

Yorkview - the candidates and their views

Mike O'Rourke - PC Jim Fleming - Lib. Fred Young - NDP

EXCALIBUR INTERVIEW: Yorkview riding candidates — Fred Young (New Democratic Party), Mike O'Rourke (Progressive Conservatives) and Jim Fleming (Liberals).

By ALAN RISEN

The weekend of October 2, Excalibur staff writer Alan Risen met individually with the candidates in the Yorkview riding. To each candidate he presented questions concerning such key issues as: Unemployment for University Graduates; American professors in Ontario Universities; Pollution; Spadina; Foreign Investment and Control in Ontario; On-Campus Voter Registration. Here are their answers.

EXCALIBUR: There are approximately 200,000 people out of work in the province. (a) What does your party feel it can do to rectify this situation in general? (b) With so many university students living in this area do you feel that anything can be done to help get them part-time jobs during the school year and full-time jobs for the summer? and (c) What about the students who are leaving the university with BA's, MA's and Phd's that cannot find a job?

YOUNG: The Conservatives have been in power for a long, long time and there is no excuse for this type of unemployment in Ontario. What would we do to rectify it? Well first of all we would undertake a massive house-building program which would give employment not only to the people building houses but to the rug makers and all the trades that are dependent upon house-building. The second thing of course that we would do is start to build the GO transit up the Weston Alignment — that is pertinent to this riding particularly — and of course the Spadina rapid transit line. This of course in Metro would give us very many men in work for a long time to come. Along with this kind of transit will go development around the stations and this, too, means very large construction projects. We think there is no excuse in the world why men should be unemployed at a time like this. In Sweden, the Scandinavian countries, and Britain when they get to one per cent unemployed they become pretty desperate and start to put a little money out to put people to work. We can do the same in Canada. The record of the two old parties is disastrous in this regard.

To answer the third part of your question, with the foreign control of our economy today so much of the research work right now, for example, is going on in the United States by the head offices of the corporations who have the branch plants here in Canada. Now this to me is simply tragic. We are exporting our brains to the United States and this is wrong. So many of our BA's and even our Phd's are roaming around without work simply because we have a partial-employment economy. I think our first job is to get a full-employment economy going so that we have full employment up to one per cent the way they do in the northern European countries. And then I do not think that anybody has to worry about jobs. Certainly there will be demand for everyone, including students who want to work part-time during the college year. It's a matter of bringing the whole economy up to the place where there is a demand for labour. And then the problem is pretty well solved.

O'ROURKE: Let's start back with last December. The Davis government, which was a brand new government, introduced this seasonal employment program where they had people who were unemployed sitting back at home trying to put bread and butter on the table not knowing where it was going to come from. They took these people and they looked for a need and they looked to an area where the government could legitimately spend money to employ these people. Therefore they had them cut down all the dead elm trees along the highways. Now it is innovative programs like these that will create further employment.

Another area is the new program introduced under Mr. Bill Davis whereby Canadian businesses with a selling technique of some product that they would like to put on the market that looks reasonable and profitable in the end can get low cost loans. These people could not get the money from established lending institutions but they can now go to the government. The small business is one that is under \$300,000 a year. By helping individuals create a new product, and developing it and bringing it out in the consumer's market will come more jobs. It is innovative things like this that I like about the Davis government personally. And I think that the government will continue to do many more things in this field.

As for part-time work for students, I think that there is a heck of a lot of it around. I think that one of the major problems with unemployment is that there are jobs available but some people for one reason or another just are not able to get up enough ambition to go out and find them. The welfare in some cases is sufficient enough to keep them at home.

FLEMING: Bill Davis brought down a budget a few months back which had the largest deficit ever in Ontario — \$450 million into the hole — it was a budget close to \$5 billion. And yet there was not one direct effort at either giving money to people to get them to spend to make an upwards cycle and thereby expand the Ontario economy and thereby create jobs. Nor was there any direct job creation program that we would see. For instance in a period like this we would deficit spend even as he has done but we would give direct incentives. The Ontario Development Corporation would be a major part of it. The Take-Over Review Board and stopping the branch plant development and trying to encourage our own industries here would be a part of it. It is a great conglomerate job and it is too bad that you can not say one, two, three, four, here are the miracles we will create.

