in regard to a development on a very broad basis in that area and this possibility will be examined among others. I cannot guarantee that the Ontario Research Foundation will take this on as a specific project, but their services are used by the government as we do our research in the area.

Also, it has come to my attention that there has been some very intensive investigation by private industry who are interested in the possibility of locating a steel processing plant at the Lakehead, so that from all these sources the matter is being thoroughly examined.

I think that is all I have, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Nixon: I was thinking perhaps the Premier might reply to a question I put to him two or three days ago about the Westinghouse workers in the west end of Etobicoke?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They have been in to see us. They gave us a brief and I have undertaken to take the suggestions they made. An appointment is being arranged so that I can meet with the officials of the company. Their wishes in this matter have been acceded to.

Mr. Nixon: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Education, who must be very anxious to make a statement on some of the things associated with his difficulties recently.

What action will the Minister take to relieve the serious inequities in school costs

caused by the 1969 grant formula and the effect of the legislation constituting county school boards?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I had a question to the Minister similar to this a few days ago. Will I ask it at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps it might be just as well to clear the two of them at the one time, if they are similar.

Mr. Good: They are similar. A question of the Minister of Education:

Is the Minister aware that the town of New Hamburg is faced with an increase of educational costs from \$92,000 to \$209,000 in 1969, representing an increase of 158 per cent or 28 mills, as a result of implementation of county school boards?

Secondly, what action is the Minister prepared to take to rectify this unfair situation which also applies to the town of Elmira and the township of Wilmot, as well as many other rural municipalities?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough has a somewhat similar question.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): A question, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. Minister of Education:

1. What will be the nature of the probe of "soaring school taxes" as reported by the *Globe and Mail* this morning?

2. Has there been any change in the Minister's policy that there can be no increase in the total grant to individual county boards? Is the maximum of 104 to 110 per cent realistic in view of the rise of costs reported by several county school boards?

3. Would the Minister comment on the statement from a source "close to the department" that the new provincial grant structure was the result of drastic cutbacks ordered by the Treasury Department? What was the degree of cutback from the support envisioned by the Minister when Bill 44 was introduced in the Ontario Legislature?

4. Is a 300-per-cent rise in education taxes the highest reported to the Minister of Education by any municipality? How many municipalities have reported a rise of over 100 per cent?

5. Can the Minister defend a policy of promising in 1968 an 85-per-cent grant in support of capital expenditures, with the policy in 1969 of limiting the increase in school-board budgets caused by new debenture issues to ten per cent?

6. Will school boards be given an opportunity to appear before the standing committee on education in view of the role this committee played in amending Bill 44?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I will try and deal with all three questions at once, some of them arising from the story in the paper this morning.

At the outset, there is no probe with respect to soaring school taxes. For the past week or ten days we have been requesting from the boards, information relative to the application of the new grant programme within their own areas.

I should point out that, to date, we have had a limited number of boards bringing forward material because they have not finalized their own budget processes, they have not determined the mill rate.

I would suggest that from the limited sampling we have had to date, there does not necessarily appear to be any common pattern. But there are some problems, of course, that we did anticipate which are emerging with respect to the application of the new grant programme.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister did anticipate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, we did anticipate there would be some problems.

Mr. Nixon: I hope the Minister anticipated some answers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I should point out, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the member for Peterborough on whether 104 to 110 per cent is realistic in view of the rise in costs within the school system generally, that the Provincial Treasurer made this abundantly clear in his Budget.

It was very necessary for the boards, for every public agency, to do a very special task this year in reviewing their costs. And, of course, whether the 104 or 110 per cent is realistic, depends really on the position taken by the individual boards themselves.

I should also point out with respect to the grants in 1968, which the hon. member for Peterborough refers to as that of the 85 per cent. This grant, I believe was only 75 per cent—and it came to an end two days ago, or at least the applications had to be in. This applied to the technical-vocational programme—this 75 per cent did not apply to any other area of capital grants.

This, of course, is taken into account with respect to the amount per student that is suggested in the new grant formula. Whether

or not the debenture payment that will be coming forward in 1969 related to this expenditure in 1968 is in itself adequate—well, we are prepared to examine as we get some feedback from the boards concerned.

With respect to the question of the member for Waterloo North: I indicated to him a day or so ago on the phone, the Waterloo board was one of those boards which wished to come in and discuss their situation with us, as we have with two or three others, including the Wellington county board just a few minutes ago. We would then be in a better position, after getting further information, to make whatever determinations have to be made at that time.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a supplementary question. He has commented on the general situation, but my question was: What action would he take to relieve the situation?

The Minister has indicated he feels it is just occurring in some selected areas, but where it is occurring, it is a very serious matter indeed. Has he any action which might relieve the situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I think I have indicated, we are in the process of giving them what we hope will be fairly complete information in the next few days, and at that point we can make determination or a delineation of the problem and see what solutions, if necessary, will be found.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Minister would agree that he and the Treasurer and the Minister of Municipal Affairs have succeeded in shifting the fiscal nightmare from the province to the school boards and municipalities?

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask the Minister a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker—whether he has re-thought his policy that there can be absolutely no rise in the total grant to any particular county. It would seem to me that otherwise the problem is simply a matter of shifting expense from one municipality to another within the county.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that one cannot oversimplify the complexity of the situation by saying, we can do this or we can do that. I think it is far more appropriate to make some determinations after we have adequate information from a large number of boards.

Mr. Pitman: All right. Just another supplementary—a very simple, short one, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the Minister is aware of the fact that certain counties have passed resolutions demanding municipalities not collect taxes for educational purposes over a certain percentage. First, it is possible for a municipality to refuse to co-operate or to activate this taxation machinery in order to collect these taxes under these circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be expressing a personal point of view that really should be expressed by perhaps either the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. But my own guess is that they cannot.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. leader a further question?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister left over from a few days ago. Has the Minister announced a decision on the establishment of a transfer review board as requested by the Ontario Teachers Federation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the Minister has not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pitman: I think I have the same—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) if the hon. member wishes to ask a question related to the transfer review board, may I just repeat once again what I have said on several occasions. There will be an opportunity, either here or at the education committee, for the member for Peterborough, the member for Sudbury East and perhaps the leader of the Opposition to express their points of view on that particular subject.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park has the floor.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General, in six parts. Is Mr. Dennis Latten, executive director of the Ontario Police Association, correct in his charges—as reported yesterday in the *Oakville Journal-Record*—that the government is about to make changes to The Police Act which will radically decrease the security of individual officers?

Is the Minister aware that certain police departments already have copies of the proposed changes and that at least one officer has been informed that he is to be dismissed under the new laws?

Why was the Legislature not informed of these proposed changes before copies were supplied to individual police departments?

Is the Minister aware of the acute unrest that has been produced among police officers throughout the province?

Is the Minister aware that the Ontario Police Association intends to call a mass rally of police departments throughout the province within two weeks to protest the proposed changes in The Police Act?

Has the Minister read Mr. Latten's charges in which he states that:

Attorney General Wishart claimed the Ontario Police Commission had discussed the changes with the police association, but we never heard about the changes until they were made.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, as a preliminary to answering the question, that the hon. member is confusing references to The Police Act, with regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I have not heard from Mr. Latten with respect to his views on any proposed amendments to The Police Act and I will not attempt to anticipate what his views may be. I am sure he will bring them to my attention when the amendments are brought before this House in the proper and usual manner.

I would like to say that there have been no changes in The Police Act. Of course, since the last session. There will probably be legislation introduced later this session.

However, I have had correspondence over the past few days respecting the regulations, which have been made under The Police Act, and which became effective on March 24, when they were filed in the office of the Registrar of Regulations.

I am aware that certain police departments have copies of the regulations and indeed, these departments received the copies at approximately the same time as the copy was provided to Mr. Latten. When he asked for a copy, it was made available to him immediately a copy could be made available. This took place, I am advised, toward the end of last week. I am aware of the other factors to which the hon. member for High Park has referred, Mr. Speaker.

I would point out however, that it is not the practice that regulations be published in the House. The regulations are dealt with under The Regulations Act where provision is made for the filing and publication of the

regulations. All of these provisions are being complied with and the regulations will be published in the *Ontario Gazette* on April 5.

Mr. Speaker, I have as grave a concern as the police association for matters relating to the welfare and conduct of the police service in this province. It is a source of regret to me personally, that this present misunderstanding has arisen. The regulations have been in the course of review and preparation by the Ontario Police Commission since 1965. I was under the impression that this review had included the views of the association and I am advised that the association was given the draft regulation in December 1965. It expressed its disagreement with the draft. In January 1966, at another meeting, it again rejected any proposed changes preferring the existing regulations.

However, Mr. Speaker, it will not serve the purpose of law enforcement to engage in public recrimination about what may or may not have taken place. The important thing is to bring the parties together and resolve any differences that may be capable of resolution. And this, I intend to do.