But what you do is you restructure government. You use your fiscal policy because there are more tax dollars spent by the provincial government than the federal government in Ontario. You use those dollars. You use the Ontario Development Corporation to expand to give incentives to small business. You have to do something but it has to be practical and reasonable. We have to buy back control here because of course that is why we have the problem we have.

In the United States if they have a recession then the first cutbacks come with the branch plants, the branch plants are here and we are suffering. The surcharge just puts weight on that and proves it. So Bill Davis' first priority is to find 200,000 jobs. Our first priority is just to put the whole damned Ontario economy back into some sort of proper form and expand from there. But government would involve itself directly, which Davis has not done. We will do as the federal governments have done over the years in fiscal policy to find jobs.

As for the second part of your question, the federal government had its Opportunities for Youth program. Whether we can do a branch sort of development of that I don't know. Again, the way I have to approach it is to attack what they (the Conservatives) have done because they have created the situation. And then suggest we would not do it that way. For instance they have spent hundreds of millions of dollars developing community colleges and yet they did not even have the common sense to sit down and do a study and say what courses are these people going into; when are the years they will graduate; where will the output be; do we have jobs available? If we don't, for instance if we have 50 students graduating in chemical engineering in a particular area in Sudbury, say, out of a university or a community college, then surely they have to find out whether there are resources available to take up those people. And if there are not perhaps ODC should give some incentive to develop it. But there is no use doing that unless there is a market for the products. It's a matter of tying the whole thing together and giving guidance.

For temporary help for university students and so on? Things like that come with a healthy economy. And that is the only way you can do it. If it is at a point where students in effect cannot go to school because they do not have the money to support themselves you have to take emergency measures. You either have to open up a loan program or you have to have the original interest-free loan situation — and that is not party policy; it is simply my belief. In a crisis-situation where you have a heavy drop-out factor at the university level, then you have to compensate for it. Meanwhile what you have to do first is develop a situation so that your graduates do not find themselves on the job market without jobs after spending all those years struggling through school. And that is where we are at right now — thousands coming out with no jobs available.

EXCALIBUR: We have heard that American teachers are getting priority in getting positions in Canadian universities and that Americans with the exact same qualifications as Canadian teachers are receiving higher pay and quicker promotion. Do you feel that it would be at all possible to institute Canadian content laws in staffing Ontario universities? If so, what would they be?

FLEMING: I do not think that either of the other two parties as far as I've seen have a program that sets down point by point by what we will do, this and that. We do. In the Blueprint for Government (the Liberal Party policy handbook) we explain point by point exactly what we will do. It says that within two years the majority of the total teaching staff of the universities must be Canadian citizens and within six years two-thirds of the teaching staff of each individual department must be Canadian citizens. The idea being that if professors or lecturers come in from outside, we feel that they are not only here to earn a living but also to enjoy the country and to be a part of it. Then they should become citizens. Otherwise we want Canadians. It is a very tight program. People have challenged me on that and said, "Can we do it?" And it seems to be the essence is not "Can we do it?", but to put absolute pressure on to do as much as we possibly can. If we find out later on that we can't meet that time demand without really seriously affecting the quality of education at the university level, then maybe we will talk about changing it. But I would like to have the deadline there to force heavy development of our own professors and teachers.

O'ROURKE: I do not know about Canadian content laws. What you are really talking about is a philosophy — a philosophy of the educational system in the university. I don't pretend to know exactly what is happening in the universities today. What I am concerned about though is that we are achieving the purpose in having the university structure as it is. That is that we are educating the student in the most feasible way whereby he is fed a challenge; he reacts to it; and some good comes from it. Whether the professors be American or Canadian, if they have the best qualities — whether they have done research work and have had their books printed and things like this, should be of no consequence. If the university professor has the ability to take the student and put him through classes and educate him in the best way possible, then this should be the priority — not whether they are Canadian or American.

YOUNG: It is perfectly possible to institute, as you suggest, Canadian content laws in staffing our universities. This is simply part and parcel of the total penetration of the American economy into the Canadian economy. Our own young people certainly can be trained and are being trained to take on these type of jobs. I suppose that when the universities were expanding so rapidly were paying the price of past neglect. So we brought in teachers from outside and they are now established in senior posts. But there is no reason in the world why from this point on our young people who are qualified should not be taken on and given real priorities in our universities, just as they are in almost every other country in the world.

EXCALIBUR: What can be done to keep the costs of university residence fees down?

FLEMING: Surely that is part of your overall university affairs planning. I am not deeply familiar with that particular problem. When I went to Varsity I stayed in a residence. I went through that particular problem. It started out with \$550 a year and then up to \$600 the next year then up to \$660. It has been a steady climb. In my last year I found myself in a

basement flat — which I enjoyed much more by the way. But there is no easy solution except to say that obviously if it comes to a point where people cannot afford to live in residences or find a home because they are going to school, you have got to solve the problem. Are you convinced we are at that point?

Quite frankly I don't have any depth of knowledge in that area. It is hard to be an expert on all things. I would think that if you have a genuine problem there, then come on back to me and I will look into it and try and find out what I personally think can be done. Obviously if the situation is critical where students cannot go to school because they cannot find accommodation, you have to solve that situation.

O'ROURKE: To tell the truth I really do not know what the cost of a university residence is. Education is one thing that I would very much like to investigate, if elected, in a very thorough way. It is very hard to give neat and tidy answers. I would like to make sure of the right answer before I talk about it.

YOUNG: Other countries are keeping these costs down. I mentioned the Scandinavian countries before. I have seen in some of those universities where young people come in, they are given free tuition and most of the residential costs are paid. These people think in terms of the training of our young people being just as important as training in the army for killing each other, and just as important as training of apprentices in other fields. We think that the cost of education is an investment in human skill and human brain. The more we train our young people the greater putting it on a cross level — the greater the wealth production is going to be in the years to come. We think that it is just a real good investment.

And ever since the New Democratic Party was formed we said that education should be made as free as possible. It should not depend on the dollar sign and the size of the purse of the parent. It should depend entirely upon the student's ability and his willingness to work. As long as he is showing initiative, as long as he is showing a willingness to work, and he is willing to study and is getting a reasonably good mark, then nothing should be put in his way.

EXCALIBUR: What about the question of pollution? What do you feel should be done here?



Jim Fleming — Liberal

Fred Young — NDP

Mike O'Rourke — PC

O'ROURKE: There has been a strengthening on the Ontario Water Resources Commission. And getting into the question of pollution: if a company has been found guilty through the courts of polluting once, is later taken back and found guilty twice, both times being given minimal fines, it is like the old ball game — three times and you are out. And the government does provide fines of up to \$10,000 a day.

But perhaps something more should be done and can be done. Perhaps instead of taking money out of petty cash to pay the fines, companies should be more heavily fined. We have arrived at the point where we cannot allow the environment to be polluted and it is about time we got very, very tough with those who do not co-operate.

YOUNG: The classic case, of course, is where Domtar was fined \$1,000 one day and the next day was given \$450,000 forgivable loan. This is incredibly bad. The other classic case, of course, is where Dow Chemical pouring the mercury into the St. Clair River was taken to court rather than the government saying "You have got to pay for the cost of cleaning it up." They have been taken to court with the result that we cannot even discuss the issue in this election campaign. It is subverted, you see. We should have simply passed legislation about this situation and force Dow to clean up the mess. But instead of that, the government simply chose to take them to court and bury the thing for another ten years. And this is incredibly bad.

What the fine lines are far too low. We would increase the fines dramatically. We would put all the industries that are polluting under ministerial order. We would give them a reasonable time limit and say that by the end of this time limit you must clean it up. Now if they can come up with the proof that science has not yet discovered how to do this thing then we should take a long careful look as to whether or not this process is socially beneficial. I think that almost any industry can find a way if it is told it must re-cycle it waste and bring it back into a viable substance. There is no reason in the world why we should have the kind of pollution we have today, except that I am afraid that too often the two old parties are too dependent for campaign funds on the large corporations. So they let them get away with murder.