On April 1, I sent a wire to the association inviting it to meet with me to discuss their submissions. I have received a reply but the suggestion of a meeting may have been overlooked. I am today, writing to the association repeating my suggestion that we meet. I am sure that the president will recognize our mutual interests and that a meeting will be arranged in the near future.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will receive and consider any submissions and comments fairly made and that I will undertake any amendments that may then appear to me, to be necessary and equitable in the interest of both the public and the police forces of this province.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: In view of his comments, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the unhappiness among the police officers, would he be willing to withhold the implementation of the regulations until such time as he has had an opportunity to consider the submissions of the police association?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that would be proper even if I could undertake it. The regulations have been passed. I think, although the hon. mem-

ber suggests that one member of a police force is being dealt with under the regulations, I do not think I can undertake to suspend their operation—the regulations having been passed. I would hope that the meeting I have suggested will be held before the middle of this month, and since the regulations can be quickly changed, I am quite prepared to make amendments if I see there necessity and reasonableness. I think that the operation of the regulations in that short time would not do any great harm.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister inform me, if they have officers dismissed and we subsequently change the regulations, will he endeavour to have them replaced on the forces?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not make any such undertaking either. I think the hon. member realizes that for me to do that would be out of order. The regulations may or may not be, as we examine them, so bad in their effect as perhaps they have been represented to him. What he is referring to are the disciplinary provisions. I am quite sure that, when the matter which is presently under consideration is dealt with, there may be general satisfaction. I think there will be a fair and proper disposition of the matter.

I could not undertake to suspend the regulations which were passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I am quite prepared to undertake, and I think I am prepared to admit, as I understand the matter now, that perhaps there was not sufficient discussion with the members of the Ontario Police Association, but I am quite prepared to consider their representations and if it is shown to be proper, reasonable, and in my view right to make changes, I shall do so at the first opportunity.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Correctional Services. Was Stephen F. transferred from Sudbury Jail to Millbrook after his acquittal, rather than being returned to Burwash because he had communicated the details of the Burwash homosexual case to two members of this House?

If there is any other reason for Mr. F's transfer, will the Minister give it to the House?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can possibly do anything else but express my resentment at the implications contained

in this question, that is, that members of my staff would transfer an inmate for the reason suggested by the hon. member. The answer is emphatically no, and as far as the answer to the second part of the question is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I gave that answer yesterday.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not give that answer yesterday. He refused to answer it, which is why I asked it again today.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

An hon. member: He did not answer today.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I had a question of the Minister of Health who has departed this place. It was an important question and there is a recess. Can I put it on the record, or does one have to wait now for two weeks to get some indication to—

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest to the hon. member that we do not deal with that until the end of the question period. In the meantime some of the other Ministers might not be here who are now here, and we have many questions of Ministers who are not here now that we will have to determine as to—

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Health is on the run.

Mr. Speaker: I will be glad to deal with that problem as well as the other questions which I have of that Minister, and other Ministers who are not in the House, when we get done with the ones who are here now.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I have to slip out for a moment so—

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member for Riverdale will—I will hear him on it. The hon. member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I have two questions, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Education:

How many resignations or firings have there been from the administrative staff of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute in the past two years, and what are the reasons given?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, my information from Ryerson Polytechnical Institute would indicate that during the past two years

and out of roughly 28 administrative positions, including the president, the vice-president, deans, and so on, have been resigned. One resigned to resume purely academic work; two resigned to accept promotions elsewhere and one was asked to resign because of reorganization within the administrative structure.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, my second question is: In the recent past and possibly at present, has there been, or is there now, a representative of the Minister's department on the island of Anguilla? If so, is he there as an official ambassador of Ontario, as a member of the occupying forces, or in some other capacity; and if the latter what is he doing there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in these questions there is always the odd light moment. I can only tell the hon. member that on March 10, two officials from the department accompanied a shipment of school desks and other supplies in "Operation School Supplies". These were ferried down by The Department of National Defence. They went to Jamaica, the Cayman Islands and British Honduras.

There has never been any departmental staff member whom one could construe as being in the position of an ambassador for this province, although I like to think that the departmental staff people always act in this capacity when they are outside Ontario; nor do we know whether or not one of them, or both of them, at any point had visited Anguilla. I cannot really be any more helpful to the hon. member on this particular major issue at this moment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Education?

Will the Minister indicate whether he intends to revise The Public Libraries Act during the present session?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Peterborough will be fully aware, certainly after today's discussions, there will be advance notice on the order paper of any amendments to Acts, and when I am in a position to inform members I shall do so.

Mr. Pitman: A second question.

Did The Department of Education receive a brief suggesting the establishment of summer courses on Indian teacher education,

to begin in the summer of 1969? Is the department willing to carry through with the plan to initiate such a programme? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did receive such a brief to establish summer courses for Indian education. This submission has been and still is under consideration by the department. It is relatively complicated; it involves our relationships with the Indian affairs branch of The Department of Indian Affairs and the relationship with the boards that they have with the department. We think there is real merit in this, but whether or not we will be in a position this summer, quite frankly, is doubtful. But we are proceeding hopefully for the summer of 1970.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask a supplementary question?

Has the federal Department of Indian Affairs indicated any interest in supporting such a programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would not say that their interest extends to support *per se*. There have been some discussions.

Mr. Pitman: My next question is: In view of the recommendations of the committee on conflict of interest, will the Minister encourage suitable amendments to existing legislation which will allow teachers in Metro Toronto area the opportunity to serve on boards of education other than the one by which they are employed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the report is under full consideration by the department and when some determination is made I shall be pleased to inform the House.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question here which was handed to me by the member for Sudbury East who has been ill. I wonder if it would be worthwhile to have this—

Mr. Speaker: It will be quite in order for the hon. member to ask it if he has asked to do so.

Mr. Pitman: Fine, thank you.

Has the teachers' superannuation commission approached the Minister to have the existing policy changed whereby only one pension can be drawn by the remaining member of a husband and wife teacher team? If so, will the Minister comply with the request?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am just going by memory now, I did not bring the

answer to the question with me, but I do not believe the teachers' superannuation commission did make any approach. I believe that that particular request formed part of several requests from the Ontario Teachers' Federation.

Mr. Pitman: Could the Minister indicate whether he has come to grips with the problem yet?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no determination of this yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent was on his feet a moment ago?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Will the Minister explain the details of the farm products marketing board issuing a tomato packing licence to Essex county canners for the year 1968, and tell us if the company posted a bond to certify their ability to meet their commitments to its producers?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, the farm products marketing board received an application from Essex county canners for a licence as a processor in 1968. The farm products marketing board arranged for an examination of the financial status of the new owners of the company by a firm of chartered accountants. On the basis of this examination, the farm products marketing board concluded the new owners of the company appeared to possess adequate funds to meet the commitments of an applicant company. And therefore on September 3, 1968, it issued a licence to process.

No bond was posted because the regulations do not require the posting of a bond. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that before the application was ever made to the farm products marketing board for such a licence to process, contracts had been signed between the applicant company and the farmers involved, and most of the tomato plants were in the ground; in fact I think they all were, because the licence application was not made until quite late in May. So it was a case of which comes first, the chicken or the egg; and unfortunately the tomatoes were planted before the licence was even asked for.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary. Is it correct that a liquor

permit for a wedding banquet costs \$5 and a liquor permit for a bar mitzvah costs \$10? If so, what is the reason for the difference in cost?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, there are four types of special-occasion permits, two in the no-sale category, and two in the sale category.

The \$5 no-sale permit covers wedding receptions and wedding receptions only. The \$10 no-sale permit covers all other no-sale situations — confirmations, christenings, bar mitzvahs, anniversary parties, graduations. I think it is important to realize that the only exception in the no-sale is for the wedding reception which is that way.

There are \$15 sale permits and \$10 sale permits for reasons which were, I think, explained when the liquor licence board was before the committee on government commissions.

Mr. Deans: Is the Minister able to tell me why there is such a difference made between the different celebrations where no sale takes place?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There is only one exception in the no-sale and that is the wedding reception. I suppose it has just been the policy of the liquor licence board to make it a wedding present for all the married couples in Ontario, to make that one exception.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Owing to the low price of Lake Erie perch and the uncertainty of future prices for perch, will the Minister of Lands and Forests respond favourably to a request by the Lake Erie commercial fishermen that they be included under the federal inland fish marketing board?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Kent, as he knows, I introduced today The Fresh Water Fish Marketing Act and this Act provides authority to the fresh water fish marketing corporation which is in the process of being established. On Monday last I attended a meeting in Winnipeg with the hon. Jean-Luc Pepin and a number of other federal and provincial representatives. We had a very interesting meeting. The plan is designed in a manner which will allow it to be enlarged throughout the whole province. But in the initial stages it is proposed to have northwestern

Ontario included. As time goes on, when others have assessed the advantages and disadvantages they may be included in this plan. Once the plan is established and operating, consideration may be given in consultation with federal authorities, to include other parts of Ontario.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a supplementary question? I take it the Lake Erie commercial fishermen do not come under the new bill that you introduced today.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, that is correct; they are not at the present time. But as I just mentioned, if they feel there would be advantages in being included they may be included on making application.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has a question from yesterday of the Minister of Education.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Education. How many junior kindergartens are there in Ontario and is there a constant expansion in this area?

How many principals in our public schools, and in our high schools, are women, and out of how many?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we do not collect specific information on the number of junior kindergarten classes. To be helpful to the hon. member we have some figures relating to enrolment: In 1966, 1967 and 1968 the enrolments were successively 3,284, 3,226, 5,020.

With respect to the question of the numbers of principals: in the public school system, 3,136; in the secondary school system, 553. Of course, I am quite sure the hon. member would agree with this philosophy; we have not segregated the sexes in the gathering of this statistical material; we treat all our principals the same. In other words, I do not know how many are female.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, do we have women principals in both the public schools and high schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, indeed we do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South has two questions.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Mines.

Can the Minister inform the House if there was any substance to the rumours that International Nickel has discovered sizeable ore bodies as a result of their explorations in Langmuir township, southeast of Timmins?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. member is not aware that there are laws in this jurisdiction relating to the public disclosure of information that would affect the stock market price of certain stocks. So I may say to him that, even if I had the answer to his question, I would deem it a most improper question and I would not answer it.

Mr. Ferrier: I have another question, Mr. Speaker, equally interesting.

Mr. Lewis: I guess that means they knew about it.

Mr. Ferrier: In view of the fact that a majority of the people meeting with the Minister of Mines to discuss the Texas Gulf smelter location are American, representing wholly owned American interests, would not the Minister feel it appropriate to assert more fully the Canadian presence by inviting to the next meeting the chief economist of Ontario, the mayor of the town of Timmins, and Professor Melville Watkins, of the Watkins report on foreign ownership in Canada?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, may I say that certainly in consultations in relation to this matter I have consulted the provincial economists, I have been in verbal communication with the mayor of Timmins, and six months ago I wrote to Professor Watkins about the overall general problem and I received no reply from him.

Mr. Ferrier: Would you ask him to the next meeting?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I do not think I would.

An hon. member: How about the member for Cochrane South?

Mr. Speaker: May I draw to the attention of the members that I have some 20 questions placed by various members of Ministers who are not now in the House. It has been suggested by the member for York South that perhaps these might be asked by those members who are still here and placed on the record for answer after the Easter vacation.

Normally I would not allow, nor would the House wish to allow, that they be given unless the Minister were in. I would like

to have from the House leader his views as to whether these should be dealt with this way or whether they should be held, as in the normal course, until after the Easter recess, when perhaps some of them would not be of as much value.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the questions being placed on the record now, if the members want to place them there.

Mr. Nixon: I would certainly welcome the chance to put some of these on the record. When the vote was called earlier in the afternoon, sir, most of them, actually, were present. It is a shame that they are not here to finish up the business on the last day.

An hon. member: Ring the bell.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Let us proceed to put them on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Then I would be delighted if—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I could move the adjournment of the House, and have them all back.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, unless he is going to make a motion of adjournment, is out of order. Perhaps he would let us get on with getting these matters into *Hansard*. The hon. member for Riverdale, then, I believe has one or two for the member for York South.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do have them. Before placing them I would comment that it seems strange to me that the Ministers can be in the House for their own nefarious purposes, but they cannot be here for—

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. member is in order in commenting. The hon. member has the floor to place certain questions on behalf of the hon. member for York South. This is not a debate, this is a question period.

Mr. J. Renwick: On behalf of the hon. member for York South, I would ask this question of the Minister of Health, who was here earlier but has since fled. Has the Minister approached Physicians' Services' Incorporated requesting that this body become an agent or carrier within a proposed Medicare plan for the province of Ontario?

Did the government present a proposed agreement to PSI? What was PSI's reaction? Sort of a futile operation.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to place a question which he has? The hon. member for Cochrane South has the floor.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question that I had for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). A two-part question.

(1) Has the Ontario Northland Railway made a study to determine the significance to the railway if the Texas Gulf smelter is built in Porcupine?

(2) If so, will it make any appreciable difference to the financial position of the Ontario Northland Railway if the Texas Gulf smelter for zinc is built in the Porcupine area, rather than elsewhere?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): I have a question of the Minister of Health that I would like to ask on behalf of the member for Dovercourt (Mr. De Monte). How many microbiologists are on the payroll of The Department of Health? What are their duties and where in Ontario are they employed?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent:

Mr. Ruston: I have a question for the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme); it is in three parts:

(1) How many miles of provincial highways in the counties of Essex and Kent are being turned over to the municipalities as of July 1, 1969?

(2) Did the Minister say at a meeting held at Chatham three years ago that all such roads would be built to a first-class standard, prior to any negotiations to have them turned over to local municipalities?

(3) How can the Minister, in fairness to the counties and municipalities concerned, turn provincial highways over to these local areas without first seeing that they are built to the specifications of the department's own rules and regulations?

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have one for the Minister of Highways.

(1) Would the Minister advise how many miles of provincial highways have been handed back to the counties and districts in Ontario?

(2) How many miles have been taken over by the department of Highways?

(3) Are the grants being increased to compensate for the maintenance of the roads the counties take over?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Under protest, Mr. Speaker, I think we should send the Sergeant-at-Arms with his sword and bring them in.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is on his feet for the purpose of placing a question.

Mr. Ben: To the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

In the light of all the new medical evidence which has accumulated in the interim, does the Minister still believe that we are dealing only with the effects of inorganic fluorides in the Port Maitland area?

On what medical evidence does he base his own opinion, given on page 2859 of *Hansard* that there is no significant risk of acute fluorosis or health hazard from organic fluorides in the Port Maitland area?

Does the word "significant" imply little risk to any given individual, or is it merely referring to statistical significance?

And I have a further question, Mr. Speaker; 1109: (1) Will the numerous factual errors we have found in the Hall report remain uncorrected in the public record for all time, merely because the committee has now disbanded?

(2) Will all questions arising from the report go unanswered by the Minister, merely because the committee has now disbanded?

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to place questions in the absence of the Minister? The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have eight questions of the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall)—three regarding units of empty housing, and five others. I have also four questions of the Minister of Health regarding Brockville psychiatric hospital. I decline, Mr. Speaker, to present them at this time.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, sir. I decline to present my supplementary to the Minister of Health, in answer to the question that he has not yet received, nor answered.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: On behalf of the Minister of Health, I decline to answer the member's supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: I might say, Mr. Speaker, in the interests—as I know you have, sir—of literary parallels, you might ask the Minister

of Health whether his feelings were not those akin to—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member is quite out of order.

Mr. Lewis: I was appealing—

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I realize that, but we have had sufficient amount of the time of the House taken up with matters which are not of too much consequence, in view of the important business which is before the House.

Before we go to the next order of the day, I would like to say to the House that yesterday there was a considerable disturbance to my right as Mr. Speaker was leaving the House. I unfortunately took it for granted that it was members of the staff of the Minister whose estimates are under discussion and probably spoke more harshly to him than did the Opposition members.

I have since found out that they were not on his staff and I apologize to him and his staff for this misapprehension on my part. I have always found them to be most helpful public servants and not inclined to impede Mr. Speaker's coming and going.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): These words are very gracious of you, sir.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, if I might record the question outlined to you—it is to the Minister of Trade and Development:

How many contracts has Ontario Housing Corporation entered into with Headway Construction Limited.

How many contracts were, as a result of tenders by such company, more than the lowest tender received with respect to the project for which such contract was entered into?

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to have a question recorded?

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the Chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES (Continued)

On vote 2001:

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, during the discussions we

examined the functions of the review board for welfare recipients who are refused welfare or receive inadequate assistance. Besides the matter of considering whether the people on welfare have been denied or are receiving inadequate assistance, there is another serious matter which should be considered by the board. This deals with the type of treatment that welfare seekers or recipients get at the hands of various welfare administrators and inspectors.

Earlier in the session, Mr. Chairman, I made some charges in the House regarding the conduct—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): On a point of order, I wonder if this is in order at this point. It seems to me that the legislation spells out the functions of the board of review and I think if the hon. member has some comments to make in regard to this matter they could be made on another occasion and not at this particular point.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the board of review and these matters that I intend to raise here deal with the inadequate treatment that welfare recipients have to undergo and the lack of recourse available to them.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! If I may speak to the point of order made by the hon. Minister. There is an amount of money in the estimates for this particular purpose, and in discussion of the board of review, I think it may be permissible to refer to the legislation. I must confess I was not able to follow the member too closely to begin with—

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Because the Minister interrupted before he could explain.