FLEMING: Yes O.W.R.C. has reached a really nonsensical point. We would put it back under control of the legislature. We would increase the fines and stiffen the laws against polluters. We would also have a final factor where we would jail executives if even after stiff fining companies do not comply both in air and water pollution. We would change the law in the sense that now when the Crown sues the money that it receives if it wins the case cannot be directly

distributed to those people who have suffered. We would change that to where the Crown can sue on behalf of the little guy who suffers as a result of a major polluter. To balance things up where Big Business can afford the best in law and the little guy cannot fight it, the government would take over the fight for the little guy.

Our pollution program is extremely tough. You will notice that the Tories only a month or two ago created a Department of the Environment which is exactly what we have been advocating for a year and a half to two years. For me that is basically it. That (1) we would make the law such that government itself, through the Justice department or the Attorney General's office would attack major polluters with much tougher laws and fines that would make it uneconomical for companies, no matter how large, to continue to pollute, and even after that if they would defy it we would jail the executives. I do not think that you can do anything much tougher than that.

On the other hand, however, we would also offer long-term, low-interest loans; we would offer to sit down with them and discuss what their problems are and what their profit margin is — you know, how much they are up against it in order to correct their situation. But ultimately, even if it meant affecting their plant, if we thought that the pollution damage was more critical than their survival as an operation, then they would be shut down.

EXCALIBUR: What is your stand on the Spadina Expressway issue?

O'ROURKE: I personally was pleased that government did not allow Spadina to go through. I ask you the question: how can you justify the government spending as much of the taxpayers' money on one roadway as it did on the entire St. Lawrence Seaway? I do not see how that taxpayers alone can stand up and allow it to happen. As far as this city being car-oriented, it is about time things are changed. The city is made for people and not for cars. The government has a plan to put in a rapid transit system and I feel that this is the answer — not expressways.

YOUNG: Where as far as the Spadina is concerned all three parties have said that they will not complete the expressway because of the pollution factor involved and because of the

difficulty of parking cars downtown. In the next five years with expressways being built, the downtown area would be impossible. So all three parties are on record as being against the expressway, and as being a member of one of those parties I simply stand with the party policy. I must.

But let me say this, as an alternative I have been pushing hard for rapid transit to be completed along Spadina. Our party says that provincial government should grant Metro 75 per cent of the cost and loan it the other 25 per cent at low interest so that we can get started on this thing. The other thing that I have been pressing for is the GO transit to go up the Weston Alignment to Woodbridge and up to Malton. So that with free parking many of our people then could get downtown quickly. We could take our car to one of the free parking areas alongside the stations and go downtown and tie in with the cross-town TTC. This would solve much of the problem. It is a matter of taking those people who will take public transit off the highways by providing quick, rapid, cheap means for them to get downtown.

FLEMING: The party policy is that \$140,000,000 has already been spent on it and you cannot waste that kind of money. Spadina is not an environmental problem. The auto pollution is there now. The volume of traffic is there now. It was not an expressway for the future, it was the fourth side of the quadrant. Obviously in the long range rapid transit is the answer.

A great deal of study and a great deal of public education is going to have to be done in order to convince people to get out of their cars and into rapid transit. It is going to have to be very fast, very efficient and very economical. How government can manage that, is still a huge question mark. But that has got to be done. Countering the immediate problem of car pollution we set a deadline on proper emission and control. I believe it is by 1974 that all cars would have to meet the standard established.

And meanwhile the party says that Spadina would go down to Eglinton right away. And meanwhile there would be an objective study, it would be very easy to say just push it right through, but there would be an objective study, and if that study justifies it being put through for long range rapid transit and service vehicles for short term answering this terrible mess where you have got side streets jammed up and worse pollution than you would have with the Spadina at the moment.

The best example I can give that the whole Stop Spadina issue is a lie, is that York Township is now spending \$1,000,000 in expatriating 70 homes to widen streets because Spadina isn't being built. They simply must do this because of traffic

because of traffic volumes. This is sheer madness. You are doing a worse thing surely. Spadina should be the end of expressway building in Metro. But for Bill Davis to stop it and say "Folks in the future it is going to be rapid transit" and not say how, not say immediately what he will do for the people in northwest Metro, is the height of political opportunism.

EXCALIBUR: How do you see the role of foreign investment in Ontario in the next few years?