Mr. Chairman: I do believe that it is not out of order to refer to the legislation that set up this board. Perhaps the hon. member would continue and if I feel he is drifting out of order, I will call him to order.

Mr. Makarchuk: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will just give a brief history leading to the events. I am going to introduce some evidence here of the type of abuse that various people, who are trying to get assistance in Ontario, receive. These are the cases I feel should be brought to the attention of the board of review.

However, in this particular case, earlier in the session I made some charges regarding the operation of the welfare office and the

welfare administrator in Brantford. The ensuing controversy generated a great deal of local interest. This resulted in a well-attended public meeting with over 300 persons present and this I would like to bring to the Minister's attention—

The degree of interest that exists in various municipalities regarding the operation of welfare.

Here it was a February morning, the temperature was about 20 degrees, the meeting was held outside, there were no invitations—it was just announced that there was going to be a meeting, and over 300 people turned up, most of them either welfare recipients or people who have been abused.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I again suggest that if the hon. member wishes to talk on this matter, it should be at a different point in the estimates. I bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that section 11a of The Family Benefits Act says:

Any applicant or recipient may, by notice in writing served upon the chairman of the board of review, request a hearing and a review by the board of a decision, order or directive of the director affecting the applicant or recipient, as the case may be.

And I make the point, Mr. Chairman, that this type of discussion could properly come, if you so decided, under the next vote, vote 2002, municipal allowances and assistance.

Mr. Chairman: Well, on that basis, there is nothing in vote 2001 having to do with municipal allowances and assistance. It does come under vote 2002. In that respect, perhaps, the hon. Minister's point of order is valid, that the discussion pertaining to this particular aspect of the estimates could properly be discussed under vote 2002.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is what I am talking about. What I am trying to introduce deals with the board of review and deals with the abuse that recipients get at the hands of welfare administrators and the fact that they have no recourse or compensation of any type. This is what I want to bring up and I intend to bring up the evidence in this particular discussion—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member is, in other words, using as an example the situation that exists in the municipalities so that he can relate it to the needs of the board of review?

Mr. Makarchuk: This is exactly—the broadening of—

Mr. Chairman: In my opinion, the hon. member is quite in order.

Mr. Makarchuk: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Anyway, at this particular meeting, I called for a full enquiry into the operation of the welfare department. At the meeting, there was a tacit agreement by the Brantford city council to accept my request for a full inquiry. I went away, and so did a lot of other people—it was one of the best attended meetings, in fact it was probably the best-attended municipal meeting ever held in Brantford—and we went away with the impression that the council was sincere in its desires to get to the bottom of the matter.

The council asked me to submit a set of terms of reference for the inquiry and this was done. Briefly, my terms called for a full inquiry by a committee of social workers who would examine all evidence supplied by me, various city social agencies, and other interested individuals and members of the welfare department. The committee would report back to council and hopefully that council would implement some of the recommendations.

As events proved later, my impression of the sincerity of the council was wrong. With absolutely no prior consultation, despite the fact that charges were made by me, the council proceeded to set its own terms of reference. These were, and I am quoting from a resolution passed by council:

That his honour Judge W. W. Leech, judge of the county of Haldimand, be requested to review administration of the city of Brantford welfare department from January 1, 1967, pursuant to The Municipal Act, Revised Statutes of Ontario 1967, chapter 249, section 241 as amended; and that the terms of reference be as follows:

1. Whether or not welfare payments in the city of Brantford have been made in accordance with the provincial statutes and regulations.

2. Whether or not the welfare department employees of the corporation, in the course of carrying out their duties, have insulted citizens of the city, publicly or privately, so as to constitute misconduct within the meaning of the said section 241.

At first glance, Mr. Chairman, the terms appear reasonable. But upon being examined by my legal friends, the terms were nothing but a blatant devious attempt by council to hamstring the inquiry.

Instead of setting the terms which would permit a full scope inquiry which would shed light on the operation of the welfare department, the council, in a legalistic way, set the terms so that the evidence regarding insults on ethical behaviour and other matters would be excluded from being considered by the judge.

Instead of examining fully and impartially the operations of the department, council would be in a position to obscure, hide and sweep the whole thing under the rug.

On Monday night, my solicitor approached the city council with new terms of reference which would have permitted the judge to carry out a broad inquiry. With the exception—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. It does seem to me that the hon. member is straying from the matter relating the situation to the need for the board of review. He is reviewing the matter of an inquiry into the welfare situation and particular municipality. It seems to me he is straying from the import of the item in the vote.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, if I could interrupt. It seems to me in order for the Opposition to be able to question this Minister and his department I think the Chairman should give the Opposition the widest of latitude. In this case the speaker is merely reciting the facts that are preceding the cases he wishes to bring to the attention of the House. I see nothing wrong with that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, speaking on a point of order, I think your ruling is quite right. The hon. member is using a devious attempt to bring in a speech which can quite properly be made at another time. First of all, I bring to your attention that the matter is under judicial review at the present time.

The inquiry which is being held is under The Municipal Act, which is outside the jurisdiction of this department. I suggest to you that there is nothing within this estimate 2001, upon which the hon. member has the right to speak on that subject at this time.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, if you will hear me out, this deals with the administration of welfare which comes out of the Minister's department and what I am doing now is—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now I would like to know—

Mr. Makarchuk: I listened to you; now you listen to me! Okay?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, what in the world has the judicial inquiry got to do with terms—

Mr. Chairman: I have not made any ruling. The hon. member will please be seated.

The hon. Minister has risen on a point of order now. I do not think there is any attempt on the part of the Chairman or the Minister to eliminate this sort of discussion but we want to keep it in the proper order. It is a municipal matter, a matter of the handling of welfare within a municipality, which does come under vote 2002. This is the general vote and we have the programmes listed on page 151 of the estimates; and I fail to see yet, whether the hon. member is relating the matter of administration to the matter of the need for board of review. He is enumerating the situation in total within a municipality whereas a board of review, as I get it, is for a different purpose.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to get across here is the fact that these situations would not have developed if a board of review, with broad enough terms, was available. I am just trying to give a brief history of how the situation developed and then I am introducing the evidence as to why a board of review, with broad terms, that could investigate insults to, and abuse of welfare recipients, is necessary.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member said he is giving a brief review but perhaps he could keep it quite brief, as a matter of reference. If he keeps it brief in the reference to the situation in Brantford, perhaps he could properly relate it to the need for a board of review. But a complete rehash of the situation in Brantford, I do not think is essential at this particular point. If in fact, it has to do with the municipal jurisdiction, it could come under vote 2002, item 5. So if he can relate it briefly to the need for a board of review he is in order.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, I will try to cut out the large details. Anyway, the term councillor refused their request and said that certain types of evidence regarding welfare would not be introduced or could not be introduced. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have here about a dozen or so affidavits, sworn to me by people who went to receive welfare assistance, and I am going to read the kind of abuse that goes on in council. I will not mention these peoples' names but if the

Minister wishes to see the affidavits and examine them, these will be available to him.

This is the first one:

Early in February 1965, I went to see Mr. Fred Nightingale, Brantford welfare administrator, at the advice of Brantford Children's Aid Society. First he took my name and address and insisted that I had money. He kept insisting, "You know you have money," in an extremely insulting manner. I explained the situation, pointing out to him that I was not living at home; I had a child. He immediately asked me, "How long were you living with this man?" I replied, "I was not, I was going to school at this time; I was 18 years old." Mr. Nightingale replied, "I suppose you went to a motel." This time I was extremely embarrassed. Then he leaned back in his chair and said, "Why should I, as a citizen of Brantford, support you and your child?" I tried to explain to him that I wanted some help until I could be physically fit to get a job. He replied, "Why do you not get some guy to live with. Next year you will come back with another illegitimate child for the city to support." I walked out on the verge of tears. I was told to call back but I did not. I went and got a job, two and a half weeks after giving birth to a child.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Must be nice to run a department where that happens. It must satisfy you.

Mr. Makarchuk: Here is a family—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not understand that interjection. It is very unbecoming. I do not run a department—

Mr. Lewis: Unbecoming? If you had a board of review, it would not be required.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It has nothing to do with a board of review at all.

Mr. Lewis: Everything to do with a board of review.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is going to read affidavits now, I suggest to you he is abusing the rules of this House. That comes under vote 2002.

Mr. Makarchuk: Another one—this is a gentleman who says:

I was laid off in the fall of 1967 and in the spring of 1968, I was running out of money to pay rent. I went to see Mr. Fred Nightingale at the city hall welfare office. When I asked him if I could borrow some

rent money he replied in a sneering voice, that was heard by other people in the office and others in the waiting area, "You people from the old country think you can come over here and have things easy. There is no way I will give you the money." I left and went home.

This is followed by this man's wife. She went back to see him and she provided an affidavit. Here is what she says:

I was informed by my husband of Mr. Nightingale's attitude and manner, when he returned home in the spring of 1968 from a visit to the welfare office. I immediately placed a call to Mr. Nightingale. Upon giving my name, I was informed he was unavailable. I made a minimum of five calls within two days. I then contacted Mr. Dorian of the children's aid society. He told me to go right to the welfare department. Upon my arrival there, I was informed by Mr. Nightingale that Mr. Nightingale was still unavailable. I stated I would stay until he was available. After a period of 30 minutes or so, Mr. Dorian telephoned me at the welfare department and asked me to come to the children's aid society to meet his immediate superior, Mr. Sands. He stated, "The children's aid society will guarantee the rent money"—that was needed as we were going to be evicted—"but you will still have to see Mr. Nightingale." He personally would make an appointment with Mr. Nightingale. Mr. Sands made an appointment. Both Mr. Sands and Mr. Dorian went with me to the welfare department. Mr. Nightingale kept us waiting for three-quarters of an hour. Mr. Sands negotiated on my behalf. Mr. Nightingale was not prepared to listen until they reminded him that it was his job to listen. During the conversation he stayed well away from the counter and shouted. I told him that, if necessary, I intended to sit on the sidewalk with my furniture and explain to the public why I was there. We have three children, ages 6, 4 and 1½ years old. It was only then that I got the rent money.

This is another one by a woman:

Last winter, 1968, I phoned Mr. Nightingale. My little girl was ill with a temperature of 104. I phoned to see if Mr. Nightingale could send me a cheque by mail. I explained the situation to him. He said: "It is too bad." There was nothing to eat in the house, no medicine, nothing. So I got my little girl dressed and took her with me to the welfare office. I told Mr. Nightingale that if anything happened to

my girl there would be trouble. I got my cheque. I took my little girl home and took her temperature. By then it was up to 105. I phoned the doctor. He told me to take her to the hospital where she was put in an oxygen tent.

Here is another woman:

In October 1968 I heard Mr. Nightingale of the welfare department say to Miss Pat Marlet in his office, "Well Pat are you not making out very well on your back these days?" In January 1968 I drove a friend's car to the welfare office. There, Mr. Nightingale said, "Do you own a car?" I said, "Yes." He said, "If you have a car like that, why are you drawing assistance?" I said, "My car is worth only \$10." He said, "I do not mean that, I mean the T-bird; whose car is it?" I said, "A friend's." He said, "Who is your friend?" I said, "Why, am I not allowed to have a friend?" Then he said I would not get my cheque until I told him the name of my friend. I told him the name of my friend and he said, "If he lets you drive his car around there must be more to it than that." I said, "You must be a very evil-minded man." He then put the cheque back in the drawer and I had to get the assistance of an alderman to get it.

Mr. Lewis: Some department you run, some department.

Mr. Makarchuk: This is another woman:

On or about August 9, 1966, I was separated from my husband. I had two children and was living with my parents. In July, 1966, I notified the Brantford city welfare department that I was seeking an apartment. They said it was all right. I found an apartment on Chatham Street and went to the city welfare office on Nelson Street. At the welfare office, I spoke to Mr. Nightingale, the city welfare administrator, telling him that I had found a three-room apartment renting for \$75 a month with utilities paid. Mr. Nightingale said that the man was just in the office who had a three-room apartment and I was to go up and see it first. Then he gave me a slip of paper with the address on it.

Incidentally, the woman kept this particular slip of paper.

As I got up to leave from his office, I got to the front door and Mr. Nightingale stood in his office door. Mr. Nightingale then said, "There are some conditions with the apartment; you will have to share the

bathroom and the kitchen with the gentleman who lives there." I replied, "What?" He repeated what he had said earlier, and added, "If you talk to him real nice, you might get it cheaper". He went back into the office, I went home. I didn't go to the apartment, I told my dad. He said to call the mayor. My sister phoned the mayor's secretary and related to her what happened. The secretary called me back and said that Mr. Nightingale told her that he did not know the circumstances of the apartment.

This is another housewife:

In the month of February, 1968, I moved to Brantford from Harley after separating from my common-law husband.

I am leaving the husband's name out in the affidavit here.

That same month I went to the welfare office to get assistance for myself and my three children. Mr. Nightingale, Brantford's welfare administrator, said to me: "I have no intention of helping you because you will be back with him in two weeks.

I stated that I would not go back to Mr. Norris no matter what. Mr. Nightingale said: "That is up to you", and refused to help. Next day I contacted a woman at the children's aid society who informed Mr. Sands, also of the children's aid society, of my problem. He then called back to Mr. Nightingale.

I was then asked to go and see Mr. Nightingale again. When I saw him, Mr. Nightingale said, "You have no business going over my head". I asked him how else I was to get help and he then gave me assistance, but only enough to pay the rent on the apartment. He said that any other money must come from my former common-law husband.

One week later I was still without money to buy food for my three children, so I went back to the welfare office and told Mr. Nightingale that the former common-law husband refused to pay anything for the upkeep of the children.

Mr. Nightingale said, "You can't expect the city taxpayers to keep you and everyone who comes to the office." I said: "I don't like the idea of being here, but my children have to eat or I will have to put them out with the children's aid society." Mr. Nightingale said: "I can't help that. You have to get the money in the best way you know how." It wasn't until I had contacted the woman at the children's aid

society that Mr. Nightingale gave me assistance the following day, so I now have grocery money for the children.

I was hospitalized as a result of an accident in May, 1968, and the accident was reported in the Brantford *Expositor*. Three days later I went to see Mr. Nightingale on one of the routine visits to get welfare to buy food for the children. While I was still in the waiting room, Mr. Nightingale said to me: "That wasn't a very smart stunt you pulled." I said it wasn't a stunt. He said: "What were you doing, looking for attention? You will have to come back tomorrow for your payment."

At none of my visits to the welfare office was I ever interviewed in private—it was always in the public waiting room. On one occasion, I asked if we could go into the office to speak and Mr. Nightingale replied: "No, you are not allowed back here."

Mr. Lewis: Public warfare, not public welfare.

Mr. Makarchuk: This is another housewife—now a commercial course student:

In the fall of 1967, my husband left me and went north. The Brant children's aid society had found accommodation for me in the city of Brantford and paid the first month's rent. In January 1968 I went to see Mr. Nightingale, the Brantford city welfare administrator.

I was pregnant and keeping four children. When he recognized me in his office, he said in a very sarcastic tone in front of other persons: "Who are you with now?" We then discussed my accommodation and I explained the CAS had paid the first month's rent. Mr. Nightingale said: "If they pay your rent, then they also pay your food."

He told me to come back when the children were returned to me. When the children were returned by the CAS, I went back the next day. After waiting for three hours, I received a cheque from Mr. Nightingale.

Another lady, a housewife:

On or about September, 1967, my husband deserted me. I went to see Fred Nightingale, the Brantford welfare administrator. In front of everybody in the office and waiting there he said: "What do you want?"

I told him I needed help with my groceries for me and my three children. Mr. Nightingale said: "I didn't tell your

husband to walk out." However, after an argument he gave me assistance. In or about November, 1967, I had no milk for the children. I telephoned Mr. Nightingale to tell him I needed milk. He said he would not give me more money. I had to go to the family service bureau, who gave me tickets for milk.

Here is another housewife:

On or about October, 1966, I was pregnant, I went to see Fred Nightingale, the Brantford city welfare administrator, at the Nelson Street office to get some assistance. He started asking me intimate details about my personal life.

I became embarrassed and replied: "How did anybody get into this trouble?" Mr. Nightingale just said: "Let's face it, your life is nothing but trash." I said: "I don't think you have the right to say it."

He sat there smirking at me. He gave me a cheque. I left the office. On or about January 1967, Mr. Nightingale refused to give me my cheque. I went to see Brantford city mayor Richard Beckett. He phoned Mr. Nightingale and told me to go down and pick up my cheque. I went down and Mr. Nightingale handed me the cheque.

Another housewife:

I had occasional dealings with the Brantford city welfare office for the last four years. On or about August 1966, I was sent by Mr. Innis, of the Brantford family service bureau to see Mr. Nightingale, the city welfare administrator. I needed \$10 to make up the balance of my rent. At this time I was separated and had two children.

In the interview with Mr. Nightingale, he started asking me personal questions such as: "When you knew you were pregnant, why did you go through with it when you are separated?" He asked me intimate details regarding my relationship with my baby's father.

Mr. Nightingale asked me other insulting and degrading questions. I left in tears as I felt I did not have to go through this for \$10. Since then, whenever I needed welfare assistance, I contacted the city alderman who arranged for help.