O'ROURKE: Decreasing. In years ahead I think you are going to see that many more Canadian companies are going to take hold. And the government is going to make sure that Canadian companies do have preference over the Americans. It is a real thorny question. You have the American companies here, they are established, they are providing jobs for Canadian workers, and we are trying to discourage them from competing in our markets. They are our biggest customers. It is one hell of an economics question. It is something that is going to take a lot of thought and original ideas to solve. I think that our government has worked in a positive way in this respect. For example in the assistance to the McClelland book publishing industry. Things like this are positive steps and we have to encourage it and keep on going. I think that there has been a shift of emphasis in policy with regard to foreign ownerships since the Davis government came in. And if the Conservatives get elected I feel that you will undoubtedly see new legislation concerning this.

FLEMING: I do not think that you can just cut off foreign investment automatically, as the N.D.P. bravely suggests from time to time, the economy would absolutely crumble. You would not only have university students coming out of work, but you would probably have wild extremes. It would not even be a recession; it would be a depression if you just cut off American dollars. The 10 per cent surcharge has proven just how vulnerable we are. They are our major buyer and we maintain a false standard of living in the sense that we only have it on the level of our exports.

What we have to do is drive a much harder bargain. The takeover of the U. Board is party policy. We cannot allow any company of any size to be bought out by an American company simply because they can offer that extra couple of hundred thousand dollars in price because they are huge. The Americans came in here and spent the money when many of us didn't have the guts to do it. We went to play with our money down in New York. Now we are paying for it. But we would check them (the sale of Canadian companies) all out and we would not allow American takeovers.

What we would try and do is, as I mentioned earlier on, use Ontario Development Corporation to give incentives for those companies to remain Ontario companies and to remain in Canadian hands. We would force more cycling of raw materials. For instance the American companies come in here now and just take our ore out of the ground and put it in their ships take to their ports and have it refined there and made into sheet metal there and then made into can openers. We must demand that it be refined and made into iron here. We must drive a much harder bargain with natural resources. We must have that kind of approach. And I think that in those areas our greatest wealth lies and our greatest long-range potential lies. As time goes on they will need us more and more in those areas. There is every reason to believe we can demand much more of them and in that way bolster our own economy.

YOUNG: One thing that we have to get clear is that we just have not had any real foreign investment in Canada for some time. We have heard a lot of fairy tales about how we need foreign money to develop this country. But the facts are that since 1967-68 we have had more of an outflow than an inflow. I think that the figures from 1968 is that we had of every dollar of money which bought up foreign control of Canada only six dollars came from the United States or from outside the country. The rest was money generated within Canada, borrowed from Canadian institutions. This to me is tragic. Over the past ten years, as a matter of fact, we have had more than a \$2.5 billion total outflow from Canada to the United States. This is in the form of profits, dividends, management fees, all kinds of levies which the head office placed upon the branch plants. So that we just haven't had any kind of real investment from outside Canada.

At the same time, we have been getting our industries more and more brought under the domination of the United States simply by the use of our own money. We provide it. The myth that Canadians won't invest is just a myth. The thing that we can do, you see, is exactly what the United States itself did a century or two ago, when British money was flowing in and controlling United States' industries. They cut that off. Mexico cut off American money recently as far as share capital is concerned which brought control.

What we can do is to say to the Americans, "We'll welcome your money, but it must be bonds bearing the going rate of interest." That does not bring control. In other words, we would borrow \$5 million from the United States for a specific industry. The share capital is held in Canada. The control is held in Canada. But as the money, we pay off the bonds and the interest and the control is still here, it isn't over there. This is the kind of thing that we have got to do, just as Mexico did, just as the Scandinavian countries did. Almost every country in the world, practically, except Canada, has taken this step long ago. And we have to take it if we are going to be masters of our own house here.

EXCALIBUR: Can you comment on the present system of collective bargaining. Is it hurting or benefiting the public's interests?

O'ROURKE: Maybe. Maybe we have to take a fresh look. Personally, I was very disappointed that the Telegram was forced to close down. The Tely was with us for quite some time but simply could not afford the raises the unions asked for. But you asked the question and I will leave it up to you to answer it.

YOUNG: Well the strange thing is that in countries where you have governments like the New Democratic Party you do not have serious strikes. Sweden hasn't had a serious labor dispute until this last year, and it was not that bad, for 40-50 years.