These are some of the affidavits that I have, Mr. Chairman. I have one here that is probably another example of the type of abuse and insults. This is also a housewife:

On or about August 1966, I went to see Mr. Nightingale, the Brantford city welfare administrator. At this time I was

separated with one child and needed assistance. He refused to give me any help whatsoever. The Brant Children's Aid Society insisted I keep going back for welfare help. After a third visit, he gave me some assistance.

On or about December 1967, I asked for assistance from the welfare office at the request of the Brant Children's Aid Society. At this time I was pregnant and unable to work. Mr. Nightingale started interviewing me in the main office in front of the office secretary and people in the waiting area. I explained to Mr. Nightingale why I needed assistance.

His first reply was: "I should go back and live with my common-law husband for the money." Mr. Nightingale then said: "Why should we give you the money?" I explained why I needed it. He replied: "You should go out on the street and peddle your ass." I walked out.

On another occasion in dispute over hospitalization, Mr. Nightingale called me a liar.

These are some of the problems that have been brought to my attention. They were not solicited. These are people who have problems in dealing with the welfare office and felt so incensed that they came out themselves and swore out affidavits to the kind of abuse that has been going on in various welfare offices.

Now, my purpose in bringing this matter up at this time and reading the evidence here, Mr. Chairman, is to stress the seriousness of the situation. I have another letter here which tries to connect a suicide with the operation of the welfare office. We have other allegations for which we have no hard evidence.

But the point here, Mr. Chairman, is that these are situations that are not peculiar to Brantford. They are quite common to other areas of Ontario, as brought out regarding the Kingston situation and the Windsor situation by the member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick).

As I said earlier, the operation of welfare in Ontario can, and in many cases very seriously does, affect the lives of many people. This is the problem that is not peculiar to Brantford. There is a considerable amount of evidence available to indicate that existing provincial legislation is being terribly abused by welfare commissioners in all parts of Ontario. This is why I call on the Minister today to personally intervene, and if necessary, prevail on the Minister of Muni-

cipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) to change the terms of the Brantford inquiry. All I am asking now is that the judge be given full scope as available under section 241, to carry out an investigation into the operations of the Brantford welfare department.

I am sure the results of the inquiry, under the broad term of reference, would have a direct influence on the operations of not only the welfare department in Brantford, but also all through the province. The consequences of the inquiry can be beneficial to the people of Ontario and useful to the Minister's department in trying to set a consistent, humane pattern for the operation of these departments through the province. Once again, I am asking the Minister to get involved in the vital situation concerning his own department. The date for the start of the inquiry has been set for April 16, and if the Minister is concerned he will have to act in the next few days.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this matter is under judicial review and I think it would be improper of me to make comment on the matter at this time. I will, of course, watch with a great deal of interest what transpires in Brantford. There is no doubt that I have listened with a great deal of interest to all the cases which have—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What in heaven's name is the Minister saying—the matter is under judicial review? The point that the hon. member has just drawn to the Minister's attention is that the terms of reference were deliberately drawn so as to admit of an interpretation which means all that evidence—which is the relevant evidence, concerning the original charges, which relate directly to the Minister's department—cannot be introduced into the inquiry. What sort of a farce is the Minister going to preside over? To suggest, for example, that he cannot comment because this under judicial review—this is the very point. These charges were made in this Legislature with regard to the administration of welfare in this province, but the evidence is not going to be heard by the inquiry. Now, is the Minister going to sit there and let this farce go on?

Mr. Chairman: I would like to determine whether or not this actually is, in fact, under judicial review at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: The point is that the terms of reference have been so drawn as to exclude the evidence which the hon. member for Brantford has now put on the record.

Mr. Lewis: The affidavits.

Mr. MacDonald: The affidavits, and these sworn affidavits were with reference to charges which he originally made in the House. They are now documentation from the people who were victimized in this kind of fashion. For the Minister to get up and say that this is under judicial inquiry and therefore it would be inappropriate for him to comment, is just sheer nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not agree that it is sheer nonsense, it is the position I take. Mr. Chairman, I will discuss the matter and that particular section with the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It just means what I have said.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber was trying to get the floor.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I am willing to speak to this item shortly. I would just say this. I am rather surprised at the hon. Minister. If the member who sat down had been directly attacking the Minister's activities in that area, perhaps there might be some justifiable reluctance to go into the allegations because it would affect the Minister directly. But here the accusations are that a municipal department, which is receiving moneys from this government, is acting improperly. I would have expected the Minister to say we shall look at this immediately to determine the accuracy of the charges.

It does not affect you so directly that you have to try to weasel around the issue, and try to get out of it. There is no justifiable reason why you should not immediately agree to go into these charges and find out if they are meritorious or not. I am not suggesting that if the charges do touch the Minister directly that he ought to weasel out of them. I am just suggesting that here he does not even have that lame excuse for not immediately agreeing to go into these accusations.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I have been informed that the matter is, actually, under judicial review in the city of Brantford.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, you are missing the point. The judicial inquiry that is now being—

Mr. Chairman: No, but the matter of the administration of the welfare office in Brantford is under review.

Mr. MacDonald: The municipal council that set the terms has publicly stated that this evidence that my hon. colleague has put on the House is not going to be entertained in the inquiry. Now, whether or not this view is going to bind the judge, I suppose, is a very pertinent question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Well, I would think it could not.

Mr. MacDonald: But, they drew up the terms of reference and this is an indication of their intent with regard to the terms of reference. Their intent is to exclude the very thing for which the inquiry was set up.

Mr. Chairman: Well, of course, what their intent might be and what the determination of the judge or officiating official might be, are two different things.

Mr. Lewis: Not entirely, with respect, Mr. Chairman. There has been a precedent for this. There have been many precedents for this amongst the Minister's own colleagues, indeed—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Speaking to the remarks of the member for Brantford, he led us to believe that the reason he was reading these affidavits and making these charges—and deliberately misleading the House—was that he was going to relate them to the board of review. He did not; he sat down without mentioning it. He should have brought it up under vote 2002, municipal welfare administration. The hon. member is now asking me to institute an investigation of municipal welfare administration. Why did the hon. member not wait until vote 2002? Then, it would have been proper under discussion.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, with respect, sir. The member for Brantford indicated quite clearly that he was raising the cases in order to illustrate the need for a board of review. He might well have said that had the Minister allowed the board of review to function the last two years, these grievous injustices visited on the people of Brantford would never have occurred, they could have been corrected. We need not have debated them today. I think what the member for Brantford then said, and it is a perfect extension of the logic of the case, is that a board of review not now being available—because the process has gone this far—he comes to the conclusion that he would request the Minister to enlarge the terms of reference to make sure this material is acceptable. Now,

that is not violating a subsection of some estimate discussion, it is just expanding that discussion into a logical conclusion, and the Minister does not have to wait to give his answer, he can give his answer now on this particular point. We will get back to the board of review for the next two or three months as soon as he has given that answer.

Mr. Chairman: Well, in the opinion of the Chair, the matter of the hon. member for Brantford introducing these specific cases as examples of situations that did exist in his particular municipality, did constitute a matter of showing, by example, the need for a board of review, therefore the Chairman feels that, insofar as that was introduced, that it was in order. However, if the matter of the administration of the welfare department in the city of Brantford is under judicial review, I would have to restrict any further debate regarding the city of Brantford welfare administration as *sub judice*.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point, I think, has been made, sir, very carefully made, that the terms of reference of the present so-called judicial inquiry, exclude the introduction of the affidavits which were put to the House this afternoon. They preclude the terms of reference and preclude those affidavits. Now, I do not really understand the attitude of this Minister, when his Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts)—

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. member is not speaking to a point of order now, he is making a statement regarding the hon. Minister. The Chairman has made a ruling that the matter of the administration of the welfare department in the city of Brantford is under judicial inquiry. Any reference to the administration of that particular department would be *sub judice*. I permitted the hon. member's examples to be introduced as reasons for the board of review and I feel that was in order. However, further reference to the general administration of the welfare office or administration in the city of Brantford, would be out of order on the grounds of *sub judice*.

An hon. member: But not discussion of the commission.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, this is only an enquiry, it is not a case of a court inquiry.

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Makarchuk: —and the thing has not started—

Mr. Chairman: If it is under the provisions of The Municipals Act, and a county court

judge will be hearing the matter or investigating it, it certainly is—

Mr. Makarchuk: What we are trying to do here—and I think that the Minister has a responsibility—is to stress the fact that under the present terms of reference, the inquiry would not be complete as the judge would be hamstrung in examining the evidence, the affidavits, which will be provided, and which would be the basis for the inquiry. What we are asking the Minister is to get—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

We are not dealing with what you are asking the Minister. The hon. member has read the affidavits, he has related them to the matter of the need for a board of review and the Chairman has ruled that there will be no more discussion on the administration of welfare in the city of Brantford on the grounds that it is *sub judice*. Now that is my ruling in connection with this matter. The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: I am going to go on to some other topic.

Mr. Chairman: On the board of review?

Mr. Ben: No, not on the board of review. It is on this particular vote.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman did not suggest that you could not return to the board of review.

Mr. Ben: I would just say this before going on to the topic I wish to discuss under this particular vote. I believe the inquiry of which the hon. member for Brantford speaks is under The Public Inquiries Act, although county court judge is sitting to hear it. He is sitting as the *persona designate*. It is not a judicial inquiry, but of The Public Inquiries Act.

I will leave them to argue the merits of my statement. I am going on to something else, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The rules regarding *sub judice* do not restrict the reference to a judicial inquiry, it refers to Royal commissions, and so on—

Mr. Benn: Well, all right—

Mr. Chairman: —and other inquiries.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would permit me to make a suggestion in the interest of orderly discussion of the estimates.

We were discussing the board of review. Perhaps we might deal with that particular matter in its entirety and then proceed with some other item.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we were dealing with vote 2001, is there anything further under the board of review?

Mr. Ben: If I might, I have been trying to get the—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Humber has the floor.

Mr. Ben: I do not propose to deal with that board of review. We could come back to it, but I have sat here patiently trying to raise this one point.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Ben: Thank you. Now, Mr. Chairman, under vote 2001, there are certain grants made, for instance, to the Canadian Welfare Council, Ontario Welfare Council, Canadian Legion of Ontario Provincial Command and the Last Post Fund Royal Canadian Association, and so on, and the Salvation Army, and the Vanier Institute of the Family.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee on youth were meeting, there were many briefs submitted to them. These briefs suggested many reasons why they felt there was a decline in the moral standards of our youth.

I recall reading a brief that was submitted by—I believe it was either the Ontario Orange Order or the Ontario Masonic Order; I think it was the Orange Order. It decried the fact that there were not enough of these youth organizations and what few there were, were not being attended.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have searched through the public accounts and I have found that there were grants under The Department of Education estimates for the particular group of which I am going to speak at this time. I am referring to the boy scouts.

Under the education grants, which have not come up yet, there is a provision—or at least last year there was provision—for a grant to the boy scouts association of \$15,000 and to the girl guides, a grant of \$15,000. Subsequently, under ministerial discretion, there was a further grant to the boy scouts of \$2,500, for a total of \$32,500.

To me, the Boy Scouts Association of Canada is certainly a social, if not a family, service. There is no doubt about it in my mind. Now the boy scouts association serves to prepare our youth for a direct participa-

tion in the social and family life of this community—to make them good citizens; to try to avoid the necessity of the government supplying large sums for reform institutions, for training schools, for jails, even for welfare, if we want to go that far.

I am shocked. In this day and age, all other agencies are crying of the difficulties we are having with our youth. They are pointing out that juvenile delinquency is on the increase. Crime commission reports in the United States, like the presidential commission on crime, point out that the greatest proportion of crime is committed by youngsters, by youths, greatly out of proportion to their numbers in the community.

One would think that, if we are interested in social and family services, if we are interested in the family as a unit, and if we are interested in raising better citizens, as one would imply from the title, then we would take some effort and spend some money to avoid finding our youth in this position.

We should try to do something to keep them out of jails, out of training schools, off welfare rolls—try to give them some respect for society. You might even say we should try to create a new society by leading our youngsters in the right direction.

I look to the Minister's estimates and he will not give them a penny, a farthing, towards—

An hon. member: Department of Education.

Mr. Ben: My dear Mr. Chairman, as you were changing places with the previous chairman, I pointed out that I had searched through the estimates and I did find that, under the Education estimates, there were some funds voted. But I am also pointing out that they ought to be under these estimates.

It is true that something may be taught by the boy scouts that would entitle them to come under the Education estimates, but basically what you want to instill in them is a respect for social order and a desire to implement a new and proper social order, to strengthen family ties. This is where these grants should come and they should not be a miserly \$15,000. There are no funds for the boy scouts in this department, Mr. Chairman, and this is what I am decrying—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You made your point.

Mr. Ben: —this is what I am decrying. There is not a vote in these estimates for this worthy organization. They find great difficulty in functioning.

But perhaps I should declare a conflict of interest, Mr. Chairman, because my older boy is in the stage where he is ready to go into the boy scout movement from the cub movement. They just cannot find sufficient parents to act as scout leaders. The suggestion is that the scouts form themselves in groups of five or six, and the parents take one night a week to lead the boys and once a month they will meet at the church.

I was speaking with a man they call Akela, who is the leader of the cub pack and he brought the suggestion. I pointed out to him that much as I would like to be one of those fathers, being a member of the Legislature here, we meet two nights a week—and now the hon. Prime Minister says we are going to be sitting a further night—that I could not maintain a proper schedule. I said I was willing to pay to have properly qualified scoutmasters teach my son to be a good scout, if I may be pardoned for putting it that way. Because nobody seems to care now—

Mr. Chairman: We have no right to be talking about something that is not in the estimates. It is really under The Department of Education and any further discussion about—

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, if I can discuss an allotment here, or request for funds and argue that not enough funds are being spent—that there should be \$30,000 spent, instead of \$15,000. And if I can say that it would be—

Mr. Chairman: Argue that with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Ben: Let me finish my objection, please. It is a point of order I am speaking on now.

Mr. Chairman: I think I have got your point. We can argue that with the Minister of Education, under whose—

Mr. Ben: Look, I am on a point of order. Have the courtesy to hear out my point of order, will you?

Mr. Chairman: Please proceed.

Mr. Ben: You have the hammer. Please use it with discretion.

Mr. Chairman: Your point of order.

Mr. Ben: I argue on a point of order. If I can argue that the Minister ought to have allocated \$15,000, instead of \$5,000, for a particular service; if I can argue that the

Minister should have allocated \$5,000, instead of \$1,000, for a particular purpose, surely I can argue that he should have allocated \$5,000, instead of nil, for a particular purpose?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Ben: No?

Mr. Chairman: No. I point out to the member that there is no place for discussion of a grant to the Boy Scouts Association of Canada in this department.

Mr. Ben: Well, I say it is a shame—

Mr. Chairman: That is under the Minister of Education!

Mr. Ben:—shame that you, Mr. Chairman, should defend the Minister for not having provided under these estimates for such a worthy organization.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I think you have made your point even though you are out of order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, you have permitted the hon. member to make a very lengthy address and, because it is a very worthy cause, it is one of those situations where to make it a point of order would have been wrong, and I accordingly, did not raise the point of order.

I may say that I have been a cub, a boy scout and long-life supporter of the boy scout movement. I have—

Mr. Ben: Point of order, Mr. Chairman, point of order!

I am quite willing for the Minister to rise and rebut me providing you let me finish my dissertation on this subject. If you rule me out of order then you have to rule him out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Both are out of order. Could we go on to another item please?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have supported the Minister of Education in the grants he has made. Now I bring to the hon. member's attention that if he were not so blind and he could read—I bring it to his attention that there is an item, Yonge Street Mission Youth Centre, \$58,000. "Reaching the Hearts and Lives of Today's Boys and Girls" is the title of this brochure. I shall bring you up to date on it and send this over. This is what the department is doing.

Mr. Ben: Well, why not boy scouts?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Because the boy scouts are being looked after in The Department of Education.

Mr. Ben: For \$15,000, when there are—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Ben: There are 50 times more boy scouts than there are young people at the Yonge Street Mission.

Mr. Chairman: This discussion has continued long enough. Now, the member for Scarborough Centre please.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Yonge Street Mission Youth Centre is a very worthwhile cause—

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, you recognized the member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough Centre please.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you. I would like to ask some questions about the board of review.

I have before me, Mr. Chairman, the Canada Assistance Plan section 6, item c. This contains the undertakings by provinces:

Will ensure the provision by law not later than one year from the effective date of the agreement of a procedure for appeals from decisions by provincially approved agencies with respect to applications for assistance or the granting or providing of assistance by persons directly affected by such decisions.

That is what I want to ask, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the Minister, on what date did the province of Ontario enter into the agreement of the Canada Assistance Plan which was assented to July 15, 1966?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I believe I gave that information at the time that the legislation was discussed in this House a year ago.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Can you not get it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not have the agreement in front of me and accordingly do not have the date of the agreement in front of me.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister then, surely when he had a deadline of not later than one year he must

have some idea in his head about when that deadline came upon him.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We met the requirements of the Canada Assistance Plan.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you. That is what I wanted to know, Mr. Chairman.