The thing is that as long as we have the kind of adversary system we have today — bosses against workers, and the refusal on the part of employers to share the increase in productivity with the workers until they strike to get it — as long as we have that, we are going to have strikes and we are going to have real serious trouble. Now what some countries have done is set up a system whereby they look ahead and they say, "If we are going to increase the productivity by 6 per cent over the next twelve months, or 12 per cent over the next two years, then together, the trade unions, the employer's groups, and the government sit down and say, "Well now this is the area within which we bargain. We want to make certain that as productivity increases, the benefits go out to every segment of the population — that wages can increase by this level, that profits can go up by this much, that salaries can increase by this percentage. And within those areas, then, bargaining takes place in individual plants.

In other words, there is a willingness within those societies for increase in productivity to be shared by those people who are responsible for that productivity — that is the people with the capital, but also the people who provide the labor and the brain and the brains to do the job. I think that this is fundamental to any society that wants to get away from labor problems. We must think in terms of — well last for example in Canada we have a gross national product of near \$90 billion. Now that is about \$20,000 for every Canadian family. And yet the people who hold economic power have not been willing without a real fight to give up any of that increased productivity. And so we have a big proportion of our people working for very low pay even today with that kind of productivity. We have to work out the planning of our economic system — as wealth increases, wealth is distributed. I think that if we work that out then much of the difficulty you mentioned is going to be overcome.

EXCALIBUR: Do you think that it is possible to institute these type of policies in Canada?

YOUNG: If we elect New Democratic governments in Canada, yes. Otherwise, no. I think with old party policies, controlled as they are and financed by the business world, we are simply going to continue to have this kind of disruption and it will get gradually worse. And the pressure will become greater and greater to keep the working man, so-called, in his place. I think with a proper kind of government, with an enlightened policy, these pressures can be relieved. You will never get rid of industrial disputes or strikes entirely because as long as you believe in free collective bargaining you are going to get demands which are unreasonable; you are going to get refusals which are unreasonable; and you are going to get industrial disputes this way. But I think that you can overcome a great many of the problems that we face today.

FLEMING: I think that labor fought hard and won the right to collective bargaining simply because the problem of capitalism — maximising the profits at anyone's expense but their own — is true. That was a part of our history. You cannot destroy the collective bargaining system. But I do think that the unions must make a very real effort towards becoming Canadian unions — where their funds remain in this country, where they elect their own senior executives.

I think that there is real consideration going to have to be made in finding other means than the strike as your tool in collective bargaining. The best example is the crane and elevator operators a few weeks back who went on strike for \$2.50 an hour raise. There were about 300 of them involved and they put 10,000 of their would-be brothers and sisters out of work in the process. Of course the people put out of work did not get any strike pay. They suddenly go on welfare and unemployment insurance and the unemployment cycle is accelerated. I really think that a means must be found, but that means must be satisfactory to labor as well as management, of avoiding the strike at all costs. It has just become a factor that cripples and it costs the labor and the working class much more than it does big business.

EXCALIBUR: Some of the resident students at York have been having trouble getting enumerated and registering in this riding as voters. Have you received any complaints about this?

O'ROURKE: Yes, I have received some complaints about this. Right here is a list of names of students here from York that are having problems. Yes, I'm looking after them.

FLEMING: I have canvassed University city, the complex close to the campus. I will be going to the campus with Bob Nixon within a week or so. I have very strong feelings on that. Once again, now this might sound terribly political but it is the truth. The government, the conservatives, pass an act which says, "you will vote wherever you spend the bulk of your time, where your responsibilities are." The university community is an important segment of the community. York is entirely within this riding. In time if York became one-quarter of the population of this riding, then they should have that much influence.

YOUNG: I have received some complaints about this. I was on the select committee which revised the election law. Our first recommendation was that students could elect to vote either where they were living (at their homes), or at the university. And that was the law up until last summer when suddenly the Conservatives brought in the regulation that students should vote by proxy. We fought this in the House and we insisted that the regional law be the best. But the government with its majority steamrollered the situation.

Further information on any of the issues or candidates is available at the Yorkview riding candidates' headquarters: Fred Young (N.D.P.) - 211-8611
Jim Fleming (Lib.) - 249-7137
Mike O'Rourke (P.C.) - 247-5367