Now, in meeting the requirements to that plan, a board of review should have been established for both general welfare assistance recipients as well as family benefit recipients; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, and they were.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Is it the same board of review, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Chairman, all these matters were discussed in this Legislature at the time when the legislation was passed a year ago.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask then, Mr. Chairman, where are the regulations for The General Welfare Assistance Act pertaining to the board of review?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is a section of the Act which makes the provision that all the sections of the one Act apply to the other, *mutatis mutandis*.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you. Having established that, Mr. Chairman, having established that, I would have found some difficulty in not allowing anything to be brought before this vote that pertained to cases which, in all right if the system had been working, would have been dealt with before the board of review and would have saved the time of the House.

I would like to make mention that the Minister would not pay any heed to members of the Opposition. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I myself presented an amendment to the government bill which asked that individuals appealing to the board should have available to him, all records of the department pertaining to him, that he should be represented by council if he so desired. I believe we have covered that all right in the review. But we have not covered that the recipient might be entitled to all records pertaining to him. And, of course, Mr. Chairman, a review which is not going to allow these recipients to have access to his own records means that any decision can be told him without him knowing if it is indeed correct.

We also ask that his expenses of appearing should be defrayed. This too, was ignored. We asked that needy persons be put on the review board and the vote, Mr. Chairman, came down 49 to 35.

I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that had some heed been paid to looking at the regulation and the purpose of a board of review in the light of the recipient, instead of just in the light of the administrators and the government, all of the two hours and more that were spent yesterday on the board of review—and many more which may very well be spent, Mr. Chairman, because the board of review was not set up in the proper way—could have been avoided by anyone on the other side of the House turning the regulations around to ask how they are working for the recipients.

If I might say so, Mr. Chairman, this is very similar to the old landlord tenant Act which is now being overhauled—everything for the landlord, nothing for the tenant. This is exactly where the recipient ends up in the board of review that this government was forced into, in order to accept money from the Canada Assistance Plan.

They would not have entered into it on their own, as other colleagues have pointed out. They were obliged to do so, and it is shocking, that a modern-day government would have to be forced into a board of review.

Mr. Chairman, having been forced into it, they pass an Act; we support it, then they hamstring it completely with second-rate regulations. I will set about to prove it.

The board of review should be composed of not more than ten members, nine plus the chair, as the Minister pointed out yesterday. Yet, further down in the Act we see an item from The Family Benefits Act, 1966, regulation 19-69, made January 26, 1969, filed January 22, 1969, gazetted February 1, 1969.

The section of the Act is 15, and I am speaking about item 1, and then drawing to the fact that there is no resemblance whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, with item 15(a). Under item 15(a)(i) the chairman may authorize one member of the board of review to conduct the hearing and to report to the board. This member has all the powers of the board for the purposes of such hearing.

Item 2 under 15(a). The report of such member may be adopted as the decision of the board of review by two or more members of the board, or may be otherwise dealt with as the board deems proper.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely shocking, and as you can see we are growing apoplectic on this side of the House by this sort of shock. The regulations start out: "The board of review shall be composed of not more than ten people."

It looks like a very healthy situation. We find then, that the decision can rest with one person, providing that person takes the material back and presents it. I can only presume, Mr. Chairman—because it was not outlined in the regulations—that that one person presents the material to two others on the board of review without the recipient being present. Now, this is shocking.

This is a board that the Minister has every right not to be proud of. The only way he can keep this board from public activity, public press, public pressure is that, under item 15(a) 4, all hearings to the board of review shall be held *in camera*.

Then, Mr. Chairman, what really defeats this whole purpose is that the federal government is being had when this government takes moneys and does this sort of thing.

We heard the Prime Minister complain in the Ministers' conferences recently that the federal Minister of Health and Welfare was telling him how to run his government by saying he would give 50 per cent of the cost of juvenile delinquency homes if the government here would put them under The Department of Social and Family Services.

But I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the federal government is not going to be able to put another Act into the hands of this government without directing and insisting what kind of service it is trying to establish from coast to coast in this country.

Look under the regulations, under item 15, number 5, copies of form 6, that is the form. The notice of request for hearing and review mentioned at the end of the regulations, Mr. Chairman, may be obtained from the director by any applicant or recipient on request, therefore.

We heard yesterday; Mr. Chairman, a hundred and one reasons why this will not work for the recipient. If government is making legislation not to work for the recipient, it deserves to bear the brunt of this kind of debate.

I would like to take the shocking case in which the Department of Social and Family Services in the Essex-Windsor area asked the client to report in full to them. I spared the House the reading of the letters to do with

that case, Mr. Chairman, when I made my opening remarks.

Now I would like to point out why this system is simply not working and how close help can come to a person, but nobody offers form 6 and the recipient does not know about form 6. Form 6 is the request for the hearing in review. This is the case of Mrs. Bednarick, Diller Avenue, Essex, Ontario.

On December 23, 1968, Mrs. Bednarick received a letter from The Department of Social and Family Services. As you know, Mr. Chairman, from my lead-off remarks, the client received this letter because members of Parliament had intervened on her behalf. It is a shocking situation in the administration of welfare in the Essex-Windsor area. The letter reads:

Dear Mrs. Bednarick:

Mr. Eugene Whelan, MP, Essex, has personally written advising us of your difficulty. Our senior representative will be calling on you, Mrs. Bednarick, and you may be sure every possible consideration will be given in the needs of yourself and your family.

When thanking Mr. Whelan for his concern, I will also promise to keep him informed.

Best wishes for the holiday season,
Yours sincerely,
James S. Band.

Mr. Lewis: The format of that letter sounds familiar.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mrs. Bednarick has written a note: "This was my first letter I received from James Band."

A note on the next letter, Mr. Chairman: "Mrs. Renwick, this was the letter I sent to Band after my sit-in. His reply to it is stapled on the back of this letter and was sent registered mail:"

Now, you know, Mr. Chairman, from my opening remarks, that the Bednarick family sat in on the welfare office and got action within one hour. They got full benefits within one hour.

January 28, 1969.

Dear Mr. Band:

First may I say thanks a lot for nothing. I hope you will carefully read the enclosed newspaper clipping and the letter from my mortgage company. As you can see from the newspaper article, by last Saturday my situation had progressed to a desperate point. After weeks of waiting on Smith's office—

That, Mr. Chairman, is the local welfare office.

—your official representative, two MPs and my lawyer, I seem to be getting nowhere fast except I was sure I would soon be losing my home.

There is a small correction there, Mr. Chairman, it is one MP and one MPP. As you can see, the government is not even doing a good enough job for people to know the difference sometimes.

I surely did find out there is a lot of truth in the saying about the "power and freedom of the press." With them behind me I had my mortgage money and drug money from Smith within one hour. Whereas, for weeks before that, I had used every ounce of decency and pull I could get to try and accomplish those two things. And believe me, Mr. Band, I got damned tired of crawling and I decided it was about time I got up and walked.

I would give anything to talk to Trudeau and ask him where in hell is this just society we are supposed to be living in. It certainly cannot be in Canada—surely not in Ontario, when we have men like Murray Smith at the head of a government agency.

I know Murray Smith does not have an easy job and believe me, I would not want his job, but there must be a person somewhere more suited to the job—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I know we are nearing 6 o'clock but, on a point of order, are you going to permit the reading of cases of municipal welfare administration on vote 2001, when I continuously bring to your attention that for the orderly discussion of the estimates, those matters should properly come under vote 2002?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have a question—

Mr. Lewis: That is the funniest interjection—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has risen on a point of order. He has pointed out again that the hon. member is referring to municipal administration as such.

Now, the hon. member was going right along the track in referring to the board of review. Perhaps she did get slightly off the track in relating to municipal administration and she should keep any further detailed remarks to vote 2002.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my point was this, I would just like—

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, this might be a good time—

Mrs. M. Renwick: Can I not clarify my point? It will only take a second, really.

My point was this, Mr. Chairman. I have three government letters, from December 23 to January 21, when full benefits were granted; and nowhere in those letters is there any mention of form 6—the opportunity for this client to go to the board of review.

Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, that, when we resume these debates, there will be outlined carefully for us exactly what comes under vote 2001 due to the new structure? And are we not, in fact, approving moneys to go to municipal offices—

Mr. Chairman: No, that comes under vote 2002.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I express the wish that

you, sir, and all members of the House might have a restful and pleasant holiday and a happy Eastertime.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate to us—so the Easter period could be more enjoyable—what will occupy the House on our return?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think we would do what might be ready on the order paper. I do not know how much time would be spent on the order paper on that particular day, but after that work is completed we would return to estimates.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to join with the House leader, but my wishes for the hon. members would be, perhaps, a little different. That would be that not only would you have a restful time, but that you would come back refreshed in mind with your sitting capacity refurbished and your vocal cords in good shape.

But I do hope that everyone will have not only a peaceful, but a restful, time and that we will all be privileged to gather here again when the House reconvenes.

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

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock, p.m., to reconvene at 2:00 o'clock, p.m., April 15, 1969.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

